



FULL BOARD MEETING T-214

Wednesday, February 18, 2004

DRAFT MINUTES

The Fernald Citizens Advisory Board met from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. on Wednesday, February 18, 2004, in T-214 at the Fernald Closure Project site.

Members Present:

Jim Bierer
Lisa Crawford
Marvin Clawson
Gary Storer
Pam Dunn
Robert Tabor
Lou Doll
Gene Jablonowski
Graham Mitchell
Kathryn Brown
Gene Willeke
Bill Taylor

Members Absent:

Sandy Butterfield
French Bell
Steve DePoe

Designated Federal Official:

Gary Stegner

The Perspectives Group Staff:

Douglas Sarno
Kristie Bergeron-Hale

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.

General Announcements and Ex-Officio Comments

Jim Bierer called the meeting to order and welcomed back Lisa Crawford and Marvin Clawson. The Board approved both the December, 2003 and January, 2003 minutes.

Jim referred the Board to the two letters included in the packets handed out to the members. The first was a letter to Bill Taylor on the Fernald Institutional Controls Plan, and the second was a letter to Mike Owen on the Office of Legacy Management (LM) Strategic Plan. Jim confirmed that the letters had been mailed out and asked the Board to direct questions to either himself or Doug Sarno. Doug told the CAB that a response to the Institutional Control Plan comments was expected by the next meeting on April 6th. Doug also reminded the CAB that John Kang from LM would be on the site for a series of small group meetings in early March. Lisa Crawford informed the group that FRESH planned to be a part of those meetings.

Jim Bierer told the Board that he had participated in an SSAB conference call on January 30th. The SSAB Chairs Meeting will be held from April 21 through April 23, 2004 in Washington, DC. Jim will not be able to attend the meeting and asked if any of the other CAB members would be interested in attending. Katie Brown, Lisa Crawford, Pam Dunn, and Bob Tabor expressed an interest. Gary Stegner will also be in attendance. The Chairs have requested that Jessie Roberson attend the conference and give a presentation of SSAB funding. There will also be updates from key people at the Office of Environmental Management (EM).

Jim reported that the Chairs are hoping to receive a response regarding their joint letter pertaining to the transition from EM to LM. Doug informed the CAB that he not received any information pertaining to the Chairs meeting. He was instructed by DOE not to participate in future SSAB Chairs conference calls and has been removed from the email update list. Jim attempted to contact Sandra Waisley earlier in the day and was unable to reach her. Gary Stegner assured the CAB that Doug would be added back to the email updates list. Pam Dunn asked that Gary have Doug put back on the call list immediately.

Jim informed the Board that a user-friendly SSAB guidance document has been formalized by Sharon Ruehl of EM. It does not supercede the documents which outline responsibilities and procedures for SSABs, but it draws from those documents to create a more understandable guide. The new guide will be available soon on the SSAB website.

Jim told the Board that Fernald received kudos on the SSAB call for being a model for good public participation. Doug Sarno also received praise for conducting the IAP2 training in public participation; two members of the Los Alamos site attended Doug's training in January, 2004, and are spreading the word. They recommended the training to the other sites on the call. Sandra Waisley mentioned on the call that when sites brought their Risk-Based End States (RBES) plans to Headquarters, Jessie Roberson asked how much public participation had gone into the plans.

Glenn Griffiths of DOE said that a letter had been sent to Jessie Roberson by Bob Warther stating that the RBES process at Fernald is going to be put on hold, and that modifications will be made to the document to remove options like natural attenuation. A recent version of the document is available on the website. A copy may also be obtained through Gary Stegner.

Jamie Jameson announced that two new staff members had joined the closure team, Dave Jackson and Ken Alkema.

Graham Mitchell shared a Natural Resources Damage (NRD) update with the CAB. A meeting is being set up with the attorneys to discuss a possible settlement, but no date has been set. Glenn guessed it would occur in mid-March based on what he has heard.

Gene Jablanowski announced that in an effort to keep all parties informed, EPA headquarters would be meeting monthly with DOE to discuss RBES issues nationwide.

Jim asked the Board to keep an eye out for examples of educational facilities and information centers. He asked that the Board share the information in order to get ideas for the MUEF.

Groundwater Treatment Options

Doug Sarno told the CAB that natural attenuation and changes to discharge levels are no longer options for groundwater cleanup. The remaining options are Option A, leaving the AWWT in place and operating until the end of groundwater cleanup, or Option C, replacing the AWWT with a smaller plant and using it to handle the cleanup of groundwater until completion. Doug informed the Board that they would be discussing the variations, variables, and new information relating to the options.

Marc Jewett handed out two packets for inclusion in the "Groundwater Toolbox" that was distributed at the January meeting. The first packet was created to answer questions posed at the last meeting and to capture information shared verbally at the December meeting. The second packet contained new information, including a summary matrix. Marc stated that at the last meeting, the site was working with five options, and now 2 remained, Option A and Option C. Two variances of Option C were outlined in the packet. Option C-1 considers a Spring 2005 AWWT shutdown scenario. Option C-2 considers a Spring 2006 AWWT shutdown scenario.

Doug explained that the split in Option C occurred because the Board had requested information regarding the impact of seeking to close AWWT in time to meet the 2006 closure of the on site disposal facility. The Board asked for information to consider if it would make more sense to keep AWWT running until all streams of wastewater other than groundwater were completed in 2006.

Marc stated that one very important flow that must be considered is the stormwater and leachate flow that would originate at the OSDF itself while waiting for its final cap. Regardless of whether the AWWT is dismantled in 2005 or 2006, the groundwater strategy must be able to deal with groundwater and stormwater. He explained that dialogue has begun with Ohio EPA regarding the criteria that would be used to say that AWWT is ready to come down, and that the new plant is ready to stand alone. Marc met with DOE and EPA prior to the CAB meeting to discuss the variables. DOE owes the first set of possible criteria to EPA.

Marc stated that the handouts include a very detailed summary of costs by year, using both optimistic and pessimistic scenarios. Doug asked why there was a spike of \$43 million from 2008 to 2016. Marc explained that the debris from D&D of AWWT would be trucked off site. Pam asked if there would be a spike in costs for D&D of the new, smaller facility. Marc explained that the volume of waste would be considerably less. The smaller facility will be about 5,000 cubic yards, compared to the AWWT size of 85,000 cubic yards. All of the costs in the summary are based on a 2004 economy and

are not escalated for possible inflation. Lisa Crawford asked where the cost for the new facility was figured into this summary. Marc explained that \$4.8 million is required in 2005.

Pam Dunn asked why it was possible to turn off treatment earlier using a smaller plant. Marc explained that it does seem counter-intuitive, but it is because the trigger to turn off treatment is when the average concentration reaches the 30 parts per billion uranium discharge limit for the River. Because the larger plant extracts water at a faster rate, it pulls in higher concentrations of uranium. The smaller plant will pump slower and not achieve as high a concentration of uranium. The result is that overall pumping without additional treatment will have to continue longer to extract the total amount of uranium that must be removed from the aquifer.

Lisa Crawford asked if using the smaller plant means that reinjection will stop. Marc confirmed that it will stop, thus extending the cleanup by three years. He also confirmed that the cost for pulling out the infrastructure has been included in all scenarios. Doug stated that in the optimistic case, the plant will be replaced in 2005, AWWT will close in 2006, and the smaller plant will be shut off in 2007. Marc reiterated that the true scenario lies somewhere in between the optimistic and pessimistic.

Lisa Crawford stated that the 2005 budget has been cut from \$324 million to \$319 million, which is \$5 million less than what is needed. She asked why the Board should consider saving DOE money, when we can't get the funding we need.

In response to a question about how much contamination is actually under AWWT, Marc explained that total volume of soil and debris is 85,000 cubic yards. 15,000 of that is building rubble, and the remaining 70,000 is soil.

Pam asked if the levels of uranium will take longer to go down when reinjection stops. Gene Willeke stated that losing reinjection doesn't hurt the cleanup too much because the time when reinjection was most effective has passed. Doug stated that there would still be value from reinjection until the day that AWWT shuts down.

Katie Brown, referring to one of the handouts, asked what stagnation zones were. Marc explained that when the pumps are running, the water doesn't know which way to go. Reinjection helps to minimize that. Katie asked if more pumps will be needed without reinjection, and if the stagnation zone will grow in size. Marc said that the zones will not grow in size, but are present because of loss of reinjection. Bill Taylor explained that the duration of the cleanup in the off-property south plume with reinjection would run until 2013. Without reinjection, the cleanup would run until 2016.

Jim Bierer asked Marc if there would be drilling in the stagnation zone to see if contamination levels are rising. Bill explained that there will be a program in place using 146 monitoring wells that are checked twice a year. There will also be a geo-probing program which allows them to see a profile through the plume.

Pam asked if the contaminated soil under AWWT had low enough levels to go into OSDf. Marc responded that it was low enough. Lisa Crawford, referring to a handout, asked what was meant by "stabilization period" for the new facility. Glenn explained that AWWT has four systems that took several months to stabilize. Stabilization means that there is confidence that the levels seen yesterday will be the same levels seen tomorrow. The smaller facility will only use two of those systems. Glenn said that it would take about 3 months to fully stabilize the new facility, and that initially there will be

some variances. He said that he has already worked through a lot of the issues, and the smaller facility will be more “off the shelf” than AWWT was originally. Lisa asked if that period would require regulatory relief. Glenn replied that it would not, because AWWT would still be running. Ohio EPA would need a very specific set of criteria defining stabilization of the new plant before AWWT could be taken offline. Doug stated that the decision to shut down AWWT would be driven by a demonstration of how well the new plant is operating, not by a certain date. Lisa asked where the \$5 million would come from to build the new plant. Bill said that the money will come from EM.

Marc referred the CAB to three more handouts. The first included important dates for Option C, the second showed the stormwater flows, and the third showed a bar chart illustrating peak flows. Bob asked what would happen if some of the retention basins show signs of contamination. Doug explained that because that land will already be clean, the stormwater would not require treatment.

Pam asked if the construction of the new plant will be a self-performed project or would be contracted out. Glenn responded that Fluor will be self-performing the construction, and that this project is more straightforward than others.

It was noted that the FCAB wants DOE’s commitment to do the project right and that a smaller plant must be stable before AWWT is turned off. Pam explained that the CAB doesn’t speak for the whole public, and that more public involvement is required if the cleanup will be extended by three years.

Bob Tabor asked why DOE was willing to tear down a working plant to save 5-11%. Doug explained that this is more than a cost issue. The D&D of AWWT is a huge project that will require removal of 70,000 cubic yards of soil. The site is mobilized to do that now, and make sure that it is done well, as opposed to waiting 10 years. If the site waits, a new contract and contractor will have to be put in place. If the D&D is done now, the AWWT can go to OSDF. If it is done in 10 years, it will have to be brought off site by truck.

Lisa asked if LM was willing to take over management of the site if the cleanup is not complete. Doug explained that groundwater was never a part of closure, it was always understood that LM was taking over that project. The legal requirements are clear; DOE is responsible. Pam asked if there was legal recourse if LM cuts the staff at the new facility several years into the project. Graham Mitchell stated that the staffing would be a non-issue as long as they meet the required limits. Pam and Lisa asked that any savings recognized by DOE as a result of building the new facility be passed on for use by LM at Fernald.

Doug told the CAB that he would draft a letter outlining the criteria and concerns expressed by the CAB. Lisa asked if anyone at DOE had spoken to the elected officials. Gary Stegner said that calls and meetings had been set up. Gene Willeke stated that the public needs to know what the CAB thinks about this.

Stewardship

Doug handed out color proofs of the new Future of Fernald brochure. He told the CAB the purpose of the brochure was to build a coalition of people to support ongoing education at the site. He asked the CAB for comments by Friday, February 27th at the latest. Upon finalization, the Board members should distribute the brochure to as many people as possible.

Doug also handed out the Future of Fernald vision brochure, created four years ago at the workshop. The brochure contains a vision for the future of the site, criteria for achieving that vision, and criteria for the design of the education facility and trails. Doug recommended that CAB members give these brochures to those who inquire about the public's recommendations for future use of the site.

Doug gave a brief summary of the February 17th Stewardship Committee Meeting. He told the CAB that Luther Brown from Records Management had requested a specific set of criteria to determine what type of materials they should be setting aside for the Stewardship Committee. Doug will create an outline using the Telling the Story of Fernald Report as a guide. The Stewardship Committee also identified four specific stories that should be told:

- Site construction, production, and role in the cold war
- Workers at the site
- The public and public participation at Fernald
- Environmental clean-up and restoration

Doug stated that certain artifacts and documents are needed to tell the stories well. The CAB will share the outline with those who have been involved with the site for long periods of time to determine what types of artifacts would be most useful. The Living History Project committee will review the findings.

Doug informed the CAB about a large warehouse that DOE might offer the public as part of the NRD settlement. The warehouse could be used as an education facility, but would require construction to add heat and restrooms. The large space could be used in many different ways. Doug also told the CAB that it is very important that they talk to many people regarding the importance of long-term stewardship and educating future generations.

Doug informed the CAB that Lou Doll would be retiring the following week. The Board thanked Lou for his service.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for April 6, 2004, at 6:00 p.m., and will begin with a tour of the Silos Project Area.

Public Comment

The meeting was opened to public comment. Two comments were provided:

- Edwa Yocum and F-CHEC are looking for volunteers to fill out surveys regarding cistern use. They are also looking for retirees from the site who may have artifacts that they would like to share with others at the Living History meeting on March 22, 2004.
- Lisa Crawford informed the CAB that FRESH will be 20 years old in the fall of 2004.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

James Bierer
Fernald Citizens Advisory Board Chairman

Date

Gary Stegner
Deputy Designated Federal Official

Date