

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: NFSS Meeting Input (UNCLASSIFIED)
Date: Monday, October 03, 2011 2:25:15 PM
Attachments: [REDACTED]

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, September 30, 2011 7:35 AM
To: Fusrap, LRB
Subject: Meeting Input

Hello Corps Folks,

First off - nice job and well executed in terms that we laymen can get our arms around.

Attached please find your requested meeting feedback.

Bottom line - I believe that our government should be held to the same standards that they would expect the private sector to comply with - half way does not really cut it.

Not sure what the spin-doctor Doug brings to the table - if it acts as a buffer for you so be it - understandable today.

Thank you for listening

Best regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE

September 28, 2011 Workshop on Waste Disposal Options and Fernald Lessons Learned Technical Memorandum

Table Discussion Questions:

1. What is your overall impression of the presentation? Was it understandable? Did it provide the right level of information? Was any of it confusing or incomplete in your view?
Good / Yes / Yes / No - though I find all of this off the mark in that this was a federal project on federal land that currently exposes the populace to numerous health hazards and lower property values - should have been prioritized from the onset for all citizens both US and Canada
2. Identifying land use was a key component of Fernald's decision-making. Given the location and uses surrounding the NFSS, What do you think should be considered for the long-term use of land currently occupied by the NFSS - industrial, commercial, residential, recreational?
Should be neutralized to the point that any of the above can be utilized without exposure - so I guess that would be recreational
3. In addition to future land use and protecting human health and the environment, are there other community values or concerns that the Corps should consider as we prepare the IWCS OU Feasibility Study? Are there any other lessons from the Fernald experience that you think are important?
I do not believe so other than taking into account the terrorism threat involved with having materials located near our fresh water supply. As far as my insights - I do not feel as though I have the insight to address.
4. As you saw in tonight's presentation, safe removal and disposal of these types of residues is expensive and risky. Risk and cost associated with removal options for the IWCS will be evaluated in detail in the IWCS OU Feasibility Study. All options are on the table and we will conduct a detailed analysis of each one. What issues are most important to you as we consider the following range of alternatives:
 - a. remove the high activity residues (K-65s and others) and create an on-site disposal cell for the remaining lower activity wastes (similar to what was done at Fernald) or
 - b. remove everything in the IWCS and dispose of off-site.

Understanding the costs - this is still the only resolve

Hope an advance in technology will make the process more cost effective

~~X~~ enhance the cap and leave everything in place Responsibility remains with our govt to correct what was created by them for the greater good despite the costs involved- I would hope.