

# FERNALD CITIZENS TASK FORCE

---

Chair:

John S. Applegate

Members:

James Bierer  
Marvin Clawson  
Lisa Crawford  
Pam Dunn  
Dr. Constance Fox  
Guy Guckenberger  
Darryl Huff  
Jerry Monahan  
Tom B. Rentschler  
Robert Tabor  
Warren E. Strunk  
Thomas Wagner  
Dr. Gene Willeke

Alternates:

Russ Beckner  
Jackie Embry

Ex Officio:

J. Phillip Hamric  
Graham Mitchell  
Jim Saric

A U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SITE-SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD

## Minutes from June 11, 1994 Meeting

### Members Present:

John Applegate  
Marvin Clawson  
Lisa Crawford  
Pam Dunn  
Constance Fox  
Guy Guckenberger  
Phil Hamric, DOE  
Darryl Huff  
Gene Jablonowski, U.S. EPA  
Graham Mitchell, Ohio EPA  
Tom Rentschler  
Warren Strunk  
Bob Tabor  
Thomas Wagner  
Gene Willeke

About 27 spectators, including members of the public, DOE and other agencies, and FERMCO representatives.

### 1. Approval of Minutes:

- The draft minutes of the May 14, 1994, meeting of the Task Force were approved without amendment.

Lisa Crawford and Pam Dunn had questions about the minutes because they did not attend last month's meeting. Lisa asked the status of the effort to comply with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) and DOE's plans to establish an umbrella committee. She also asked about the impact of Ohio's interest in economic development on the Task Force's decision for the site. She also asked for about the status of the roundtable on waste siting.

Applegate said that he hadn't received information yet on who would be on the national board. Graham Mitchell then explained that Ohio EPA's interest would not override any decision the Task Force made

about the site. Huff said that they haven't decided on when to have the roundtable.

2. Remarks:

Applegate suggested that members decide at the end of the meeting whether to hold meetings in July and August. If it is decided not to hold the meetings, the September meeting would require a full day.

Applegate also reminded members about the DOE Future Use meeting, which is scheduled for July 19-21. He also reported that all the chairs of DOE site-specific advisory boards (SSABs) will meet June 21-22 in Washington, D.C., to discuss issues of concern. Applegate said he intended to discuss waste transportation with Nevada representatives.

The chair said a demonstration of the IPEX System for tracking work and costs at the Fernald Environmental Management Project was scheduled to begin right after the regular Task Force meeting adjourns. Guy Guckenberger asked if IPEX could be accessed by the public over the telephone. Phil Hamric said public access would be available by July or August. A fact sheet with an overview of the IPEX system will be distributed to Task Force members with the draft minutes from the June 11, 1994 meeting.

Applegate introduced Gene Jablonowski from the U.S. EPA, who attended on behalf of Jim Saric.

3. Report on MPN meetings in Washington, D.C.:

Applegate asked Crawford and Dunn to report on meetings they attended last month with other Military Production Network (MPN) representatives in Washington, D.C., last month. Crawford said there were about 100 activists from 18 states who attended the series of meetings. Citizens from Southwestern Ohio met with Senator Howard Metzenbaum's aide, Rep. John Boehner's aide, Rep. Rob Portman, and officials from DOE and other governmental agencies.

Dunn said the House only cut the EM budget by 10 percent and that the Senate Committee didn't make any cuts. The current funding level for environmental restoration at DOE sites is \$5.2 billion. The budget still has to go to the Energy and Water Committee, she added.

Crawford said they were told there will be no budget increases for the next four to five years.

Crawford and Dunn said they were going to be in Washington, D.C. for a meeting and planned to talk to Senate officials.

Guckenberger asked Applegate for a review of the Task Force's progress and plans to date. Applegate reported that the purpose of the *FutureSite* exercise is to develop lots of information that can be compiled in order to develop future use scenarios for evaluation. The resulting short list of future use options will be examined in more detail by the group. Then the criteria will be applied to the scenarios at September's meeting. Applegate also explained that the Task Force is on schedule to deliver its future use recommendation in November.

4. FutureSite exercise:

Applegate said the Task Force was going to play the *FutureSite* exercise at the more conservative  $10^{-6}$  risk level. He asked Doug Sarno to explain some changes to the exercise. Sarno said the changes include new numbers for volumes of contaminated soil. These new figures include volumes of material from Operable Unit 2 and Operable Unit 3. Sarno also said that the treatment option has been eliminated because under current interpretation of the regulations, the "clean" fraction of soil would still have to be handled as waste.

5. Results of FutureSite at  $10^{-5}$ :

Applegate reported that FERMCO Managers and the public played *FutureSite*, and he asked Sarno to report on the preliminary findings.

Sarno said there were two basic variables analyzed:

1. Use of Property
  - Restricted
  - Undeveloped Park/Greenspace
  - Developed Park
  - Commercial/Industrial
  - Residential/Agricultural
2. Disposition of Waste
  - On-Site

Off-Site (limited to one million cubic yards)

He reported that the following strategies have emerged from playing *FutureSite*:

1. **The Buffer Strategy**  
Many groups were concerned most with cleaning up the edges of the property as much as possible and leaving the more contaminated materials in the center of the site at the location of the former processing facility.
2. **The Incremental Land Use Volume Strategy**  
Some groups approached the problem from an incremental cost-benefit approach by removing successively less contaminated material to achieve a higher level of allowed use and stopping after each iteration to calculate total cost.

Sarno said that regardless of the strategy employed, the result was to clean up to allow for two uses: less restrictive on the borders and more restrictive in the center. In each case, the location of the disposal facility coincided with the more contaminated center.

There are three preliminary scenarios that have resulted from the initial rounds of the exercise:

1. **Residential Border, Commercial Center**  
100 percent on-site disposal: \$662 million (127 acres)  
With 1 million cubic yards off-site: \$1.262 billion (50 acres)
2. **Residential Border, Park Center**  
100 percent on-site disposal: \$661 million (127 acres)  
With 1 million cubic yards off-site: \$12.61 billion (50 acres)
3. **Commercial Border, Park Center**  
100 percent on-site disposal: \$459 million (88 acres)  
With 1 million cubic yards off-site: \$1.006 billion (11 acres)

Sarno said the approaches used by players include:

- A. **Clean To, But Do Not Allow**  
Several groups sought residential cleanup levels, but did not wish to see the property to be used for anything other than green space.

B. Prevent Ecological Destruction

Some groups were concerned with the ecological damage that would coincide with large-scale removal of soil and vegetation.

C. Limit Off-Site Transportation

Some groups were highly concerned with the number of trucks or trains that would be required for large volumes of off-site waste disposal.

D. No Physical Sign of Contamination

One group raised concern about uses that would result in physical access restrictions to property.

E. Adjacent Property at Same Use

Several groups were concerned that the property immediately at the border of the site was cleaned to the same use as that off-site.

6. New Information for the Toolbox:

Applegate asked Sarno to discuss the new additions to the toolbox. Sarno said the additions are a chemical inventory and reporting requirements for the site, as well as corrected information on radionuclide contamination at the site.

7. Opportunity for Public Participation:

A member of the public asked how quickly contamination is migrating off site. Applegate said that migration has slowed virtually to a stop. Under the South Plume removal action, extraction wells are removing contamination groundwater from the aquifer for treatment.

8. New Business:

Members agreed not to hold their regular monthly meetings in July and August. Instead, the Task Force would participate in other activities, such as the Future Use Workshop scheduled for July 19-21 in Cincinnati. Sarno will use the summer to develop detailed alternatives for future use, based on the scenarios from playing *FutureSite*. Applegate also asked members to think about some issues during the

summer, including:

- Cleanup levels for soil
- Cost of dealing with wetlands
- Level of detail to be captured in the cost estimates for site Remediation once excavation has occurred
- Information on groundwater contamination
- Location of the on-site disposal cell
- Budget concerns
- Land use criteria

9. Materials Distributed at Meeting:

- Table of Key FEMP Contaminants: Radionuclides
- List of FEMP Chemical Inventory and Reporting Requirements
- *FutureSite* Model Instructions and Information
- Military Production Network information

10. Next Meeting:

The next meeting of the full Task Force is scheduled for September 10, 1994. The time and location will be announced prior to the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

Approved September 10, 1994