



Chair
John S. Applegate

Vice Chair
James C. Bierer

Members
Marvin W. Clawson
Lisa Crawford
Pamela Dunn
Constance Fox, M.D.
Darryl D. Huff
Dan McElroy
Warren E. Strunk
Robert G. Tabor
Dr. Thomas E. Wagner
Dr. Gene E. Willeke

Ex Officio
L. French Bell
Jack Craig
Gene Jablonowski
Graham Mitchell

Minutes from the September 20, 1997 Meeting

The Fernald Citizens Advisory Board met from 10:05 a.m. until 1:12 p.m. on Saturday, September 20, 1997, at the Alpha Building, 10967 Hamilton-Cleves Highway, Harrison, Ohio. The meeting was advertised in local papers and open to the public.

Members Present:

John Applegate
French Bell
Jim Bierer
Marvin Clawson
Lisa Crawford
Constance Fox
Gene Jablonowski
Darryl Huff
Graham Mitchell
Robert Tabor
Thomas Rentschler

Members Absent:

Dan McElroy
Warren Strunk
Jack Craig
Pam Dunn
Thomas Wagner
Gene Willeke

Designated Federal Official Present: Ken Morgan

Staff Present: Tereza Marks
Crystal Sarno
Douglas Sarno

About 5 spectators also attended the meeting, including members of the public and representatives from DOE and Fluor Daniel Fernald.

Transportation Committee

Sarno provided the update on behalf of Tom Wagner, Committee Chair. The committee is still committed to intermodal transport of wastes, but wastes will not be able to go through the North Las Vegas transfer station due to public objection.

Waste Management

Doug Sarno provided the update on behalf of Gene Willeke, Committee Chair. The committee has been very busy. Willeke has been instrumental in the consideration of microencapsulation as an alternative to cementation for Silo 3 wastes. The committee traveled to Brookhaven National Laboratory on July 16, 1997, to observe the microencapsulation technology. Microencapsulation appears to be a simple and clean process. Sarno feels that Fernald will be able to get bids on this process.

Crawford commented that the FRESH meeting on September 25, 1997, would include an hour and a half presentation on microencapsulation by experts from Envirocare and Brookhaven. She invited interested members of the Citizens Advisory Board to attend this meeting. Sarno explained that microencapsulation is not a new process but has not really been applied to hazardous wastes. Commercial equipment is readily available.

The Waste Management Committee met on September 16, 1997, to discuss the Silos decision and upcoming events. An RFP for Silo 3 is at DOE headquarters now and will then be released for public review. The committee will provide input into the RFP. There will be a Commerce Business Daily announcement for Silos 1 and 2 which the committee will also review. The committee will have a teleconference on Monday, September 22, 1997, to review the CBD. Sarno also pointed out that the committee will need to consider new plans to build interim storage for the Silos' wastes. There is no detailed information on plans for this now. While there are many advantages of such an approach, the committee is concerned that this may take away the incentive to clean up the silo wastes quickly.

Bierer notified the Citizens Advisory Board members that the DOE Community Meeting on October 14, 1997, will contain a tour of the on-site disposal cell.

Efficiency Committee

Bob Tabor, Committee Chair, announced that the Efficiency Committee had its initial meeting in July to outline the scope and direction of the committee. The next meeting is planned for September 27, 1997. DOE, EPA, OEPA and Fluor Daniel Fernald all attended the initial meeting. The committee will be looking at the distinction between remediation funds and overhead funds. They need to look at what is driving the funds and the justification for the expense. Bob Tabor distributed a letter to Jack Craig, commenting on the budget priorities for Fernald and the Ohio Field Office, for review by Board members.

In reviewing these priorities lists, the committee came to the conclusion that the remediation projects were in the correct order but that there were large numbers of overhead projects which would need to be completed before remediation could begin. The committee does not believe the 1995 recommendations of the Citizens Advisory Board.

Sarno asked for recommendations on changes to the letter presented to the group by Tabor. It was suggested that the phrase "This is too high" be punctuated by an exclamation point. It was also suggested that the letter go the Ohio Field Office and be that a copy be sent to Jack Craig. Rentschler proposed that a cover letter be provided to each person to whom the letter is sent to explain why they were receiving the letter. Crawford made a

ATSDR

French Bell said that ATSDR was anticipating the release of the Public Health Assessment shortly. He suggested that the ATSDR do a follow-up letter to those of the Citizens Advisory Board addressing the effect of the delayed clean up on public health. He will also try to involve the Fernald Health Advisory Committee.

4. Membership Roundtable

Applegate explained that the issues in front of the Citizens Advisory Board have changed since the organization began. The issues have moved beyond the basics and have become more technical. For example, the decision by DOE to hold a monthly meeting is a move in the correct direction. Applegate noted that the decrease in citizen involvement in these meetings is not a result of disinterest, but rather an increase in the confidence which people have about the direction of activities at Fernald. He pointed out that the many members of the Citizens Advisory Board have been involved with the site since the beginning and are more familiar with the issues than people at DOE headquarters.

One of the first things the Citizens Advisory Board members should consider is their expectations of the Board. We must also make a clear path forward on replacing vacant spots on the Board. We need to decide how we are going to recruit new members.

Since the Citizens Advisory Board has more continuity than DOE headquarters, it needs to remind DOE of the Board's original goals. A copy of the original report should be sent to DOE headquarters and to the Ohio Field Office.

Citizens Advisory Board members need to decide how much time we want to spend per month attending meetings and working on the Board. Sarno provided handouts examining the range of time that could be spent per month. One evening a month was considered to be a minimum whereas three to four evenings/month was considered to be on the high end of the range.

Members of the Board agreed that the Citizens Advisory Board is likely to be around for a long time. Because of this, the following things must be done:

- 1) Monitor the progress of the group, both its accomplishments and obstacles
- 2) Remind DOE headquarters (and others) of the Citizens Advisory Board's goals
- 3) Keep the public informed of the Board's activities
- 4) Make a "report card" to determine how well the Citizens Advisory Board's recommendations are being met

With several openings on the Board, the Citizens Advisory Board must consider how to recruit new members. Ken Morgan noted that the spirit of the board is to represent the community as a whole, so all groups must be represented. He would like to see a member from the environmental community who is not already involved in the site. Many members felt that new members should be recruited from already involved groups, because it would be difficult to learn all the issues from scratch.

Sarno discussed the membership recruitment used in the past. He pointed out that this method provides more applicants than are needed and thus, the Citizens Advisory Board will have to turn qualified individuals down. This process could lead to the perception of the Board as exclusionary. He suggested that prospective members be approached by the Citizens Advisory Board ensuring that no one would be turned down.