

Minutes from the November 6, 1999 Meeting

The Fernald Citizens Advisory Board met from 8:30 a.m. until 12:15 p.m. on Saturday, November 6, 1999, in the Alpha Building, Hamilton-Cleves Highway, Hamilton, Ohio. The meeting was advertised in local papers and was open to the public.

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Members Present | French Bell Jim Bierer Sandy Butterfield Marvin Clawson Jack Craig Lisa Crawford Lou Doll Pam Dunn Darryl Huff Mike Keyes Gene Jablonowski Jane Harper Graham Mitchell Ken Moore Robert Tabor Fawn Thompson Thomas Wagner Gene Willeke |
| Designated Federal Official | Gary Stegner |
| Phoenix Environmental Staff | Douglas Sarno Crystal Sarno |
| FDF Staff | Tisha Patton Sue Walpole |

Approximately 20 spectators also attended the meeting, including members of the public, the media, the Silos Independent Review Team, the Silos Critical Analysis Team, and representatives from Department of Energy and Fluor Daniel Fernald.

1. Call to Order

Jim Bierer called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

2. Remarks and Announcements

Bierer asked if there were any announcements.

Susan Brechbill remarked that she believed that the Ohio Field Office had not adequately publicized their successes. In the coming week, a number of delegates from the Ohio Field Office will be in Washington DC meeting with different offices to discuss the many success stories at Fernald.

Doug Sarno announced that the International Association for Public Participation has an annual awards process for programs demonstrating outstanding public participation. John Applegate submitted the Fernald CAB as a nominee, and Fernald has won this years "Organization of the Year" award. This award is a testament to the vision of both the stakeholders and DOE. The award will be presented in Canada on November 17. As no DOE representative will be able to attend, Doug will accept the award on behalf of Fernald and we will plan a local celebration afterward.

Jack Craig provided an update on the cattle grazing issues. DOE is in the process of finalizing new lease with the cattle owner. Fences will be moved and cows relocated from the northern woodlots within the month.

3. Report on SSAB Chairs Meeting

Doug Sarno, Tom Wagner and Tisha Patton attended the SSAB Chairs Meeting, held in Richland, Washington in September. At the Chairs meeting each SSAB chair was able to present their individual concerns to DOE and Tom reiterated the Fernald concerns about holding stakeholder meetings during the week. Secretary Richardson addressed the chairs in a video conference call and Assistant Secretary Huntoon was on hand the day before the meeting to address concerns raised by the Chairs. A significant amount of time was spent planning for the upcoming SSAB's Stewardship Meeting, as well as the DOE guidance to SSABs, trying to clarify and refine the guidance.

Doug noted that it was time for the FCAB to conduct its annual evaluation of workplans, committee structure, and membership guidelines. DOE HQ is getting very strict about membership guidelines. Some SSABs have been waiting for up to six months for new members to be approved. While this has never been a problem for the FCAB, they should be aware of it in the future as they assess member terms and work to install new members. A meeting of the steering committee will be scheduled for January to evaluate these issues.

4. Report on Stewardship Workshop and Next Steps for the Stewardship Committee

Five CAB members were able to attend the SSAB Stewardship Workshop in Oak Ridge, Tennessee in November along with DOE, FDF, and Ohio EPA representatives. Doug was the facilitator for the meeting. The result of this workshop was a series of statements called "Next Steps for Stewardship". It is being left up to individual SSABs as to how they would like to use these statements in crafting site-specific recommendations. The FCAB will be addressing stewardship issues throughout 2000 and come up with a set of specific recommendations for the site.

There will be no committee meetings in December. The next stewardship committee meeting in January will be a scoping meeting for stewardship. The meeting will be used to identify the scope of stewardship issues at the Fernald Site and how they affect remediation. From that meeting the committee will begin to identify what needs to go into a site stewardship plan.

A schedule for the year 2000 will be sent to FCAB members in the next mailing from Phoenix Environmental.

5. Silos Technology Comparative Analysis

Doug Sarno introduced the issue. DOE will be making a decision on the preferred technology to treat materials in Silos 1 and 2 and deliver a draft proposed plan to USEPA by February 1, 2000. DOE has conducted a detailed evaluation of two technologies - vitrification and chemical stabilization and produced a Feasibility Study to document this evaluation. The FCAB Remediation Committee has been meeting with DOE and FDF over the past few months to evaluate the Feasibility Study. There have been two panels working with DOE to evaluate the quality of the Feasibility study and to help assess the silos issue.

The CERCLA process requires DOE to evaluate the options against nine criteria. The most important are: Compliance with Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements, and Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment. Both technologies satisfy the requirements of these two threshold criteria. The next criteria are referred to as balancing criteria: long term effectiveness and permanence, reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment, short term effectiveness, implementability, and cost. While there are many differences between the technologies, Remediation Committee members did not believe that there are clear winners and losers in any of the categories. Overall, Remediation Committee members believe that reduction in volume and implementability were the main factors where significant differences existed upon which an evaluation could be developed. The volume of material from stabilization is much higher than for vitrification, while implementability seemed to favor chemical stabilization. Overall, as far as the Remediation committee is

concerned, the scales appear basically balanced. Finally, two modifying criteria must be taken into account: community and state acceptance.

The goal of this meeting is for the CAB to determine how to make its recommendations regarding this issue.

Terry Hagen of Fluor Daniel Fernald led a presentation on the benefits and drawbacks of both vitrification and chemical stabilization. The feasibility study provides an evaluation of each technology against each of the CERCLA criteria. These results were summarized for the FCAB.

Steve McCracken of the DOE Independent Review Team was asked about the conclusions of the Team. IRT members individually conducted their own analysis and then discussed those analysis among each other. The analyses ended up very similar. There are four points that IRT members felt were most important in assuring the success of the technology that is ultimately implemented. First is the overall capability of the Vendor, regardless of the technology. Second is DOE's and FDF's ability to manage the project. Third is the success or failure of the Silo 3 project and Accelerated Waste Retrieval project, how these projects go will greatly impact the ability to finish the overall job. Fourth is the use of the labor force, concern was expressed that the current contractual agreements has Fernald workers working for someone to which they do not report.

Todd Martin of the Critical Analysis Team also agreed that implementability was the most important criteria in developing a preferred alternative. The CAT evaluated the risks associated with achieving the project's objectives. On the highest level, there are significant risks with each technology but they are different. For Vitrification, there will be difficulty dealing with off gasses and a high temperature environment. For Chemical Stabilization, the remote operations and the ability to achieve desired waste loadings will be an issue.

The IRT recommendations concentrated on two themes. First, get on with the project, the process of redoing the Feasibility Study with another year to go before a ROD is signed is taking too long. Second, provide flexibility in the ROD so that alternatives are available to deal with the very real likelihood of failure without going through this process again. Martin noted that if the CAT had to vote on which technology to select, they would come down right on the fence, it really comes down to an issue of what you value most.

It was noted that secondary waste is going to be a big problem with both technologies.

Lisa Crawford pointed out that when there is the public meeting, the most important issue – by far, will be public health and safety. She also stressed that the CAB and agencies involved really listen to the Nevada stakeholders to be sure they understand what is important to them.

Don Paine of FDF pointed out that with vitrification there was a greatly increased chance of worker injury or death. Neither process would be easy, but vitrification was far more complex and his vote would be to Keep It Simple.

French Bell commented that the public would be very likely to inquire about worse case scenarios.

Ken Moore asked when in the public involvement process does the CAB make a recommendation. Doug Sarno said that input was necessary as soon after the December 1 availability session as possible, work on drafting the proposed plan is about to get underway. It was decided to hold a Remediation Committee meeting on December 6th at 6:00 pm. All FCAB members are strongly encouraged to attend the meeting.

6. Public Comment

Bierer opened the floor to public comment. There was none.

7. Adjournment

Jim Bierer adjourned the meeting at 12:15 p.m.

I certify that these minutes are an accurate account of the
November 6, 1999, meeting of the Fernald Citizens Advisory Board.

James Bierer, Chair
Fernald Citizens Advisory Board

Date

Gary Stegner
Deputy Designated Federal Official

Date