



# FRIDAY MAILING

4/17/98

## INCLUDED IN THIS FRIDAY MAILING:

- Waste Management Committee Meeting Summary – February 9, 1998
- Technical Report Summary: Habitat Area Project Work Plan
- Technical Report Summary: Waste Acceptance Criteria Attainment Plan for the On-Site Disposal Facility
- Monitoring Committee Meeting Summary – February 9, 1998
- Steering Committee Meeting Summary – March 11, 1998
- Bi-Monthly Meeting Draft Agenda – May 16, 1998
- Newsclippings

## CAB MEETINGS:

- FERNALD CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD MEETING:** The CAB will meet on Saturday, May 16, 1998, at 8:30 a.m. in the Alpha Building, 10967 Hamilton-Cleves Highway.

## OTHER MEETINGS:

- COMMUNITY REUSE ORGANIZATION MEETING:** The CRO will meet on Tuesday, May 5, 1998, at 6:30 p.m. in the Jamtek Building, 10845 Hamilton-Cleves Highway.
- MAY MONTHLY PROGRESS BRIEFING:** The May Monthly Progress Briefing will be held on Tuesday, May 12, 1998, at 6:30 p.m. in the Alpha Building, 10967 Hamilton-Cleves Highway.

## 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: <a href="mailto:john.applegate@law.uc.edu">john.applegate@law.uc.edu</a>
Doug	Fax: 648-3629	E-Mail: [redacted]

ON-SITE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PLEASE NOTE

**Topics:**

- Silo 1 and 2 Proof of Principle (POP) Request for Proposal (RFP)
- Accelerated Waste Retrieval (AWR) Project
- Revision of the Silo 3 RFP

**Attendees:**

CAB members:	Lisa Crawford
	Doug Sarno
	Bob Tabor
	Gene Willeke
DOE:	Nina Akgunduz
Fluor Daniel Fernald:	Richard Maurer
	Dennis Nixon
	Tisha Patton
	John Smets
	Karen Wintz
OEPA:	Kelly Kaletsky
USEPA:	Gene Jablonowski

**Results:**

- Upcoming workshop on procurement practices
- Requested breakdown of vendor decisions and RFP stipulations for the AWR
- Requested information on vendors for Silo 3 RFP
- Nina Akgunduz to provide her thoughts on use of committees

**Meeting Summary:***Silos 1 and 2 POP RFP*

Nina Akgunduz and Dennis Nixon began the meeting with a discussion of the Silos 1 and 2 POP RFP. Currently, Fluor Daniel is working to incorporate the comments received from OEPA, stakeholders at the Monthly Progress Briefing, two members of the public, two consultants, and six vendors into the RFP. After the RFP is issued, FDF plans to have three conferences in order for vendors to ask questions and clarify items in the RFP. August 10th is the Enforceable Milestone for awarding the RFP. Currently, the POP RFP is ahead of schedule.

*AWR Project*

Richard Maurer discussed the AWR Project. The Commerce Business Daily (CBD) announcement was issued in December. To date, there have been eleven responses from vendors that have proposed using a variety of methods for the AWR system. The Statement of Work will be available in late March with the RFP issued in late June. FDF will continue to keep the public briefed at the Monthly Progress Briefings. Throughout the AWR process, FDF wants to utilize technical teams composed of outside experts to evaluate the project. Lisa Crawford suggested that these teams have continuity so that members will be clear on how the project is progressing. FDF envisions providing electronic information to everyone on these teams so that they will not have to physically visit the site. Lisa would like FDF to bring the whole team together, however, when major issues arise.

There are 6 major systems involved with the AWR project: the radon control system, the tank transfer area, the waste retrieval system, the decant sump waste retrieval, the transfer area waste retrieval, and the full-scale mock-up system. The radon control

system will be responsible for controlling radon emissions from the silos and tanks. The transfer tank area will consist of ten tanks inside of a concrete "bathtub." This "bathtub" will be large enough to hold 100% of the material from the largest tank and will serve as a radiation barrier. The waste retrieval system will involve not only the transfer of the material from the silos into the tanks, but will also require gross decontamination of the silos. During the full scale mock-up, surrogate material will be placed into Silo 4 and the equipment will be used to transfer this material to the tanks. The mock-up will also serve to train the equipment operators. System operability will be tested during the mock-up and then the procedures will be written based on information gained during this experience.

The contractor will be responsible for constructing the radon control system. This system will not only be necessary to prevent the release of radon into the atmosphere, but will also need to prevent over/under pressurization in the silos, which could lead to radon release. The contractor must provide local and remote controls and alarms, redundancy in key equipment, and monitoring and sampling for all emissions. The results of this monitoring will be reported as part of the site-wide monitoring.

Another system for which the contractor will be responsible is the silo waste retrieval system. This system must not impact the silo integrity. The load will have to be limited on the dome during waste removal and the berm will have to be lowered as waste is removed. The contractor will also be responsible for ensuring that radiation releases are limited.

The tanks that are constructed must be compatible with the chemistry of the materials to prevent corrosion. Currently, corrosion testing is being done with various materials, primarily carbon steel. This testing will be provided to the vendor within 45 days. Lisa felt that the results of this testing should be available before designs are begun so that certain materials could be eliminated. Doug Sarno asked whether the requirements for D&D were being considered as part of the material selection process. These are being considered and FDF intends to free release the tank material at the end of the project. The AWR project also stipulates that the tank design life be 20 years although the material should all be treated before that time. The tanks would be surrounded by a secondary containment system that would be able to hold 100% of the stored material in the largest tank. Lisa was concerned that more than one tank would fail or that radon could be released because there would be no top to the containment area. Water could be placed on top of the waste to prevent the radon from escaping. Doug asked whether there was extra room in the tanks so that any leakage from one tank could be placed in another tank. The tanks will, however, be filled to capacity. Lisa thought it would make more sense if each tank was contained separately. There will be partition walls inside of the containment area. The committee was concerned that the requirements in the RFP were not going to be detailed enough and that the contractor would be able to make all of these important decisions without the public input. Richard Maurer stated that these are only the key elements that will be followed throughout the RFP process. Doug stressed that response, impact, and planning for accidents are all very important to stakeholders and FDF must be prepared to explain its rationale for making certain decisions. Gene Willeke said he would be happy if the vendor would provide this rationale. Doug wanted a breakdown of what decisions would be made by the vendor and which would be stipulated in the RFP.

Silo 4 has been examined for integrity to give an indication of the integrity of Silos 1 and 2. The degradation of the silo has not been as bad as expected. The minimum compressive strength was found to be 3000 psi. Since Silo 4 is in fairly good condition and it contains no material, Silos 1 and 2 are expected to be in even better condition.

### *Silo 3 RFP Revisions*

Karen Wintz gave a review of the revisions being made to the Silo 3 RFP. Off-site treatment will be included in the RFP, but the necessary revisions will take some time to complete. One reason for this is the way the evaluation process is structured. The process is two-step: first proposals are received and evaluated, then a short list is developed to be further evaluated. A parallel path will have to be designed for off-site and on-site treatment options so that off-site treatment options will make it to the second evaluation stage. The criteria for this evaluation will also have to be modified to be sure they are broad enough to include both options. In either case, the transportation cost to NTS for disposal will be the same and FDF will be responsible for that cost. Gene requested information on the schedule for Silo 3. The bids will be made in May. Doug wants a timeline. Lisa wants to make sure that potential vendors are aware of the public participation process.

Nina Akgunduz expressed concern that the comment periods for the RFPs are becoming general comment periods. She suggested that a more focused group be developed that would be interested in reviewing these technical documents. She feels that such a group would provide more constructive comments to FDF. Doug said that he would be happy to have more members of the community attend the committee meetings, but would be wary of such a group trying to replace general stakeholder comments. Nina stated that she would like to somehow streamline the review process, but not replace the general public. Doug felt that it would be very difficult to streamline the process without cutting people out. Lisa said that releasing a document full of other people's comments would not be the same as being involved in the actual process. Doug stated that the CAB would be discussing issues about how to make the best use of the committees and asked Nina to write out her feelings so that the CAB could talk about them. Doug stated that two issues were probably involved: value to FDF and value to the public, which are not always the same.

Lisa was concerned that people don't understand how the procurement process works and suggested that a two-hour workshop be held outlining these procedures. This workshop should be invitation only and not include contractors. The committee agreed that a workshop would be a good idea.



**FERNALD  
CITIZENS  
ADVISORY  
BOARD**

**Waste Management Committee Meeting Summary**

**February 9, 1998**

**page 3 of 3**

4



**FERNALD  
CITIZENS  
ADVISORY  
BOARD**

### **What is the Habitat Area Project?**

The Habitat Area Project is one of five Supplemental Environmental Projects to be done as part of the OU4 Dispute Resolution. An agreement was reached between DOE and EPA to provide these extra projects in response to the missed milestones caused by the failure of the Fernald Vitrification Facility. Other projects include recycling projects and ecological research grants. The habitat area will be an area on the FEMP property that facilitates wildlife viewing and education. It will be located in the perimeter area along the western border of the FEMP. The project will consist of a small parking area, a short nature trail, several interpretive signs, and two platforms which overlook restored ecosystems. The restored ecosystems will not be accessible to the public; therefore, the nature trail will be surrounded by small areas of each ecosystem: tallgrass prairie, old field, and deciduous woodlots. This Work Plan outlines the design and implementation of this project.

### **To what other projects will the Habitat Area Project be related?**

- **Soil Certification:** The area in which the project will be placed is not known to have any contamination; however, the Soil Excavation Plan (SEP) will be used to certify the area before construction begins.
- **Research Grants:** The overlook areas will be constructed by local universities and the Hamilton County Park District, with grants outlined as additional Supplemental Projects.
- **Natural Resource Restoration Plan:** The Habitat Area Project is in accordance with the sitewide restoration plan outlined in the NRRP.

### **How will the habitats be maintained?**

DOE-FEMP will assume all maintenance activities until a sitewide long-term maintenance agreement is established. For trees and shrubs, maintenance will be primarily in the form of weed control, using either chemicals or mowing/trimming. Care will be taken not to harm the planted saplings and seedlings. The chemical weeding solution will consist of 1% Roundup. The tallgrass prairie will be controlled by periodic mowing, which will occur less frequently as the habitat matures.

### **What are additional concerns?**

The land on which the Habitat Area Project will be located is currently leased to a nearby landowner for grazing. Leasing agreements will allow the grazing to continue until March 1998.

### **What is the cost of the project?**

The estimated cost of the Habitat Area Project is \$173,000. This figure includes estimates for permitting, design, and construction costs.

### **What is the schedule for the project?**

The schedule now calls for certification of the area on June 3, 1998, and for construction to begin July 8, 1998. Revegetation activities can only occur in the spring and fall. If revegetation cannot be completed by December 1, 1998, the activities will be rescheduled for March 1, 1999. Planting will not be conducted between April 15 and September 15, 1998.



## What is the Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC) Attainment Plan for the On-Site Disposal Facility?

This document is a support plan for the OSDF that is used with the Impacted Materials Placement (IMP) Plan to define the on-site disposal requirements for materials generated by environmental restoration and D&D activities. The IMP Plan defines the material size and configuration considerations associated with waste placement in the OSDF and provides engineering-based requirements for material conditioning, segregation, placement, and compaction to enhance the long-term integrity and performance characteristics of the facility. The WAC Attainment Plan complements the IMP Plan by defining the radiological, chemical, and physical WAC for all materials destined for placement in the OSDF.

## What are the goals of the WAC Attainment Plan?

The Plan has four goals:

- 1) To consolidate all of the sitewide WAC into a single document.
- 2) To present the WAC attainment strategies for each waste stream that is targeted for on-site disposal.
- 3) To describe the quality assurance, quality control, and organizational responsibilities for WAC attainment.
- 4) To identify the plans for accommodating independent oversight by EPA and OEPA in the attainment demonstration process.

## What actual materials are destined to be disposed in the OSDF?

The primary materials for on-site disposal include all contaminated in-place soil and soil stockpiles (OU5); the waste materials present in the South Field, Active and Inactive Flyash Piles, the Lime Sludge Ponds, and the Solid Waste Landfill (OU2); and the debris resulting from sitewide facility D&D efforts (OU3). These materials represent 2.5 million cubic yards. Smaller amounts of other materials, including personal protective equipment, water and treatment plant residuals, analytical laboratory sample returns, and other solid wastes will also be disposed in the OSDF. Any materials excluded from disposal in the OSDF will be disposed of off-site. For the purposes of the WAC Attainment Plan the materials to be disposed in the OSDF are divided into three broad categories:

- 1) Soil and soil-like material (soil and soil-like materials will compose 85% of all the waste in the OSDF.)
- 2) Facility D&D debris (this debris is further subdivided into ten categories which are all eligible for disposal in the OSDF except for process-related metals; acid brick; product, residues, and special materials; and lead sheeting unless treated.)
- 3) Ancillary remediation waste (these waste streams do not lend themselves to WAC attainment planning and must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.)

Materials containing free liquids, whole or shredded scrap tires, and oil are categorically excluded from disposal in the OSDF.



## What are the WAC limits and how were they derived?

For soil, the WAC were derived through fate-and-transport modeling, to ensure the long-term protection of the Great Miami Aquifer (GMA) underlying and down gradient of the OSDF. The modeling used a conservative approach that assumed:

- An OSDF performance of 1000 years.
- The hydraulic and geochemical barrier properties of the OSDF engineered earthen liners and caps.
- The persistence and mobility characteristics of the constituents placed in the facility.
- The hydraulic and geochemical properties of the grey clay liner beneath the OSDF.
- The potential for cumulative impacts to the GMA.
- No credit for the additional protectiveness of the geomembranes and the high-density polyethylene barriers that are part of the liners and caps of the OSDF or any of the natural geologic layers separating the OSDF from the GMA.

The results of this analysis found that WAC limits were necessary for 12 of the 93 constituents of concern at the FEMP. This modeling was repeated for RCRA-regulated constituents; 6 of the 27 RCRA constituents needed WAC limits.

The modeling done for soil was adjusted to apply to debris material. These result found that only total uranium and technetium-99 have the potential to enter the GMA. The OU3 ROD reflected these results and stipulated that all uranium-contaminated debris materials, with the exception of visually discernible process materials, can safely be disposed of in the OSDF. The WAC development model identified that a total mass limit of 105 grams of technetium-99 could safely be placed into the OSDF, thus materials with the highest levels of technetium-99 contamination will be shipped off-site for disposal.

Ancillary waste must meet the soil WAC if they are soil-like or the debris WAC, if they are debris-like.

## What other subjects are covered by this document?

The WAC Attainment Plan reviews the procedures outlined within the Sitewide Excavation Plan for characterizing and removing impacted soils. The Plan also outlines the tracking procedures to be used to keep track of removed soils and debris until they are placed into the OSDF.


**Topics:**

- Sitewide Monitoring and Sampling
- Copper Ingot Recycling

**Attendees:**

CAB members:	Pam Dunn Darryl Huff Bob Tabor Gene Willeke
CAB Support:	Doug Sarno
DOE:	Kathi Nickel Pete Yerace
Fluor Daniel Fernald:	Mark Cherry Bob Lehrter
OEPA:	Donna Bohannon Bill Lohner Tom Ontko
USEPA:	Gene Jablonowski

**Results:**

- Future presentation on excavation and WAC levels in soils
- Upcoming stakeholder meeting to discuss copper recycling
- Further discussion of copper recycling

**Meeting Summary:**
***Sitewide Monitoring and Sampling***

Kathi Nickel began the meeting with a discussion of sitewide monitoring and sampling. She noted that there has been some confusion as to the difference between monitoring and sampling. Soils are sampled and not monitored; therefore, they are not included in the Integrated Environmental Monitoring Plan (IEMP). Soils are not monitored because they are assumed to remain the same and not change over time. To take a sample, an aliquot is removed and analyzed. Monitoring involves taking samples over a period of time to see how things change. There are two types of monitoring: *process control* and *environmental*. *Process control monitoring* is done to ensure that a particular design is working. *Environmental monitoring* is conducted to assess the changes in the levels of a particular contaminant in the environment. For example, the soils in the Southern Waste Units were first characterized by sampling. During removal of the soils, the air is monitored to ensure that the soil is not becoming airborne. Once the soil is in the truck, the soil is monitored for dust release. Upon placement in the OSDF, the soil is again monitored for airborne release. All monitoring activities are required by a regulatory driver and, therefore require the preparation of document outlining the monitoring results. There are checks and balances for all monitoring activities.

Doug Sarno asked that a presentation be prepared to explain how the sampling determines the excavation and Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC) levels in soils. He suggested that an overview of the Sitewide Excavation Plan (SEP) and WAC Plan be presented to the committee. Doug feels that the committee needs to start examining the systems levels of these activities, i.e., how the various pieces of the programs fit together to form the whole. The committee needs to get a sense of the big picture. Bob Tabor suggested that the committee have a refresher on the major monitoring documents in order to be able to do this.

8

## *Copper Recycling*

Pete Yerace and Bob Lehrter discussed the plan to recycle 59 metric tons of copper ingots that are volumetrically contaminated. Most of the material released from the site is surface contaminated, and the paint on surface is either removed or the surface is painted to eliminate surface contamination. Volumetrically contaminated materials have been melted down so the contamination is present throughout the material. The purpose of this copper recycling project is to help DOE to develop a dose-based volumetric release standard. Currently, a standard exists only for surface contamination (less than 400 dpms). Since every copper ingot has been sampled, these ingots are a prime candidate to be the first free-release material with volumetric contamination. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory did free-release some volumetrically contaminated copper but it was shipped to China which has its own free-release standards. EPA is going to eventually release a dose-based number for volumetric release. This number will be between 0.1 and 10. DOE would like the number to be 1. The dose number generated from this copper using a conservative model is only 0.02. Therefore, there should be not be a problem getting this copper released. FDF should also save money on this project because the copper will not have to be buried as radioactive waste.

Currently, DOE and FDF are answering comments received from stakeholders about the copper recycling project. One of these comments concerns the validity of the data. Although outliers always exist among samples, the 500 samples from this project are all consistent. Pam Dunn was concerned that all of the copper might go to one company. She also wanted to know whether these dose-based release values would be generated on a site-by-site basis or whether they would be consistent throughout the DOE complex. Other sites will have to do their own dose studies, but EPA will be setting a standard for where those dose numbers may fall in order to free release the material. This number will be different than the numbers set for cleanup levels because cleanup levels are very dependent on site conditions and thus, must vary from site to site. The study done in this case was very conservative and actually considered that all copper went to one site. Doug wanted to know if it would be possible to actually track this copper through the retail market and compare the end product with another similar product not made with the recycled copper. Pam has gotten feedback that people are appalled by the use of the contaminated copper. DOE would like to do airborne sampling in the workplace but the copper industry may not like this idea because natural radioactivity exists in copper. Pam wanted to know if extra precautions will be taken to protect the workers. OSHA has regulations and the dose numbers generated from this copper are based on very conservative models. Doug felt that this is a very important issue and the CAB should examine it in more detail.

The next steps are to get the formal responses together for the stakeholders and have a final meeting to go forth with the recycling. Then, they must obtain formal approval from DOE-Ohio. Afterwards, they will be able to put the ingots up for sale. They would like to have a final meeting with all the stakeholders in mid-March. However, Pete and Bob cannot attend the March 14th CAB meeting.



**FERNALD  
CITIZENS  
ADVISORY  
BOARD**

**Monitoring Committee Meeting Summary**

**February 9, 1998  
page 2 of 2**

**Topics:**

= 1385



**FERNALD  
CITIZENS  
ADVISORY  
BOARD**

- Corrective Action Plan
- Membership/Leadership
- Committee Organization/Priorities for 1998
- Review of Past Recommendations
- Conflict of Interest

**Attendees:**

CAB members: John Applegate  
 Jim Bierer  
 Lisa Crawford  
 Pam Dunn  
 Doug Sarno  
 Bob Tabor  
 Gene Willeke

DOE: Jack Craig  
 Gary Stegner

Fluor Daniel Fernald: Tisha Patton

**Results:**

- Conflict of interest statement
- Procedure for electing a new chair
- Jack Craig to discuss main points of Corrective Action Plan at March 14th meeting
- Steering Committee to be involved in RFP process for facilitator bids
- New committee structure and issues to be discussed at March 14th meeting
- Annual review of past recommendations

**Meeting Summary:**

*Corrective Action Plan*

Jack Craig began the meeting with a discussion of the Corrective Action Plan that was created in response to the Type B Investigation. The plan is rather detailed and he preferred to discuss procurement and quality assurance in terms of the big picture. Gene Willeke thought it would be helpful for the CAB to know exactly who is involved in the creation of the plan. Jack said that the plan examined three or four major areas including quality assurance and organizational changes. John Applegate suggested that Jack use the recommendations letter that the CAB had written as a guide for discussion on the plan. Doug Sarno said that the letter actually addressed specific questions in several key categories, such as the previous leaks and procurement issues. After reviewing the letter, Jack thought that many of the specific questions could be answered in the Type B Investigation Report. Doug agreed but felt that the Type B Investigation Report was inadequate because it did not explain how the situation had come to exist and how such a relationship had been developed with Nevada that allowed the leaks to continue. Jack stated that the bottom line is that bad decisions had been made. Doug thought that the systems in place may have allowed people to make the wrong decisions. Jack agreed that the right people were not always involved in making the decisions because a good system was not in place. John asked Jack to boil down the letter to six or seven main topics and discuss those topics at the March 14th meeting.

Gene asked why Nevada did not raise more of a flag during the previous leaks. Doug answered that the waste attainment criteria at Nevada has nothing to do with the box. Gene then pointed out that the transportation procedures for noting the leak had worked out well. Doug was concerned, however, that previous leaks did not raise flags at Fernald. Jack said that after the initial leaks Fernald concentrated its efforts

10

**Steering Committee Meeting Summary**

**March 11, 1998**

**page 1 of 2**

on the absorbent and not on the box; the root cause analysis of the initial leaks did not work. Doug then asked about the current political fallout from the leaks. Jack said that DOE-Nevada was anxious for Fernald to start shipping again. DOE-Nevada is working with the local government to address their concerns. Shipping should resume at the end of April.

### *Membership/Leadership*

John announced that he has accepted a job at Indiana University, so under the bylaws he must resign as Chair. He expressed the need to have a logical transition from Vice Chair to Chair. The committee, thus, needs to do two things: (1) develop a process for naming a Chair and Vice Chair, and (2) move forward on naming Jim as Chair so that continuity of leadership is maintained. John also wanted the CAB to present a strong continuing presence at the Low-Level Waste Forum in Nevada. This Forum has been postponed until sometime in May. After some discussion, the committee agreed that the procedure for selecting a Chair and Vice Chair would be for the Steering Committee to make a recommendation to the full Board, and then for the Board to make a recommendation to DOE. The committee agreed to recommend that Jim Bierer be named chair at the March 14th meeting. The selection of vice chair would be postponed until later.

Pam Dunn then brought up the issue of Doug Sarno's contract. She is concerned that issuing a RFP could result in someone else receiving the contract. This person would not have the experience needed and the CAB would suffer. Jack explained that every contract reaches a point where it must be put out for a bid again; the RFP can be made to account for things like continuity and experience. Pam suggested that members of the CAB once again be involved in writing and selecting the contractor for the RFP. Gary Stegner said he would try to make this happen. Pam would also like to see the contract made into a five year contract. John suggested that the Steering Committee be involved in developing the RFP and evaluating bids.

### *Committee Organization/1998 Priorities*

John suggested that the new committee structure be presented at the March 14th meeting and that members of the CAB be asked if they are happy with their committees. Doug explained that the new structure assigned each person to only one committee, but if they want to join another, that would be fine.

John also suggested that the full Board discuss the issues for each committee during the March 14th meeting.

### *Review of Past Recommendations*

John wanted the full Board to discuss the past recommendations during the March 14th meeting. He suggested that they discuss the 1995 recommendations in some detail and then go through a summary of the recommendations made since then.

### *Conflict of Interest*

John presented a draft of a conflict of interest statement to the committee. Gene expressed some concern that the statement was worded too strongly, although he was in agreement with the intent. Doug thought it was good for the CAB to make a strong statement on this issue. John explained that the intent was only to prevent visits to non-government funded projects, but did not exclude gathering information or viewing video tapes. John also stated that if a special case arose, the CAB could discuss the problem in a public meeting.

Doug then announced that the lease was not going to be renewed on the Jamtek Building thus the CAB would need to find another location to hold committee meetings. Gary suggested they look into using the PEIC. Jack then announced that the head of the Nevada CAB would be in Fernald on Tuesday, March 17, and would like to meet with CAB members from 3:00 to 4:00 p.m.



**FERNALD  
CITIZENS  
ADVISORY  
BOARD**

**Steering Committee Meeting Summary**

**March 11, 1998  
page 2 of 2**



# BI-MONTHLY MEETING DRAFT AGENDA

May 16, 1998

Alpha Building, 10967 Hamilton-Cleves Highway, Harrison, OH

- |                 |                                   |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| 8:30- 8:50 a.m. | Call to Order and Opening Remarks |
| 8:50- 9:20      | WCS Injunction                    |
| 9:20- 9:35      | FY2000 Priorities                 |
| 9:35- 10:35     | Native American Reinterment       |
| 10:35- 10:45    | Break                             |
| 10:45- 11:45    | Closure Fund Management Plan      |
| 11:45- 12:15    | Committee Updates                 |
| 12:15- 12:30    | Public Comment                    |
| 12:30 p.m.      | Adjourn                           |

April 6, 1998

Inside Energy

Front Page

"Richland Hits Fluor, Duke Over Cleanup"

By: Jeff Barber

1385

**RICHLAND HITS FLUOR, DUKE OVER CLEANUP**

DOE's Richland Operations Office has accused its Hanford Site contractor and one of the company's key subcontractors of badly mishandling a \$1-billion project to remove spent nuclear fuel from concrete storage ponds near the Columbia River.

In a harshly worded March 22 assessment sent to Fluor Daniel Hanford Inc. President Hank Hatch, Charles Hansen, Richland's assistant manager for waste management, said neither Fluor nor Duke Engineering and Services Co., the project's subcontractor, have met the promises made to the government when they were awarded the contract in 1996.

While acknowledging that both companies have "well-earned reputations" for outstanding management and nuclear design, Hansen said commitments the companies made to the department "have not been realized" on the spent nuclear fuel project (SNFP).

"These commitments included issuing top quality authorization basis documents, reducing SNFP costs 15% over five years, and acceleration of portions of the project," Hansen wrote. "Instead, poor quality authorization documents are still being submitted, work continues to slip

*(continued on page 9)*

**RICHLAND BLASTS FLUOR, DUKE OVER CLEANUP . . . . . begins on page 1**

compared to baseline schedules, and costs are expanding beyond budgeted levels. Not only is mitigation of an urgent risk to the Columbia River not being realized, but also other Hanford cleanup work is having to be deferred to cover cost increase" in the project, he added.

Hansen's letter comes three months after DOE officials approved a 14-month schedule delay and \$274-million cost increase in the project, which calls for Duke to transfer to dry storage spent fuel from two concrete ponds known as the K-Basins (*JE/FL*, 29 Dec, 1). The 14-month delay followed an announcement last May that the project's timetable had slipped by five months. State and federal regulators, as well as

April 6, 1998

Inside Energy

Front Page

**"Richland Hits Fluor, Duke Over Cleanup"**

By: Jeff Barber

local environmental groups, have long considered removal of the fuel a priority because the basins are located only a few hundred feet from the Columbia river and because one of the pools has leaked twice in the past. Hansen told Hatch that while DOE recognizes the companies have been taking action to improve the project's management, progress is continuing to fall short of the department's expectations.

Neither company, the letter said, has completed a "systematic root cause analysis" of the reasons for the project's problems. Because of this failure, Hansen said the companies are developing plans for action "which cannot be tied to cause." Hansen also blamed the project's problems on a "lack of teamwork" between Fluor and Duke, saying that an inability to work together is "interfering with technical integration and effective prosecution" of the effort.

Indeed, in a DOE project assessment that accompanied Hansen's letter, the agency characterized the relationship between Fluor and Duke as "obviously strained," and added that the future of the team "appears uncertain. Any significant changes in the makeup of the team could result in major disruptions to the SNFP as new management transitions and the work force adjusts."

The assessment also criticized Fluor and Duke for refusing to seek outside expertise to help on the project. No one company "has or can produce all the right talent with experience for this work," the report said. "Past actions to close ranks and reject outside help must change if success is to be achieved."

In addition, Hansen said the "magnitude of the task at hand appears to be continually underestimated by contractor management," and added that the companies have not assigned sufficient numbers of properly qualified and experienced management, engineering, and operations personnel to the project.

Hansen, moreover, attacked the companies for failing to bring a "strong sense of urgency" to the work. "Delays occur, commitments are missed, but accountability does not appear to drive the management response," he wrote. The DOE assessment also appears to raise the possibility that the schedule delays and cost overruns approved in December may not be the last. Fluor, the review said, has "now identified major deviations against [the December] baseline."

The delays to date have already brought DOE unwelcomed attention, the report said. "Because the SNFP does not have [a credible baseline], [the Richland office] is at high risk of regulatory enforcement action; in addition, this has created the need for oversight inspections by DOE headquarters and congressional investigators. Without strong contractor leadership and control of the work, the SNFP cannot reestablish required credibility with customers, regulators and stakeholders," the report said. Any delays beyond the 19-month slip already approved "will continue to exacerbate the perception that the [contractors are] ineffective in carrying out the ... work."

In its report, the DOE team said it is "particularly concerned with the attitude of many on the [contractor] team that DOE should or will come up with additional budget to cover their cost overruns. Federal and DOE budgets have been and will remain tight," the report warned, "there simply is 'no more money.' If the SNFP is not a good steward of the budget allocated then there will be delays and serious repercussions."

In his letter, Hansen said that because DOE must begin final negotiations with the Environmental Protection Agency and the Washington State Dept. of Ecology by April 15 to establish new milestones for the project, Fluor and Duke must deliver a new baseline for the project that includes achievable costs and dates. The new schedule, Hansen added, will also be used to meet promises DOE has made to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board. "Changes in schedule, once the [new] milestones are submitted for public comment, are unacceptable," Hansen warned.

He also asked that Fluor and Duke "strongly consider" bringing in other subcontractors at the site to help with the project, and urged Fluor to assess "whether the current [contract] organizational and fee sharing structure are hampering effective execution of project work by discouraging use of other company's assets."

A Fluor spokesman Friday declined to discuss the specific charges in the letter, but said the company is "reviewing the letter very carefully and will respond in due course."

"The spent fuel project has, is and will continue to be a very high priority with Fluor Daniel and as prime contractor we are committed to moving this project forward," he said, adding that the work has "a very high degree of difficulty when compared with" other projects at the site. "We won't move any fuel until it is safe to do so and to do that we need to have a realistic path forward."

Adding to Fluor's woes last week was an April 2 letter to Energy Secretary Federico Peña from lawmakers investigating work on the project. House Commerce Committee Chairman Thomas Bliley, R-Va., and Texas Republican Rep. Joseph Barton, chairman of the panel's oversight and investigations subcommittee, questioned a decision by Fluor to seek \$329,000 from the SNFP's contingency fund to "prepare background information, including budget and schedule analyses" to support the company in a potential committee investigation.

"It is difficult to understand why [Fluor], after 18 months at Hanford and after several reviews and analyses of their performance on the SNFP project, would need a task force of managers and engineers to 'prepare background information' regarding [its] activities, at taxpayers' expense," the letter said. — Jeff Barber

April 6, 1998

Inside Energy

Page 8

**"DOE last week said it will fine it's Hanford Site Operator"**

1385

**DOE LAST WEEK SAID IT WILL FINE ITS HANFORD SITE OPERATOR** nearly \$141,000 for a series of safety violations at the facility's Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP), including several connected to the May 1997 explosion that damaged the structure and led to the release of small amounts of radioactivity.

The proposed \$140,625 fine covers four categories of violations, each of which is considered the second most severe on a three-tier scale of potential safety significance, the department said Monday. In the aftermath of the May chemical explosion, DOE found that Fluor-Daniel Hanford Co. failed to assure that breathing devices operated effectively, failed to issue prompt notification of the accident to state and local officials and failed to conduct proper radiological surveys of workers. Each of the actions cited in the fine are required by the contractor's own safety procedures, DOE said.

The other violations cited by DOE last week were connected to a number of events between November 1996 and June 1997 and involved the contractor's failure to follow procedures designed to prevent a criticality from occurring at PFP.

In its investigation, DOE determined that criticality safety procedure violations at PFP were "multiple and recurring," and included such events as storing and transporting small quantities of plutonium material in violation of established controls, violations of procedures requiring employees to understand and comply with criticality limits and postings, and multiple failures to identify and correct criticality safety infractions.

In some cases, DOE said, supervisors were aware of the problems, but failed to correct them in a timely fashion. Fluor Daniel's subcontractor, B&W Hanford Co., curtailed movement of fissile materials at PFP in December 1996.

DOE said the violations cited in the penalties were the result of work by B&W and a second subcontractor, DynCorp Tri-Cities Services Inc. As managing contractor, however, Fluor Daniel is responsible for ensuring compliance with safety regulations and is liable for the fine and for ensuring that corrective actions are taken.

The penalties will go into effect within 30 days unless contractor appeals the decision.

April 6, 1998

The Energy Daily

Front Page

**"House GOP Takes Fluor Daniel to Task For Funding Request"**

1 of 2

## House GOP Takes Fluor Daniel To Task For Funding Request

BY GEORGE LOBSENZ

In a request that has drawn strong protest from House GOP leaders, the operator of the Energy Department's Hanford site sought \$329,000 for a special task force to respond to a House investigation into a troubled nuclear waste cleanup project.

Two senior Republicans on the House Commerce Committee last week expressed "strong concerns" about the funding request by Fluor Daniel Hanford to pay for its task force staff to answer questions and provide documents to the Commerce panel's oversight and investigations subcommittee.

The Feb. 13 funding request followed numerous letters from the oversight and investigations subcommittee to DOE seeking information about the cleanup of Hanford's K-Basin, an aging spent nuclear fuel storage facility posing some of the most serious contamination threats in DOE's nuclear weapons complex. Some 2,000 tons of corroding spent fuel are

*(Continued on page 2)*

April 6, 1998

The Energy Daily

Front Page

*"House GOP Takes Fluor Daniel to Task For Funding Request"*

1 385

## House GOP Questions Fluor Funding Request...

(Continued from page one)

stored underwater in the two concrete basins, which are heavily contaminated by fuel debris and likely leaking contamination into the ground.

Fluor Daniel, as DOE's prime Hanford contractor, is overseeing efforts to remove the spent fuel from the basins and put it in safer storage—a dangerous \$1 billion project that has been plagued by management problems and technical uncertainties.

The oversight and investigations subcommittee began looking into the project earlier this year after learning it was 14 months behind schedule, with projected cost overruns of \$240 million. As is typical with congressional probes, investigators sent DOE multiple requests for documents and other information on the K-Basin problems.

But the Republicans told Energy Secretary Federico Pena in an April 2 letter that Fluor Daniel's request for \$329,000 to respond to the subcommittee's questions appeared wildly excessive.

"We are writing to express our strong concerns about the appropriateness of this request with respect to the amount of taxpayer funds proposed to be used for these purposes, and, in particular, the use of any project contingency funds for these or similar activities," said Reps. Thomas Bliley (R-Va.), chairman of the Commerce Committee, and Joe Barton (R-Texas), chairman of the panel's oversight and investigations subcommittee.

"It is difficult to understand why Fluor Daniel Hanford, after 18 months at Hanford and after several reviews and analyses of their performance on the [K-Basin] project, would need a task force of managers and engineers to 'prepare background information' regarding Fluor Daniel Hanford's activities, at the taxpayers' expense," the lawmakers added. "It is remarkable, considering the hemorrhaging cost and schedule baselines for this project, that the DOE would not object to the amount of money proposed for this questionable purpose."

The Republicans said DOE responded to Fluor Daniel's request in a March 5 letter that neither approved nor rejected the request, but suggested that contingency funds should be used only for "critical"

activities. Otherwise, the DOE letter said the request was "below the...threshold for disposition."

"We are interested to learn what portion of this \$329,000 request is or could be considered 'critical' to the project's success, and have serious questions as to why DOE did not simply direct Fluor Daniel Hanford not to use any contingency funds for such a project," the Republicans said.

In response to the GOP letter, DOE officials told *The Energy Daily* they did not approve Fluor Daniel's request. However, they said Fluor clearly would incur costs in answering congressional inquiries, and that some of those costs would be allowable.

The officials said they would not approve the entire \$329,000 request, but noted that congressional investigators had sought thousands of pages of documents dating back to January 1995 and that simply locating and reproducing large numbers of documents would consume substantial staff time.

"The fact is, fulfilling these [congressional information] requests costs money," said Carmen MacDougall, a DOE spokeswoman.

A Fluor spokesman said the contractor has spent \$107,000 to date responding to the congressional inquiries.

April 6, 1998

Weapons Complex Monitor

Page 5

*"Fluor Daniel's Future at Hanford Questioned by Senior DOE Official"*

## FLUOR DANIEL'S FUTURE AT HANFORD QUESTIONED BY SENIOR DOE OFFICIAL

In a scathing letter to Fluor Daniel Hanford President Hank Hatch, Richland Operations Office Assistant Manager for Waste Management Charles Hansen alleges "PHMC's team work on the [K-Basin spent fuel project] is obviously strained," and warns "the future of the Project Hanford Management Contract appears uncertain." The March 22 letter urges Fluor to infuse a sense of urgency into the effort to remove 2,300 tons of spent fuel from the K-Basins and to improve the project's overall management. His letter details a litany of problems on the project, including poor team work, an inability to find the causes of problems and to fix them, a reluctance to keep to a tight budget, and problems in nailing down timetables and cost estimates. The K-Basin work, Hansen wrote, "should have a strong sense of urgency, but it does not. Delays occur, commitments are missed, but accountability does not appear to drive the management response." A Fluor spokesman said the company is studying DOE's letter and "will respond to it in due course." The company official maintained the K-Basin project is a high-priority for the Fluor team, and stressed the company is committed to making the project succeed.

## Fluor Sent Cure Letter in December

In December, Fluor sent DE&S a cure letter (*WC Monitor*, Vol. 9 No. 4) in which it outlined several management concerns and implied that DE&S could lose its contract if improvements were not made (DE&S has since addressed the problems mentioned in the cure letter and has revamped its management. Fluor and DE&S have recently said publicly they are now working well together.

But DOE claims in the Hansen letter that Fluor and DE&S have, in fact, closed ranks on the K-Basin project and have rejected offers of outside help from other members of the PHMC team. "DOE is particularly concerned with the attitude of many on the PHMC that DOE should or will come up with additional budget to cover their cost overruns. Federal and DOE budgets have and will remain tight; there simply is no more money."

## DOE Wants to Avoid Hosting Investigators

The letter arrived in the context of an upcoming renegotiation of the Hanford Tri-Party Agreement. The next round of talks on the TPA begin April 15, and Hansen's letter emphasizes that any additional changes in the K-Basin project must be in place by then to allow for public comment on the TPA by May or June. Hansen stresses the department does not want to see changes in the K-Basin schedule popping up after the plan has gone out for public review. The fact that the project does not have a credible plan with solid timetables and cost estimates, Hansen wrote, increases the risk of regulatory agencies hitting DOE with enforcement actions and of Congressional and DOE headquarters investigators coming to the site. ◀

April 6, 1998

Weapons Complex Monitor

Page 6

**"DOE Proposes Fines for Fluor Daniel Related to Pu Plant Explosion"**

1385

**DOE PROPOSES FINES FOR FLUOR DANIEL  
RELATED TO Pu PLANT EXPLOSION**

The Department of Energy Richland Operations Office intends to fine Fluor Daniel Hanford more than \$140,000 for a number of safety violations at the Plutonium Finishing Plant during the past 18 months. The fine, outlined in a March 26 preliminary notice of violation, covers four broad categories of safety rules, three of which were breached during an explosion last spring at the facility. The fourth category involves criticality safety rules; DOE identified three separate incidents in which workers broke those rules.

The proposed fines follow the findings of the Richland Operations Office Accident Investigation Board, which looked into the May 14 explosion at PFP and reported in August that:

[S]ignificant, persistent problems exist within Facility operations that reflect adversely on DOE and its contractors' implementation of safety commitments. Analysis indicated that components of the integrated safety management system were not fully implemented; and, had they been, could have prevented the accident. (*WC Monitor*, Vol. 8 No. 29).

In September, the state Department of Ecology fined DOE, Fluor Daniel, and B&W Hanford \$110,000 for safety violations that contributed to the explosion and for inadequate emergency responses afterwards. Fluor Daniel officials said they are reviewing the DOE notice to determine whether an appeal is warranted. The appeal is due in 30 days. A company spokesman said if Fluor decides not to appeal, the fine will be distributed appropriately among Fluor Daniel and associated subcontractors. ◀

April 8, 1998

The Harrison Press

Page 3A

*"Fernald radon data available at Ohio EPA Web site"*

1385

# Fernald radon data available at Ohio EPA Web site

Ohio Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Office of Federal Facilities oversight has real-time radon monitoring data available on the Internet. Ohio EPA's continuous radon monitors at the Fernald Environmental Management Project send hourly updates to Ohio EPA's federal facilities Web site at <http://offo2.epa.stat.oh.us/frealttime.htm>. Real-time monitoring allows Fernald residents and other interested parties to view on the Internet the most current radon concentrations at Fernald's boundary compared to a background location.

Ohio EPA's monitor located at Fernald due west of the K-65 silos along Paddys Run Road is the closest publicly accessible location to the silos. The waste in these K-65 silos, left from former uranium production activities, produce radon gas some of which escapes into the environment. A background monitor is located 28 miles north of Fernald in Eaton. Also available on the Web site are 1997 average maximum and median radon data for both locations. Ohio EPA has been collecting radon data at Fernald since 1996.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recently released

results from its draft Risk Assessment Report which estimates that the number of lung cancer deaths occurring between 1951 and 2088 may be increased by one to 12 percent as a result of Fernald-related radiation exposures. The study focused on lung cancer because exposure to radon contributed 70 to 90 percent of the lung dose to residents of the Fernald community.

Ohio EPA has additional Fernald information available on-line, including monitoring results, community involvement opportunities, and monthly progress updates. The Fernald Public Environmental Information Center, located at 10995 Hamilton-Cleves Highway, has two computers available on which the community can access the Internet.

Fernald, located 18 miles northwest of Cincinnati, is a 1050-acre facility once operated as a part of the nation's nuclear weapons complex. During production years more than one million pounds of uranium were released into the surrounding environment. The plant's current mission is the cleanup of contamination resulting from past releases.

April 9, 1998

The Energy Daily

Front Page

**"Worker Transition Programs Worth Far More Than They Cost—DOE"**

By: George Lobsenz

## Worker Transition Programs Worth Far More Than They Cost—DOE

BY GEORGE LOBSENZ

More than 43,000 contractor employees have been laid off at Energy Department sites since 1993, costing DOE some \$787 million in worker separation payments but saving an estimated \$2.8 billion annually in payroll and benefits, according to a new DOE report to Congress.

The report, delivered to Congress late last month, responds to a 1997 legislative directive that DOE explain the continued need and justification for its worker and community transition program, which some lawmakers have characterized as unnecessary and overly expensive.

However, the department said aid to workers and communities suffering from post-Cold War DOE cutbacks has been well worth the

(Continued on page 2)

## Transition Programs... (From page one)

cost, not only in overall savings to the government but fewer lawsuits, improved economic conditions in DOE-dependent communities and increased productivity among workers remaining on the job at DOE sites.

Furthermore, DOE said while nearly one-third of DOE's 1992 workforce of 150,000 has been laid off, thousands more layoffs are planned over the next several years and DOE still must navigate difficult labor issues raised by its privatization and other contract reform initiatives.

"The department will continue to be confronted with decisions on workforce restructuring issues," Energy Secretary Federico Pena said in the March 18 report. "Prior to the worker and community transition program, these decisions were often made without consistent departmental guidance or oversight to assure their reasonableness and consistency with national policies and best business practices. Maintaining the program and the oversight it provides is a cost-effective use of taxpayers' money."

The department estimates it will lay off between 3,000 and 4,000 workers this fiscal year and that similar jobs cuts are expected in fiscal 1999 and 2000. Further down the line, it noted that a few sites, such as Mound and Fernald in Ohio, are scheduled to close down completely by 2003, affecting not only individual workers but also entire communities now largely dependent on DOE payrolls.

DOE said some DOE-dependent communities already are suffering. It cited a 10 percent unemployment rate in communities near DOE's Hanford site in eastern Washington, nearly double the national average; the loss of \$800 million in income to communities around the Savannah River Site in South Carolina; and some 3,169 layoffs at the Oak Ridge site, translating into a 7 percent reduction in annual salaries for the Knoxville, Tenn., area.

The department said the worker transition programs will be especially helpful at Oak Ridge in light of a new contract that took effect there April 1 that calls for outsourcing of most environmental cleanup work. DOE said it will be overseeing implementation of contract provisions designed to assure that present Oak Ridge workers are smoothly transferred to cleanup subcontractors at comparable pay and benefits. DOE said it hopes these provisions will avoid millions of dollars in severance payments that otherwise would be required.

In fact, DOE crafted the Oak Ridge provisions in large measure to avert similar problems caused by privatization and outsourcing at other sites. The department was repeatedly sued by DOE worker unions over alleged failure to comply with congressional directives that longtime DOE workers have preference for jobs with cleanup subcontractors.

The department acknowledged other past difficulties in the program, particularly regarding funding methods that "created difficulties in tracking overall spending for work force separation benefits that went beyond those required by contract or existing [contractor] policy." However, DOE said it has changed its funding mechanism so that all "enhanced" benefit payments—beyond contract and company requirements—are paid out of one account; it said that would assure spending for extra benefits would be limited and fully accountable to Congress.

But while conceding that implementation problem, DOE said its workforce separation costs overall are comparable to those of private-sector companies engaged in downsizing. It cited GAO findings that the average cost of a DOE worker separation is \$25,600.

As for its economic diversification aid to DOE-dependent communities, the department said it has helped create or maintain 11,400 private sector jobs at a cost of less than \$10,500 per job. It said that is less than half the \$30,000 per job spent by the Defense Department in aid to communities hard-hit by military base closings.

April 13, 1998  
Engineering News-Record  
Page 11  
"DOE Raps Hanford Staff-Again"

1385

## Nuclear Waste

# DOE RAPS HANFORD STAFF—AGAIN

THE DEPT. OF ENERGY SLAMMED FLUOR Daniel and Duke Energy Systems late last month for problems concerning removal of spent nuclear fuel at the former nuclear weapons plant at Hanford, Wash.

In a March 22 letter, a DOE official says the \$1-billion project is suffering from a lack of project management skills, technical leadership and teamwork between Fluor Daniel Hanford and its subcontractor, Duke Energy Services Hanford. "It is apparent that lack of teamwork between [them] is interfering with technical integration and effective prosecution of [the] work," the letter says.

A Fluor Daniel spokeswoman says the project has made real progress but there are cost and schedule issues that disturb

DOE officials. "Fluor Daniel, Duke and DOE are working tightly together to resolve these issues," she says.

The project involves removing spent fuel from two concrete storage ponds near the Columbia River, which environmentalists and state officials fear will leak and contaminate the river.

Just three months ago DOE approved a 14-month delay in the cleanup schedule and approved a \$274-million cost increase for the project.

In the letter, DOE Assistant Manager for Waste Management Charles Hansen says the contract with Fluor Daniel was meant to bring the best-in-class management team to the Hanford cleanup. "Fluor Daniel and Duke Energy have well-

earned reputations for outstanding project management and nuclear design, construction and operations. However, the commitments made to DOE by [them] have not been realized on the Hanford spent nuclear fuel project," he says.

In the five-page letter to Fluor Daniel President Henry Hatch, Hansen says the agency recognized that both companies have taken action to improve the situation, but added that progress to correct project management and technical problems are not sufficient. "The problems affecting performance are not new; innovation and strong leadership will be required to identify root causes, correct them, and to achieve project goals and objectives," he wrote.

DOE says the contractors have continually underestimated the magnitude of the task at hand. They are using insufficient numbers of properly qualified and experienced people, the letter says. □

April 15, 1998

Cincinnati Enquirer

Page B2

*"Fernald gears up to resume shipments"*

By: Tim Bonfield

# Fernald gears up to resume shipments

## Changes being made to avoid waste leaks

BY TIM BONFIELD

The Cincinnati Enquirer

Radioactive waste shipments from Fernald to Nevada could resume as soon as June, now that an investigation of leaky shipping containers is nearly finished, Department of Energy officials said Tuesday.

Waste shipments have been suspended since Dec. 15, when a truck driver near Kingman, Ariz., noticed waste liquids dripping from his trailer. Several more leaking "white metal boxes" from the same convoy were later discovered at the Nevada Test Site, where the waste was scheduled for burial.

None of the leaks posed significant health threats. But restarting shipments will be done gradually, starting with the driest, least risky waste.

"We are ramping up very slowly and very methodically," said Tricia Thompson, spokeswoman for Fluor Daniel Fernald, the contractor managing the cleanup project.

Fernald, about 18 miles northwest of Cincinnati, was a uranium processing plant for nuclear weapons. Since production stopped in 1989, the site has been Greater Cincinnati's biggest environmental cleanup project.

In recent years, Fernald has shipped thousands of truckloads of low-level radioactive waste to the Nevada Test Site, mostly in the 4-by-4-by-7-foot white metal boxes. More than 1,100 of the boxes remain at Fernald, filled with waste.

In February, a report blamed the December leaks on a manufacturing

flaw that Fernald inspectors failed to detect.

The leaking boxes carried solid waste — earth and chalk-like silica that contained trace amounts of uranium — but were found to be leaking water that formed in the wastes.

Investigators concluded that the water seeped through container cracks that developed during handling at Fernald, then opened because of vibrations on the road.

Based on the February report, Fluor Daniel has been ordered to make 50 changes in its waste-shipping procedures. Those changes are nearly complete, said Ms. Thompson.

Shipments could resume in June, once Department of Energy officials and interested groups in Ohio and Nevada are satisfied with the changes, said DOE spokesman Gary Stegner. An exact date has not been set.

Initial shipments will use other types of containers, rather than the white metal boxes, which are being redesigned. The filled boxes at Fernald will remain in place until a new plan for repackaging them is complete, Ms. Thompson said.

Members of a neighbors group, Fernald Residents for Environmental Safety and Health, want the shipments resumed as soon as possible, spokeswoman Edwa Yocum said Tuesday. The neighbors worry that the Nevada test site might not accept any more waste from the 1,050-acre Fernald site.

"Then we would be stuck with the waste," Mrs. Yocum said.

April 15, 1998  
Journal-News  
Page A10  
"DOE: Fernald can ship waste again"

# DOE: Fernald can ship waste again

The Associated Press  
CINCINNATI

## STATE

Radioactive waste shipped to Nevada from the Department of Energy's Fernald cleanup site could resume in June, after being stopped because of a leak in December, a department official said Tuesday.

The department's Fernald

field office and its cleanup contractor are still choosing a modified design of the waste containers, said John Sattler, leader of Fernald's waste-management team.

A container leaked Dec. 15 near Kingman, Ariz. No one was

injured, and no evacuations were required. Sattler said he could not predict exactly when the truck shipments will resume because the department and its Nevada test site, where the wastes are sent for permanent disposal, must approve the plan.

"We have done a lot of work. We have made a lot of progress," Sattler said.