



6-710.38

1083

FRIDAY MAILING

11/7/97

INCLUDED IN THIS MAILING ARE:

- Announcements
- Summary of Citizens Advisory Board Recommendations since the July 1995 Report
- Chart of Citizens Advisory Board Recommendations since the July 1995 Report
- DOE News Press Release "Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management Al Alm Announces His Resignation"
- Fluor Daniel Fernald News Release "Fluor Ranks Number One Among *Fortune* Magazine's Most Admired Companies"
- 1998 FCAB Meeting Schedule
- Newsclippings

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- FERNALD CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD MEETING:** The Fernald Citizens Advisory Board will hold its next meeting on Saturday, November 15, 1997, at 8:30 a.m. in the Alpha Building.
- STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING:** The Steering Committee of the Fernald Citizens Advisory Board will hold its next meeting on Saturday, November 15, 1997, after the Fernald Citizens Advisory Board Meeting.
- COMMUNITY REUSE ORGANIZATION (CRO) MEETING:** The monthly CRO meeting will be held on Tuesday, November 18, 1997, at 6:00 p.m. in the Ross High School Media Center, 3425 Hamilton-Cleves Highway.
- WASTE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING:** The Waste Transportation Committee of the Fernald Citizens Advisory Board originally scheduled for Monday, November 24, 1997, has been cancelled.
- NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE MEETING:** The Natural and Cultural Resources Committee of the Fernald Citizens Advisory Board will meet on Monday, November 24, 1997, at 6:00 p.m. in the Jamtek Building. *Please note that the time has changed.*

CANCELLED

NEW TIME



ANNOUNCEMENTS

11/7/97

ANNOUNCEMENTS (Continued):

- **WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING:** The Waste Management Committee of the Fernald Citizens Advisory Board will meet on Monday, December 1, 1997, at 6:00 p.m. in the Jamtek Building to discuss the Silo 3 RFP.

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]



**Summary of Fernald Citizens Advisory Board
Recommendations
Since the July 1995 Report**

Number	Title (response letters are listed in italics)	Date
95-1	Remediation Schedule for K-65 Wastes	10/11/95
96-1	On-Site Disposal Facility Design	2/23/96
96-2	Recommendations to Natural Resource Trustees	3/14/96
96-3	Traffic Information and Restrictions	6/28/96
96-4	Information on Rail Transport to NTS <i>No Viable Intermodal Option</i>	7/15/96 11/1/96
96-5	Security Overhead Costs and Radium Removal from K-65 Wastes	7/15/96
96-6	Radium Removal from K-65 Wastes and Solidification of Silo 3	10/5/96
96-7	Silo 3 Information <i>Silo 3 Information</i>	10/17/96 4/29/97
96-8	Intermodal Transport <i>Information and Comparison of Truck and Intermodal Transport</i>	10/31/96 2/5/97
97-1	Citizens Information on Site Changes <i>Bi-weekly Publication and Resource Restoration</i>	2/19/97 5/9/97
97-2	Recommendations on Remediation of Silos 1, 2, and 3	3/15/97
97-3	Proof of Principle for Silos 1 and 2	6/11/97
97-4	Prioritization of Activities	9/23/97
97-5	Commerce Business Daily Notice for Silos 1 and 2	9/23/97
97-6	Supplemental Environmental Projects for OU4 Dispute Resolution	9/25/97

Please note: In July, 1997, the Fernald Citizens Task Force changed its name to the Fernald Citizens Advisory Board. Recommendations made before this name change still refer to the Citizens Advisory Board as the Task Force.

**Document Summary of Fernald Citizens Advisory Board
Recommendations
Since the July 1995 Report**

Recommendation 95-1: Remediation Schedule for K-65 Wastes

A potential delay in the remediation schedule for K-65 wastes arose because the radium in the wastes from the K-65 facility was identified as a possible source of radium for a new cancer treatment. The Task Force strongly opposed conducting research on the cancer treatment and on the use of this waste as a source of radium at the expense of timely remediation. The Task Force also expressed concern about the scheduling of the vitrification of these wastes for the same time period as the proposed radium extraction. Ability to extract radium from vitrified wastes is an unknown and could further delay vitrification plans.

No formal response requested.

Recommendation 96-1: On-Site Disposal Facility Design

Original Task Force recommendations for design of the on-site disposal facility were outlined in the July 1995 report. The Task Force recommended that the 1995 recommendations for this design still be followed. In particular, they recommended that the multiple-cell design with redundant line and leachate control systems be implemented. The Task Force indicated a desire to have a system put into place to collect and manage leachate exceeding 20 ppb after the AWWT is shut down.

No formal response requested.

Recommendation 96-2: Recommendations to Natural Resource Trustees

The Task Force charter supplies the group with the ability to provide recommendations on natural resource issues. In accordance with that charter, the Task Force outlined the priorities which they felt should be used to establish a comprehensive plan for the protection and restoration of natural resources on site. The Task Force supports the spending of natural resource money specifically on the protection and replacement of natural resources. As part of this philosophy, the Task Force expressed a wish to see land set aside as a natural preserve where habitat areas naturally found at the site are reflected. In order to accomplish a total restoration, the Task Force recommended that remediation be concurrent with restoration. Some areas, such as the planted pine forests at the northern part of the site, could be enhanced without impacting remediation activities, thereby, allowing them to be restored concurrently with remediation. The habitat areas which were listed as ones which should be optimally protected included the Paddys Run corridor and the forested wetlands to the north. The recommendation also indicated that these areas and the buffer zone surrounding the disposal facility should be given priority for restoration. Since some wetlands would be destroyed as part of remediation efforts, the recommendation stated that new wetlands should be created in equivalent acreage to those destroyed. The Task Force expressed a preference for on-site restoration and replacement of natural resources to off-site actions.

No formal response requested.

Recommendation 96-3: Traffic Information and Restrictions

As a result of remediation activities, increased truck traffic would be entering the site and some roads would be closed. This increased traffic in combination with the road closing would create a need to improve traffic safety. The University of Cincinnati conducted a 1994 report "Baseline Traffic Study of State Route 128" to address traffic issues. The Task Force concurred with the recommendations outlined in this report, but added that truck traffic should be restricted so as not to share the road with school buses, and should alternate between Miamitown and Ross, so that each locality receives a proportionate share of the traffic. In order to make additional recommendations on traffic safety, the Task Force requested information estimating the total truck traffic, the impact of increased traffic on area roads, and a feasibility analysis of intermodal transport to ship wastes to NTS.

Recommendation 96-4: Information on Rail Transport to NTS

The Transportation Committee of the Task Force traveled to NTS in order to evaluate transportation issues associated with shipping wastes to NTS for disposal. To minimize risk to workers and the public, the committee recommended that wastes be transported by rail from Fernald to NTS. The committee proposed three options for this intermodal transport: the wastes could be shipped to an existing intermodal facility near Las Vegas, the transfer of wastes could occur near Envirocare, or the transfer could occur in Caliente, Nevada. Before making a recommendation for the intermodal transfer facility, the committee requested information on the feasibility of each of these options.

The Ohio Field Office of DOE responded to this request by providing the requested information. Waste from OU4, some OU3 wastes and a portion of the legacy waste are to be shipped to NTS for disposal (50,000 cubic yards of waste material). Another 436,496 cubic yards of waste will be shipped to a PCDF for disposal. In 1995, Fluor Daniel and DOE evaluated the use of intermodal transport versus truck transport for shipment of waste to NTS. Although cancer risk was acceptable in both scenarios, the study found that the cost and risk levels to workers and the public were less with the truck transport. A separate study concluded that rail transport was less expensive than truck transport, but this study did not consider several cost factors such as on-site storage and additional packaging for rail shipment. The use of a dedicated train would also require that wastes be stored at Fernald until enough had accumulated to fill an entire train, thus increasing risks to workers. Intermodal transport of wastes would also increase shipment time. The use of intermodal transfer in Las Vegas is not practical because of the proximity to local populations and DOT requirements for waste to be moved into trucks within 48 hours of arrival. Envirocare would not be a good intermodal transfer point because it cannot accept 11(e)(2) byproduct material and because the site is hundreds of miles out of the way. Caliente, Nevada, was evaluated as a transfer point but a facility does not currently exist there and, in order to reach NTS, trucks would need to utilize a "back road" through Nellis Air Force Base. Routing trucks around Nellis would add several hundred miles to the journey. Other issues also needed to be considered when evaluating intermodal transfer facilities, such as how to route trucks around populated areas and how to provide storage at transfer facilities.

Recommendation 96-5: Security Overhead Costs and Radium Removal from K-65 Wastes

In July 1995, the Task Force provided recommendations on the reduction in maintenance and security overhead costs resulting from safe shutdown and mortgage reduction. The

Task Force requested more information on this topic. The Task Force also requested additional information on the activities surrounding radium removal from K-65 wastes. The Task Force needs to understand this issue before remediation activities actually begin.

Recommendation 96-6: Radium Removal from K-65 Wastes and Solidification of Silo 3

The Task Force was still concerned with the impact that removal of radium from K-65 wastes could have on the schedule and budget for remediation of these wastes. However, Task Force members also did not want to ignore the possibility that this waste could provide a valuable medical treatment. The Task Force felt that this dilemma necessitated that DOE identify when commitments were made which would make the radium irretrievable, that DOE develop a relationship with the team investigating the medical use of radium, and that DOE study the possibility of removing radium from vitrified wastes. No action had been taken on studying the removal of radium from vitrified wastes although the Task Force had outlined this need in Recommendation 95-1. A further issue with K-65 wastes was that the Task Force could not recommend solidification of Silo 3 wastes at that time. The Task Force had four major concerns about recommending solidification for these wastes: cementation is not a fool-proof technology; decisions about all three silos are interrelated, so this decision could impact remediation of Silos 1 and 2; solidification of these wastes would require the construction of a new facility which would eventually be disposed of on-site; and there was significant time until a remediation decision needed to be made.

No formal response requested.

Recommendation 96-7: Silo 3 Information

The decision for the treatment of wastes in Silo 3 was scheduled for March, 1997. The Task Force needed several pieces of information to be informed enough to make a recommendation at that time. The Waste Management Committee requested that DOE provide information on the legal implications of changing the remediation treatment for Silo 3 wastes, the track record of cementation, how cementation would increase waste volume, and how cementation would impact disposal of the wastes. The Committee also recommended the appointment of an independent team to study this issue and to report its findings by March 1.

DOE responded by providing the information requested. The legal implications of changing the method of technology for remediation of Silo 3 wastes would be dependent on what type of changes occur: significant, non-significant, or fundamental. Significant changes would result in an ESD, while non-significant changes would simply be recorded as part of the post-ROD. Fluor Daniel Fernald had already solidified wastes similar to those in Silo 3 and was performing bench-scale studies on Silo 3 wastes. There would be no total disposal volume increase if Silo 3 wastes were treated by cementation. Cementation is also as effective as vitrification in meeting transportation and disposal requirements. The use of cementation would not impact disposal at NTS. The IRT had already been appointed and was scheduled to begin meeting in November 1996.

Recommendation 96-8: Intermodal Transport

The Transportation Committee has been actively pursuing the best course of action for waste removal from Fernald to NTS. In Recommendation 96-4, the Task Force

recommended transport of these wastes by rail using a transfer point. After reviewing information on rail transport, the committee decided that rail transport of Fernald wastes should occur on dedicated trains in order to prevent unnecessary risk to the rail system and its workers. The Committee recommended that intermodal transport of the wastes occur through Envirocare, even though Envirocare cannot accept 11(e)(2) wastes. Envirocare would not be disposing of these wastes and the transfer point would most likely be constructed off site. This option reduces total mileage and exposure to this waste by populated areas. Additional cars could be added to trains already traveling to Envirocare with other wastes, thus decreasing costs. The Committee requested that DOE further develop this scenario so that future recommendations could be made.

A study had been conducted comparing truck transport to intermodal transport for Silo 3 wastes. Envirocare was open to discussion of using their facility as a transfer point for this waste but did not want to build such a facility near their site. An evaluation of Envirocare as a transfer point showed that there was no increased risk or benefit from intermodal transport using this scenario. DOE was still considering a transfer point in Salt Lake City and a new transfer point closer to NTS.

Recommendation 97-1: Citizens Information on Site Changes

The Natural and Cultural Resources Committee reviewed the draft Natural Impact Assessment and the draft Natural Resource Restoration Plan. These documents led the committee to make two general recommendations to DOE. First, the committee recommended that DOE provide information to citizens containing detailed information on activities which are changing the physical appearance of the site. Secondly, the committee recommended that DOE use concurrent resource restoration to minimize the impact of site remediation.

In response to the recommendations of the Natural and Cultural Resource Committee, DOE-FEMP and Fluor Daniel Fernald began publishing a bi-weekly publication to keep citizens informed of site activities. The publication is mailed to residents and stakeholders. Also, DOE-FEMP began installing aesthetic barriers in areas where remediation activities are occurring.

Recommendation 97-2: Recommendations for Remediation of Silos 1, 2, and 3

These recommendations are the formal recommendations of the Task Force in response to the March deadline for recommendations on the path of remediation for Silos 1, 2, and 3 in OU4. The Waste Management Committee formulated these recommendations and presented them to the full Task Force. The recommendations were as follows:

- (1) "The material in Silo 3 should be treated separately from the materials in Silos 1 and 2. This statement does not mandate any particular treatment method for any of the materials." The rationale for this recommendation is that the waste in Silo 3 is chemically very different from that in Silos 1 and 2, thus treatment of the wastes together could result in problems.
- (2) "The committee does not have a specific proposal for the treatment of Silo 3 wastes at this time, because more information needs to be developed concerning treatment alternatives." Cementation is not a fool proof process and other issues surrounding the use of an alternative technology for remediation of this waste need to be resolved.
- (3) "Vitrification continues to be the remedy of choice for Silo 1 and 2 materials and should be vigorously pursued. Recognizing that there is some possibility that vitrification may prove to be infeasible, it is important also to continue the evaluation of stabilization to determine whether stabilization is a bona fide back-up option for the treatment of Silo 1 and

2 materials. Any future decision to abandon vitrification must be clearly and fully developed and determined with full stakeholder participation." There are several reasons why vitrification should be pursued for this waste and there is not enough information to warrant a change from this technology.

Approach followed by DOE.

Recommendation 97-3: Proof of Principle for Silos 1 and 2

Due to increased costs for treatment of wastes in Silos 1 and 2 of OU4, the EPA has decided that a new ROD needed to be done. Three options for the reevaluation and new ROD for Silos 1 and 2 were introduced to the Waste Management Committee. Using the information obtained from both the pilot plant and IRT, the old feasibility study could be updated and a single remediation technology selected for the new ROD. Using the proof of principle process, multiple vendors with multiple remediation technologies could be evaluated. A generic ROD could also be developed which would stipulate that the wastes be remediated with a stabilization process to achieve certain waste disposal goals. All of these options would require a preliminary screening of technologies to select 3 or 4 best alternate technologies. Each option also requires that the vendor show proof that waste criteria will be met. The first option, however, does not evaluate market knowledge before tying the site to a technology. Option 3 does not provide room for stakeholder involvement following the proof of principle process. Thus, the Committee's recommendation was that a proof of principle be done prior to the ROD (option 2). This option provides the most opportunity to utilize stakeholder involvement and latest technological information. In implementing this recommendation, the committee would like the performance criteria stated and developed with stakeholder involvement. They also felt that the ROD should contain mention of an alternate technology in case the selected technology fails.

Approach adjusted by DOE.

Recommendation 97-4: Prioritization of Activities

After review of the FEMP FY 1999 Budget Priorities List and the Ohio Field Office FY 1999 Integrated Priority List, the Citizens Advisory Board felt that many non-remediation activities were given a higher priority than remediation activities and that a staggering amount of funds was assigned to these activities. In the FEMP budget, the ninth-ranked project is the first remediation project. On the Ohio Field Office budget, the silos are ranked 37th and the waste pits are 47th. The Board felt that although many of these non-remediation projects are necessary, many are not. The Board felt that DOE is not following their 1995 recommendations for a fast and cost-effective cleanup of the Fernald site.

No response as of 10/3/97.

Recommendation 97-5: Commerce Business Daily Notice for Silos 1 and 2

The Waste Management Committee reviewed the CBD notice issued as part of the proof of principle for Silos 1 and 2 (Recommendation 97-3). The committee found that the language of the notice was vague and several terms were undefined. Also, the situation and wastes were not adequately discussed within the notice. The purpose of the notice (for vendors to receive the RFP) was not discussed until late in the document.

No formal response requested.

**Recommendation 97-6: Supplemental Environmental Projects for OU4
Dispute Resolution**

As part of the dispute resolution for OU4, EPA has recommended several Supplemental Environmental Projects. After reviewing these projects, the Natural and Cultural Resources Committee had several comments and recommendations. Project 1, the creation of a habitat area, would not add to the community and the use of off-site land for this project is unacceptable. Projects 2 (grants for wildlife studies) and 3 (creation of a conservation area) should be done as a part of the normal restoration process at the site. The Board supports recycling and removal of contaminated wastes from the site and, thus, concurred with projects 4 and 5. Since recycling and reuse are important to the Board, they suggested that the majority of the money reserved for Supplemental Environmental Projects go to these activities. The committee also suggested that the reinterment of Native American remains be considered as an alternative Supplemental Environmental Project.

No response as of 10/3/97.



Summary of Fernald Citizen Advisory Board Recommendations

Since The July 1995 Report

Document	Overview of Recommendation	Response Document
<p>10/11/95 letter from John Applegate to Hazel O'Leary and Thomas Grumbly</p> <p>#95-1</p>	<p>Formal Task Force Recommendation:</p> <p>Agreed with DOE position that remediation schedule for K-65 wastes should not be interrupted to conduct research on radium extraction.</p>	<p>No formal response requested.</p>
<p>2/23/96 letter from John Applegate to Jack Craig</p> <p>#96-1</p>	<p>Informal Task Force Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stated that the preliminary design for on-site disposal facility should be consistent with July 1995 recommendations. • Requested that systems be put in place to collect and manage leachate exceeding 20 ppb after AWWT is shut down. 	<p>No formal response requested.</p>
<p>3/14/96 letter from John Applegate to Thomas Grumbly</p> <p>#96-2</p>	<p>Task Force Recommendations to Natural Resource Trustees that following issues were priorities in establishing comprehensive natural resources plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set aside clearly identified acreage as a natural preserve. • Develop site-wide grading and landscaping plan. • Protect Paddys Run corridor and forested wetlands to the north from degradation. 	<p>No formal response requested.</p>

Fernald Citizens Advisory Board Recommendations

Document	Overview of Recommendation	Response Document
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create new protected wetlands equivalent to acreage being destroyed. • Give northern areas of site, Paddys Run corridor and buffer zone priority in replacing natural resources. • Institute site enhancements concurrently with remediation, especially restoration of pine forests. 	
<p>6/28/96 letter from John Applegate to Jack Craig</p> <p>#96-3</p>	<p>Task Force Request for Information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total truck traffic expected over course of remediation. • Feasibility analysis of using intermodal transportation to deliver waste to NTS. • Expected wear and tear on area roads due to site construction traffic. <p>Task Force Recommendation to DOE to consider the following traffic restrictions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separation of school bus traffic and truck traffic from site. • Alternation of truck traffic between Miamitown and Ross. 	

Fernald Citizens Advisory Board Recommendations

Document	Overview of Recommendation	Response Document
<p>7/15/96 letter from Tom Wagner to Jack Craig</p> <p>#96-4</p>	<p>Transportation Committee Request for Information:</p> <p>Requested that DOE provide information on three options for using rail transport waste to NTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using the intermodal transfer in Las Vegas. • Moving the point of transfer to Envirocare facility. • Creating a transfer point at Caliente, NV. 	<p>11/1/96 letter from Jack Craig to Thomas Wagner indicating that no currently viable intermodal options exist.</p>
<p>7/15/96 letter from John Applegate to Jack Craig</p> <p>#96-5</p>	<p>Task Force Request for Information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress toward reduction in maintenance and security overhead costs. • Activities/decisions regarding removal of radium from K-65 wastes. 	
<p>10/5/96 letter from John Applegate to Jack Craig</p> <p>#96-6</p>	<p>Summarized Task Force stand on three issues from 9/29/96 meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Radium • Silo 3 • Frequency of future meetings 	<p>No formal response requested.</p>

Fernald Citizens Advisory Board Recommendations

Document	Overview of Recommendation	Response Document
<p>10/17/96 letter from Gene Willeke to Jack Craig</p> <p style="text-align: center;">#96-7</p>	<p>Waste Management Committee Request to DOE for information regarding treatment of Silo 3 materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify administrative and legal requirements of changing Silo 3 treatment. • Identify the potential effectiveness of cementation on Silo 3 material. • Provide a detailed analysis on increased volume of wastes associated with cementation. • Provide a detailed analysis comparing effectiveness of vitrification and cementation, risks of transportation, and compliance with waste acceptance criteria. • Verify that receiving facility is permitted to receive this waste, that waste meets transportation requirements, and that local stakeholders understand the changes. • Appoint IRT. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October, 1996 appointment of the IRT. • 4/29/97 letter from Jack Craig to Gene Willeke containing the requested information.
<p>10/31/96 letter from Tom Wagner to Jack Craig</p> <p style="text-align: center;">#96-8</p>	<p>Transportation Committee Recommendation and Request for Information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended that DOE not spend any more resources on evaluating rail transport by non-dedicated trains. • Recommended that transfer should take place near Envirocare using temporary facility to serve DOE only. 	<p>2/5/97 letter from Jack Craig to Thomas Wagner</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contained the requested information involving intermodal transport at a point near Envirocare. • Contained a comparison of the use of intermodal transport and truck

13

Fernald Citizens Advisory Board Recommendations

1083

14

Document	Overview of Recommendation	Response Document
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested information on intermodal transport. 	transport.
<p>2/19/97 letter from Jim Bierer to Jack Craig</p> <p style="text-align: center;">#97-1</p>	<p>Informal Natural Resources Committee Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested that DOE prepare fact sheets to keep citizens informed of site activities. Endorsed the Natural Resource Restoration Plan for early action to contour and plant in buffer zone. 	<p>5/9/97 letter from Jack Craig to Jim Bierer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicated that DOE will be sending a bi-weekly publication to update stakeholders of site activities. Planned to implement natural resource restoration to minimize visual impact of remediation activities.
<p>3/15/97 Gene Willeke presented to full Board and voted on unanimously</p> <p style="text-align: center;">#97-2</p>	<p>Formal Fernald Citizens Advisory Board Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "The material in Silo 3 should be treated separately from the materials in Silos 1 and 2. This statement does not mandate any particular treatment method for any of the materials." "The committee does not have a specific proposal for the treatment of Silo 3 wastes at this time, because more information needs to be developed concerning treatment alternatives." "Vitrification continues to be the remedy of choice for Silo 1 and 2 materials and should be vigorously pursued. Recognizing that there is some possibility that vitrification may prove to be unfeasible, it is important also to continue the evaluation of stabilization is a bona fide back-up option for the treatment of Silo 1 and 2 materials. Any future decision to abandon vitrification must be clearly and fully developed and determined with full stakeholder participation." 	Approach followed by DOE.

Fernald Citizens Advisory Board Recommendations

Document	Overview of Recommendation	Response Document
<p>6/11/97 letter from Gene Willeke to Jack Craig</p> <p style="text-align: center;">#97-3</p>	<p>Waste Management Committee Recommendation:</p> <p>A Proof of Principle should be done prior to the ROD for Silos 1 and 2. This would provide the best combination of the latest information and stakeholder input.</p>	<p>Approach adjusted by DOE.</p>
<p>9/23/97 letter from John Applegate to Bob Volker</p> <p style="text-align: center;">#97-4</p>	<p>Citizens Advisory Board Recommendation:</p> <p>Prioritization of non-remediation projects and the amount of funds spent on them are too high.</p>	<p>No response as of 10/3/97.</p>
<p>9/23/97 letter from Gene Willeke to Jack Craig</p> <p style="text-align: center;">#97-5</p>	<p>Waste Management Committee Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CBD notice for Silo 3 was vague. Recommended that a few sentences should be added to describe the site and wastes. • The term "proof of principle" was not adequately defined. • Microencapsulation would have been better defined as polymer-based microencapsulation. • The purpose of the document was not clearly stated. • The notice called for use of "full-scale" use of the applied technology when "proven" or "demonstrated" would have been more appropriate. 	<p>No formal response requested.</p>

15

Fernald Citizens Advisory Board Recommendations

Document	Overview of Recommendation	Response Document
<p>9/25/97 letter from Jim Bierer to Jim Saric</p> <p>#97-6</p>	<p>Natural and Cultural Resources Committee Recommendations for Supplemental Environmental Projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project 1 did not contribute to the site. Additional off-site land should not have been acquired for this purpose.• Projects 2 and 3 should have been inducted as a matter of course for resource restoration.• Projects 4 and 5 were in alignment with the Citizens Advisory Board's previous recommendations.• SEP money should go to recycling and reuse projects.• The reinterment of Native American remains should be considered as an SEP.	<p>No response as of 10/3/97.</p>

1083

DOE NEWS

NEWS MEDIA CONTACT:
Anne Elliott, 202/586-5806

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
October 31, 1997

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY FOR ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT AL ALM ANNOUNCES HIS RESIGNATION

Secretary of Energy Federico Peña today expressed his regret that Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management Al Alm has informed him that he is leaving the Department of Energy at the end of January 1998.

"Mr. Alm has accomplished a great deal, and he will be missed. He has spearheaded the effort to accelerate cleanup of the weapons complex, and he has been willing to make difficult decisions that will result in faster cleanup, lower risk and substantial savings for the American taxpayers," Secretary Peña said. "Mr. Alm has displayed a sense of courage and integrity throughout his career, and he has served admirably in what has to be one of the most demanding jobs in government. I wish him well in his future endeavors."

"I have been gratified to have had the opportunity to serve in this important job," Assistant Secretary Alm said. "I very much appreciate the efforts of the talented DOE staff in helping us achieve a new focus on completion."

Among his accomplishments while at the Department of Energy, Assistant Secretary Alm spearheaded the Accelerated Cleanup Plan 2006 to accelerate cleanup of the legacy of 50 years of weapons production. He worked hard to develop the management foundation to achieve these cleanup goals, focusing on project completion, metrics and strong efforts to improve the efficiency of Department of Energy contractor operations.

Mr. Alm's distinguished career includes work in government, academia and business. He started with the Atomic Energy Commission at the beginning of the Kennedy Administration. He then worked for the Bureau of the Budget (now the Office of Management and Budget) for seven years, most notably on environmental problems. He was the first staff director of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, and moved on to become the Environmental Protection Agency's Assistant Administrator of Planning and Management. He served as chief staffer to President Carter's National Energy Plan and then became the first Department of Energy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Evaluation. After a period as a faculty member at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, he became EPA's Deputy Administrator. Mr. Alm also spent ten years in senior positions in the private sector.

R-97-121

-DOE-



Printed with soy ink on recycled paper

■ U.S. Department of Energy

● Office of the Press Secretary

● Washington, DC 20585 ■

17



Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

October 31, 1997

To My Fellow EM Employees:

When I accepted the appointment to be Assistant Secretary of Environmental Management over a year and a half ago, it was my personal mission to lay a new management foundation that could accelerate the cleanup of former nuclear weapons production facilities. My vision of this approach derived not from political expediency or change-for-change sake, but from a deep-rooted belief that we owe future generations a legacy of cleanup and completion, not generations of more cost and continued contamination. That foundation is now firmly in place, and I have a real sense of pride in what we have accomplished together.

Now that this is accomplished, I want to let you know that I have told Secretary Peña that I will be resigning the position of Assistant Secretary. I expect to leave by the end of January 1998.

The accelerated cleanup program that will see many former DOE weapons sites restored by 2006 and billions of dollars saved is a great source of pride to me and should be to each of you. In a time of tremendous budget and policy pressure, we have obtained funding in some areas that is more than requested. Congress has endorsed the 2006 acceleration plan, and we have successfully pursued new relations with States and stakeholders that can garner consensus on how to meet the cleanup challenges.

Particular pride should be taken in the major steps made toward opening the first geologic repository in the Nation, the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico. We have completed the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and, even more critical, the Environmental Protection Agency has supported the project with their draft compliance certification. Movement of the transuranic-contaminated materials to that repository is now more than a hope...it is on schedule for next year.

I know you will continue in the tradition of highest technical and analytical expertise. Even under the enormous strain of a Reduction-In-Force, this program and its employees has maintained its focus and kept faith with the great responsibilities laid upon it.

My greatest regret during my tenure is that we have been unable to avoid that RIF, despite all of our efforts to do so. I realize the pain and dislocation that this is causing some of our employees.

My greatest satisfaction is the new direction that we have begun together one that brings the vague vision of a cleaned-up weapons complex into focus and into reality.

Transforming many "activities" into "projects" and reformulating the budget into one based on closure, will assure that what we have started will be able to sustain support and maintain funding to complete what we together have started.

I will not be able to thank each of you personally, though many I will. Let this message be just one "Thank You".

Al Alon

1083



Fernald Environmental Management Project
P. O. Box 538704
Cincinnati, Ohio 45253-8704
FEMP Web site: <http://www.fernald.gov>

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Nov. 3, 1997

NEWS MEDIA CONTACTS:

Tricia Thompson
Fluor Daniel Fernald Public Affairs Director
513-648-4068
tricia_thompson@fernald.gov

Kathy Graham
Fluor Daniel Fernald Public Affairs
513-648-4072
kathy_graham@fernald.gov

Fluor Ranks NUMBER ONE Among *Fortune* Magazine's Most Admired Companies

CINCINNATI, Ohio, Nov. 3, 1997 - *Fortune* magazine has identified Fluor Corp. as "the world's most admired public company in the engineering and construction industry." Its Oct. 27 issue features the first-ever list of global companies ranked by their peers. Fluor is the only U.S.-based company ranked in the engineering and construction industry.

"I am proud of all the Fluor Daniel Fernald employees for adding to the success of Fluor Corp.," said John Bradburne, president of Fluor Daniel Fernald, a subsidiary of Fluor Corp. "Fluor Corp. is successful when the thousands of projects located throughout the world are successful -- including Fluor Daniel Fernald. Fluor Daniel Fernald has made tremendous progress in cleaning up the Fernald site and we will continue to work with the U.S. Department of Energy and members of the community to eliminate health risks and eventually close the site."

Les McCraw, chairman and chief executive officer of Fluor Corp., said, "We are honored to know that our peers judged us so favorably against criteria which truly measures the strength and culture of an organization. This acknowledgment shows that our reputation stretches around the world -- a reputation which has been built by the outstanding contributions of our employees to bring value to our clients' projects worldwide and to enhance their business operations."

-- more --

Fluor Ranks NUMBER ONE Among *Fortune* Magazine's Most Admired Companies

Judged by senior executives and outside directors in the industry, as well as by financial analysts, the criteria *Fortune* used to rank companies included:

- Innovation
- Overall quality of management
- Value as a long-term investment
- Responsibility to the community and the environment
- Ability to attract and keep talented people
- Quality of products or services
- Financial soundness
- Wise use of corporate assets
- Effectiveness in doing business globally.

Fluor Corp. is one of the world's largest engineering, construction, maintenance and diversified services companies. Fluor Daniel Fernald is a subsidiary of Fluor Corp., and is the primary contractor responsible for cleaning up the Fernald site.

#####



MEMORANDUM

TO: Fernald Citizens Advisory Board members

FROM: John Applegate

SUBJECT: 1998 Meeting Schedule

DATE: November 3, 1997

Here is the proposed 1998 schedule for Fernald Citizens Advisory Board meetings.

Saturday, January 17

Saturday, March 14

Saturday, May 16

Wednesday, July 15

Saturday, September 19

Saturday, November 11

October 30, 1997
 Cincinnati Enquirer
 Hometown, B3
 "New lab captures
 interest of kids"
 Reporter:
 Gina Gentry-Fletcher

New lab captures interest of kids

Businesses help make it reality

BY GINA GENTRY-FLETCHER
 The Cincinnati Enquirer

HARRISON — Julie Feldkamp strapped on her safety goggles, shoved her fingers into the surgical gloves and methodically arranged materials for a science experiment on a lab table.

With intense concentration, she created a mixture of borax, water and glue, then squeezed the gooey mess with her gloved fingers.

This so-called "ghastly alien slime" was created in Pam Stevenson's sixth-grade science class Thursday at Harrison Elementary School.

It, and other hands-on experiments, were not possible last year. A new science lab has changed that. With help from the school's business partners, parents and local companies, an empty classroom at the school, in the Southwest Local School District, has been transformed into a children's wonderland for science.

On Monday, the school will dedicate and show the lab to supporters who donated about \$15,000 and contributed furniture, equipment and supplies.

"It's been almost 100 percent community-driven," said Principal Robert Stoll. "We needed a place for the kids to study science, and we went to the local businesses and said: 'We need your help.' Their response was overwhelming."

As part of its effort to enhance science education, Fluor Daniel Fernald formed a school-business partnership with Ross and Southwest local school districts. The company donated about \$10,000 to Southwest for the Harrison Elementary lab, and wants to contribute \$10,000 more to each district in the



Harrison Elementary sixth-grader Staci Kraus, 11, measures water for an experiment in the school's new science lab Thursday.

The Cincinnati Enquirer/Tony Jones

programs.

Its program, called Successful Teaming for Education Partnerships in Science, is designed to help the districts update science equipment and labs, provide teacher workshops and support curriculum development, said company representative Susan Walpole, who visited the school Thursday.

Harrison teachers say the lab will better prepare students for the science portion of the Ohio Proficiency Test, given in the fourth, sixth, ninth and 12th grades.

"The kids have to have hands-on experiences in order to pass the test," Mrs. Stevenson said. "Labs give

with real-life skills in terms of predicting and thinking."

Microscopes, lab tables, beakers, aquariums and many other science tools are now vital parts of Harrison's science instruction. But it doesn't stop there. In the hallway, students can also monitor a glass-encased ecosystem with turtles, a snake and plants.

Teachers have noticed the difference in students' interest in science.

Rachel Deaton, 11, eagerly showed off a pair of leopard geckos — a type of lizard — in a classroom aquarium. "That hole in his head is his ears, and if you look at just the right angle, you can see

told a classroom visitor.

"When they do with their hands, it stays in their minds," Mrs. Stevenson said. "The kids come in and always ask, 'Is it lab day?' They can't wait to do more."

The slime experiment was one way to grab their attention, but the plan was to teach them about chemical and physical changes.

The students say these often-goopy lessons are fun.

"I like the lab a lot," said Julie, as she, Jim Brown, Ryan Westrich and Steven Simpson, all 11, created their slime. "We get to do more besides just reading."

Said Ryan: "You get to try new experiments. We never

Broad Fernald health study sought

CDC requests funding from DOE

By **NICHOLAS G. JONSON**
Journal News
HARRISON

A branch of the federal Centers for Disease Control will ask the U.S. Department of Energy to fund a study to examine whether various diseases more frequently affect

Fernald-area residents than the general population.

The request marks a change in the way the CDC has studied the health effects of radiation exposure.

The CDC previously sought to study whether a relationship exists between incidents of lung cancer and the proximity of residents to the former uranium-processing facility.

But in August, a committee of citizens overseeing health-related research asked the

CDC to change its focus. The committee — the Fernald Health Effects Subcommittee — asked the CDC to direct its efforts toward determining whether other health conditions, in addition to lung cancer, may have resulted from radiation exposure.

On Wednesday, Dr. Jo Anne Burg of the CDC's Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry said her agency will ask the DOE to fund a \$60,000 study to docu-

ment the diseases occurring among certain residents within 10 kilometers of the plant.

Burg said the study would analyze the health disorders of 9,500 residents in the Fernald Medical Monitoring Program to determine whether abnormal numbers of certain disorders are occurring.

The results could then be

(Please see FERNALD, Page A2)

Fernald

(Continued from Page A1)

used to warn area physicians of recurring illnesses and to provide guidelines for further research, Burg said.

Burg said it would not be scientifically sound to deduce health trends about the general population from the small sample in the medical monitoring program.

The reason is that those people who have reported their health conditions to the monitoring program are more likely to be suffering from radiation-related disorders, she said.

Nevertheless, several members of the health-effects subcommittee voiced their support for the study.

"It seems like an extraordinarily cheap way to get some very valuable information," subcommittee member Robert Hanavan Sr. said.

If the DOE approves funding, the study could begin by the end of this year and be finished by October 1998, Burg said.

Burg said she would present details of the proposed study to the health-effects subcommittee during the next quarterly meeting.

23

November 07, 1997
 Cincinnati Enquirer
 Local, C1
 "Nuclear records assailed"
 Reporter: Paul Barton

Nuclear records assailed

Critics say ingestion not logged

BY PAUL BARTON
 Enquirer Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON — Radiation exposure records of 500,000 to 600,000 Cold War nuclear weapons workers — including those at Fernald — are "deeply flawed," because inhaled or ingested materials were not included, a leading watchdog group on nuclear cleanup issues charged Thursday.

The Institute for Energy and Environmental Research (IEER), based in Takoma Park, Md., made the charge based on internal Department of Energy documents it recently obtained.

A review of Energy Department records showed that prior to 1989, only exposures to external sources of radiation, as opposed to internal, were included in radiation exposure records of workers, the group said.

Internal radiation exposures come when radioactive material or particles are inhaled through the mouth or absorbed through wounds or cuts.

"Large numbers of nuclear workers have received information which systematically understates their actual exposures," said Dr. Arjun Makhijani, president of the IEER, which carries out research with funding from major foundations.

New study sought

The group said it was calling on the Energy Department to commission a new independent assessment of the quality of external and internal dosage data it has for Cold War workers.

The call follows recent

complaints by workers at the former Fernald uranium processing facility that not enough attention has been paid to the health risks workers endured during the Cold War.

Much more attention has been given to the radiation exposures experienced by communities near the former weapons plants, they complain.

It was urine samples and other tests that IEER scientists performed on Fernald workers during a class-action lawsuit settled in 1994 that first alerted the group to the danger of internal exposures.

Exposures not logged

But the recently obtained Energy Department documents now show the same internal radiation exposures were not included in the radiation dose records of workers across the nationwide nuclear weapons complex.

"Just as the nuclear weapons establishment chose not to properly inform the public about the risks and sacrifices imposed by radioactive iodine in fallout from weapons tests, plant operators assured their employees that their exposures were under allowable limits," said Bernd Franke, IEER executive director, in a statement.

The Energy Department replied Thursday that it wanted to provide "state-of-the-art" radiation protection for its workers and remains concerned about what may have happened to former workers.

Peter Brush, acting assistant secretary for environmental, safety and health issues, said Thursday the department plans to conduct a test at a "representative departmental site" to determine whether "including internal exposures would contribute in a meaningful way to our understanding of overall doses."

November 05, 1997

Cincinnati Enquirer

Opinion, A19

"Fernald making progress in cleanup"

Chuck Easley

1083

Fernald making progress in cleanup

I would like to comment on the front-page story, "Fernald, DOE get another 'F'" (Oct. 24).

It appears to me that the so-called watchdog group merely dredged up old information and reported on it again. As your article stated, *The Enquirer* reported the problems with the waste vitrification pilot plant in February 1996. How many times must *The Enquirer* and others rehash this old information?

I toured the Fernald site and learned of the many facets of the clean-up program being carried out there. It would be good to see *The Enquirer* give a report on the overall site cleanup effort, instead of continuing to harp on the vitrification project. If you did, I am sure you would discover that very real and commendable progress is being made toward cleanup of the site. Some of the activities seldom mentioned in the press include:

- ▶ Decontamination and dismantling of process buildings.
- ▶ Removal of waste materials and uranium inventories for safe disposal or use at other locations.
- ▶ Pumping of ground water through specially constructed purification systems to remove contamination.
- Construction of containment cells for holding low-level contaminated soil to prevent its further contamination of ground water.

It is unfortunate that past expediences at the Fernald site resulted in the environmental contamination problems that must now be cleaned up. But we should remember that those efforts, which spanned a period of nearly four decades, were very significant in helping the Western World win the Cold War.

The Enquirer should continue to report on the Fernald cleanup, but it should report fairly on current progress instead of concentrating on past errors.

CHUCK EASLEY
Loveland

November 9, 1997
Cincinnati Enquirer
A13

"Study faults way radiation danger was measured"

By Matthew Wald

Study faults way radiation danger was measured

BY MATTHEW L. WALD

The New York Times

WASHINGTON — In the first 45 years of nuclear weapons production, the U.S. government failed to properly track the radiation exposures of thousands of bomb workers, according to a new report by a private nonprofit group.

Until the late 1980s, the government did not properly analyze the effect of radioactive materials these workers inhaled or swallowed, according to the report. Instead, the government tracked only radiation doses from sources outside the body, usually by requiring workers to wear badges made of photographic-type film, whose cloudiness was measured to determine radiation exposure.

Urine samples were also taken from workers to look for signs that employees had inhaled or swallowed uranium or any other radioactive material. But measurements of the intake and ingestion were not combined with data about external doses to calculate a total exposure rate, according to the report by Institute for Energy and Environmental Research.

Fernald investigated

The institute, based in Takoma Park, Md., has also investigated radiation exposures at the Fernald uranium-processing plant in Crosby Township. A 1995 study by the group concluded that radiation doses for Fernald workers were understated routinely in the 1950s and 1960s.

That study found that more than half of Fernald workers were overexposed in every year but one throughout the 1950s. The now-closed Fer-

naid plant, formally known as the Feed Materials Production Center, processed raw uranium ore into uranium metal products used by other plants to make atomic weapons and reactor fuel.

Between the mid-1940s and the late 1980s, an estimated 500,000 to 600,000 people worked in the U.S. nuclear weapons complex. During the arms buildup, the nuclear weapons effort was managed by the Atomic Energy Commission and successor agencies, most recently the Energy Department.

Large numbers affected

The new study shows that "large numbers of nuclear weapons workers have received information which systematically understates their actual exposures," said Arjun Makhijani, president of the institute. But he said the data available were not sufficient to say how many workers were affected.

At the Energy Department, Peter Brush, the acting assistant secretary for environment, safety and health, said that Mr. Makhijani was correct that the combined doses had not been calculated. He said, though, that until the late 1980s, it was not universal practice to do so. "We weren't overexposing them, in accordance with the then-accepted guidance," he said.

He said the department would take a sample of workers and study the combined doses "to determine whether including internal exposures would contribute in a meaningful way to our understanding of overall doses." But he said that the sample would probably not find many cases of overexposure.