



# MEETING SUMMARY

**Date:** February 12, 2003

**Topics:**

- How to Address DOE's Long-Term Stewardship Commitments
- Suggested FCAB Action on the Natural Resources Injury Settlement
- Process to Determine Feasibility of a MUEF

**Attendees:**

**Fernald Citizens Advisory Board**

Jim Bierer  
Marvin Clawson  
Lisa Crawford  
Pam Dunn  
Bob Tabor

**FRESH**

Edwa Yocum  
Carol Schroer

**The Perspectives Group**

David Bidwell  
Douglas Sarno

**U.S. Department of Energy**

Gary Stegner

**Ohio Environmental Protection Agency**

Donna Bohannon  
Tom Schneider

**Fluor Fernald**

Joe Shomaker  
Rick Strobl  
Jeff Wagner  
Sue Walpole  
Eric Woods  
Larry Stebbins

**Others**

Jim Innis

## **General Announcements**

Doug Sarno opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda. He distributed a complete Stewardship Toolbox binder to each of the committee members and highlighted some of the toolbox's contents. This resource will be updated on a monthly basis.

Doug noted that DOE had announced that the new Office of Legacy Management would be fully established by October, 2003. Mike Owens, from the Office of Community and Worker Transition, will be the interim manager of the office. The Grand Junction Office, which has been named as the steward for Fernald, will report to this new organization. Legacy Management will also manage some benefits for past site workers. Few details are available at this time, but the proposed FY04 budget shows a slight increase in funding for long-term stewardship. Doug explained that because Site Specific Advisory Boards are chartered to the Office of Environmental Management, they might have no official standing with this new office. The Stewardship Committee asked Doug to draft a letter that would stress the importance of public participation in the activities of the Office of Legacy Management. The committee agreed it would recommend to the FCAB that this letter be sent to Jessie Roberson and copied to Mike Owens and Bob Card.

Doug announced that the feasibility study report, *Telling the Story of Fernald*, has been distributed to all SSABs, many DOE sites that do not have advisory boards, and other officials. He stated that some nonprofit organizations would also receive copies of the report. Pam Dunn offered to distribute copies of the report at the March meeting of the Alliance for Nuclear Accountability.

Jeff Wagner explained that the Public Affairs department was responsible for coordinating public involvement in the Site Technology Coordination Group, which was recently disbanded. He apologized for having communicated poorly regarding the status of the group. Jeff stated that he spoke with Paul Petit at the site, and Paul is receptive to meeting once more with the group to discuss any outstanding issues.

Jeff also announced that Luther Brown would begin an electronic system to notify people sixty days prior to the destruction of any site records. Pam Dunn, Jim Bierer, and Bob Tabor all asked that they be added to the distribution list for these notifications. Jeff stated that Luther would provide an update to the group at the March committee meeting.

Jim Innis noted that Graham Mitchell from Ohio EPA would be speaking at the March 3 meeting of Fernald Living History, Inc. The meeting will be held at the Crosby Township Senior Center.

## **How to Address DOE's Long-Term Stewardship Commitments**

Doug acknowledged that the committee had expressed many concerns at recent meetings regarding DOE's commitments to long-term stewardship at the Fernald site. He reviewed a draft chart, which outlined DOE's current commitments and public expectations for four stewardship components: long-term surveillance and maintenance of the remedy, maintenance of the ecological restoration, Native American reburials, and community-based stewardship. Doug announced that Steve McCracken offered to provide the FCAB with a presentation that would clarify all of DOE's current stewardship commitments. Doug stated that this presentation would allow the committee to better strategize how it wants to address other needs for the site. Committee members suggested that this presentation should highlight past commitments and any changes to those commitments. Pam Dunn requested a review of public comments that were offered on the Environmental Assessment (EA) and Master Plan for Public Use.

Gary Stegner noted that the Comprehensive Stewardship Plan was submitted to DOE Headquarters at the end of January. He stated that the plan should have been framed as the preliminary plan to protect human health and safety after site closure, rather than a comprehensive plan for all stewardship activities. Committee members stated that it is important that all parties work together to achieve the community's goals for stewardship. Doug stated that it is imperative that the committee understand DOE's commitments and community desires for stewardship, so it can better plan how it wants to address disconnects between the two perspectives.

Eric Woods provided an overview of what are anticipated to be the three major planning documents for stewardship at Fernald. He explained that the Comprehensive Stewardship Plan presents broad issues. He noted that the version of the plan that was submitted to Headquarters was much more explicit than earlier drafts and that the plan is a working document that will change over time. The two other documents—an institutional controls plan and a surveillance and maintenance plan—will provide much greater detail regarding how stewardship will be conducted at Fernald. The institutional controls plan will be submitted to U.S. EPA and will be a legally enforceable document. Eric noted that EPA has produced draft detailed guidance for what must be contained in this plan. He stressed that institutional controls will apply to the entire site, not just the on-site disposal facility. The surveillance and maintenance plan will be formally submitted to agencies, so it will also be considered a legally enforceable document. The site has not yet decided if each of these three plans will stand alone, or if the two detailed documents will become appendices to the final Comprehensive Stewardship Plan.

### **Suggested FCAB Action on the Natural Resources Injury Settlement**

The committee discussed the lack of progress that has been made by DOE and the State of Ohio in reaching a settlement of the Natural Resources Injury lawsuit. Previous discussions of this issue by the Stewardship Committee indicated that an informational event was needed, at which the parties to the lawsuit could explain their positions. David Bidwell noted that some members of the FCAB had suggested writing a letter to the judge who oversaw the lawsuit. A committee member suggested that receiving an invitation to speak to the FCAB may be enough to get the parties working towards a resolution.

The committee agreed to recommend that the FCAB send a letter to the appropriate parties, asking them to attend a roundtable discussion in May. The letter should specify that appropriate decision-makers are expected to attend from DOE and the State of Ohio, not just the regular Natural Resource Trustees.

### **Process to Determine Feasibility of a MUEF**

David stated that he had spoken with Laura Busby of the Audubon Society regarding the process her organization undergoes to determine the feasibility of constructing a new nature center. She shared a fairly methodical approach. David used her input to outline a feasibility study for the construction of the proposed multi-use education facility (MUEF). He reported that he had shared the outline with Jim Bierer, Marvin Clawson, Steve DePoe, Pam Dunn, and Larry Stebbins, committee members who volunteered to discuss this issue at the January meeting. The process would involve contacting other museums and education centers to assess what is already offered in the region, as well as schools and other potential audiences to assess their needs and interest levels. Then, more detailed planning can be done to determine staffing needs, potential exhibits, potential programs, and the costs associated with them. Finally, these plans can be shared with stakeholders, anticipated users of the MUEF, and potential funding sources. Only then would a decision be made to pursue construction of a facility. Pam Dunn suggested that the process should also define the scope of work to be conducted by the Grand Junction Office, the site steward. She stated that any funding sources would want to know how Grand Junction would relate to the education facility and its programs.

David will continue to investigate potential funding sources for conducting a feasibility study for MUEF. David asked committee members to provide him with any suggested sources of funding. Doug stated that some time from the Perspectives Group contract could probably be devoted to conducting some feasibility study work. Committee members stated that some funds may only be available to a 501(c)3 nonprofit organization. David stated that a MUEF feasibility study may require that committee members volunteer to coordinate and coordinate some tasks.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m. The next meeting will be held on Thursday, March 13, at 6:30 p.m. in the T-1 trailer.