

170019 Interviewer: Let's start with a couple of background questions. Can you just tell us your name, where you grew up, where you went to school?

170042 Pam: O.K., well, Pam Dunn, officially Pamela. I was born east of Cincinnati, out in Brown County Ohio, not Indiana but Ohio. Went to Eastern Local High School and then I attended the University of Cincinnati, went in the 70s dropped out and then went back in the 80s. I got serious in the 80s and got my degree, so...

170105 Interviewer: What did you study?

170106 Pam: Uh, the first time I was in design, art and architecture in interior design and but when I went back I went to the College of Business and double majored in Accounting and Finance.

170115 Interviewer: O.k and what do you do now?

170118 Pam: I'm an auditor for the state of Ohio so I audit governments.

170122 Interviewer: When did you first move to this area and how did you choose this location?

170128 Pam: 1974, my late husband worked at Northgate so we wanted something close. We kind of liked the west side of town it was kind of similar to, 'cause we both grew up out in the Brown County area, so it was kind of like that with a rural flavor, yet it was much more convenient to the city and for things like that. Just kind of happened to stumble on to the mobile home park that was across the street from the site from Fernald. So we moved in there in 1974.

170201 Interviewer: 1974. How far, just directly across the street?

170207 Pam: Yeah, basically, it's like right on the corner where Willey Road hits 128 and River Road comes in. It's right there. I mean you can see the site and Knollman's Farm and all of that from the park.

170219 Interviewer: Wow, do you remember at the time what you thought the plant did?

170222 Pam: Didn't have a clue. You didn't know. I mean you saw the water, the checkered water board on the water tower and the signs out front just said feed and materials production facility. It didn't say it was nuc-feed for weapons. So you know, so you just really ... so people would say it's a government facility don't stop and stare at secure. But, you know, nobody really talked about it and you just really didn't think about it. You know, because when we started looking for property where I live now, which we moved into in 1984, uh, we didn't know. You know, 'cause I know with the lawsuit and everything that went on it was like if I would have known than maybe I would have looked further away from the place, you know. I mean but once I did it's like I liked where I was at. I liked the price and the land and I was like I'm not going to give up something I spent a couple of years to find because you messed up.

170325 Interviewer: The home that we are in right now, how far is it from the site?

170328 Pam: It is less than a mile from the boundaries. You know, if ... as you go down out the driveway down New Haven to Paddy's Run and zigzag around to the very center of the site it is like one and a half miles or so but on a straight line it's probably even less than a mile from the center of the site. And it's less than a mile from the fence side.

170350 Interviewer: You said you moved here in 1984 and that's around the same time that everybody started finding out what the site did. Give me the chronology there. Did you find the property and then the news reports came out? How did that happen?

170400 Pam: Yes, we actually had put the bid in and settled on everything in February of '84 and moved in May and I think stuff started leaking out like November, December of 1984 and that's when stuff really started to hit with the releases and the off-site contaminated wells. I think that it was like January or February, it all kind of blends in sometimes after awhile. They were started to get together about the class action lawsuit. So ...

170439 Interviewer: Can you remember where you were when you very first heard what the site actually did? Do you have any memory or can you recall?

170445 Pam: Probably at home, probably heard it on TV, you know and then heard about and went to the public meetings. You know, kind of heard about that there was going to be a public meeting. Because I can remember going to some of the early meetings at the Crosby Elementary School. They weren't real pleasant meetings. I do remember going to some of those. At first you are just like, no way, that can't be what happened. But then ... Which I think was the prompt to get involved with the lawsuit because you wanted the information. You now, you're angry and you want to know what happened. "What did you really do?"

170528 Interviewer: Sure. So you and your husband were part of the class action lawsuit?

170531 Pam: Yes.

170533 Interviewer: Can you describe that a little bit and what made you decide to be a part of that?

170541 Pam: The biggest reason probably was ... anger was one. Like we said we had spent all this time trying to find this place, put a nice down payment down and it was like all of a sudden something that was supposed to be an investment was essentially worth nothing or next to nothing. You know, because all we had was well water, there was no city water. No, you know, that was it. Your only source of water was well and the water contamination is like coming south and you knew that's where the wells were. Later on you got the information and found out that was the flow of the aquifer. Uh, that and just ... I think one of the main reasons was trying to gain the information because they weren't really forthcoming. Even when all that happened it

was like, “yeah we did, but you don’t need to worry, it’s okay, it’s safe.” And that was kind of one avenue to find the information about what really went on and how bad it really was.

170642 Interview: Sure. You had mentioned earlier that your water here had been tested. Was that around the time of the class action lawsuit?

170650 Pam: Right after that I think the well testing probably started I want to say in 85, 86 somewhere in that vicinity. The EPA did some of the testing, the Department of Health, Ohio Department of Health did some of the testing. Ours was tested I think it was the Ohio Department of Health that actually did the one out here. And that was they did the first one in like March and it came back high in beta and they said that it was attributable to potassium 40, which could be naturally occurring. So they tested again. So they came back out in the summer and they got completely different readings than what they got in March. So they came out again in like November and got totally different readings so they finally said “so it’s potassium 40, it is probably naturally occurring and the readings are different because of the fluctuations in the aquifer, the levels of the aquifer.” But it still didn’t make me feel real safe, you know. I had a private test done on the well, but it wasn’t for any type of radionuclides. It came back high in some of the things that you would expect because of this area...sodium, hardness. And it was also high in what they call, gosh, TDS total dissolved solvents or something. And the company suggested a volatile toxic chemical test, I forget what the cost was, but I never did get it done. I became a test well for DOE, so they came out.

170838 Interviewer: Is this around the time that they were announcing uranium in other neighbors’ wells?

170844 Pam: I think they were trying to determine the extent of what was going on because ’84, at the end of ’84/’85 was when they had announced about the off site wells over off Wiley that were very high in uranium and they were doing tests in the area. And I think it was just kind of for them to...I mean I don’t know...nobody’s ever said, but my gut instinct says they were trying to get an idea too on what was going on with a lot of your area wells.

170913 Interviewer: Could you tell us how that made you feel?

170920 Pam: Uh, I’ll choose a nice word, MAD, uh, DECEIVED. And I think that the deceit was the biggest thing because I don’t really like to be lied to. I mean the fact is that that is some of my taxpayer money over there too. You know and the double standard of it is that if that had been a private industry or a private citizen that would done that level of you know contamination or degradation to the environment they would have crucified them. They would have just hung them. And here you know your own government who would do that to somebody else had been doing that for years and they were in a denial stage too. They were thinking it was real safe. Uh, and it took, the trust factor of the deceit I mean that has improved I mean you know after all of these years (15, 16 years of going on with the site over there) it’s better. I don’t know if I could ever say it’s 100% and I think that’s the other thing that is the driver to try to get the information so you could make a decision yourself and try to get some outside analysis on what was going on.

171040 Interviewer: During all of this did you ever suspect any health impacts to you or your husband?

171046 Pam: I honestly I mean you thought about it but that wasn't probably the primary reason that I got involved. Uh, I mean you'd think about it and I mean yeah you could do bottled water to drink and cook with but every now and then you would be standing in the shower and think, "what's really in this water?" You had to do your dishes and laundry and stuff with it and you would think about it. I wouldn't say I was totally preoccupied with that uh, I think it was just more the anger of what they did you know it just really. You know, and the biggest thing like I said I mean you know, you're kind of taught that you know save your money and invest it in a place to live, in property that is a good long-term solid investment. And it turned out you know that we might as well have lit a match to the money that we put down on this place because the market value is, you know, nothing.

171210 Interviewer: Can you tell us when and how you got involved with FRESH?

171212 Pam: At one of the public meetings, gosh I don't remember the date on it now, when Lisa and Kathy Meyer, well, Kathy Meyer was the one who actually started FRESH and then Lisa got it inherited you know not too long into the process. And I knew it was going on and kind of was interested in that and that's when I heard about it. And then a lot of events kind of happened and I didn't really get actively involved with FRESH until like 1989. I attended some meetings here and there, but I had hip replacement in '86, so that kind of kept me out of commission except for the telephone was there. So that was when I would call them, bug them about stuff. The two chemical companies, I would call them and ask questions about those that are right down here too.

171314 Interviewer: Do you remember any of those conversations?

171316 Pam: Just calling and saying you know, just I don't know "what is going on, when are you going to tell us this, when are you going to release that?" Just, you know or calls to the EPA. The US EPA I think is who I called more in the beginning like "what are you going to do about this?" You know. "You're supposed to take care of this kind of stuff." "When are you going to get in here and make them do something?" You know. Just kind of that kind of stuff. And then in '87 my husband got killed so I 'd gone back to school to get my degree. So I was in school and I was working and when I could go to meetings I could, but I usually worked nights and weekends and I was in classes through the day. I had gone to a meeting, I think it was in '88, it was on a Saturday before I went to work. It was a workshop that FRESH was doing, Bill Mitchell who had founded the Nuclear Safety Campaign and started the Military Production Network, which is the national group that FRESH belongs to which is now called the Alliance for Nuclear Accountability. But, uh, we were at a meeting talking about different stuff and who we were and what we did and you know Bill was asking me all these questions about my degree and my background, I mean. He was kind of like how or why did you get interested and I said "well, you know I have always been a little bit of an environmentalist. I have not been too radical, but you know a little bit. You need to take care of what's here you now 'cause if you

destroy ... if it doesn't support plants and animals it's not gonna support us for very long. Kind of a little wasteful of our environment anyway", but what my area was in and I can remember looking at Lisa and he said you are going to need her some day, you are going to make sure you stay in touch. So Lisa and I talked off and on. I graduated in June of '89 and in about a week or 10 days after I graduated Lisa called and said, "Are you still interested in getting involved?" I said, "Yeah, I am out of school now." She said, that's what I thought, she said "I'll come down" and when she came down, that's when I first officially got the books and started doing the treasurer stuff. And we got Fresh. We started getting a little more serious then. We got the paperwork to do the 501C3 and because before that everyone sort of paid for stuff themselves or what contributions you would get from people at meetings and stuff.

171549 Interviewer: So you have been treasurer since 1989?

171554 Pam: Yeah, basically. Yeah, and then we officially incorporated and when did we apply for our 501-C-3? '90, I think we put in our application for 501-C-3 'cause we went through the probationary period and did all that and got the final thing from IRS and that has been a couple of years ago.

171610 Interviewer: Within the FRESH group was there a particular issue that you took the lead on? Like Edwa Yocum heads up health concerns. Did you have a particular issue that was important to you?

171616 Pam: Uh, I was kind of concerned about the water uh and I guess too 'cause it kind of opened the door when we got involved with the national group too, that we found out that it wasn't just us. We had also done some meetings at the Highlander Center. They used to have these meetings called Stop the Pollution (STP Workshops). And it was more of private sector from private industry that had done like paper companies or other type of chemical type places. You kind of saw a commonality, and especially with the DOE sites. It might be different radionuclides that were the problem, but it affected the same things. I mean basically they just dumped it, buried it, or didn't know what they did with it or what was going on in water, soil, air. And all...you know within an issue all over, so I think the other issue was too, they should have to comply with the same laws as everyone else. Federal government or not, you 're no better than everybody else and you need to just suck it up and do what everybody else should have to do. So...

171739 Interviewer: Around 1994 I remember FRESH and I think the CAB [Fernald Citizens Advisory Board] as well got involved in convincing congress that Fernald needed an accelerating clean up. And that eventually had produced the budget. How involved were you in that effort to convince them of that?

171752 Pam: I never quite totally bought into the 10-year plan. I did think they could accelerate. I mean I did think they could do it faster than what was originally planned. I thought 10 years was a bit ambitious. You know, I mean I was like you know 2010, 2015, I think that is a little more reasonable and they would still save money. But we were fairly involved in the fact that, yeah you can save money if you do it and fund it and I mean back then we had pushed a lot for a

kind of a flat line budget, but more of what our baseline is and what's happening. The recent, you know our recent budget stuff, but I mean their numbers had been crunched to figure out and I am not sure not what present value interest factors they used, but I mean it just makes sense that the cost of money goes up every year. So if you can bring it in quicker you are going to save money in the long run. But the biggest concern was don't cut corners. You know, do it right the first time because if you have to go back in 25 years it's gonna cost more than if you would have just taken a couple of extra years and done it right the first time.

171911 Interviewer: So how did you feel about the recent news that it will take until 2010 to finish?

171917 Pam: I think it was the last public meeting and I just kinda looked at DOE and all I said this once, "I told you so." We told you you'd never do 2006, that 2010 was more realistic and a logical, you know, timeline than 2006 so I mean it didn't really bother me that bad.

171941 Interviewer: Are there other instances or times when you had sort of put on your business hat, you know "Pam the auditor" and kind of address what their budgets were and their priorities? Did you ever did a critique of that and use that to help FRESH's efforts?

171956 Pam: Yeah, I mean I never dug, dug but I mean I would, you know I hounded for budget actual statements. What is your budget compared to what you actually spent? You know, the DOE had a bad habit. They would have a lot of carry over and in the real government sector outside the federal government it's called encumbrances. You know, but they would have uncommitted amounts and they would just carry over and it was like, yeah if you don't have something that's committed for, they're going to reduce your budget by it. Uh, in the beginning they would kind of say you just don't understand how it works and I would have to get in the auditor hat and the attitude. I would be like look, "I have a bachelor's degree in Business and Accounting and Finance and I understand a little more than you are giving me credit for. But I think it did help, and it did help like if congressmen or senators asked you questions about how you felt about it. Just to be able to look at it and to ask them the questions that they couldn't really walk around you on. What's the basis of this, what's your assumptions, how did you derive that estimate? I think it's helped in the long run because they have been a lot more open with the budget and what they've done and how they do it. Gosh, it has been quite a few years now really, they have involved us in some priority settings. I get monthly cost performance reports now so I can see what they're doing with the money.

172138 Interviewer: Do you feel that they have committed the budget that's needed to finish this out by 2010?

172144 Pam: Uh, with what has happened within the beltway? Yeah, headquarters and that, that's one of the main reasons that they have been pushing it back. They have kind of insinuated that they are going to flat line Fernald at 290 million which that's a lot of money, don't get me wrong. But if you look at the baseline which they made them do years ago like the baseline for fiscal 2001 was 23 million more. So if they flat line them in that kind of a reduction in the baseline that they said they needed to come close to being done. Even with that at 2006 there

was still groundwater you know pump-and-treat restoration that had to be going on and probably some demolition on silos I mean that stuff is going to be the last thing that would need to be done, a final capping on the disposal facility and that. Uh, if they flat line an amount like that it is definitely going to take longer. For them to think they can still do it with those kind of reductions, it is just not possible.

172253 Interviewer: Is the flat lining what you meant when you said what's been going on in the Beltway [Washington, D. C.] right now?

172258 Pam: They pretty much said Fernald can do it at 290. I mean the problem is that the site asked for their baseline, but then when headquarters got kinna pushed to shove they said that they can actually get along on this amount of money. So the leanings of the Office of Management and Budget and Congress is, you know, to flat line the environmental management budget side of DOE which means that today's dollars flat line out. So all the sites took a reduction.

172332 Interviewer: Do think there should be more stakeholder input on these discussions about budget allocations?

172338 Pam: I think that they should get the stakeholder involvement on it. I mean our site has been pretty good. They will have meetings with the CAB, they'll have meetings with you know FRESH and they have had open workshops and stuff on it too. 'Cause if you don't talk to the people that live around here with it everyday then you don't know what they think is important.

172403 Interviewer: Let's step back a minute and think about when FRESH started mid-1980s. Can you kind of tell us what the most important goals were for FRESH? What were they attempting to do?

172415 Pam: Get as much information on what is going on over there as possible. Educate ourselves on it. I mean none of us had nuclear physics background, or chemistry, or ...you know any of that uh and to try to get the site cleaned up, to make them you know remove the source of the contamination and deal with what was there. And as we did educate ourselves and get the information I think because in the beginning FRESH was like you will take this to background, there will be no waste left here on the site and as you really started looking at it logically and realistically that just wasn't possible. That was probably one of the toughest decisions that came over there was the onsite disposal facility but nobody wants this stuff in their backyard. We call it NIMBY, "Not In My Back Yard". You can't be a NIMBY and some of this stuff does because of the proximity of people and the sole-source aquifer have to go off of this site. So we consciously went to what they called the balanced approach. You know we'll keep as much as we can here, some of its got to go. And I mean that was a big step I think. That's when FRESH, I mean we didn't have a consensus agreement as FRESH but I think that's when the majority of the members and the officers realized number 1 "there is not enough money to take it to background" and number 2 "it would have just been a moonscape to have taken it to background". You would have just done total ecological destruction to the whole place. And the shipment amounts would have just been phenomenal to even take it all off site. So I think that's

when the reality kind of set in. That's when we had to sit down and figure out what everybody could live with.

172617 Interviewer: Sure, sure. When you look at FRESH's overall accomplishments do you see this move to the balanced approach as one of the biggest things that you will have accomplished?

172623 Pam: That and public participation. Public participation I guess I would probably have to put at the top. I mean because that was a big thing that we kinda pushed for too. And maybe it was an automatic with the strive to get the information and get educated and learn what was going on. But to be involved. I mean because in the beginning and early years we called it the "Decide Announce Defend" mode of DOE. They made the decision, announced it and then just defended it. There were no discussions on anything. And I mean we do really have a seat at the table. You know the stakeholders and FRESH and that has a seat. I mean it's meaningful and active participation. I mean there's the lip service for public participation that happens, and then there's real public participation, which you know you had meaningful active involvement from the beginning to the end of the process. It took a while to get that but I think that's what you have got to have. That hasn't sunk in at all the sites and every now and then you have to smack them a little bit. And say, "wait, wait, wait, this isn't what we had ..." you know. Our site's pretty good. I have to say they are pretty good about involving us. I think they realized too and there again was the trust factor. They were afraid to let you see a draft document because you would say what's in it is gospel and once they realized we understand what draft means, you know. Once we did some trial runs and they found out we understood and we're going to hold them to that and that we could work on stuff. It helped a lot.

172810 Interviewer: Let's talk about kind of how that relationship has evolved over the years too. Think back to the early years and the relationship ... (**Pam:** You mean fighting and screaming?) and contrast that to now.

172820 Pam: There probably wasn't a relationship in the beginning except for hate and animosity and you know yelling and screaming. Uh, I mean I don't know now, I mean now we talk, we can agree to disagree, but we have meetings and we can go and sit down and talk about stuff over a beer. You know there's some people at the site who if I have to go out of town real quick they will cat sit and dogsit and catsit for me. Which people find that hard to believe. The relationship has changed quite a bit. I'm sure there are still some people probably who still aren't real sure about everything, but for the most part most people ... We know we can say what we have to say and figure things out.

172923 Interviewer: Can you think of any example that illustrates the early years? And an example that illustrates now?

180016 Interviewer: Can you think of an example to illustrate the relationship in the early days and then one for now? (**Tape change**)

180035 Pam: The first meetings there was just a lot of yelling and screaming. You know, we would call them "Blue Suiters". They would show up in their blue suits and maroon ties and they all looked like these clones with different haircuts or something. And they'll just say, oh, yeah, like when they announced about Lisa's well, they'd say "Oh yeah there's (whatever # she didn't know) there was a hundred ninety parts per billion or million one is soil, one is water...but of uranium in your well, but that's okay." The one guy I can remember saying, "Well you could eat a tablespoon of uranium a day and it wouldn't hurt you." And it's like well let's see you eat it then. I remember at one meeting Lisa just brought a jug of water out from her well and set it on the table and said "Drink it, if it's fine let's see you drink it." You know there probably wasn't much communication except you know screaming and yelling and cussing and you know all of that, but I'm trying to remember there was a meeting it was when John Till had started the dose reconstruction and somewhere in that process there had been a meeting at Meadow Brook. We all ended at the Castle up in Ross and here was Ohio EPA, US EPA, Westinghouse was the site manager, contractor then. There were some Westinghouse people, the FATLC union was there, there was some DOE people and FRESH and we were all sitting around, and I think CDC was there because they were in for the John Till. Here were these federal and state, the labor unions and FRESH. Here we were sitting around this table with pitchers of beer taking about what had happened at the meeting I mean we were just looking at each other like, "Wow, if somebody would have told us this a couple years ago we would have said no way. No way you would have ever got this to happen." That was kind of the first I think start to where people start you know ... all sides started to have a little more trust you know and willingness to work together a little bit more. Things just went so much smoother once that happened. You know I mean, when I had my second hip replacement and I was home quite a bit and I mean I actually read the entire operable unit 5 FS [feasibility study] and ROD [record of decision] and stuff, and poor Dennis Carr, I would be on the phone with him all the time, you know. You had that ability. You knew you could pick the phone up and you can call and if they weren't in they would return your call and answer questions. Where before, you know, you can't even talk to anybody.

180337 Interviewer: What do you think was the impetus for that? I mean somebody just invited and said, "let's go get beer and reach out"?

180339 Pam: I don't even remember how that happened. I mean we just all kind of, you know we talked at the meeting and it just ... it was ... I don't even know who suggested it now. It was just kind of a...

180404 Interviewer: And from that point on you had more of a one-on-one relationship.

180410 Pam: Yeah, we always I think ... we probably had an earlier relationship that we could communicate with the regulators, you know the US and Ohio EPAs, and the DOE and the contractors came later. And I think part of it too was just we call it the "old war horse" mentality you know. And unfortunately it's still some of those within the Department of Energy in DC. But, uh I think once people accepted the fact that the mission over there was clean up and there was going to be no more production and that this was what had to be done. I think that helped a little bit too. You know, 'cause I think in the beginning they all really thought they would not

really have to clean up and they could all go back to production again. You know it was kind of a un... but I think that helped quite a bit. FRESH was just very persistent in public participation. I mean we just hammered and hammered and We personally non of FRESH was active but there was a process that went on that was called the keystone dialogue. And it involved a lot of grassroots people and other, uh I don't ... hate to say activists but activist around other DOE sites on a fair and equitable process for meaningful public participation. And it took a while to do that. The members we knew, it was NPN then, that were involved in that, you know we would have some discussions and this and that. And that really kind of laid the groundwork. 'Cause it was something I think that the other agencies recognized too, at least DOE. They pretty much got slammed with it pretty hard. Uh, and I mean that was the basis for the advisory board was that. But it basically just took a lot of persistence because there would be times that something would happen and I mean the Department of Energy hates bad press. Then it's like you need to be honest and up front and let people know what's going on if you don't want to be blasted in the press. Something happens and people don't know about it and you are called and asked what you want and what do you expect people to say. You know so I think ... and as I said the site is pretty good, I can't It'd be nice to say complex wide that the same thing was going on, but it is not quite complex wide. In fact the one site plan public participation is part of the site plan. And I think that was also, I can't remember, but I mean it's been brought up when they do contracts and stuff and with sub-contractors coming in. It's like you might as well tell them up front that they are going to have to come to public meetings, they are going to have to tell us what's going on, and they're gonna have to be able to take questions and deal with it. It's just something that is ... and I think it's advantageous both ways. You know if you give people the information and they are informed on what's going on, you know.

180723 Interviewer: Sure, yeah. Now while you guys were getting more involved and pushing the issues, how were some of the workers and other community members reacting to these efforts of FRESH?

180733 Pam: I know in the earlier years before I got really involved, uh, I would say the relationship probably wasn't the best with the workforce. I think "cause they thought that we were trying to take their jobs away. Uh and I think once they realized that because FRESH really helped out with that the legislation 3161, but it's for workers, for retraining. You know we really tried to help make sure that in like new sub... when the contractors were hired and all of that, that the workers didn't just get left out in the cold, you know. Uh, 'cause it's not there fault that ... this is what's happening and it's going to close down. That's a pretty good relationship now too. Uh, the community I think there again is the same thing. People were like the site brings in money and business and ... but some economic studies happened. Some people might stop in the little towns around here on their way home from work, but the majority of people who work at that site don't live in the community. So it really isn't as much of an economic impact as you would think because the dollars aren't actually coming directly back to the community because the people don't live here. But it's gotten better. I mean there's still some people that, you know, I mean and you just agree to disagree.

180913 Interviewer: Sure, sure, now has the role of FRESH changed over the last 15 years? Because in the beginning you were kind of carving out a place for public input, public involvement. You said you have a place at the table now, so has the overall role changed at all?

180930 Pam: Uh, no, I don't think so. It's maybe, what is the word I wanna use? Uh, it's kind of grown as the things may have changed at the site, but I mean I think it's still a watchdog role. You know the education factor is still there because as you move in to different technologies to try to stabilize, I mean I don't know that you can ... they say treat, but I don't know radio material you cannot really destroy them or it would be so difficult to do . The waste management and treatment issues so you still got that education factor and to get the information out to the to the community and that. Because a lot of people are tired. I mean FRESH a couple of years ago we went to a meeting every other month instead of every month 'cause people were just burned out. You know, 'cause I mean, there for the longest time there were just meetings, meetings, meetings, and all the time. And, uh, so that's why we had the new newsletter. We tried to get all the information out in the newsletters in stuff for people. If you call, like we helped out on the "future for Fernald" on the long-term stewardship issues. You know little extra letters or post cards to members that were around here. Please try to come to the meeting and get your input in, and stuff like that. That could be one change that is going to change and that would be our role with the stewardship issues with the site once it is cleaned up. Uh and I guess that is where my college background will come in because it's like you really have got to think about this now because the way the federal budget process works. I mean we're in 2001 now, 2002 budget should go to congress in January but who knows. Things are kinda in a mess up there. But you know, from the time you make your decision you are really looking at two years before you can really do anything as far as budget wise for what you're trying to do. 'Cause that's just the way it works. And so I mean that's gonna become a pretty big issue I think. Uh, the workshop, you know, some people don't want trails, some do, but I mean even some of the members or officers in FRESH well they don't want to walk or ride a bike or walk over there realize that some people may.

181158 Interviewer: Let's back up a minute so that we have the context of what you are talking about. This is the Fernald Citizen's Advisory Board.

181210 Pam: Yes, they did some workshops on, you know, what you wanted Fernald to look like once it's cleaned up.

181215 Interviewer: And there were some proposals on the table for bike trails ... Describe that a little bit.

181217 Pam: There was a workshop last year and then two this year. DOE was kind of moving along with it and it's like you got to get the public involvement on this or it's not going to fly with what you do. So it kind of went out and the first workshop was just kind of to get ideas. You had little break-out groups and it was kind of like five or six areas. And it was just kind of like throw out ideas. What would you like to see? And it was a good turn-out on it. And then the stewardship committee and the CAB took those back and kind of sorted through to see what they had the most of. You know, from all the different groups. I mean it was pretty resounding,

only a couple that wanted to see economic development or commercial, but it was pretty predominant no commercial development. Green space, reburial of Native American remains that was a predominant throughout all the groups and throughout the community. And a lot of them wanted to see the educational museum, cultural whatever center you wanna call over there. Uh, but it was just kind of a brainstorming thing. So that got kind of all synthesized and set up another workshop and put that out and that's where we kind of started to talk about it "o.k. that's what came me out of the first one so lets do a little more detail on this". And then from that the CAB used that to give like a recommendation, at least to that point, to DOE on what we felt should happen over there for Fernald once it's cleaned up.

181404 Interviewer: Sure, o.k. Your role in this has also been as chair of the Stewardship Committee of CAB (**Pam:** Yes the chair of the Stewardship Committee on the CAB). How have you felt about being in that position, in that role.

181419 Pam: You see, I think it's something that's kind of overlooked, because, I mean, at Fernald, uranium has a life of 4.something million years, you know, and it's not cleaned up to background. I mean the levels left in the soils are levels that will maintain safe drinking, proposed drinking water standards for the aquifer. You know, so you don't really want somebody in 100 years over there digging around and stirring that stuff up because it's still going to be there. So it's like "what's it going to be?" "Who's going to take care of it?" "What's gonna be over there?" How is it going to be a benefit to the community? The on site disposal cell I mean that's the DOE or whatever it's called and perpetuity, they are always going to have that to monitor, maintain, and deal with. The rest of it, I mean it's pretty much in all the records of decisions from the CERCLA Superfund process. Don't ask me to say CERCLA, I know it's a acronym, and I'll have to put 50 cents in the jar but Comprehensive Environmental Resource ... Response Compensation Act or something like that. We are so acronym bound here. I lost my train of thought...

181543 Interviewer: We were talking about stewardship, long-term stewardship.

181544 Pam: The government has to own the site. That's been embedded in all the records of decisions. Uh, whether that is DOE, I don't know. That's one of the issues that we will be grappling with this year. "Who is best suited?" The state of Ohio has sued the Department of Energy as well as the citizens. To settle that lawsuit they had what was called the national resource trustees, it's a member of the Department of Interior, a member of Department of Energy from the site and a representative from the Ohio EPA. What they came up with was rather than having DOE give the state money, that they had to set aside so much of the site for natural resource preservation and restoration. Uh, so that pretty much determined we're gonna have green space in that and natural resource preservation, which is what I personally wanted to see over there all along.

181640 Interviewer: So FRESH saw that as a win.

181419 Pam: Yes, we did, because we couldn't get a confirm. I that's basically what we wanted to see happen over there. The cultural center is not a bad idea because we also wanted and said

that, you know, Fernald has one of the best reading rooms off site around the complex as far as collection of materials and dated information about Fernald and the DOE complex. And we don't really want to see that go back to Germantown, Maryland or DC or end up in a vault in Oakridge, Tennessee or something. And we really think that needs to stay here and in the community not off somewhere else. And I think that was kind of what got everybody started thinking, well, you know. It's kind of expanded from there and you know to the museum, cultural, educational, type of the facility. So that is the type of stuff the stewardship committee is going to be dealing with this year. Who's best suited to do this, local, state, another federal agency? You know, where would the funding come from over the long term? That's some of the things that are getting started to be looked at too.

181758 Interviewer: Kind of talking right now about your role, your current role on the CAB and what their current agenda is. Lets go back a little bit and talk about when you first got involved with the Fernald System Advisory Board and how did you get involved?

181811 Pam: Uh, God, from the beginning. We pushed to have one, FRESH had pushed to have one. Gosh I'm trying to remember dates. '93, I think discussions were happening in '92, but I think in '93 is actually when they hired an outside facilitator, Eula Bingham, I think, yeah. She took applications, they had applications out, anyone could apply. You had name, address, interest in the site, background, this, this and this. And she kinda looked and weighed all the applications and people who came in and tried to come up with a pretty diversified representation of the surrounding area as far as Fernald and she did a very good job of it. There were some meetings and she did one-on-one interviews, you know kind of narrowed the written applicants down, did some face-to-face, one-on-ones, and came up with the initial selection of the CAB. We had our first meeting, I think it was in September, somewhere in that area, I mean we only had met a couple of times and decided we had to get a facilitator. We whipped up an RFP, put it out on the street and got Doug Sarno in here. It was too much information. I mean some of us who have been active knew, but a lot of people who came on while they knew about Fernald, they really had to come up to speed on the technical issues. Because there was still the records of decisions on the waste pits, the silos, operable unit #5, we call the "Mother OU", that's water, soils, I mean ... A lot of those had to be made yet and the majority of the CAB felt like they wanted to be able to weigh in on those. I mean it was a pretty fast track.

182009 Interviewer: What were the goals of the group at the time? What were you all looking at and what were you all making recommendations on?

182012 Pam: We had the one report in the beginning. On the clean up levels on the site we really decided to not, intentionally not to do a future use per se. Some people tried to take our decisions and tie it to future use based on CERCLA clean up levels, like 10 to the minus 4 says you can do this. But we were like no, no, no read the report. I mean the CAB really did buckle down and push their sleeves up, all the members. I mean, it's a pretty good report. The recommendations in there kind of what ended up getting embedded in the record of decision for operable unit #5, soils will be cleaned up to maintain a 20 parts per billion, I think, million, I don't know. I get those confused. Which means there is a 50-70 or 80 parts uranium in the soil is what can be left to maintain 20 in the aquifer for safe drinking. That's the proposed drinking

water standard. We did go on to say no agricultural, no residential, we did say what we didn't want to see over there, but basically, it was to be cleaned up to meet the 20 proposed drinking water standard for aquifer and a hazard index of 1 for the other chemicals. So we basically used environmental clean up standards for protection of the aquifer with the whole driver in what we came up with.

182147 Interviewer: O.k., so one recommendation was on clean up levels. What were the other areas?

182156 Pam: Oh gosh, we've had a lot of recommendations over the years. The major report that came out within like two years of the CAB forming was that. And we've had a lot of wins here and there.

182259 Interviewer: O.k., what do you see kind of as one of the major accomplishments of the FCAB.

182213 Pam: I think that was a big one. A lot of the information we asked for in terms of coming up with the decisions for the on site disposal facility because that was another major decision. The silos are still looming out there, the CAB is going to be dealing with that. Some of the monitoring issues, we've pushed for a lot of real time monitoring, you know especially around the on site disposal facility and that. We just came out with one on stewardship. DOE's asked us to do some of this stuff. I don't know if they have always like what we have come up with, but they have always responded. And most of it they have tried to incorporate in. I think with the waste pits one of the biggest things is with the transportation issues. 'Cause that's a big one. You know that's probably the scariest thing, all these trucks going from here to Nevada, Utah or wherever they are going. With the waste pits, the CAB and FRESH, and everybody kind of had a unified front on the unified trains, the dedicated trains, you know. They don't stop, they change engines, they just go. Because I mean some of the spent fuel, I mean there was one here a few years back sat down at the train yards in Cincinnati for a couple of days, you know. Because it's thick and can attach to anything else. I know when they were going to try that, that's just been a couple months ago. They wanna to try the ... I don't know what is the term of it I am not thinking of the technical terms. It's a mixture of a rail and truck and they were going to do a trial run on it and I mean with some of the industries here around Cincinnati found out that some of their trains could be hooked to some trains with waste from Fernald and they kinda went kaput. Inter-modal, that was it. So transportation is something that we are going to see some work on in the future. I just saw something too where one of the trucks for Whip ended up on the wrong route and police in Mexico rerouted it back, and I mean that's what DOE has touted as their perfect method and even DOE didn't know it got on the wrong route. So there's some major things to be worked out on that one.

182436 Interviewer: To what extent do you and other CAB members feel like the DOE listens to your recommendations and to your input on this level?

182443 Pam: They usually respond. Every now and then you have to raise your voice a little bit. You know, "look we're going to give you this and you have to respond and let us know if

you are doing something, if not why” and this and that. But they have been pretty good. When we’ve given something they have gave us a response back and that usually goes, when we do get a response back it will go to the full CAB.

182508 Interviewer: So you feel like getting response. Do you all get a report on how much it’s incorporated into the decision-making process?

182516 Pam: Well, they generally let us know, I mean like the long-term stewardship they’ve been pushing pretty hard on that because they wanna know, you know because they have to make some decisions on that stuff too.

182528 Interviewer: Sure, well, we have heard about a lot of meetings, a lot of reports, you’ve devoted a lot of your time and made big a commitment to this. Can you kind of describe for me the satisfaction you get out of being both a FRESH member and an FCAB member? You’re putting a lot of time in it, what are you getting back?

182549 Pam: Uh, I don’t know, it’s kind of my civic responsibility and duty I guess. I live here, you know. I’m the one that looks at it every day. I mean if you don’t get involved and express your opinion, you really do not have a lot of room to complain about what happens. Uh, I don’t know, I guess just the fact that I don’t think the double standard is there so much as in the beginning that they have to be responsible the same as anybody else and take care of their mess. I can remember one of the things in the early days Admiral Watkins was the secretary of Department of Energy and they gave him a report card and DOE failed everything except rhetoric and they got an A in rhetoric. They didn’t like the press that came out on that one either. I can remember Lisa just looked at him and said, “If you were my child you would be grounded for life.” If you brought home a report card like this. It’s like, you’ve played with your toys and now it is time to clean up your mess. I mean they’re doing that here so I guess there is some satisfaction there. I really don’t want to be like, you know, in a wheel chair shaking something at them at 80 years old, but you know I think it will get done before that.

182709 Interviewer: O.k., talk a little bit about public participation. This has been one of the themes we talked about this evening. When you think of the word public participation, what does it mean to you?

182721 Pam: Meaningful active involvement from the beginning to the end of the process. You know, it’s just not yeah, o.k., we heard what you want, o.k. thanks, good-bye. You come in on the ground floor, you are involved in the discussions, the information sharing, and the debate. You give your input and you get a response back and just hammer it out through out the whole process.

182753 Interviewer: What do you think it means to DOE?

182754 Pam: They’re getting that idea here at Fernald. It’s taken awhile, but they get the picture now. I can’t say the same thing for headquarters and the field office all the time, but the

site and even the site will get frustrated sometimes. Because we will look at them and we know that they don't get the picture. It's like, you got it.

182819 Interviewer: Can you give an example of Headquarters not getting it and the site getting it?

182824 Pam: Uh, probably the budget this year because headquarters thought they could live with 290 and still not have to not get something done even though the site and the stakeholders were saying, "look, just give us the baseline." We're not saying and we know that's not chump change, you know, that's a lot of money, but you made them jump through all these hoops and do all these baseline, BEMR [Baseline Environmental Management Report] reports on the estimates to do this and now you're not even going to give them that for no good reason other than you guys can do it in that amount of money. You know, it's like, "you know, we have talked about this. We have been involved in this." And you know but they kind of went ahead and made a decision anyway.

182919 Interviewer: Sure, if you are kind of thinking about public participation of the site what would you say are the main milestones or events or triumphs the public has had in terms of site involvement?

182926 Pam: The records of decision all reflect stuff that FRESH pushed and harped and you know, we battled out in workshops or round tables or what ever you want to call it. 'Cause we pushed really really hard for federal ownership and the perpetuity and you can't just dump this land when there is still going to be stuff here. And the clean up levels. I mean, I mean they basically took the input they got, you know, from the public meetings and the CAB and FRESH and they did actually get incorporated into the record of decision on the on site disposal cell, the clean up levels for the soils and the aquifer. I mean, I guess the difference if you looked at the very first documents that were done, the response summaries are probably almost this thick because of all the comments, public comments that they would have to respond to. To where you got to the last one where they brought you in from the beginning and you were involved in making the decisions there were a lot less comments and stuff because you kind of worked everything out before it got to that point. And I guess another example of headquarters not getting it is they came out with Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, which we all said was a total waste of trees that they used to print this thing on. People commented on it and their comment back was, well this is what we've decided and this is what we're doing.

190027 Interviewer: Earlier you were talking about your accomplishments of your involvement being this balanced approach. Can you think of an example that would illustrate the balanced approach for us?

190044 Pam: The on-site disposal cell is probably the best example on the balanced approach. That was a hard decision, uh, caused a lot of discussions even within FRESH and I don't think there was a consensus agreement within FRESH on that. But I mean you just, you know, it was

the fact that we were willing to keep what we can keep here, rather than being a major NIMBY and having everything shipped to somebody else's backyard.

190116 Interviewer: Explain what the proposal was on the table that you all were deciding.

190122 Pam: Well, the decision was like with the soils and like when they tore down the buildings. We had all the debris from them tearing down the building. And the buildings are so old, I mean, you know. The site started because, you know, our race with the Soviets during the Cold War. But they are made out of transite so you've got asbestos, you've got ... and just all kinds of different stuff that's over there. So I mean you've got the buildings that have to be disposed of, once they're dismantled and torn down. Soils that would have to be dug up. You have the actual waste itself and then the water where the water was pumped out of the aquifer and treated you have the residue or waste that's in where the water treatment is. Well, all that stuff has to have something done with it. And I mean originally, you know, the community and even FRESH "all that stuff is out of here, off site, there's none of it going to be left here, nothing". And, you know I think the reality hit in, but it was still a tough decision. I mean nobody really wanted to publicly say we have to keep some of this on site. I mean once the ice finally got broken on that I think I probably just did a public meeting and had to say, "Look, we've got to keep it. We can't do this". So that kinda got it out to where we all discussed. And I mean it brought on like I said that was a good example of public participation because it's a scary thing for all that even though it's just soil and building debris and stuff like that, I mean it is still sitting over the aquifer, you know and it is still there. So there were a lot of meetings and input and I mean they would come back to answer our questions, like how is it going to be constructed. I mean there is a lot of additional stuff in the underneath part of the disposal cell that they probably wouldn't of done if the public had not put their two cents worth in on this. You know there is some extra gravel layers and filtration piping, you know ?? type and what is it called geosynthetic, some type of synthetic type of a liner. It is a pretty involved process, I mean if you look at a cross section of what it is and all the different thicknesses and everything before they actually start to put any waste in there. And I mean I don't know that it all would have been there had the public not been so insistent on that. And the regulators were supportive on that too, you know. The site would go back, work it out and we'd have another meeting, you know and we talk about it some more. To keep our fair share here.

194020 Interviewer: Sure, sure. We were talking about the CAB. Can you kind of articulate for us what is a CAB and why you think a CAB is important?

190433 Pam: Uh, it's supposed to be a citizen's advisory board where you don't get paid or anything, but you give recommendations on the decisions that need to be made concerning the clean up, the environmental restoration, whatever you want to call it, of the site. And I think the principle behind it is just involvement of citizens in the process that is going on over there. I know that the one guy in meeting, we ... and again you know after one point, we got along. But I mean I know there would be comments every now and then like, "well some of us aren't activists and some of us..." but I think after a while he figured out that we were doing this because we were concerned and we cared and we, you know, don't want to leave something that in 100 years, the third generation of kids are going to come back and say, "Oh my god, why were

they that stupid back then that they did this. Were they so concerned with doing it so fast and so cheap that they didn't think about what it was going to leave for us in the long run?" You know, and the advisory board gets a different cross-section in of people. It's just not local immediate people. I mean in the beginning there were people from like closer to downtown and kind of the East Side and the Clifton area, I mean it, you know, you had a wide variety of backgrounds you know on there as well. So you get different perspectives, you know. Which I think kind of helped to balance out the final responses that would come out of it. But it's just ... uh, I guess part of it ... we weren't given a choice. I know I am a smoker and that is not a politically correct thing, but oh well. The government has done their responsibility, they've told me the dangers. I am aware of what it has done to me and I chose freely to do it. They didn't give anybody a choice to drink water with this stuff in it or have it in your air, you know there is a potential that it could have been in produce that you ate. They throughout the Cold War decided that they had to have more nukes than anybody else. I don't know why because it only takes one to destroy the earth, but we weren't involved in that decision. So I mean we should be involved in the decision to try to fix that mess, you know. Maybe had we been involved in the beginning it would not be the mess it is now, you know. I think your normal average citizen might have said, "but what are you doing with that stuff?" But I mean back then you had international security, blah, blah, blah. I think anyone can get on the Internet now and figure out how to do what they did in the 50s. So I think the advisory boards are an important mechanism and to get a different voice, besides you know your local community and your environmental people that are involved in it as well.

190809 Interviewer: Sure, and who was it organized and supported by?

190813 Pam: The Department of Energy is who started them. They were pushed, you know, by different people across the complex. FRESH here and different groups like Idaho, Savannah River, Oak Ridge, Hanford. The original slate for DOE was like the big six, that's what they would call it, and what we kind of get refer to the big six sites within the complex. They were the first sites that were slated to get advisory boards and that was Fernald, Savannah River, Oak Ridge, Idaho, Hanford and Rocky Flats. Those were the six major sites that were slated. Since then New Mexico got one. New Mexico was predominantly the labs, the weapon's labs, Sandia, since they have done something that's totally weapons related. Ah ... Livermore, Lawrence Livermore, another lab they have basically some type of advisory board. Paducah does now, Nevada Test site. So I mean they have added some extra ones along, but in the beginning it was just the six.

190929 Interviewer: What does it mean to you to be an activist?

190936 Pam: Uh, well I have a bumper sticker on my car which maybe kinda ... "Question Authority". You know, I mean I would hope one of the lessons learned from Fernald is that you should always question your governments whether it is local, state or federal. They are supposed to be looking out for the best interest of their citizens, but that may not always be the case. You need to, you know, I am not saying you have to like become totally involved and study, but you need to be aware of what is going on around you and don't be afraid to question what is going on. And if you don't like your answer push it, you know, and find out what really is going on.

191026 Interviewer: Right, well in the effort to push it, we have talked about how you've spent countless hours, meetings, and reading documents, and we heard from you what sort of satisfaction you get out of that. How do the FRESH members deal with burn out that comes from that type of commitment and involvement in addition to family, and work, and lives.

191045 Pam: Well DOE kind of sometimes helps with that. Every now and then they will still do something really stupid. Like when the melter melted on the vit [vitrification] plant, you know. Just like every time everything is going along they will just get you totally fired up and mad again. Like "how could you not ..." you know. We talk with each other a lot, Lisa and I battle and balance off each other a lot on stuff. And you just have to say you know, "I'm stepping back, I got to step back, you know if it's really important I'll be there, but you know it's like in July - I like to go to concerts - August is my concert month. And I just say look "if its really important I will be there, but I am telling you right now, don't schedule anything, you know I am gonna to see STP this night and this night I've got tickets for Jimmy Buffet and Pearl Jam, you know, so, sorry. You just have to come to a point and say I've got to step back. We try to have no meetings in August and no meetings in December. And the CAB's done the same thing and I think DOE kinda maybe appreciates it, too. I mean we try to take one month in the summer and in like December with the holidays and everything else and just say no meetings. It's got to be something pretty drastic to have a meeting ... because everybody kind of needs a break, you know. And then you just have to kinda recognize yourself and just say look I have to walk away from this and think about something else for a couple of weeks and check back in then.

191240 Interviewer: Sure, sure. How would you react to the statement by some that it is the end of the Cold War that is fueling clean up rather than public participation inside issues. How would you react to the people who see it that way?

191254 Pam: Uh, activism probably started on the cleanup before the wall came down and the cold war stopped. I think the end of the Cold War gave extra support to what people had been saying all along. It's an issue now, though, that is hard for some of us to understand, you know, because you still have defense programs running full steam ahead. I mean they are still trying to figure out how to make new toys with their nuclear things. Uh, you know, they have what they call sub-critical testing, which it is still kind of testing. Maybe they not exactly what they did before and you have this new National, NSA, I think, National Security Administration within the Department of Energy. Some people have not got it that the Cold War is over. They still want to come up with some enemy that they need it for. But I think it helps people who for a while been saying: "You need to clean..." 'Cause I mean FRESH never actually said stop making, we never said don't make this, uh, but it's like "if you can't clean it up you shouldn't make it." You know until you can produce it to where it is safe and not harmful to the people in the environment, then you shouldn't be making it and you've got to clean it up first. Basically that is when the site shut down. Because they can't. You know they haven't put the effort into trying to develop the technology to deal with the waste. I mean we've often joked around and said that we need a Manhattan Project for clean up, you know, maybe that might help here because the effort and the money ... but it is not sexy to do clean up, you know, it's sexy to

make bombs, but it's not sexy to deal with the mess that they have left, you know, and talk about what is done to the people that's worked at the sites and lived around them. So I mean that's just kinda cultural sociological thing that still has to be pressed on with. It is better, but...

191517 Interviewer: Sure. Imagine you are sitting down writing your memoirs, your experiences about this time, what would you want future generations to learn? What is the most important thing for them to take away from your activism and your involvement?

191525 Pam: Don't be complacent. Ask the questions, find out. If it really does seriously bother you, you don't want to deal with it well, see that's hard for me. But stay involved in what's going on around you. I mean there is not an invisible fence whether it's Fernald or a chemical company or industry. There is not this fence around these places that keeps all these hazardous materials and radioactive materials within those boundaries. You know, just because you live there doesn't mean you are not going to be effected. You know, I mean like I said the transportation and disposal side of it, you know, it could go past your house in a train, or a truck or whatever, so I mean you know, it's just ... you need to be aware of what is going on around you and not be afraid to ask questions, attend the meetings and, you know, be involved in questioning. Educate yourself and then you can decide, you know, yeah, is it a problem or isn't it, and how to deal with it. And uh, pay attention to who is supposed to be representing you because they may not always be that way, you know. If they are not, get them out, you know. They're supposed to represent everybody, not a few.

191714 Interviewer: Sure. Can you think of anything that you wanted to mention tonight that we haven't touched on?

191719 Pam: No not really, I don't think. Other than be involved, you've got to take care... There is only one earth here, you know. We've become a disposable society. Use and abuse. But you know, you've got to learn to take care of it. The sooner you do it the less problems it's going to be for people and the less costly it is going to be in the long run. You can't be a *me* and just think that it won't bother me and they can just deal with it down the road. You know, I mean at some point you just can't say it is going to be dealt with down the road, you know. You have to take an initiative and try to make sure that it happens, you know. That people do get and stay concerned about it and take care of it.

191818 Interviewer: O.k. Thank you.

191818 Interviewer 2: I have one final thing. Can you talk about why it wasn't totally cleaned up? Could you do that one more time. Why are they keeping some of it there.

191914 Interviewer: Can you tell us what factors led up to the decision for the on-site storage cell?

191915 Pam: Uh, it was kind of a mixed thing. Uh, we were trying to decide clean up levels first. How clean is clean, if you can ever decide that. Uh and you had to debate between background versus not background. You actually started to see some costs associated. The

biggest thing that hit me was when I saw what was gonna happen ecologically. There would have been, it would have been a moonscape over there. To have taken that site to background would have been almost impossible and then when you looked at the dollars you would have never got the funding, you know, from the federal government to go that route, you know, that much. That kinda got the discussions rolling and then the CAB, the advisory board. And part of that report that we had to do was called 'cleanopoly' and I have it around here somewhere. But it was like this board and we glued these poker chips, different colored poker chips together which said this is the level you go if you go this route and they glued so many together that showed how many cubic yards of waste would have to be shipped. They had already equated out an estimate of how that would relate transportation wise trucks, and cost for trucking and what the site would look like if you did that. I think that's when it sunk into the whole community. That's when the cost associated with trying to do that, that is when every body took a step back and said ok, maybe we can live without background as long as the aquifer is protected. Then you start looking at the cost and say that you have this much stuff that you gonna have to deal with and then that not led to the other discussion. We had decided on the cleanup levels, and after that all got all hammered out then the discussions of the on site disposal facility hit. That's were we did it with the balanced approach. Even with not going to background, it was a pretty massive amount of soils and debris that was going to have to go to probably to the Nevada test site. We know people in Nevada. The test site doesn't like this, you know. The people that live out there don't want it. I don't think the test site cares, but the citizens out there aren't necessarily into it. Some of the tribal governments didn't want it out there. Uh, you know, we had to start thinking about it. Nobody wants it, the NIMBY thing in their back yard, but then the costs. The cost to keep it on site versus the cost to ship it. And then the risk, I mean with some of this they will try to play down the risk factors with transportation a lot of times you have to watch, and I guess I should thank some of my college courses in statistics on that. The modeling is only based on your waste shipments and average transportation. And it's like, "Wait an minute, you have wastes from that DOE site and that DOE site and trains from here and trains from there and you have to model all of this in, for factors for accidents if something happens from here to there. Cost was probably the big thing, you know and it's like "what do you want to do?" Do you want to spend all the money that we could possibly get to ship what we technically could keep here or do you maybe want to try to get it done a little quicker and get the nastier stuff like the waste pits or the silos taken care of and start to be able to remove the source of the contamination so that the aquifer can have a little bit of a chance to maybe do some regeneration on ...

of its own. We ended up with a disposal cell.

192553 Interviewer: Thank you very much.