

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)
FOR S... ALLOY METALLURGICAL
CORPORATION FACILITY -- CAMBRIDGE, OH

Meadowbrook High School
Auditorium
58615 Marietta Road
Byesville, Ohio
December 13, 1993

The above-entitled meeting was held, pursuant to
notice, at 7:15 p.m., Michael Weber presiding.

050021

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.
Court Reporters
1612 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-3950

9401070128 931213
PDR ADOCK 04008948
C PDR

0/
NL17

1 PARTICIPANTS:

2

3

PRESENT ON BEHALF OF THE NRC:

4

5

Michael Weber

6

Chad Glenn

7

Mike McCann, Region III, Fuel Facilities &

8

Decommissioning Section

9

Barbara Stinson, Meeting Facilitator

10

11

PRESENT FROM THE PUBLIC:

12

13

Scott Eaves

14

Tom Laughman

15

Carolyn Arnold

16

Art Valentine

17

Mayor Shaub

18

Deborah Lorz

19

Greg Nageotte

20

David Ellison

21

Sherwood Bauman

22

Chris Trepal

23

Bob Greenbaum

24

John Perera

25

1 PARTICIPANTS, CONTINUED:

2

3

John Sedor

4

Joe Latchik

5

Bill Davis

6

Jack Dunning

7

Brenda Hibbs

8

Greg DeDinato

9

Tony Celebrezze

10

William T. Oliver, II

11

Nancy Howard

12

Michael Finn

13

Matthew Bennett

14

Barbara Miller

15

Melvin Eubaniks

16

James Jewel

17

Michael MacMurray

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

P R O C E E D I N G S

[7:15 p.m.]

1
2
3 MR. WEBER: Good evening. My name is Michael
4 Weber. I am here from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
5 from Rockville, Maryland, a suburb of Washington, D.C. I am
6 pleased to be with you tonight. I am looking forward to a
7 productive interchange. We are here to hear what your
8 concerns are. We are also prepared to share with you some
9 background information regarding the Shieldalloy
10 Metallurgical Corporation facility in nearby Cambridge --
11 half-way between here and Cambridge, Ohio.

12 I certainly want to express my appreciation for
13 your turnout. Like I said, we are here to hear your
14 comments and the issues that are of concern to you. That is
15 our principal objective in being here tonight. We are at
16 the very early stage of a process which, if everything goes
17 according to plan, will be played out over the next two
18 years or so in the development of what is referred to as an
19 environmental impact statement, which the NRC will prepare.
20 And the purpose of tonight's meeting -- and I will get into
21 this in more detail later on, but I just want to set the
22 stage at this point -- is to hear and share with you about
23 the project that we are focusing on.

24 I also want to express my appreciation to the
25 Meadowbrook School. This is certainly about the best kind

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.
Court Reporters
1612 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-3950

1 of facility that I have been in in public meeting, and I
2 think it is a tribute to the citizens of the local
3 community.

4 Several months ago, Shieldalloy Metallurgical
5 Corporation proposed to the NRC staff that the radioactive
6 waste currently at their facility in Cambridge would be
7 stabilized onsite as part of the decommissioning operation.
8 My presentation a little bit later on and the presentation
9 of Chad Glenn, will hopefully illuminate for you what that
10 means and also how we plan to address that and evaluate it
11 as part of our process.

12 I want to call your attention to several documents
13 that are on the back table. If you did not get them, please
14 don't get up. You will have plenty of opportunity later on.
15 But, I certainly want you to be aware of them. One document
16 is a summary of the slides that Chad Glenn and myself will
17 be using tonight. There is also another document that is
18 caused the Action Plan for Timing and Clean-up of Site
19 Decommissioning Management Plan Sites. That gives you kind
20 of a policy, regulatory background on how the NRC -- the
21 Nuclear Regulatory Commission -- approaches these kinds of
22 decommissioning actions.

23 There is a general summary and background
24 information on radioactive material and radiation and
25 general. That is for your information. Then there is the

1 notice that we refer to as the Scoping Notice, which was
2 published several weeks ago in a document called the Federal
3 Register. That provides, in gory detail, the scoping
4 process, what we are about here tonight, and what we would
5 propose as an agency of the Federal Government to carry out
6 over the next two years.

7 The other document I will call your attention to
8 is a small publication that looks like this. It is called
9 the Public Document User's Guide. This document summarizes
10 for you how you, as a local representative or citizen, or
11 just an interested individual can access information that is
12 in NRC's files that may be pertinent to this particular
13 licensee.

14 At this point, I would like to turn the meeting
15 over to Barbara Stinson. Barbara is joining us tonight from
16 the Keystone Center. She will describe to you a little bit
17 about what the Center is and what it does, and facilitate
18 the rest of the meeting.

19 So, without further ado, I give to you Barbara
20 Stinson.

21 MS. STINSON: Thank you. As Mike said, my name is
22 Barbara Stinson. You will get an opportunity to meet the
23 other gentlemen at the table here this evening shortly.

24 Let me start by just introducing you to the format
25 for this evening and a few details about how we hope to

1 conduct this session. It is a little bit out of the
2 ordinary, in that it is a public hearing, per se, but it is
3 also an information exchange opportunity. So, we try to
4 structure the discussion so there will be more opportunity
5 for question and answer and understanding of particular
6 perspectives regarding the decommissioning of the facility
7 in question.

8 Let me say, first of all, you may have received as
9 you came in the front door, a description of the public
10 meeting process for this meeting. I just want to call your
11 attention to the first three bullets. They are in fact the
12 purpose behind this meeting and what we hope to accomplish.
13 And really what my role is here is to help and assure that
14 we accomplish the following things: Increasing an
15 understanding of the technical information that is before us
16 and the actual alternatives that have been proposed and will
17 be under consideration.

18 This is your opportunity to effect those
19 alternatives and the alternatives that will be analyzed by
20 NRC and any cooperating agencies. And we will talk more
21 about what that means, "cooperating agencies" -- and also
22 just to encourage communication on the issues amongst
23 members of the community. So, that is the "Community," with
24 a capital "C," including members of the local community,
25 regional representatives that are here from environmental

1 organizations, state representatives that are here on behalf
2 -- as elected officials, and state and Federal Government
3 representatives who are also here. So, as I said, we are
4 trying to encourage that communication and cooperation as a
5 big part of this meeting. And it is just the beginning of a
6 process that will hopefully build on that throughout the
7 next year or how ever long the scoping and actual EIS --
8 Environmental Impact Statement process goes.

9 The last bullet item is specifically to receive
10 comment on proposed -- the scope of the proposed EIS and
11 also on the onsite disposal alternatives. There are five
12 alternatives mentioned. But, as Mike mentioned already, the
13 licensee has proposed onsite disposal, and that is what
14 brings about this entire process.

15 So, we are looking forward to just general
16 discussion that will illuminate your ideas on that disposal
17 alternative, but also specific comments during the public
18 comment period.

19 Please note that this is the first of several
20 opportunities for input. Don't feel pressured that you have
21 to speak tonight. Don't feel pressured that it is your only
22 opportunity for input into the agencies that are here to
23 listen to you. You can do it in writing. As Michael
24 described, there is a lengthy public participation process
25 that goes along with the development of an Environmental

1 Impact Statement and so tonight you can sit back and get --
2 just get information if you want and formulate your opinions
3 and register those in many other forms later on down the
4 road.

5 The other point to make is this is hopefully an
6 exploration meeting. We are here to explore the issues,
7 explore the alternatives, discuss the ins and outs and
8 impacts of all of those. It is not a decision-making
9 meeting. No one will walk away from this meeting and say X
10 or Y will happen. So, you can breathe a little bit of a
11 sigh of relief on that. But, it doesn't remove the
12 importance of this meeting and the importance of this input
13 opportunity.

14 Mike introduced that I am with the Keystone
15 Center. So, I will tell you a little bit more about my role
16 here at this meeting and what the Keystone Center is. We
17 are a non-profit, neutral mediation organization. That
18 means that we are neutral, in the sense that we are process
19 advocates. We try to established fair and balanced
20 discussion opportunities on specific environmental natural
21 resource management issues. So, I am basically here to
22 assist all of you all in conducting a productive meeting,
23 and having an opportunity to speak, and ensuring that people
24 listen to each other. So, you may notice me being a traffic
25 cop over here, insisting on people not interrupting one

1 another. That should be one of our ground rules, on not
2 targeting any comments to any personal -- either an
3 individual or a personal characterization of anyone. So,
4 keep your comments slated towards the issues at-hand and not
5 towards individuals. And, as I say, it is going to be
6 important to give the people that are at the microphone and
7 people that are speaking from the audience your full
8 attention. Don't interrupt them. I will be assuring that
9 we have one person speaking at one time.

10 So, if there are no questions about that general
11 process and those ground rules, I am going to describe a
12 little bit the agenda and the structure for this meeting.
13 Any questions or comments at this point?

14 [No response.]

15 MS. STINSON: Okay. Pull out your agenda. It is
16 the one-pager that describes the course of the evening. We
17 will be moving right into presentations of information
18 shortly. During this period, two members of the Nuclear
19 Regulatory Commission, two employees from headquarters in
20 the Washington, D.C. area will make presentations of
21 information that hopefully will lay out some factual
22 information and offer you an opportunity to ask questions
23 about that information. So, we will first have a site
24 description and status presentation and a short question and
25 answer period after that for questions of clarification

1 only. This is not the opportunity for you to express your
2 views on anything presented, but rather, just ask questions
3 to make sure you understand it.

4 The same with the second and third bullets. We
5 will get a description of the alternatives. NEPA is the
6 National Environmental Policy Act, which -- the development
7 of an Environmental Impact Statement, an EIS, is brought
8 about under the jurisdiction of this Act, and you will have
9 an opportunity to understand more of the scoping process,
10 the timeline involved, the various benchmarks that take
11 place during the scoping process.

12 Hopefully, by 7:45 or shortly thereafter, we will
13 be moving into the public comment period. We have
14 structured this discussion to offer an opportunity for all
15 of us to hear from specific interest groups all at the same
16 time or by category. So that, first, we will listen to the
17 Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corporation representatives make a
18 brief presentation about the issues of concern to them and
19 some general facts, and then have a short question and
20 answer period if there is time. Then any representatives
21 that are here, local officials or as elected officials or
22 local government will have an opportunity for 15 minutes to
23 offer their perspectives, and we will move on accordingly
24 throughout the schedule.

25 Now, let me say that this is a general break-out

1 of the timeframes. We may be somewhat flexible about the
2 timeframes. We are going to insist that people not take
3 more than 15 to 20 minutes for their entire interest group
4 presentations. So, pay attention to -- if we have four
5 people, then obviously, you are going to have to take less
6 than five minutes a person for your presentation. Again, we
7 want to get a flavor of the concerns and interests that are
8 represented by that group. So, that is the purpose of each
9 of those discussions.

10 Then, at 9:30, hopefully we will have time for an
11 open discussion, where you can ask each other questions, you
12 can ask the NRC, you can ask the licensee questions, you can
13 explore issues that have come up as a particular concern to
14 you.

15 We will take closing comments at 9:55. Unless
16 this group wants to go on longer, and we get agreement on
17 that, we will adjourn at 10:00 o'clock.

18 This entire meeting is going to be transcribed.
19 If you signed up in the back, on the right-hand side, on the
20 general sign-up sheet, you will receive a copy of that
21 transcript. You may be sorry. It is probably going to be
22 very thick. There are also plenty of other documents back
23 there. And, if you want to, note next to your name any
24 special documents that you would like to receive that are
25 not listed back there -- you can do that.

1 Do be sure that you sign in so that we know you
2 are here. Let me see if there are any questions regarding
3 the agenda and the format for the evening.

4 [No response.]

5 MS. STINSON: Okay. Good.

6 Let's move into the opening presentations.

7 MR. WEBER: By way of introduction, if I didn't
8 introduce myself earlier, I am Mike Weber. I am a Section
9 Leader -- out at the office of Nuclear Materials Safety and
10 Safeguards in Washington, D.C. With me tonight is the
11 Project Manager -- the NRC Project Manager for the
12 Shieldalloy facility, and that is Chad Glenn, sitting in the
13 middle of the table. Chad will make the next presentation.
14 We are also fortunate to have with us tonight several
15 representatives of our Region III Office, located just in
16 Metropolitan Chicago. With us at the table is Michael
17 McCann, who is the Section Leader of the Fuel Facilities and
18 Decommissioning Section at our Region III Office.

19 So, without further ado, Chad.

20 MR. GLENN: Okay. Good evening ladies and
21 gentlemen. What I would like to do in this segment is offer
22 just a brief overview of the site, a description of the site
23 and follow that. But, first I would like to start with a
24 little bit on NRC involvement.

25 Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corporation possesses -

1 - has an active NRC license from the Nuclear Regulatory
2 Commission, which authorizes them to possess uranium and
3 thorium. NRC refers to this material sometimes as source
4 material. The Vanadium Corporation of America initiated
5 operations at the site in 1953. Foote Mineral Company --
6 Vanadium Corporation of America merged with Foote Mineral
7 around 1970 and Shieldalloy purchased the facility in 1987.

8 The facility imported and processed niobium ore to
9 produce a ferro-columbium alloy from the '50s, all the way
10 up to the early '70s. I want to point out that niobium is
11 not a radioactive material. It is a metal used to harden
12 steels. However, the niobium ore does contain trace amounts
13 of uranium and thorium, which is what we refer to as source
14 material.

15 The Shieldalloy Corporation continues to process
16 ferro-vanadium to the present day, but the processing of
17 source material was ended prior to the Shieldalloy purchase
18 of the facility in 1987.

19 Decommissioning at the site was initiated in 1988
20 and continues to the present. Shieldalloy has -- their
21 cleanup -- their decontamination activities have been
22 effective in cleaning up the radiological contamination over
23 most of the site.

24 NRC has conducted, with its contractor, Oak Ridge
25 Associated Universities, three radiological surveys and has

1 confirmed that the contamination on the site presently is
2 limited to two slag piles.

3 I want to move now to just a picture of the site.
4 As most of you are probably aware, the site occupies
5 approximately 130 acres situated between Cambridge and
6 Byesville, Ohio. It is bounded on the north and east by the
7 Conrail property, on the south by Route 209, on the west by
8 Chapman Run.

9 The focus of this discussion, as you are aware, is
10 on the ultimate disposition of two slag piles. I want to
11 point out the east slag pile and the west slag pile. The
12 east slag pile occupies about two and a half acres and
13 contains about a million cubic feet of low-level waste. The
14 west slag pile occupies seven and a half acres and contains
15 approximately six million cubic feet of low-level waste.

16 I think it is also important to point out that the
17 groundwater beneath the site generally moves from the east
18 to the west. The surface water generally moves from the
19 southeast to the northwest.

20 Chapman Run is a small stream on the western
21 portion of the property. It runs north and flows into Wills
22 Creek, approximately a thousand feet north of the property.

23 As far as the Shieldalloy process, niobium ore,
24 which contains the natural uranium and thorium, is taken to
25 the facility. This ore contains approximately two percent

1 thorium and .04 percent uranium. In the process, the
2 niobium is extracted and used as a metal alloy in the steel
3 industry. The slag from the process is stored onsite.

4 Now, this is what the form of the slag is today.
5 This is a fair advanced slag. It is not source material.
6 It is not regulated by NRC. It is similar to the form of
7 slag -- the ferro-columbium slag. As you can see, it is
8 very dense and this is what it looks like.

9 I would like to now turn to the radionuclides we
10 are going to look at. The radionuclides that are in this
11 slag are basically the radionuclides in the uranium decay
12 chain and the uranium-238 decays -- and this is the decay
13 chain for uranium. We are going to be talking about
14 uranium-238, but we are actually looking at all of the decay
15 products of uranium 238. Likewise, thorium is the -- is
16 also regulated by the NRC and, like uranium, this is the
17 decay chain for thorium. We looked at all of the
18 radionuclides in the decay chain.

19 The next slide. I would like to talk a little bit
20 about the concentrations in the east and west slag pile. As
21 we indicated, the primary radionuclides are thorium-232,
22 uranium-238 and radium-226. The quantity of radioactivity
23 or activity is measured in curies. Generally, the larger
24 the activity level, the greater the potential health hazard,
25 if the material is not controlled properly.

1 In the environment, the activity of these
2 radionuclides are typically described in terms of
3 picocuries. A picocurie is one-trillionth of a curie. We
4 have a brochure in the back, I believe, Mike --

5 MR. WEBER: Yes.

6 MR. GLENN: -- that describes some of these terms.

7 If we look at the east slag pile first, we can see
8 that the concentrations in the east slag pile are thorium-
9 232, is four picocuries per gram; uranium-238 is 21
10 picocuries per gram; and radium-226 is 66 picocuries per
11 gram.

12 In the west slag pile, the pile is really divided
13 into two layers: A lower layer, which we refer to as the
14 original slag, and an upper layer which contains slag and
15 soil. This upper layer was slag that was placed on the
16 original slag in the process of cleaning up the site. The
17 original slag on the base has concentrations of thorium,
18 uranium and radium below five picocuries per gram. Average
19 concentrations in the slag and soil on the upper layer are
20 between 40 and 50 picocuries per gram.

21 One other point that I would like to point out is
22 that on the west slag pile there is no fence surrounding the
23 slag pile, however, there is a three-foot cover that is
24 depicted on your diagram. On the east slag pile there is no
25 cover. There is a fence that extends around the slag pile.

1 Now, just for perspective, the next slide we are
2 going to get into is the average concentration of
3 radioactive material in the slag. Here the concentrations
4 of radioactive material in the east and west slag pile are
5 compared to NRC guideline concentration for unrestricted use
6 and natural background concentrations. By natural
7 background concentrations, I am referring to the
8 concentrations of uranium and thorium that would be expected
9 prior to any source material being processed at the site.

10 As you can see on the far left, background
11 concentrations of thorium-232, uranium-238, and radium-226,
12 are in the range of one to two picocuries per gram. NRC's
13 guideline for unrestricted release contains basically two
14 options: The option one level for thorium-232, uranium and
15 radium is five picocuries per gram; the option two limit is
16 restricted to thorium-232, and there the limit is 25
17 picocuries per gram. There are no option two limits for
18 uranium or radium, so the option one limits apply.

19 On the right, you can see the concentrations in
20 the west slag pile and the east slag pile, compared to those
21 guideline concentrations.

22 The next slide provides the exposure rates at the
23 Shieldalloy site. By exposure rate, this is basically the
24 gamma radiation in the air. The unit we use to measure the
25 gamma radiation in air is the micro -- is the micro ranking

1 or micro-R as we refer to it.

2 In the environment, the exposure rates are usually
3 measured in terms of micro-R per hour. The background
4 exposure rates in this area, 10 micro-R per hour. NRC
5 guideline for unrestricted release of a site is background
6 plus 10 micro-R per hour, or NRC's guideline is actually 20
7 micro-R per hour.

8 The west pile, which has a cover, is essentially
9 at background. It is 23 -- average exposure rates are 23
10 micro-R per hour. The uncovered east slag pile has an
11 exposure rate of 115 micro-R per hour.

12 This chart I think clearly shows the effect the
13 cover has on absorbing gamma radiation. You can see the
14 difference between the west and the east slag pile, which
15 essentially is similar concentrations. Actually, the west
16 pile has higher concentrations on the upper layer, and the
17 cover has a significant affect on the exposure rate.

18 That concludes my presentation.

19 MS. STINSON: Let me just say that you have heard
20 a lot of information here and a lot of terminology used. I
21 am going to leave it to you to flag -- get my attention when
22 there are either phrases or acronyms that you don't
23 understand, and we will make sure we get those spelled.

24 Let's take about two or three minutes of questions
25 of clarification, if anybody has ones that they would like

1 to ask?

2 Yes, sir?

3 FROM THE FLOOR: You said that the 23 micro-R per
4 hour -- was the background radiation.

5 MS. STINSON: Excuse me. You are going to have to
6 repeat the question. Please repeat the question, and then
7 answer it.

8 MR. GLENN: I think the question was, as I heard
9 it -- I stated that 23 micro-R per hour was background. And
10 that is not -- I should clarify that. You are correct. 23
11 micro-R is not background; 10 micro-R is background. The
12 exposure rates over the west slag pile actually range
13 between six and 23 micro-R per hour. I have used the upper
14 range of that, which is 23. So, that is above background.

15 MS. STINSON: Yes?

16 FROM THE FLOOR: You point out the significance of
17 how much the count dropped when you cover it. My question
18 is is that for exposure airborne -- my question is, if you
19 cover that pile and it is raining and we have a heavy rain
20 and the area floods, and the water goes up underneath that
21 cover, and then it drains off into the wetlands that those
22 piles extend into, what happens to those numbers, as far as
23 far as the downstream migration?

24 MR. GLENN: If I understand it, your question is
25 what happens if you have precipitation -- you get a lot of

1 rain, and a lot of groundwater gets into the pile? Perhaps
2 the water table gets higher or you get water getting into
3 the pile from underneath the pile, or from above the pile?
4 What is the effect of leeching the radioactive material out
5 of the pile and downstream, offsite? I don't have an answer
6 for that. I think that is a question that we intend to look
7 at these types of scenarios in the Environmental Impact
8 Statement and we would expect to evaluate those in the
9 course of doing this EIS. I think that is all I would like
10 to say. We can look at this rock and say it looks
11 relatively dense, and leech-resistant, but, in fact, we have
12 not conducted tests that demonstrate that, so I cannot -- we
13 would have to look at that and evaluate that in the EIS
14 process.

15 FROM THE FLOOR: What have been the tests that you
16 have done?

17 MR. GLENN: This leechability test -- what tests
18 have been done to the slag? And this slag -- the licensee
19 has done leechability tests for slags of this nature at
20 their Newfield, New Jersey facility. Based on that
21 information, the slags in the Newfield, New Jersey facility
22 are very leech-resistant, from the tests that they have
23 conducted. So, if these are similar slags, we might expect
24 similar results; but, the fact is that these tests have not
25 been conducted on these slags.

1 MS. STINSON: Any other questions of
2 clarification?

3 [Show of hands.]

4 MS. STINSON: We will take one, maybe two more.

5 FROM THE FLOOR: My colleague here mentioned the
6 wetlands on the site. Maybe you could show the map again.
7 Have these wetlands been delineated? Has there been any
8 function or value assessment done to these wetlands?

9 MS. STINSON: The question is have there been an
10 examination or delineation of the wetlands on the site.

11 MR. GLENN: I don't think adequately, to answer
12 your question. We know that the slag piles are adjacent to
13 wetlands. They are also in the 100-year flood plain. Both
14 of those concerns need to be evaluated in the Environmental
15 Impact Statement.

16 MS. STINSON: Any other questions from anyone
17 else?

18 [Show of hands.]

19 MS. STINSON: Right here?

20 FROM THE FLOOR: That one slide that shows the
21 gamma rate -- how far down is that?

22 MR. GLENN: Well, it depends on the --

23 MS. STINSON: Please repeat the question.

24 MR. GLENN: She wanted to know how far gamma rays
25 will travel. A gamma ray being essentially like light, as

1 it is the same type of energy, a photon-type energy, will
2 travel quite far. It can go miles, or it can go inches,
3 depending on what is in between it and the type of
4 radioactive material. Do you know what the average gamma
5 ray field is? Okay. But, it can go far.

6 FROM THE FLOOR: Will it go through -- the
7 uncovered --

8 MR. WEBER: I think what we can do -- I think that
9 was what we were going to talk about at the end of the
10 meeting -- more technical information. We will give you
11 what you need as a clear background of what Chad has
12 mentioned earlier, the magnitude of the radiation levels
13 being measured. In other words, it is directly proportional
14 to the radioactive material that is there in the quadrant.
15 So, I think we can scope that a little bit better.

16 MS. STINSON: The purpose of the public comment
17 period is to raise issues of concern, just like that, and to
18 explore them a little further. So, we will have plenty of
19 time to do that.

20 Let's move on to the second part of the
21 presentation.

22 MR. WEBER: We will address the question. I am
23 getting the sign from the facilitator, so I better move on.

24 By way of overview, what I plan to do, as a
25 follow-up to the previous presentation is to overview for

1 you the NEPA process which was briefly touched on earlier,
2 describe what an Environmental Impact Statement and what is
3 the purpose of the scoping process here tonight, and the
4 period that ensues. I will also talk about the proposed
5 action being onsite disposal of the radioactive waste that
6 already exists at the Cambridge Facility. I will talk about
7 alternatives to that proposed actions, or at least those
8 alternatives that the NRC would propose to consider as part
9 of its evaluation. I will talk about what impacts we would
10 evaluate associated with those alternatives and then end
11 with an overview of when will the EIS be available and what
12 is the schedule for developing and what additional
13 opportunities are there for public input to the process.

14 And Environmental Impact Statement is basically an
15 evaluation of the environmental impacts associated with the
16 proposed action. Now, that is a mouthful. What we do is we
17 identify alternative actions, as well as the proposed
18 action, and then we try to estimate or project what, if any,
19 environmental impacts would be associated with that. In
20 other words, would we expect that there would be some risk
21 of accidents because trucks would be driving down the road,
22 as part of one alternative? Would there be airborne
23 emissions of either a toxic material or a radiological
24 material? What is the impact on the workers that might be
25 engaged in moving material around as part of the

1 alternatives? These are all of the sorts of things that we
2 evaluate. I will describe a little bit later on what
3 specific impacts we would propose to consider.

4 It also assists us. It is important to the NRC
5 because we use it as the basis for our decision-making
6 process. NEPA was enacted by Congress to ensure that the
7 agencies did not take major Federal actions without first
8 evaluating, in a deliberative process, what are the impacts
9 and what alternatives exist that might reduce those impacts
10 on the human environment. That would include impacts on the
11 environment in general. In addition to all of these good
12 things, it is also required by the law and by NRC's
13 requirements in 10 CFR Part 51. CFR stands for the Code of
14 Federal Regulations.

15 Now, the scoping process that we are here tonight
16 as part of the public meeting is just the first part of the
17 development of the EIS. So, we haven't made any decisions
18 at this point, other than the decision to in fact prepare an
19 Environmental Impact Statement and to hold this public
20 meeting as part of the scoping process.

21 Basically, you can summarize what we are about
22 here tonight as is the NRC on the right track? Are we
23 considering the right kind of alternatives that are feasible
24 or viable for this facility? Are we planning to evaluate
25 the right kind of issues or environmental impacts? What we

1 would like to hear from you, if you believe that we have not
2 identified them appropriately, that is what we are here to
3 hear. If you believe that there are alternatives that we
4 have not identified, if you believe that there are impacts
5 that we have not identified, we would like those comments
6 here tonight or in writing from you before January 15th.

7 Also, there is the general issue of are there
8 other issues besides just the impacts and the alternatives
9 that should also be considered as part of the development of
10 the Environmental Impact Statement?

11 Briefly, let me overview the alternatives that we
12 have identified in the notice that is available at the back
13 of the table. The licensee's proposed action is to dispose
14 of the radioactive waste that currently exists on the site
15 at the site. And something -- I will be going into more
16 detail in this briefly -- but just let me overview the
17 general alternatives that have been identified. What NRC
18 has tried to do is come up with a suite of alternatives that
19 reasonably bounds the type of alternatives that may exist,
20 all the way from leaving all of the radioactive waste
21 onsite, to taking it all offsite. So, you can see that that
22 pretty much spans the spectrum.

23 The other alternative involve the offsite removal
24 of the contamination. In this scenario, the material would
25 be removed from the Cambridge facility and disposed of

1 elsewhere.

2 There is also an alternative of doing some
3 processing onsite, which may be useful in reducing the
4 volume or reducing the hazards of the waste that currently
5 exist onsite, perhaps with offsite disposal of some of the
6 higher concentration material. There is also an onsite
7 processing by bringing in relatively clean soil and diluting
8 the contamination to reduce the average concentration, thus
9 protection any people who may, in the long run, penetrate
10 into that waste and become exposed to it.

11 And the final alternative is the no-action
12 alternative. Now, by raising it, we are not saying that we
13 are proposing to take no action at this facility. Let there
14 be no mistake about that. The no action alternative
15 provides us a baseline against which to compare the other
16 four previous alternatives.

17 Briefly, onsite disposal would primarily consist
18 of the type of disposal activity that Shieldalloy has
19 already engaged in stabilizing the west pile, or some sort
20 of earthen cover of some design or another would be placed
21 over the waste, perhaps used to be used of the material that
22 is already on top of the west pile in the form of a cover.
23 Perhaps some other alternative would have to be used as part
24 of an onsite disposal. But, the principal components here
25 would be using some combination of engineered material, as

1 well as natural materials to provide for long-term
2 stabilization of the radioactive waste at the site. That
3 would be stabilization, in terms of preventing or mitigating
4 airborne releases, water-borne releases into Wills Creek,
5 and into the run nearby, or groundwater discharge, or
6 gaseous release from the pile. All these sorts of things
7 will be taken into the development of the disposal
8 alternative.

9 The second alternative would be offsite disposal.
10 In this alternative, what is contemplated is that the
11 material would be exhumed from the site, placed in either
12 trucks or train cars and would be sent offsite. Now, the
13 offsite disposal location would have to be licensed by the
14 NRC, or by an Agreement State, depending on where it would
15 go. That could include areas in the near vicinity of
16 Cambridge. It could be someplace within the State of Ohio.
17 It could be someplace outside of the State of Ohio. All of
18 those are reasonable alternatives.

19 I show in the diagram an arrow indicating that the
20 stuff is going to New Mexico. That is only for figurative
21 purposes. I am not sure the citizens of the State of New
22 Mexico would appreciate the waste coming to them. But, in
23 any case, I am just showing that to indicate that offsite
24 disposal would entail, in fact, removal of the material --
25 of the waste on the site and taking it elsewhere.

1 A variation of that theme would be combining
2 offsite disposal with some sort of processing onsite. I
3 mentioned earlier, this may entail taking the waste and
4 separating it physically or chemically, or using its
5 radioactive properties to try to segregate the material that
6 posed a greater risk from the material that poses a lesser
7 risk -- the concept being leaving some of the lesser-risk
8 material behind and taking the material or waste that poses
9 a greater risk to the environment and to humans offsite for
10 disposal in a licensed facility.

11 For the sake of completeness, we also included a
12 dilution scenario or a dilution alternative. This would
13 entail, rather than removing the material from the site,
14 bringing the material to the site, mixing it with the slag
15 in some process to reduce the average concentration of the
16 radioactive materials within the disposal.

17 And then the last alternative that we have
18 identified so far is the no-action alternative. Again, we
19 are not proposing this. We are just saying that this is one
20 of the alternatives that we will be considering, just to be
21 sure that we have a complete spectrum of what is currently
22 available and has been identified. The no-action
23 alternative provides us with a baseline.

24 It is important to point out, with the no-action
25 alternative, however, that even though NRC may take no

1 action, there certainly are other regulatory bodies, for
2 example, the state agencies and the Federal agencies, like
3 the Environmental Protection Agency, that may, on its own,
4 initiate action that could stabilize this material in some
5 way or lead to the selection of some remedial action of some
6 disposal alternative.

7 In fact, the NRC has proposed to these various
8 local, state and Federal agencies that they consider whether
9 they are willing to cooperate with the NRC in the
10 development of the Environmental Impact Statement. The
11 objective of that cooperation is to provide for early
12 consultation and cooperation between the agencies so that
13 there is sharing of information and so that all of the
14 agencies that may have jurisdiction or special experience or
15 expertise about this kind of action be brought in. That
16 information can be then used in developing a coordinated
17 remedial action plan.

18 I mentioned earlier about potential impacts. This
19 is just a brief picture to show what kinds of impacts we
20 would propose to consider. They are described in greater
21 detail on the notice that is available at the back of the
22 room. Principally, we would be looking at potential
23 exposures to residents that may move on to the site at some
24 point in the future. How might they be exposed? Would they
25 dig a foundation in the material? Would they grow crops on

1 top of the contaminated material? Would they be exposed to
2 radioactive gasses like radon that may be emitted through
3 the cover in the facility? What would the construction of
4 the disposal cell itself -- how would that impact upon the
5 environment? Would there be sedimentation and run-off into
6 adjacent surface-water? Would there be groundwater
7 contamination, either during remedial action, or the
8 stabilization of material, or after at some point?

9 Certainly, for the offsite disposal alternatives,
10 this would entail consideration of transportation impacts.
11 By driving so many trucks down the road, what is the
12 probability that somebody may be injured or in fact killed,
13 because you are moving so many trucks, or because you are
14 transporting the material through rail cars. This gives you
15 a range of alternatives. As I mentioned, the full range of
16 alternatives is described in greater detail in the scoping
17 notice.

18 To wrap up on the schedule, what we would propose
19 to do is, in February, based on the public comments that we
20 have received here tonight, as well as any written comments
21 that may come in, and the consultation that goes on between
22 the state, local and Federal agencies, with our cooperation,
23 we would prepare a scoping summary. And that document would
24 digest the comments that have been received on this scoping
25 process, and identify specific alternatives or specific

1 issues which will need to be considered by the NRC as part
2 of the development of that Environmental Impact Statement.

3 We would also propose then to proceed in the
4 publication of a draft Environmental Impact Statement and
5 then complete a final Environmental Impact Statement, you
6 can see, by June of 1995. This schedule is contingent upon
7 the successful resolution of some of the financial issues
8 that currently face Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corporation,
9 as well as other additional information that may come out as
10 part of the scoping process. For example, new information
11 may come to light which would identify new issues which will
12 take far longer to evaluate. On the other hand, information
13 may also surface which could be used to accelerate the
14 schedule somewhat.

15 By this point, you are saying, okay, when do I
16 have an opportunity to have input into the process? I have
17 tried to describe up here what alternatives exist for public
18 input throughout. We have tonight's scoping meeting where
19 you can submit both oral or written comments, if you choose
20 to, to identify issues of concern that you may have. There
21 is also the opportunity, as I mentioned earlier, to submit
22 written comments for the record by January 15th of 1994.
23 And the mailing address is provided in the notice on the
24 back of the table.

25 After the scoping summary is distributed to people

1 who request a copy, you may also feel free to write in and
2 say, no, you don't have the issue quite right, I meant this
3 issue. That is another alternative that you have.

4 At the time that the NRC publishes the draft
5 Environmental Impact Statement, there will be a formal
6 public comment process -- at least a 90-day comment period,
7 where the document will be available, and you will be
8 entitled to go through, get a copy if you want one, and
9 identify the comments on that.

10 I might also point out that there is an
11 opportunity for continuing consultation. You have met Chad
12 Glenn from his previous presentation. He is here as a
13 project manager. It is important to identify him as the
14 point person with the NRC. So, if you have concerns or
15 comments that may come up at any time, please feel free to
16 comment and to tell Chad what those are.

17 That's my overview of the schedule.

18 MS. STINSON: Once again, we will take questions
19 of clarification, if you have any at this point. If not, we
20 can -- you can certainly return to them.

21 [Show of hands.]

22 MS. STINSON: Yes.

23 FROM THE FLOOR: What is being done in terms of
24 the workers at the site?

25 MR. WEBER: Okay. That is a good question. The

1 question was what is being done to protect the workers at
2 the site until all this matter is resolved?

3 As Chad mentioned in his overview, the west pile
4 is currently covered. And so, with some minor exceptions,
5 the level of exposure that we see at that west pile is
6 roughly what it is as you would find around the level. The
7 levels are not elevated significantly. So, it doesn't pose
8 a risk to the workers who continue to work on site.

9 The east pile, as Chad also mentioned, is fenced.
10 There is an elevated exposure rate along the fence line.
11 But, generally, the work takes place far from the east pile
12 location. Just being out there today, we had our survey
13 meters. You don't see any elevated exposure rates beyond
14 what, about a hundred yards or so or less from the east
15 pile. And merely driving by would not pose a significant
16 risk.

17 The material that is presently being handled at
18 the site is the ferro-vanadium material, and that is not
19 licensed by the NRC. But, we surveyed this piece of slag
20 and the levels are not significantly elevated in that
21 either.

22 MS. STINSON: Any questions for clarification of
23 understanding the scoping process?

24 [Show of hands.]

25 MS. STINSON: Yes, sir.

1 FROM THE FLOOR: Has the NRC and the company put a
2 dollar limit on the preparation of the Environmental Impact
3 Statement and have other Federal agencies done likewise?

4 MR. WEBER: We have contracted with the Oak Ridge
5 National Laboratory.

6 [Show of hands.]

7 MS. STINSON: Question?

8 FROM THE FLOOR: [Inaudible.]

9 MS. STINSON: Repeat the question.

10 MR. WEBER: The question was has the NRC put a
11 dollar limit on the preparation of the Environmental Impact
12 Statement? And have the other Federal agencies done
13 likewise?

14 FROM THE FLOOR: And state agencies.

15 MR. WEBER: And the state agencies and the
16 company.

17 FROM THE FLOOR: That's right.

18 MR. WEBER: With respect to the NRC, we have
19 contracted with the Oak Ridge National Laboratories. I
20 think the contractual amount is \$300,000 for the preparation
21 of this environmental impact statement. We are also
22 planning to do another one for Shieldalloy's other facility
23 in Newfield, New Jersey. The value of that contract is the
24 same.

25 As to whether the other Federal and State agencies

1 have committed to specific dollar amounts, I am not aware
2 that they have. I think, at this point, many of them are
3 just right now sorting out what their role is and do they
4 want to cooperate with the NRC in developing this
5 Environmental Impact Statement.

6 There are representatives of those agencies here
7 tonight. Perhaps later on, if they can, they can answer the
8 question.

9 MS. STINSON: And, in terms of the company,
10 perhaps they will address the question in the course of
11 their comments coming up.

12 Any other questions at this stage?

13 [Show of hands.]

14 MS. STINSON: Yes, ma'am?

15 FROM THE FLOOR: Is it mixed waste, hazardous and
16 radioactive waste?

17 MS. STINSON: The question is is it mixed and
18 radioactive -- is it mixed waste, radioactive and hazardous
19 waste?

20 MR. WEBER: I think we are sorting that out. The
21 reason I say that is because the material when it was
22 generated, to our knowledge, would have not been mixed
23 waste. But, it may have been mixed with other materials
24 onsite, which may make it mixed waste today. In fact, we
25 have been discussing that with EPA. I think, rather than

1 make a decision here tonight, I think we have got to
2 continue those discussions.

3 MS. STINSON: So, it sounds like it is a question
4 before them.

5 Any other questions at this point?

6 [Show of hands.]

7 MS. STINSON: Yes?

8 FROM THE FLOOR: How can you say that, looking at
9 the records from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, in
10 reference to a particular accident at the Shieldalloy site I
11 believe back in 1990, when they were cleaning up part of one
12 of the piles and a canister of hazardous waste exploded?
13 That is in your records.

14 MR. WEBER: The question was how can I say that
15 when --

16 FROM THE FLOOR: That it is not mixed hazardous
17 waste?

18 MR. WEBER: I am not aware that we determined that
19 it is mixed hazardous waste. I am not -- I am going to have
20 to check into what you are saying.

21 MR. GLENN: I will just try this one. I think, in
22 terms of the slag itself, at the present time, we don't view
23 that as a mixed waste. However, there was this ferro-
24 vanadium dust that does contain heavy metals and is used as
25 the capping material on the west slag pile. That -- it may

1 turn out that that cover and the heavy metals in that cover
2 contain hazardous components. That is all I can say at this
3 point in time.

4 MS. STINSON: Any other questions of
5 clarification?

6 [Show of hands.]

7 MS. STINSON: One last one. Go ahead.

8 FROM THE FLOOR: [Inaudible.]

9 MS. STINSON: Can you describe the explosion
10 situation that he is referring to? Sherwood? Okay. We
11 will have to pose that question to the company.

12 FROM THE FLOOR: [Inaudible.]

13 MS. STINSON: Okay. We will reserve that question
14 and make sure we get back to it.

15 Anything else?

16 MR. WEBER: Can you repeat the question?

17 MS. STINSON: The question was related to the
18 explosion on the site and what was it precisely.

19 Okay. As I described earlier, during the next
20 period, for probably at least an hour, we are going to hear
21 from various perspectives that have signed up to present
22 comments from their perspective. The interest groups that
23 have signed up are the licensee themselves, elected
24 officials and local government, environmental citizen
25 organizations, folks that are site employees, or members of

1 the labor union and various local business representatives.
2 We will just ask each individual as you come up to please
3 limit your comments to about three minutes. That ought to
4 keep us relatively on schedule. Hopefully, at the end of
5 each interest group session, we will have time for questions
6 back to that group.

7 Let's begin with the SMC, the Shieldalloy
8 Metallurgical Corporation's comments.

9 MR. WEBER: Please state your name.

10 MS. STINSON: During this period, whenever you
11 approach the mike, you are going to have to state your name
12 clearly so that it is on the record. Thank you.

13 MR. EAVES: Good evening. I am Scott Eaves. I am
14 Vice President of Environmental Services for Shieldalloy
15 Corporation. I wanted to tell you that in 1987 Shieldalloy
16 bought the Cambridge facility. The previous owners had
17 processed columbium-ore at the site from the early 1950's
18 until 1971. This processing generated a slightly
19 radioactive slag which was left onsite when Shieldalloy
20 bought the facility. The slag has been sitting on the site
21 for over 20 years. In 1993, the NRC said the sight poses no
22 immediate threat to the public.

23 Shieldalloy has never processed columbium at the
24 site, but has spent over \$4 million remediating the site so
25 far. The Environmental Impact Statement that is going to be

1 prepared -- and this is the first step in that process, is
2 estimated to cost an additional \$2 million.

3 In all the time since the slag was first put down
4 on the land in the early '50s, there has been no evidence
5 that there has been any radiological contamination spreading
6 from the piles. Risk is one of the terms that you have
7 heard used tonight. You will hear it a lot through this
8 whole process. For practical evaluation of a remediation
9 technique, there are two components of risk that need to be
10 evaluated. One is the risk of performing the remediation
11 and the other is the risk remaining after the remediation is
12 complete. These two components have to be added together to
13 come up with a total risk for a given project.

14 When the risk of constructing and installing a cap
15 for the two piles is calculated and compared to the risks
16 associated with moving the material offsite, the risks from
17 moving the material offsite are much much higher. This is
18 due to the hazards associated with the excavation and with
19 moving the material over highways using trucks. The amount
20 of material that is onsite for it to be moved offsite would
21 take 26,000 tractor trailers. The risk of death and injury
22 go way up because of this transportation portion.

23 The proposed remediation methods -- stabilization
24 and capping is the alternative that poses the least amount
25 of risk to members of the public. Not insignificantly, it

1 is also the next to lowest in cost. This is important to
2 Shieldalloy because the company is currently trying to
3 develop a reorganization plan under Chapter 11 of the
4 bankruptcy code.

5 Some of the major points I would like to leave you
6 with is that there has been no known migration of radiation
7 since the material was placed on the ground; that the lowest
8 risk to the general public is capping in place; and that
9 proceeding with a capping in place solution will allow
10 Shieldalloy to continue to protect jobs and to be a viable
11 member of the community.

12 That is all I have.

13 MS. STINSON: I believe you are the only
14 representative of the company making comments? Okay. We
15 will take questions.

16 [Show of hands.]

17 MS. STINSON: Yes?

18 FROM THE FLOOR: Yes. I believe you stated that
19 there have been no known studies showing any migration
20 offsite and that there is no threat to humans. What I would
21 like to ask you is -- the major programs and perform the
22 site assessment of the Shieldalloy facility in September of
23 1990. They concluded, and I quote: "That Shieldalloy
24 threatens human health and the environment in the following
25 manners: One, because of its proximity to commercial and

1 residential areas, Shieldalloy Metals Corporation poses a
2 threat of radiation and metal exposure to the surrounding
3 population. Unrestricted access to the area surrounding the
4 facility increases the likelihood of exposure to
5 radionuclides and heavy metals.

6 "Two, Wills Creek and Chapman Run border a large
7 portion of the SMC site. These streams directly supply
8 drinking water for the City of Cambridge. Elevated levels
9 of certain metals and radionuclides were evident at the
10 confluence of the two streams. Likewise, samples collected
11 from the wetlands west of SMC exhibited elevated levels of
12 certain metals and vanadium compounds and radionuclides."

13 Now, my question is how can you sit here before us
14 tonight and tell us that there is no study that shows
15 offsite migration, when this study was done for site? And,
16 two, how can you sit there and tell us that there is no risk
17 to human beings?

18 MS. STINSON: The question was referring to a
19 study that was completed, in the questioners mind, I believe
20 for the SMC site. He cited several citations from that.
21 Let me just say, at this point, if you are going to have
22 long questions, I think we are going to have to get them in
23 on the record through the microphone. So, you may have to
24 step up and ask your questions. Go ahead.

25 MR. EAVES: I will answer the second part of your

1 question first. The allegations that Westin put in this
2 report that says that there are elevated readings of metals
3 and radiation don't have anything to do with and make no
4 reference to any impact on human health.

5 The second part of it that is one data point.
6 There have been a number of other tests that refute that.
7 So, there has been no conclusive information on your
8 question.

9 MS. STINSON: Other questions? This is a good
10 time for me to state that we all know that there are a
11 variety of perspectives on all of these issues. We are
12 going to disagree on our perspectives on those issues. We
13 know that. So, I think we should strive tonight to better
14 understand what the different points of view are and what
15 those disagreements are, and you have got to remain tolerant
16 that there are going to be different points of view coming
17 out of this microphone and from the audience. So, bear with
18 us on that.

19 Any other questions for SMC at this time?

20 [Show of hands.]

21 MS. STINSON: Yes?

22 FROM THE FLOOR: Does the metallurgical operation
23 -- what happens to the dust on the road, if it runs off --
24 water run-off from the road in the area -- do you process
25 that at the site?

1 MR. EAVES: The question was what happens to the
2 dust from the manufacturing operations? The questioner
3 wanted to know if it had been treated. The company does not
4 process any of the columbium ores that result in the
5 radioactive slags at all. We have never processed them
6 there.

7 MS. STINSON: Other questions?

8 [Show of hands.]

9 MS. STINSON: This won't be your last chance.
10 Yes?

11 FROM THE FLOOR: Does Shieldalloy now have --

12 MR. EAVES: I think that question would be better asked of
13 the NRC.

14 MS. STINSON: Can you repeat the question?

15 MR. EAVES: I don't think I completely understand.
16 She wanted to know -- the questioner wanted to know if
17 Shieldalloy had the license that was previously held by
18 another company to process ores onsite.

19 MR. WEBER: Shieldalloy no longer has a license to
20 process source material. Their license authorizes them for
21 possession only and decommissioning.

22 MS. STINSON: Any other questions?

23 [Show of hands.]

24 MS. STINSON: In the back.

25 FROM THE FLOOR: Does Shieldalloy have sole

1 responsible for the --

2 MR. EAVES: I think that the question was does
3 Shieldalloy have sole responsibility for the radioactive
4 slags and other toxic materials onsite or would liability
5 fall to the previous owners, if the site became a Superfund
6 site? I would have to say I don't know the answer to that
7 question. It is probably involved in the documents of sale.

8 MS. STINSON: That also sounds like a question for
9 the U.S. EPA. I know there are representatives here. Maybe
10 they will take an opportunity to answer that question at
11 some point.

12 Other questions?

13 [No response.]

14 MS. STINSON: Okay. Thank you.

15 We have a number of elected officials and local
16 government representatives who are here tonight to make a
17 few comments. Why don't I just run straight through the
18 list so you will know when you are up? Tom Laughman,
19 Carolyn Arnold, Ernest Rogers, and Art Valentine. If there
20 are others who did not sign up, who may wish to come up to
21 the mike and make a few comments, you will be allowed to do
22 so. Take about three minutes. We will start with tom.

23 MR. LAUGHMAN: Thank you. My name is Tom
24 Laughman. I am President of the Gurnsey County Board of
25 Commissioners. I want to welcome the Federal and state

1 agencies that have traveled to our fine county this evening.
2 We are proud here in Gurnsey County to have many responsible
3 corporate citizens. Shieldalloy has been one of our
4 corporate citizens since 1987. At the time Shieldalloy
5 purchased the Gurnsey County Plant, they inherited a
6 slightly radioactive area which was generated by the
7 previous owner. We have been told that in 1993 the NRC,
8 through an updated report on a site decommissioning
9 management plan, stated that the site poses no immediate
10 threat to the public.

11 While we understand that the NRC has a duty of
12 regulating such activity at the Shieldalloy site, we ask
13 that you understand the economic impact offsite disposal
14 would have on Shieldalloy, especially given their present
15 financial status. Removal of material from this site would
16 impact no only Shieldalloy, due to the cost, but also
17 Gurnsey County, as a whole, considering the traffic
18 congestion, in an already burdened industrial artery.

19 We are proud to have Shieldalloy as one of our
20 long-standing corporate citizens. They contribute in the
21 neighborhood of \$3 million in payroll to our local economy.
22 This figure translates to approximately \$7 million in total
23 cumulative expendable income for our area. In addition,
24 Shieldalloy pays real estate taxes which amount to \$27,000 a
25 year, as well as their share of personal property taxes.

1 While these figures may seem minimal at the Federal level,
2 they are very essential to Gurnsey County's economic base.
3 To lose over a hundred employees, as a result of cost-
4 prohibitive, offsite disposal of these areas would result in
5 a negative impact on Gurnsey County.

6 I ask that you continue to work with Shieldalloy
7 to decommission these areas onsite, which, in the end, will
8 benefit both Shieldalloy, as well as Gurnsey County as a
9 whole. Thank you.

10 [Applause.]

11 MS. STINSON: Any questions for --

12 [Show of hands.]

13 MS. STINSON: Yes?

14 MR. BAUMAN: Yes. You mentioned Shieldalloy's
15 contribution to the community. I was wondering if you would
16 care to comment on their contribution in the way of fines
17 for continued dumping of chromium and chlorine into our
18 sewage treatment plant?

19 MR. LAUGHMAN: I have not seen any indication in
20 writing.

21 MS. STINSON: I am sorry. Could you repeat the
22 question, or do you want me to do it?

23 MR. BAUMAN: I have a letter here from the City of
24 Cambridge about fines for continued dumping of chlorine and
25 chromium into our sewage treatment plant. If you are

1 talking about the contributions, I was wondering if you
2 would care to talk on that?

3 MR. LAUGHMAN: So, your question is what
4 contributions have they done in the way of dumping into the
5 sewage treatment plant?

6 MR. BAUMAN: Right. Above and beyond the
7 radioactive waste?

8 MR. LAUGHMAN: I think that they have --

9 MR. BAUMAN: Do you think they are being good
10 cooperate neighbors? Let's look at the entire story.

11 MR. LAUGHMAN: I am saying that this county cannot
12 afford to lose over a hundred jobs, Mr. Bauman. That is the
13 bottomline. I have not seen anything indicating any kind of
14 industrial waste dumped into a sewage treatment plant.

15 MR. BAUMAN: Maybe you could do something to bring
16 --

17 MR. LAUGHMAN: I am not here to debate that.

18 MS. STINSON: I don't want to get into -- excuse
19 me, both of you. I don't want to get into a debate between
20 two people here. Again, it is going to be a difficult
21 discussion. What we want to do is to try to explore the
22 issues. I think your question, Sherwood, relates to the
23 fines themselves. I think there is a City of Cambridge
24 representative here who can possibly answer that more
25 specifically. So, we will try to get to that.

1 Any other questions?

2 [Show of hands.]

3 MS. STINSON: Yes.

4 FROM THE FLOOR: [Inaudible.]

5 MS. STINSON: Yes. The question is can we stay to
6 the point. The point is that I think there will be
7 different interpretations of what is on point and what is
8 not. So, bear with us on that as well.

9 Any other specific questions of Tom?

10 [Show of hands.]

11 MS. STINSON: Yes, sir. If you can speak up?

12 FROM THE FLOOR: [Inaudible.]

13 MS. STINSON: Sure. Sherwood, what is your last
14 name? Bauman?

15 MR. BAUMAN: Bauman.

16 MS. STINSON: This is Sherwood Bauman, and he
17 represents Mills Creek Environmental Organization.

18 Other questions?

19 [No response.]

20 MS. STINSON: Okay. Thanks. We are having a
21 problem here in that we can't register each of the questions
22 on the microphones because we only have two. So, our
23 stenographer is struggling. If you do have your comments
24 typed out, that would be helpful. We will enter them into
25 the record that way.

1 Carolyn? Carolyn Arnold?

2 MS. ARNOLD: I really have nothing to say. I just
3 want to say --

4 MS. STINSON: Carolyn, I am sorry. Can you step
5 up to the mike? You can use this one.

6 MS. ARNOLD: Thank you. I just want to say that I
7 am here at the request of Senator John Glenn to hear from
8 you tonight. Here I am. If you want to talk to me at any
9 time, please, make yourself known. Thank you.

10 MS. STINSON: Ernest Rogers?

11 MR. ROGERS: I will pass at this time.

12 MS. STINSON: I am sorry. You will pass at this
13 time? Okay. How about Art Valentine? Do you mind coming
14 down? I am sorry. What we really need is a portable
15 microphone, and it just wasn't available.

16 MR. VALENTINE: I am Art Valentine from Byesville.
17 I would like to second Mr. Laughman's comments, and I want
18 them to stay here.

19 [Applause.]

20 MS. STINSON: We now are going to hear from some
21 of the environmental organizations. As I am peaking through
22 this, I think it might be a good idea to adjust the schedule
23 slightly and allow for -- did you want to make comments now,
24 Mayor?

25 MAYOR SHAUB: Yes.

1 MS. STINSON: Okay. Why don't you go ahead and do
2 that. This is Mayor Shaub obviously.

3 MAYOR SHAUB: Thank you. I apologize that we were
4 late. We had a council meeting in Cambridge, and we just
5 arrived a few moments ago.

6 I would reiterate and reinforce the comments made
7 by Commissioner Laughman, in that we feel that Shieldalloy
8 has been a good corporate citizen within our community. I
9 would very briefly address the question or comment raised
10 with regard to chlorine dumping into the city sewer system.
11 The city does have a pre-treatment program, and there are
12 certain permit levels whereby only a certain amount of
13 chlorine or anything can be dumped into our sewer system.
14 The idea that chlorine going into the sewer system is not a
15 problem in itself, what happened was an excessive amount
16 went into the sewer system in a short period of time which,
17 if it had been diluted, it would have been totally within
18 the permit limitations which we in the city have established
19 with EPA approval.

20 We did confront Shieldalloy, advised them that
21 they were out of permit violation. And the first
22 occurrence, we did impose a fine upon them, I believe it was
23 of \$2,500 for the first occurrence. Some time later,
24 whether it was accidental or what, but maybe a year later,
25 another dumping occurred, which we again notified

1 Shieldalloy and this time we fined them I believe it was
2 \$12,000, which they paid to the city.

3 I have been advised, since that time they have, at
4 their own expense, expended approximately \$28,000 to come up
5 with some type of a system so that this unfortunate
6 accidental dumping will not occur again. I, as the Mayor of
7 the City of Cambridge, appreciate the cooperation on the
8 part of Shieldalloy. Shieldalloy is not the only company or
9 plant within our community which has had EPA violations. We
10 are more than willing to work with those and have great
11 hopes of their continued cooperation. So, we, too, would
12 like to see Shieldalloy stay within our community. We would
13 also think that the onsite contamination remain there for
14 whatever degree it is, rather than remove it.

15 I would address one other question or comment. I
16 have been Mayor for 14 years. Two or three years ago we
17 were approached, not by Mr. Bauman, but by someone else
18 saying that this slag pile was contaminating our city water,
19 which is the source of Wills Creek, as the city source of
20 water. At least twice we had independent testing done above
21 and below the stream side of the slag site itself, upstream
22 and downstream, and the water tested on both sides of where
23 it could leech into our water system. The test came out the
24 same on both sides of the slag pile, which would indicate to
25 us that there has been no adverse impact upon the city's

1 source of water at this point in time.

2 Those are my comments, ma'am. I am sorry that I
3 didn't have them prepared.

4 MS. STINSON: That is fine. Will you take
5 questions?

6 MAYOR SHAUB: Oh, sure. I love to take questions.

7 MS. STINSON: Oh, good.

8 [Show of hands.]

9 MS. STINSON: Let's see. Yes, ma'am, back here.

10 FROM THE FLOOR: Did you say chlorine? I didn't
11 understand what that was -- chlorine?

12 MS. STINSON: Would you repeat the question,
13 please?

14 MAYOR SHAUB: The question, I believe, was I
15 stated chlorine and she thought they were being fined for
16 chromium. The part involved with the city only involved
17 chlorine.

18 [Show of hands.]

19 MS. STINSON: Apparently chlorine, not chromium.
20 Yes, Sherwood?

21 MR. BAUMAN: May I read it into the record?

22 MS. STINSON: Yes. Come over here.

23 MR. BAUMAN: You just stated it was chlorine and
24 not chromium. I would like to read that part. "Since SMC
25 has rather consistently violated its permit for free

1 chlorine and other pollutants, notably chromium, without
2 what I consider much regard for the permit compliance nor
3 requirement to notify the city when any such violation has
4 occurred, SMC is fined \$5,500 payable to the City of
5 Cambridge within 10 business days from the date of this
6 letter, plus an additional \$15,000 for the repair of the
7 damage caused to the lift station."

8 The first part of the question is would you like
9 to explain why you are willing to forgive chromium dumping,
10 when you believe that it is chromium that can destroy the
11 bacteria in our three-stage water treatment facility? Two,
12 I would like to know why, when your own utilities director
13 says blatant disregard of rules and violations, you are
14 standing up for Shieldalloy.

15 MAYOR SHAUB: I didn't have a copy of the letter
16 in front of me. I know the concern that we expressed -- our
17 concern when the chlorine was dumped into our system, it was
18 for the safety, health and welfare of our employees. In
19 other words, the chlorine gas can be very dangerous. There
20 is a lift station in the close proximity to Shieldalloy.
21 When our workers went to check out the lift stations, which
22 we do on a daily basis, this was the first thing that was
23 brought to my attention.

24 I don't know what the chromium violation was
25 permit-wise, on down the line. It was the chlorine which

1 did damage to our lift station. That was what we zeroed in
2 on. If we had not fined Shieldalloy, EPA would have fined
3 us. It is a trickle-down theory. I was not trying to cover
4 up the idea of chromium. I talked with the utilities
5 director today and he said it was the chlorine which was the
6 big violation. So, I will stand on that. I will defend
7 Shieldalloy again, Mr. Bauman.

8 MS. STINSON: Any other questions for the Mayor?

9 [No response.]

10 MS. STINSON: Okay. Thank you, sir.

11 MAYOR SHAUB: Thank you, ma'am.

12 [Applause.]

13 MS. STINSON: Now, we move to the environmental
14 citizen organizations who registered that they would like to
15 speak tonight. Deborah Lorz is going to start us out with
16 the Green Party of Ohio.

17 I am sorry. Let me just read the list, if I can.
18 We have several tonight. Greg, you are going to have to
19 help me with your last name.

20 MR. NAGID: Nagid.

21 MS. STINSON: Nagid. It looks a lot worse than it
22 sounds. Greg Nagid is here from the National Audubon
23 Society; David Ellison, Northeast Ohio Greens; Sherwood
24 Bauman from Save Wills Creek Water Resources Committee;
25 Chris Trepal, is here from -- I have forgotten what EDC

1 stands for -- Environmental --

2 MR. TREPAL: Earth Day Coalition.

3 MS. STINSON: Oh, Earth Day Coalition, that's
4 right. Sorry. Bob Greenbaum is here from the Sierra Club,
5 from the Ohio Chapter. So, that will be the order that you
6 will speak, if you don't mind.

7 MS. LORZ: Hi. My name is Deborah Lorz, I am with
8 the Greens, Green Party of Ohio. I am one of our
9 representatives to the National Council of the Green Party,
10 USA. I have been active in the debate in Ohio concerning
11 the low-level radioactive waste dump that has been proposed
12 here for the Midwest Compact. The areas that I will comment
13 on today are the legal requirements for decommissioning, the
14 health effects of exposure to low levels of ionizing
15 radiation, the proposed alternatives, and processes for
16 involving the public in the costing process and decision-
17 making.

18 My foremost concern is in the arena of
19 regulations. Currently, 10 CFR 40.42 requires that a site
20 be able to be released for unrestricted use before a license
21 is terminated, period. Now, I am aware that NRC is
22 currently involved in drafting an Environmental Impact
23 Statement concerning codifying, decommissioning, and
24 decontamination regulations that may be less restrictive
25 than the current regulations. The fact is that these

1 regulations do not yet exist. This leads me to question the
2 authority of the NRC to consider Shieldalloy's proposed
3 action at all.

4 Section 40.36 of Title X of the Code of Federal
5 Regulations requires licensees to submit a decommissioning
6 funding plan and assure funds for decommissioning. The
7 amount required to be set aside is a pittance compared with
8 decommissioning costs. This mechanism does, however, infer
9 that decommissioning should be an early consideration for
10 anyone applying for a license from NRC. These funds should
11 have been set aside long before Shieldalloy applied for
12 bankruptcy.

13 It is hard to find sympathy for short-sighted,
14 profit-minded thinking; but I do feel very strongly for the
15 workers who will be affected by this kind of thinking.
16 Industries in this country have often shown a lack of
17 concern for the health and safety of their workers; but, as
18 soon as an environmental concern comes up, start a job
19 versus environment kind of debate, which tends to obscure
20 the concerns that we hold in common for health and safety.

21 Section 40.14 of Title X of the Code of Federal
22 Regulations, allows the NRC to grant exemptions, provided
23 that it is authorized by law, it will not endanger life or
24 property, or the common defense, and it is in the public
25 interest. Those requirements seem to me to make the

1 granting of such an exemption to the Shieldalloy Corporation
2 to be illegal. Beyond the lack of legal authority, it may
3 well endanger life and property, and is in the interest of a
4 private corporation. not the public.

5 The Federal Government has bailed out the nuclear
6 industry from day one. The Price Anderson Act made the
7 taxpayers liable for nuclear accident. Subsidies of uranium
8 mining and processing have further shifted the costs
9 associated with nuclear technologies onto the citizens.
10 Shieldalloy is asking the residents of Gurnsey County to
11 pay, not only with their tax dollars, but also with their
12 health, the value of their property, and the health of their
13 children. The Atomic Energy Commission originally had the
14 dual role of promotion and regulation of nuclear industries.
15 There are many who question the integrity of the NRC has a
16 regulatory agency as well, due to the revolving door, from
17 positions of regulation of the industry, to employment
18 within the industry.

19 Well-respected researchers who differ from the
20 industry's preferred findings are routinely ostracized and
21 painted as crack-pots. Dr. John Gofman, Dr. Author Tamplin,
22 Dr. Alice Stewart, and Dr. George Kneale, are all examples.
23 Their studies found there to be no safe level of exposure to
24 ionizing radiation. The work of Dr. Gofman was requested by
25 the Atomic Energy Commission's Chairman, to study the

1 effects of peaceful uses of atomic energy. When Gofman
2 found that the risks to public health were significant, his
3 findings were ridiculed and suppressed.

4 There is no end in site to the debate on the
5 effects of low levels of radiation. Even the Bible of the
6 industry, the BEIR V, states that some forms of low-level
7 radiation can be more effective in causing health problems
8 than high doses. Until there is an open and fair debate
9 floor, there is no way to find the truth. Until such time
10 as it can be definitively stated that there is no risk, we
11 must behave as though there is. It is only fair to be
12 conservative in our action in this arena, where our
13 decisions affect life for thousands of years.

14 My understanding of this site is that it is in the
15 watershed that supplies the City of Cambridge with drinking
16 water. This would indicate to me a need to proceed with
17 great caution.

18 I would like to move on to a discussion of the
19 alternatives proposed by the NRC for consideration in the
20 draft Environmental Impact Statement. Again, I question
21 whether the NRC has the authority to grant an exemption to
22 the Shieldalloy Corporation to do anything other than
23 offsite disposal, which is alternative two in the notice I
24 received. I have grave concerns for any community that has
25 to deal with radioactive waste. I question the current

1 technologies that are used to isolate radioactive waste.
2 But, it does seem preferable to have some engineered
3 barriers and containment processes rather than having none.

4 Alternative one suggests leaving the waste onsite
5 and providing some minimal barriers to intrusion -- the
6 addition of a grass cap, as proposed, to minimize
7 groundwater contamination. Now, at the Barnwell, South
8 Carolina low-level radioactive waste dump, the older
9 trenches of waste were covered with dirt and grass. These
10 trenches have leaked into the water table, as evidenced by a
11 plume of tritium, which is migrating offsite. This
12 technology has been proven to be ineffective.

13 Currently, Chem Nuclear Systems, Incorporated,
14 proposes above-grade concrete modules, with an engineered
15 cap of high-density polyethylene, clay and grass. I am not
16 enamored of this technology either; but it is certainly more
17 responsible than this current proposal. I would hope that
18 NRC would not consider using a method that has already been
19 proven inadequate.

20 My other concern is about the proposal to monitor
21 the site for problems and possible remediation. I wonder
22 who would do the monitoring and who would mitigate any
23 problems or threats to the public health that might arise?
24 If this company had filed for bankruptcy already, I have
25 serious doubt as to whether they will be able to do anything

1 about later problems.

2 My concerns about alternative three hinge on
3 issues of safety. It seems that such a process would result
4 in unnecessary exposures to workers. I also wonder what
5 processes are used and what the cost of that may be.

6 Alternative four is one of the more creative
7 methods I have seen for sweeping a problem under the rug --
8 the idea of diluting radioactive waste and leaving it there
9 unrestricted turns my stomach. There is no proof that any
10 level of exposure is safe, even 10 picocuries per gram.
11 Regardless of the concentration, the amount of radioactive
12 uranium and thorium left onsite would be the same. The same
13 amount of rain water would pass through it. The same amount
14 would end up in the water, in the air, in the food and in
15 the people.

16 Alternative five seems ridiculous to even mention.
17 I know it has to be included in the Environmental Impact
18 Statement, but I hope you have no intention of taking it any
19 further.

20 I know that you include socioeconomic impacts in
21 the costing process. I think that there are areas of impact
22 that are difficult to quantify, but also need to be included
23 in the equation. Impacts on human health and the
24 environment are hard to measure, but they are there and need
25 to be considered. Attention needs to be given to developing

1 and implementing processes for quantifying these impacts.

2 My final area of concern is in the realm of
3 democracy and process. I think the idea of a site-specific
4 advisory board composed of concerned citizens, environmental
5 representatives, labor representatives and technical
6 advisors would be appropriate. I would like to see forums
7 for public participation in decisions and monitoring.

8 Thank you for your time.

9 MS. STINSON: We are going to move on just with
10 the next commenter --

11 [Applause.]

12 MS. STINSON: -- just because of the extended
13 comments, which is fine. Greg?

14 MR. NAGID: Hi. My name is Greg Nagid. I am
15 Wetlands Coordinator for the National Audubon Society, the
16 Great Lakes Regional Office. I was just invited last week
17 to come by Sherwood Bauman to support the environmental side
18 of this issue.

19 I just have a few comments that -- I will
20 reiterate what Deborah here says. We are concerned with the
21 slag being left onsite if there is inadequate monitoring.
22 This makes common sense. You don't leave a mess and have
23 nobody watching after it, especially when the radioactive
24 material can last for billions of years.

25 Now, a concern I have specifically, Audubon,

1 rather, is about the wetlands onsite. It has been conveyed
2 to me that the two slag piles are located either adjacent to
3 or within the wetlands. This isn't -- I don't know this
4 myself. I haven't seen the site; but, for some reason, a
5 proper delineation process and value assessment process has
6 been neglected. Typically, when a wetland is impacted by
7 dredge or fill material, there is a permit process initiated
8 from the Army Corps of Engineers. This is called Section
9 404 of permit process. This has not been done to my
10 knowledge. Typically, the Ohio EPA will also perform a 401
11 water quality standard permit process as well, where these
12 assessments are evaluated and proper mitigation action can
13 be required of the permittee or, in this case, Shieldalloy.

14 It is my concern that, with this EIS, these proper
15 assessments be made, and that the wetlands be given their
16 full consideration in terms of all of their functional
17 values. That may be flood control, wildlife habitat, water
18 quality, water recharge for the groundwater, et cetera.

19 I think that is all I need to say right now.

20 MS. STINSON: Thank you.

21 Let's move on. David Ellison.

22 MR. ELLISON: Hello. My name is David Ellison. I
23 am the convener of the National Committee of the Green
24 Party, USA, and the Treasurer of the Northeast Ohio Greens
25 and the Green Party of Ohio. For your information, the

1 Green Party is based on values. There is ecology, social
2 justice, non-violence, grass-roots democracy and community-
3 based economics.

4 Our official position on the workers who are
5 involved in nuclear technology is that a Superfund be
6 established to cover tuition and compensation during the
7 period of retraining and the divestiture of the nuclear
8 industry.

9 The termination of Shieldalloy's NRC license
10 unfortunately does not alleviate the community's burden of
11 uranium, thorium and other radioactive pollution of the
12 environment. An Environmental Impact Statement is an order
13 to assess the corporation's liability and complete
14 decommissioning efforts; but, in a broader sense, an EIS is
15 appropriate to begin to weigh the environmental impact felt
16 by the people of Ohio as a result of an industrial system
17 and regulatory agency which historically has been less
18 concerned with long-term sustainability than with short-
19 term profits.

20 Already legal actions have cast a pall of
21 censorship and repression on parts of the Cambridge
22 Community. Already threats of violence towards those who
23 speak out contaminate the environment in a way more
24 immediately visible than the insidious effects of
25 radioactive contamination, which will begin to show

1 themselves in future generations.

2 We commend the NRC in their determination that
3 their action regarding the Shieldalloy site constitutes a
4 major Federal action and warrants the preparation of an EIS.
5 In response to their solicitation for public input on the
6 scope of the EIS, the Northeast Ohio Greens offer the
7 following questions which should be addressed in the
8 eventual Environmental Impact Statement.

9 The area around the Coshoctin Flint Outcropping
10 and east of the Hopewell Civilization's Earthworks has a
11 high probability of containing early archaic, and that would
12 be from 500 B.C. through pre-Columbian, which is from a
13 thousand to 1,500 A.D., archeological sites, which would be
14 likely to include burial ground, ceremonial and sacred
15 places, and other remnants of prehistoric culture. In order
16 to preserve this archaeological record, we believe any
17 archaeological findings should be left in tact and
18 undisturbed. What will any action taken by Shieldalloy have
19 on the archaeological record left by the prehistoric people
20 who lived in this area?

21 I-70 follows what at one time was the National
22 Road, and was the first road into the Ohio Territory. The
23 area around Cambridge has a high probability of containing
24 historical sites and archeological records of the early
25 settlement of Ohio by Europeans. It is likely that it

1 contains remnants of early glass industry and clay works.
2 What impact will any action taken have on this historical
3 and cultural record?

4 The costs involved in moving materials,
5 administration and constructing barriers are fairly simple
6 to calculate, based on contractor's bids and company
7 employment projections. Other less tangible costs exist
8 which must be estimated. A value system might be used which
9 considers only the most immediate economic costs, thus
10 predetermining the outcome of this process. The
11 archaeological, cultural, historical, ecological, economic,
12 social, transportation risks and other costs need to be
13 assigned values. How will the NRC and its contractor
14 determine these values?

15 Long-term care of the waste generated by
16 Shieldalloy and its predecessors will have an impact on
17 whatever community is burdened with it. What social,
18 cultural and economic impacts will long-term care and
19 radioactive waste products, which require monitoring,
20 sequestering, and possible future remediation have on that
21 community?

22 Uranium and thorium have half-lives of four to 14
23 billion years and hazardous lives of 10 to 20 times that.
24 If public access to the site is to be restricted, will the
25 institutional control period be commensurate with the

1 duration of the hazard?

2 In radiation monitoring activities, it is
3 important to plan for long latency periods. In the receding
4 waters of the Mississippi River this past summer, it was
5 found that significantly more pesticide and fertilizer
6 residue existed in the unsaturated zone of the soil than had
7 reached the groundwater, suggesting a long latency period
8 between soil contamination and groundwater pollution. What
9 will the actions do to alleviate or create a problem of
10 materials migrating through the soil to the groundwater.

11 And experience with thorium contamination, where
12 the material is mixed diluted with clean fill and spread
13 around, there are indications of elevated incidence of
14 pancreatic, colon and lung cancers, as well as abnormally
15 high incidence of Hodgkin's Disease. In any of the options,
16 how will the health effects of this waste on the community
17 be determined?

18 In the processes of decommissioning, license
19 termination and long-term oversight, how are the people who
20 are directly affected going to be involved? What processes
21 will be used to involve the general public in decisions
22 which will affect them? What formal process will be used to
23 reach consensus on the action to be taken?

24 Onsite disposal, with restricted access is not
25 allowed under current regulations. Dilution has been proven

1 to decrease property values and cause doubt regarding a
2 place's healthfulness. Clean-up and release of the
3 decommissioned site for unrestricted use is the only
4 apparent option within the authority of the NRC. What
5 effect would altering the rules to allow higher levels of
6 contamination and restricted access in the Shieldalloy case
7 have on decommissioning and pollution prevention efforts
8 around the country?

9 Thank you.

10 [Applause.]

11 MS. STINSON: Sherwood Bauman.

12 MR. BAUMAN: My name is Sherwood Bauman. I am
13 with the Save the Wills Creek Water Resources Committee.

14 On May 3rd, 1993, Shieldalloy submitted a
15 decommissioning document to the Nuclear Regulatory Agency,
16 wherein they contend that the best method of clean-up is in
17 situ disposal. In common terms, it amounts to covering up
18 the radioactive waste and pretending that because it is
19 covered up, the problem has been taken care of.

20 A cursory glance at the Federal Code of
21 Regulations for the Nuclear Regulatory Agency would point
22 out that for a license to be retired the company would have
23 to accomplish the following tasks: One, terminate use of
24 source material; two, remove radioactive contamination to
25 the extent practicable. You will notice that nothing is

1 said about leaving it there in the middle of a wetland that
2 drains into the tributary that supplies the City of
3 Cambridge's water supply. Three, properly dispose of source
4 material. Disposing of source material does not mean
5 covering it up for the next 14 billion years, which is only
6 its half-life. Four, submit a report that demonstrates the
7 premises are suitable for release for unrestricted use in
8 some other manner. These regulations can be found in
9 Section 40.42 in book number 10 of the Federal Code of
10 Regulations. Section 40.42 shows that the Shieldalloy
11 Company's preferred choice of decommissioning falls far
12 short of the NRC clean-up guidelines for the site.

13 I am sure that the company will tell you that,
14 with proper policing of the site and other safeguards, it is
15 a site that will propose no risk to human health or the
16 environment. In effect, they are saying trust us. Sadly,
17 we as affected citizens, cannot trust Shieldalloy.

18 In a guest column that appeared in the
19 Jeffersonian, Shieldalloy claims they are being made a
20 scapegoat in this whole affair. However, before the Nuclear
21 Regulatory Agency or you, the members of the public, believe
22 this, let's look closely at a few cold, hard facts. One, in
23 the Company's decommissioning report of May 10th of this
24 year, they make some assertions that are based on purely
25 fictional facts and figures. A, for instance, option number

1 four of the report, which is complete clean-up and removal
2 to an approved storage facility of the radioactive materials
3 has an estimated cost to implement of \$467 million. With
4 that large of a price tag, I would admit that the company's
5 \$200 million plus dollars in assets would fall far short of
6 covering that cost. However, that cost is false. I submit
7 as proof a letter dated November 15th, 1993 from Envirocare,
8 wherein they state, and I quote: "The document quotes \$467
9 million as the cost of offsite disposal at Envirocare.
10 Since we have not received an inquiry from Shieldalloy, we
11 do not have adequate information to determine the exact
12 disposal fees. However, it is my understanding that the
13 material at the Shieldalloy site may approach five million
14 cubic feet, and, for such a large volume, our disposal fees
15 currently are clearly less than \$10 per foot."

16 The letter goes on to fault other assertions of
17 Shieldalloy's decommissioning report. I, at this point and
18 time, do not have enough information to endorse or recommend
19 against Envirocare as a site of choice to dispose of the
20 radioactive waste from the shield allow site.

21 However, their letter to the Nuclear Regulatory
22 Agency brings into doubt the very validity of Shieldalloy's
23 decommissioning plan. This letter, coupled with faults
24 noted by the various governmental agencies involved, should
25 be enough to through out the entire report and force

1 Shieldalloy to allow the decommissioning report to be
2 prepared by an uninterested outside source.

3 These faults cited by the Ohio EPA, the NRC and
4 others, include but are not limited to the following
5 examples: One, Shieldalloy's soil concentrations would
6 exceed the option one concentrations limits for natural
7 uranium and, therefore, the site could not be released for
8 unrestricted use; two, adoption of a specific dose objective
9 would have to be justified by site-specific alloy analysis.
10 Shieldalloy has not done this; three, after the license is
11 terminated, there is no restriction on the use of the land
12 and, therefore, no guarantee that the cover will be
13 maintained over its intended life or that it will continue
14 to be effective in shielding humans from direct gamma
15 radiation; four, soil ingestion is not included among the
16 pathways listed; five, the report did not provide a
17 rationale for using a drinking water intake of 410 liters
18 per year, and places the restrad default value of 510 liters
19 per year, or the NRC's default value of 730 liters per year.
20 These are five of the dozens of deficiencies pointed out by
21 the Federal and state agencies who reviewed the Shieldalloy
22 decommissioning report.

23 Two. Despite the company's view that they are
24 scapegoats, I would like to point to a letter from the City
25 of Cambridge, wherein, I quote, it states: "Since SMC has

1 rather consistently violated its permit for free chlorine
2 and other pollutants, notably chromium, without what I
3 consider much regard for permit compliance, nor requirements
4 to notify the city when any such violation has occurred, SMC
5 is fined \$5,500 payable to the City of Cambridge."

6 Three. I submit, as a final example of why
7 Shieldalloy cannot be trusted, a letter dated November of
8 this year from the Ohio EPA, wherein Shieldalloy is cited
9 for a total of 12 separate brand new violations of the Ohio
10 revised code. As you can see, Shieldalloy does not deserve
11 our trust in the cleanup of this site.

12 I would like to discuss the pros and cons of all
13 six of the alternatives in the Shieldalloy decommissioning
14 plan. Option one is simply to do nothing. Being as the NRC
15 has known about this site for 20 years and done exactly
16 that, nothing, I am surprised they haven't already approved
17 option one. However, the reasons this option will not work
18 are very simple. Offsite migration of radionuclide
19 contamination thereby contaminating the water source and
20 exposing the human population, as well as the entire flora
21 and fauna to tremendous health risk, including birth defects
22 and cancer.

23 Option two is the one that Shieldalloy Company
24 actually favors. The reason they favor this option is two-
25 fold. The first, in my opinion, revolves around corporate

1 greed. The cost is less than \$2 million. The second reason
2 they favor this option is very simple. It is a glorified
3 version of option one, which is to do nothing, simply
4 putting a cap over a problem in the old out-of-site, out-
5 of-mind scenario, has not and will not ever work. We deal
6 with the problem and it is a very real menace to our health
7 now, or we deal with it in the future. Perhaps, if the NRC
8 had done its job back in 1974, Cypress Foote Mineral, would
9 have already done the decommissioning work at a much lower
10 cost than today's efforts will cost either the company or us
11 the taxpayers.

12 This option does not meet any of the following NRC
13 rules and regulations: One, NRC's branch technical
14 position, disposal or onsite storage of thorium and uranium
15 waste from past operations, which is why the company is
16 seeking exemption from NRC regulations, as allowed under
17 Section 10 Code of Federal Regulations 40.14. Nowhere in
18 the NRC regulations is there anything giving this agency the
19 right to grant such an exemption that would leave the
20 citizens of Gurnsey County at great risk to their health and
21 safety for billions of years to come.

22 In fact, I would propose that, if the NRC is even
23 seriously considering this proposal, that they, the NRC, and
24 the Federal Government sign a contract with each and every
25 citizen of Gurnsey County, wherein they agree to accept all

1 of the moral, legal, and financial obligations, should the
2 proposed decommissioning plan fail to provide the safety we
3 deserve as United States' citizens. Their refusal to do so
4 is absolute proof that option two will fail.

5 Two. Section 40.42 discussed earlier this evening
6 -- options one and two can never meet any of the
7 requirements in this section in the Federal Code of
8 Regulations.

9 Three. Section 40.36 of the Federal Code of
10 Regulations dealing with financial assurance and
11 recordkeeping for decommissioning. Even should the
12 exemption be granted, the company cannot guarantee the
13 monies to provide the perpetual care that would be needed to
14 maintain the cover for some 14 billion years; in fact, not
15 even our own Federal Government could make that kind of a
16 guarantee, let alone a company attempting to escape its
17 moral and financial obligations through the Federal
18 Bankruptcy Courts.

19 Option three is relocation of slag and onsite
20 disposal. Again, this is the world-famous shell game
21 scenario of which shell is the crap under. Anywhere on the
22 site the slag materials sit on a flood plain and also the
23 company does not have the ability to guarantee our safety,
24 nor the health of our future generations. Any disposal
25 method that leaves the materials onsite or in the hands of

1 Shieldalloy has to be unacceptable.

2 Option four is the workable solution. For
3 starters, it allows the site, as required by NRC
4 regulations, to be returned to unrestricted use. It removes
5 the materials from the wetlands, as well as the 100-year
6 flood plain. We already know that the Company's figure of
7 \$467 million for this option are bogus.

8 As to where the money is going to come from, I
9 would make the following suggestions: One, our entire
10 Governmental leadership has failed us, by failing to
11 exercise good judgment and enforce regulations. In plain
12 language, you are guilty of gross negligence. You should
13 pay whatever portion of the bill cannot be covered by other
14 parties who have a legal and financial responsibility to
15 clean-up the mess they created.

16 Two, although in Federal Bankruptcy Court,
17 Shieldalloy has close to or over \$100 million in assets,
18 above and beyond their liabilities, they volunteered to
19 accept responsibility to decommission the site, if
20 necessary, liquidate their assets and use the revenue to
21 remediate the site.

22 Three. Let's not forget Foote Mineral, who was
23 bought out by Cypress, and is now called Cypress Foote
24 Mineral Company. The latest financial sheets that I pulled
25 on the company show assets of over \$5 billion. They have a

1 moral, if not legal obligation to the citizens of this
2 county to see that the site is properly cleaned up and
3 returned to full, unrestricted use.

4 Options five and six are not even worthy of review
5 because, by the company's own admittance, the technology to
6 implement them is still in the developmental stages.

7 I have now touched base on the six available
8 options. On behalf of the Save the Wills Creek Water
9 Resources Committee, I would like to state for the record
10 that we feel it is a fair and workable solution that takes
11 into effect the safety and health concerns of all of the
12 citizens of the county, but also deals with the workers of
13 Shieldalloy who, through Governmental delays, corporate
14 misconduct and greed, stand to pay the highest price.

15 With that, we would like to suggest the following
16 10-point clean-up plan. One. There are approximately 100
17 people employed at the Shieldalloy plant in Cambridge. More
18 than likely, they will be displaced as a result of the
19 cleanup of the plant site. We propose that, within the
20 decommissioning to plan be approved, \$10 million be set
21 aside into some type of an investment account. The interest
22 and dividends from this account would generate at least
23 \$600,000 a year. These new revenues should be equally
24 distributed once a year to the employees of Shieldalloy
25 company until their death. Once the last employee has

1 passed away, the entire escrow account should be turned over
2 to Gurnsey County's Government to be used to improve and
3 build the infrastructure that would attract new, viable,
4 much needed industry to our area. In this action, you at
5 least provide a stipend to the displaced employees that
6 would amount to some \$6,000 a year. You, in the future,
7 would also repay the County for all that it has done over
8 the years for the companies that occupy the site and brought
9 so much trouble and worry to our county.

10 Two. All parties to the suit agree to open up two
11 document repositories here in Gurnsey County, Ohio. The
12 first will be sited at the Gurnsey County Library and the
13 second is to be placed with the Save the Wills Creek Water
14 Resources Committee.

15 Three. Option four becomes the only acceptable
16 means of remediation of the site, and all parties agree to
17 abide by Senate Bill 130, now in statute form, which would
18 make it illegal to leave the radioactive slag onsite.

19 Four. As part of the decommissioning, NRC perform
20 a rad fly-over of the entire county to assure the citizens
21 that none of the hot slag was sold in the past as road or
22 construction fill.

23 Five. The Save the Wills Creek Water Resources
24 Committee be recognized as the official watchdog group for
25 the cleanup of this site.

1 Six. In conjunction with the slag piles, the Ohio
2 EPA take all steps necessary to also decommission the other
3 environmental problems at the site, including hazardous
4 waste, as well as the chromium contamination in and around
5 the bag house.

6 Seven. The NRC enforce all portions of the
7 Federal Code of Regulations pertaining to this site, and
8 deny the exemption sought by Shieldalloy.

9 Eight. The Ohio EPA also enforce all Ohio rules
10 and regulations in reference to this site, including civil
11 penalties, and/or criminal charges against Shieldalloy's
12 management for their ongoing violation and disregard of
13 Ohio's laws.

14 Nine. If the Gurnsey County water supply is
15 threatened during cleanup, the NRC include, as part of the
16 cleanup cost, the money it would take to lay a 12-inch pipe
17 out the Salt Fork to access the second water supply.

18 10. To assure that moneys are available to clean
19 up this site, the Shieldalloy site must be accepted into the
20 Superfund cleanup program.

21 I would also at this point like to point out that,
22 for various reasons, a lot of the information on this site
23 is not yet available to the general public. The U.S. EPA's
24 water test results, the Ohio EPA's verified complaint
25 findings, and the NRC's own findings of tests conducted in

1 October at the site are but a few of the documents not
2 released for general consumption. I feel it only fair that,
3 realizing this impact, the NRC agrees to an additional town
4 meeting after this information has been provided to the
5 general public of Gurnsey County, Ohio.

6 Thank you.

7 MS. STINSON: Chris Trepal.

8 [Applause.]

9 MS. TREPAL: My name is Chris Trepal. I am the
10 Co-Director of the Earth Day Coalition in Cleveland, Ohio.
11 My organization has been working on an SDMP site in
12 Cleveland for the past four years. To those of you who
13 haven't already guessed, it is not a pretty process.

14 I did have a process question to the NRC. A lot
15 of folks have asked questions that have not received
16 answers. When you generate the document from tonight's
17 meeting, will those questions be answered in the text?
18 Because I planned to ask about a dozen questions. That was
19 one of my first ones.

20 MS. STINSON: Good. I am glad you asked that
21 question. I think the answer is -- we will have to give
22 that question to the correct individual.

23 MR. WEBER: I think our intent would be to --
24 since we are preparing this document at the beginning part
25 of the process, we can only answer those questions for which

1 we have the answers. If it is the kind of question that
2 deserves an answer that has to come out of some thoughtful
3 evaluation, we won't have those answers until we go through
4 that and get the draft EIS.

5 MS. TREPAL: Okay. We will look for some answers
6 then when it comes out.

7 A previous speaker had referred to this fact --
8 and I guess -- I mean, I don't expect you to answer now;
9 but, my understanding is that, on the NRC's part, there are
10 no specific regulatory guidelines at the moment, and that
11 the Federal agencies do not have compatible regulations.
12 So, I have to kind of echo one of the previous speaker's
13 comments. I am a little concerned that at the beginning of
14 this process, you know, we have an incomplete set of
15 regulations on behalf of the regulators.

16 I also wanted to bring up our newly-enacted BRC
17 bill, Senate Bill 130. At the other site that I am working
18 on in Cleveland, it is the opinion of the state agencies
19 that onsite disposal would conflict with the certain
20 statutes of Senate Bill 130. I was wondering if the various
21 state agencies and the NRC -- how they have taken that into
22 account. At the site that I am working on, the latest
23 information we have that all solid waste landfill rules
24 would apply to an onsite disposal, including post-closure
25 regulations, and I wondered how that information would apply

1 here?

2 I would like to know what the total quantity of
3 the materials processed was during the 20 years at the site
4 and the total volume and curie content of the licensable
5 materials.

6 I was very disturbed to here words thrown around
7 like seasonal flooding, flood plains and wetlands. I think
8 it is absolute lunacy to even consider onsite disposal when
9 this is the quality of the land that we are talking about.
10 I am wondering what the NRC and other state agencies are
11 going to require in terms of hydrological and geological
12 assessments.

13 We very much oppose any proposal for dilution. We
14 think that it is just absolutely not the way to go. Our
15 company in Cleveland and the NRC have sort of agreed --
16 well, the company has agreed not to do dilution at our SDMP
17 site. I would like to ask the company to consider such a
18 pledge to the citizens of this county.

19 In terms of the run-off control, my understanding
20 is that there is some run-off control done at the piles now.
21 What is done with this contaminated run-off? Where does it
22 go? How is it treated? Is it processed? Who is it
23 processed by? What happens to it?

24 I am really concerned -- and I need to throw this
25 back on the NRC. How did the NRC allow Vanadium and Foote

1 Mineral, their license to lapse? I think that is a very
2 disturbing sentence. It needs some looking into.

3 We oppose the unrestricted public use of lands, if
4 there is going to be onsite disposal. Uranium-238 has a 4.5
5 billion half life. I don't know what anybody could do to
6 protect the public health and safety for four and a half
7 billion years.

8 We are also opposed to Shieldalloy being released
9 of their license. We feel that we need to hang onto
10 responsible parties. Regulations change, the weather
11 changes, the proposed cap can change. A lot of things can
12 happen. Our only security is that we have a responsible
13 party, and that means the license.

14 I wondered if the site characterization has been
15 deemed adequate and has been accepted? I don't really have
16 all of the documents. I haven't reviewed it. I had a lot
17 of questions about that.

18 My understanding was that there were past
19 decommissionings. I would like to know where the past
20 decommission materials were sent, volumes and activity,
21 where they were put.

22 I also wonder if any of the materials from the
23 site were sent offsite. I would like to have those records
24 made available in terms of volume and where they were sent
25 and if they were used for fill or construction materials.

1 I have a question. If an option is chosen, like
2 onsite disposal, what would happen if let's say in another
3 30 years regulations changed and were strengthened, would
4 that mean the company or the responsible party or the
5 citizens of Gurnsey County would have to go back to the site
6 and make other changes?

7 I had a question. If both sites were totally and
8 completely fenced off and there was signage, I didn't quite
9 -- I know it seemed like one of the piles was completely
10 fenced. I wasn't sure about the other one.

11 I have a lot of concerns about the bankruptcy
12 impact. I think where there isn't money -- we have a very
13 very hard time talking about a cleanup. I saw a little note
14 on one of the slides, in terms of even this very process, if
15 bankruptcy were declared, that the EIS process might be
16 discontinued. I would like to know from the NRC what
17 happens if that in fact comes to be.

18 I would like to know -- I am pretty sure that what
19 we saw were average concentrations of waste. I would like
20 to know what the very highest concentrations of the waste
21 are. Maybe that exists in some documents I don't have.

22 I would like to know what the proposed thickness
23 of the cap is? At our site in Cleveland, the proposed
24 thickness was 16 feet. I have a hard time imagining a big
25 lump of waste with yet another 16 feet of fill, but maybe it

1 can happen. So, I would like to know what is being proposed
2 here.

3 I am really concerned -- and I am not quite sure
4 if I heard this right -- that assumptions based on either
5 site characterization or some studies from New Jersey might
6 be used for the site here in Ohio -- if that isn't true. I
7 think it is really inappropriate.

8 I am also very concerned that -- what I thought I
9 heard was that hazardous waste was used to cap one of the
10 piles. I think that is pretty indefensible, if that in fact
11 did happen.

12 I would like to know if there is any record of
13 trespassing over the waste piles in the past 30 years -- if
14 there are any records of animal traffic, children, hikers,
15 hunters, whatever in the area. I am not real familiar, so
16 maybe it is not an appropriate question, but I would like to
17 ask it.

18 Finally, I just had kind of a philosophical
19 question about above-ground disposal and cap integrity. I
20 have heard of a lot of below-ground disposal where, you
21 know, a cavity is excavated and the contaminated materials
22 put in and then capped. I am just really concerned that we
23 have an above-ground disposal proposal with a totally --
24 three-quarters of the waste pile would be enclosed in a cap.

25 Finally, I had a question about one of the

1 comments that was made on the slides. In terms of an
2 exposure rates, I thought I heard one of the NRC folks say
3 that the west capped piles exposure rate was cut -- the
4 gamma exposure rate was cut because of the capping. I
5 thought that was very unusual, and I didn't know that you
6 could -- I thought gamma required actual shielding, concrete
7 and lead, and I wasn't aware that steel could be used for
8 shielding. So, those are my questions. Thank you.

9 [Applause.]

10 MS. STINSON: We have two more commenters in this
11 category. Let me just give you a check on where I think we
12 should head. We will ask these two commenters to keep their
13 comments to three minutes or as close to it as you can. And
14 then we will go on to the other two categories that have
15 listed -- requested time.

16 Then I think it would be a good idea to spend some
17 time answering some of the questions that have been posed.
18 So, if you hear a question posed that you know you have --
19 or you would like to offer an answer to, there will be time
20 to do that in the discussion, question and answer period at
21 the end. Also, note that we are hearing sort of two kinds
22 of questions -- one kind of question offers an answer -- or
23 poses a question that can be answered now as a factual-type
24 question. I think another type of question we are hearing
25 forms or somehow shapes the EIS analysis. I see NRC madly

1 writing over here. Hopefully they are getting some of these
2 questions down that can be reflected in the EIS scoping
3 document -- the scoping summary that will come out.

4 The next speaker is Bob Greenbaum.

5 MR. GREENBAUM: Okay. Thank you. In the interest
6 of time, I am going to submit my comments to you in writing
7 by the 14th. I would like to comment very briefly on a few
8 things that I think have not quite been touched on
9 adequately here.

10 To begin with, I am Bob Greenbaum. I am down here
11 representing the Sierra Club, Ohio Chapter. The Sierra Club
12 is a half million member, nation-wide group of
13 conservationists with about 17,000 members here in Ohio. We
14 have had contact and work with a number of radiological
15 problems around the country. We have worked with Senator
16 Glenn on the Fernault problem and in a number of the
17 Department of Energy sites.

18 I would just like to comment to the community at-
19 large, and particularly to the workers and management of the
20 Shieldalloy plant. You are undertaking a journey right now
21 that, although it looks on paper like this will be completed
22 in a one-year period, the experience of the site that Chris
23 Trepal was talking about in Cleveland is that so far it has
24 been four years and they have not reached the first
25 milestone at this point yet on characterizing the site and

1 agreeing on the scope of the delineation. So, in all
2 likelihood, you are facing a rather extended learning and
3 study period here. I ask you to take into account during
4 this period that this is a problem of survival in the short-
5 term -- people have got to eat, you have got to have jobs.
6 It is also a problem of survival, in the long-term. Any
7 site that is contaminated beyond use, there will be no new
8 industries located on these sites. We have to keep that in
9 mind. Your children and grandchildren won't live here if
10 you have a site that is contaminated beyond possible use.

11 So, there is a balancing that goes on between the
12 long-term of the community, the short-term survival, and you
13 are going to have adequate time over the next several years
14 to evaluate this as a community. Don't make any real early
15 judgments here. Perhaps some of those who are coming to you
16 from the outside that you perceive as your enemies are your
17 best friends. Perhaps we have some information for you that
18 you are not aware of.

19 We would be happy to help you network with some of
20 the workers and their unions at some of the other facilities
21 that have faced radioactive waste problems, where the
22 consistent message has been, first, the workers were
23 informed, there was no problem and everything was safe.
24 Secondly, that there were no health effects and so forth.
25 First, there was stonewalling, second there was denial,

1 third, there were lies, finally there were lawsuits, lastly,
2 the truth came out.

3 There has been a long record in the nuclear and
4 chemical industries of these things. I ask you to consider
5 the historical record of other sites. I ask the workers of
6 this plant to network with some of the workers at the
7 Fernault facility, oil, chemical and atomic workers -- to
8 network with some of the folks at the Piketon facility. I
9 could put you in touch with some of their union leadership -
10 - to network with the steelworker local, I believe it is in
11 Ashtebulah, at a radioactive site RMI, where the past
12 president of the union is currently dying. So, these are
13 the kind of things I want you to consider slowly over time.

14 The Sierra Club is here to support the
15 environmental perspective in this, to work with the
16 community in all of your concerns, as outdoors people, as
17 drinkers of water, breathers of air, and as workers in the
18 plant. We are going to be here for quite some time. We are
19 going to be here to support the free exchange of ideas. We
20 will do that legally, if we have to. We will do that with
21 amicus briefs, it looks like there are slap suits being
22 instituted, as we have elsewhere in the country. But, most
23 of all, we will be here speaking for the environment and
24 seeing what we can do there.

25 We view this -- and want the NRC to realize this -

1 - as kind of a test case of two things. Ohio has been asked
2 to become both an Agreement State and to host a radioactive
3 waste dump for the Midwest Radioactive Waste Compact. We
4 also understand from some research that Senator Glenn's
5 office has done that there are 800 other sites like
6 Shieldalloy in the state here. Most of them have not been
7 characterized. We can get you the information on that.

8 We ask you where are these sites? We want to know
9 what the public record has been on those sites, in terms of
10 the health protection of the communities, not only here in
11 the Cambridge area, but at these other 800 sites.

12 Again, you are asking us to do two things, NRC.
13 You are asking us to become an Agreement State. What are we
14 agreeing to? Are we agreeing to the standard of cleanup and
15 enforcement that we have seen here so far -- that we have
16 seen in some of the other facilities around the state, such
17 as Bird Avenue in Cleveland? What are you asking us to
18 agree to? Okay. The second thing that we are concerned
19 about here is that we are being asked to host a low-level
20 radioactive waste dump. So, the standards that you will
21 enforce here are something that we are going to publicize
22 around the state, because the record of your enforcement and
23 the kind of work that you do will reflect how the citizens
24 of Ohio can expect to be treated several generations
25 downstream for the waste that you are proposing through the

1 Midwest Compact being imported in through Ohio.

2 And this doesn't involve only you. We ask that
3 you and your Environmental Impact Studies collaborate
4 closely with the Ohio EPA, the Federal EPA and so forth. I
5 have walked this site. I have been on the site. This site,
6 in my opinion, would not qualify as a garbage dump under the
7 rules in place in Ohio, much less a hazardous waste dump,
8 much less a nuclear waste dump. In walking the perimeter of
9 the site, you walk on wetlands. There is run-off directly
10 into a stream.

11 Now, my understanding is -- and please correct me
12 if I am wrong on this -- my understanding is that Thorium is
13 water-soluble; is that correct? Okay. You can look at some
14 of these things. I think it should be a thorough
15 characterization, not only in terms of nuclear things, but
16 in terms of the hazardous materials on this site.

17 Again, we will submit our comments to you in
18 writing; but I think we should all prepare for a lengthy
19 process, with much sharing of information. I do not have
20 all of the information. I am looking forward to learning
21 from the NRC, from the EPA, from the plant management, from
22 the citizens and from the workers here. We ask you to be
23 open to some other information also in this very long
24 process.

25 Thank you.

1 [Applause.]

2 MS. STINSON: And, lastly, John Perera.

3 MR. PERERA: My name is John Perera. I am the
4 Water Co-Chair of the Northeast Ohio Sierra Club in
5 Cleveland, and I sit on the RAP, the remedial action plan to
6 clean up one of our rivers, one of the 43 sites that runs
7 into Lake Erie. I have spent a couple of years in many
8 committee meetings with hundreds of people, thousands of
9 hours, thousands of pages, looking at one river and how do
10 we clean it up, of the 43 that run into the great lakes. We
11 are dealing with sediment on the Kiahogi River that has been
12 polluted for over 150 years. We thought it would never be
13 cleaned up. We now find fish living in it. You can almost
14 swim in it. No, it doesn't burn anymore. It is a very
15 complicated process and it takes a long time.

16 One of my concerns when I sat on the RAP group was
17 air pollution as well as water pollution. What goes up does
18 come down. I realize when we looked at -- which is only
19 recently established toxic release inventory of chemicals
20 found or found to be hazardous by EPA and other groups, we
21 are only looking at 20 categories of chemicals. We are only
22 looking at 300 chemicals, of thousands that are known to be
23 hazardous, which have never been evaluated by EPA. So, we
24 don't even have handles on these -- of the seven million
25 known chemicals, some of which you have both the elemental,

1 the natural and the process refined in this site.

2 I was concerned, as I listened to this and saw the
3 diagrams and the cross-sections of this that it is now
4 marked as a radioactive site. You also have mixed
5 materials, some of which are soluble. Who knows what is
6 under that site? Who knows what leeches out the bottom of
7 it? Because you are certainly not going to dig it up and
8 look at it easily. Has it ever been cored and sampled? How
9 far down does it go? Some things leech out of this by being
10 wet from below and drained out again as flooding happens in
11 this area. We also know that very small quantities, below
12 detectible limits until recently -- and our testing is
13 getting much better in detecting parts per million, parts
14 per billion, parts per trillion -- very small amounts of
15 substances getting into the groundwater, the drinking water,
16 your bodies, the air, what you eat, what your cows eat, the
17 crops you raise, get into your system and they affect you -
18 - affect you not only by cancers, leukemias, birth defects,
19 reproductive abilities; but genetic defects that affect your
20 immune system forever.

21 We are finding that NRC, which is the son of AEC,
22 didn't know and didn't tell and actually covered up,
23 concealed and lied to us for a couple of generations. There
24 is a book that your library ought to have known as Deadly
25 Deceit. They have systematically done this when things got

1 really bad. They didn't want you to look at the fallout
2 from Three Mile Island. They didn't want to tell you about
3 Savannah River. They didn't want to tell you about
4 Millstone when it affected the Lyme Disease. Many of these
5 are changes that have happened in our environment --
6 mutations that took a long time to come into effect, and are
7 now found almost everywhere.

8 You need to look into the fact that nobody has
9 rules and regulations for some of these, and nobody has
10 tested and found the results, and you are all guinea pigs.
11 I do not know whether you can see the headline here, but
12 even the reports are trashed, covered up, and people who
13 blow the whistle are fired, ostracized, attacked on the
14 street or killed on the highway, like Karen Silkwood. This
15 is not unknown in the chemical industry. You and I and
16 workers in this community and people who live here and have
17 children are facing a million-dollar industry onsite here,
18 and billions of dollars of vested interest that don't want
19 you to know.

20 You will have to keep asking questions for
21 yourself, for your present job, and for your future, if you
22 have one, if children are ever going to be born in this
23 area. Thank you.

24 [Applause.]

25 MS. STINSON: Okay. Keep your questions in the

1 back of your mind. We will return to those. We have a
2 number of representatives either from local unions or from
3 labor who would like to speak tonight. The order that I
4 have them in is John Sedor, first, from the United
5 Steelworkers of America; Joe Latchik, who is a retiree
6 actually; and Ronald -- I can't read your last name, who is
7 an employee.

8 If anybody else wants to speak, you can identify
9 yourself. Let's start with John.

10 MR. SEDOR: My name is John Sedor, President of
11 the Local 5050, United Steelworkers, of the Shieldalloy
12 Plant. I am here. I have been listening to all of the
13 comments from the different groups. I am here first to say
14 that Shieldalloy is not hiding anything. If they were
15 hiding anything, they wouldn't have even brought this to
16 anybody's attention.

17 I have got a few questions that I haven't even got
18 answers for. The first one was, if they didn't want to
19 decommission this site, would there have been any stink
20 raised at all about it? Because, for so many years, no one
21 said anything about these sites. No one knew they were
22 there. All of a sudden Shieldalloy decided to decommission
23 them, and let it known to the public. That is one reason
24 why we are here today -- is they are not hiding what they
25 are doing. They are open with people. They have been open

1 with people for quite a few years since Shieldalloy has
2 taken over. They have had meetings in the past with the
3 community to solve some of these problems. They have asked
4 the community for their input. I think, working together
5 with them, they have come up and solved some problems. I
6 have been there for 20 years. I wish one man was here that
7 just celebrated 40 years. He is not glowing in the dark as
8 some of you might think. He has walked those sites, and he
9 has filled some of the slag in those sites.

10 From what I have got in the information, you have
11 got more radiation coming from your own homes than what is
12 on these sites. The NRC has been down there many times in
13 the past years. They have run tests. I am aware off some
14 of their tests that they have run. They are continuing to
15 test the grounds for leech into the water systems. From the
16 reports that I have gotten from the NRC or from Shieldalloy,
17 or from my own digging around, there is still no
18 contamination of any great amount that is going anywhere.

19 Yes, they have been cited before, as every factory
20 in this county has been cited before. So, I think that
21 people ought to wake up, because Shieldalloy is not hiding
22 anything.

23 One guy said about trust -- one guy mentioned
24 about taxpaying. Well, in the papers you can see one guy
25 don't pay his taxes. One guy, right now, through the

1 courts, of stealing documents, but yet he wants people to
2 trust him. I think it is time that people wake up and see
3 who is in the right.

4 Now, with the NRC. I have been there, like I
5 said, for 20 years. One of the main questions I have since
6 I have been there 20 years -- what effects has anything got
7 to me? As I said before, we have got people who have been
8 there 40 years, and they are in probably better health than
9 some of the people who have never worked there. So, I would
10 like to have a report on the radiation levels and how it has
11 affected me.

12 Again, if this was never decommissioned, would
13 there be a meeting here tonight? As I read one report, I
14 see that there seems to be a difference in agreement between
15 the NRC and EPA on how to handle things. I would like to
16 know if your two companies or organizations are going in
17 opposite directions, or somewhere down the line, are we
18 going to come up with a happy meeting that everyone can live
19 with?

20 No one mentioned that a few years ago when this
21 all started that there was another group involved that has
22 done some of the onsite covering of the slag, known as the
23 west pile. That was through a national organization. I
24 believe that was Inscr that came in there and dug up what
25 they did and moved material and covered it. It has been

1 covered I will say for three or four years. I may be wrong.
2 From the last report that I have got on that, is that the
3 levels are within reason. We are waiting for a cap on that.
4 Why has there never been the okay to cap it?

5 So, that is about all I have to say. As I said
6 before, if Shieldalloy was going to lie to anybody, they
7 wouldn't even have had this meeting today. Thank you.

8 [Applause.]

9 MS. STINSON: Now, Joe.

10 MR. LATCHIK: I am Joe Latchik. I live in
11 Cambridge, Ohio. I worked at the plant that is now known as
12 Shieldalloy for 31 years. I started in 1955 and I retired
13 in '86. I have heard the talks on this slag, pro and con.
14 I realize that modern technology, you can get more results
15 than you can with a human being. I have walked over these
16 sites that they referred to for 31 years. I wore my clothes
17 that I worked in, I wore the protection that the plant
18 mandated me to wear, and I don't -- to my knowledge, I have
19 never been affected by anything in that plant.

20 You men can talk about your environment. I agree,
21 we should be aware of our environment. But, while I worked
22 at that plant, I have seen deer feed on the lawns that were
23 mowed around in the immediate area, and I have seen more
24 rabbits on that plant ground than I have seen on my farm
25 when I worked on nightshift. I have seen ducks raise their

1 young on the streams that you referred to that go past these
2 slag piles. The only thing that bothered them was the
3 snapping turtles that feed on them.

4 I pumped the manholes that the electric current
5 flowed to the plant. And what I found in the manholes after
6 the water was pumped out were crayfish and earthworms.

7 You are concerned. I realize you have got to be
8 concerned, but you also have got to be fair-minded enough to
9 realize what you are referring to and what you are getting
10 into when you are talking about moving this slag or covering
11 it over onsite.

12 I worked there, and you can see, if it has had a
13 slight affect on me, so help me, I do not know it. You
14 listened to the Union President talk there, and he talked
15 words of wisdom. He has been there for 20 years. I think
16 you have got to listen to people like that. You have got to
17 listen to these people that work there and get their point
18 of view. You can go down there and walk over that site one
19 day. Good. You can pass judgment on something that has
20 been going on since 1952. But, I don't think you can get
21 right down there to the core of it. I think you should
22 think this over. This is something that affects the
23 community and, not only the community, but the children in
24 this community. It is going to cause more kids to grow up
25 in poverty -- what you are talking about. Is it going to

1 save lives or cause poverty? I think we ought to consider
2 that.

3 I looked at this fact sheet, and I agree that
4 Shieldalloy's intent is to protect the environment and the
5 people in the vicinity of the plant, and to implement the
6 safest, most effective cleanup possible. Shieldalloy will
7 continue cooperating with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
8 and arrange for a permanent disposition of slag on the site.
9 I see no fault in that. I agree with the Commissioner and
10 the Mayor and all that this has been an asset to the
11 community. And, if it necessary, yes, but if it is not,
12 think it over and think it over hard. If it not necessary,
13 let's do what we have to and continue to have a plant
14 operating in the Cambridge area.

15 Thank you very much.

16 [Applause.]

17 MS. STINSON: Ronald. Where are you? Is he still
18 here? Ronald -- it looks like Travis maybe?

19 [No response.]

20 MS. STINSON: Okay.

21 We will move on to the next perspective then.

22 Finally, tonight -- at least for now, finally, we will hear
23 from a number of local business representatives. Bill Davis
24 is here from the Cambridge area -- the Chamber of Commerce -
25 - Jack Dunning, the Community Industrial Association, and

1 Brenda Hibbs, from the Byesville Board of Trade. Bill.

2 MR. DAVIS: Thank you. It is rather difficult
3 following everyone that has used all of the key phrases and
4 terms already. My name is Bill Davis. I am the President
5 of the Cambridge area Chamber of Commerce. Our main reason
6 for being here tonight, of course, is our interest in
7 Shieldalloy and certainly, as was stated before, Shieldalloy
8 hasn't been sneaky about this. They initiated the meeting
9 and they certainly have wanted to be up-front on everything
10 they have done. I believe all the things that have been
11 done on the property by Vanadium, by Foote Mineral and by
12 Shieldalloy have been done according to the regulations and
13 the terms that were established by our Government, the EPA,
14 those bodies.

15 Shieldalloy, in one of the comments they made, was
16 to protect the environment and the people in the vicinity of
17 the plant. I believe they do have that concern. I have not
18 seen anything contrary to that. We certainly would be
19 supportive of that statement -- to implement the safest and
20 most effective cleanup possible. We certainly would believe
21 in that -- the safest and most effective.

22 Of course, we are concerned about losing a plant.
23 Global competition is having an effect on Shieldalloy. They
24 are now competing globally, as well as just here in the
25 United States. It certainly puts a drain on their funds.

1 We certainly want to see them healthy and able to take care
2 of their plan for cleaning up the facility. Of course,
3 Gurnsey County, being in the top 10 in the state in
4 unemployment, certainly cannot afford to have a good quality
5 company leave the area. So, the Chamber, I think, would
6 just like to go on record as being supportive of Shieldalloy
7 and certainly their intentions, to this point, have been
8 honorable, and we certainly support that.

9 Thank you very much.

10 [Applause.]

11 MS. STINSON: Jack.

12 MR. DUNNING: Thank you. I am Jack Dunning and I
13 am a businessman in Cambridge. I spend a lot of time -- I
14 am deeply involved in economic development in this county.
15 I am always glad to see the radicals on both sides of an
16 issue because they do all of the ground work that lets the
17 silent majority make sensible decisions.

18 We certainly spent an awful lot of time to develop
19 a hundred good jobs in this county. We certainly don't need
20 to see Shieldalloy leave. Thank you.

21 [Applause.]

22 MS. STINSON: Brenda.

23 MS. HIBBS: My name is Brenda Hibbs. I am the
24 President of the Byesville Board of Trade. One of the major
25 priorities of the Byesville Board of Trade is to work

1 diligently for the retention of business in our area.
2 Certainly, the last thing the Board wants to see is a
3 business closing its doors or for a manufacturer to move.
4 Our area has experienced enough unemployment and loss of
5 jobs.

6 Naturally, I was very concerned when the rumors
7 began to circulate about Shieldalloy. That is why I am here
8 tonight and why I attended the onsite tour earlier this
9 afternoon. I wanted to see for myself if indeed Shieldalloy
10 was in danger of closing; if so, why, and if there was
11 something that could be done to keep the plant open.

12 After today's tour I was greatly relieved to see
13 how the management team at SMC is aggressively addressing
14 the problem. They are currently cooperating with the EPA
15 and the NRC to initiate a plan that is both effective and
16 cost-efficient -- cost-effective.

17 You might ask, are we allowing money to override
18 our good judgment or moral duty concerning the potential
19 health hazard presented by the waste product? I don't
20 believe so. The information given today explains an
21 alternative plan to contain the waste product that would be
22 safe for the employees of the plant, the residents that live
23 nearby and even for the environment. Moreover, this plan
24 would save jobs, not just for the SMC employees, but, in
25 many cases, for their spouses as well. After all, who knows

1 how far the negative impact would reach of yet another plant
2 closing in our area. We can't afford to let that happen,
3 especially when capping the slag piles seem to be the most
4 feasible and easiest plan to execute, with minimal economic
5 impact on Shieldalloy and its employees.

6 Speaking on behalf of the Byesville Board of
7 Trade, I offer our full support and to Shieldalloy. I
8 encourage the EPA and NRC to allow Shieldalloy to cap the
9 slag piles as a solution to this problem. Thank you.

10 [Applause.]

11 MS. STINSON: There are two other representatives
12 of local businesses who would like to speak. Who are they?
13 Come on up.

14 MR. DeDINATO: Hi. I am Greg DeDinato, the State
15 Representative for the Gurnsey/Tescarales County area. I
16 guess I am basically here today to say probably for someone
17 who has experienced -- this is probably my fifth site in
18 three years of being in office that I am going through --
19 problems with environmental problems on the sites. I guess
20 what I would like to express and also be involved in some
21 environmental issues in Columbus is to the NRC Commission is
22 basically to move very -- I guess slowly, but very
23 professionally on this. I think we have to use common
24 sense. I think so often we are driven by emotions and some
25 of our actions sometimes are extremely severe, extremely

1 expensive and really do not resolve a problem.

2 I guess I caution -- I think we need to work with
3 the company. I think we need to be open and honest to all
4 here -- citizens, employees, and everybody. I think there
5 needs to be honesty through the whole process. I think we
6 have got to deal with the problem practically. This problem
7 didn't come overnight. It is not going to go away
8 overnight. And driving the business out of business, to
9 stick the tab to the taxpayer is not sensible. If most of
10 you have any knowledge of the Superfund, you will find that
11 it has done a very poor job. 80 percent of it goes to legal
12 fees -- it doesn't go to cleaning up -- and consultant fees.

13 I have a site that is currently -- just got
14 finished after about 25 years in Jeanette, Ohio that was
15 under the Superfund. So, if anybody thinks by shutting the
16 business down or not working with them is going to clean it
17 up tomorrow, they are wrong. We will probably go another 20
18 or 30 years.

19 I just am here to express -- to please take a good
20 look at the whole situation, act with good conscience on the
21 problem and a practical sense, because I have also learned
22 there are a lot of things -- we have spent millions and
23 billions of dollars in this country thinking we have cleaned
24 up a problem, when really we did not resolve the problem.
25 When you get into these types of situations, whether we move

1 it around, whether we pass the buck, or what we are doing,
2 we still do not have the technology, in many ways, to deal
3 and address the problems we have created today that we have
4 to clean up. They are not available.

5 I guess what I am saying is to spend millions and
6 millions of dollars to haul it away, may not be the
7 practical sense here. So, I am, again, encouraging the
8 state representatives -- some of you are familiar with the
9 area -- like I said to use good common sense to address the
10 problem. I think common sense would be to try to work with
11 all parties involved to come up with a solution.

12 Thank you.

13 [Applause.]

14 MR. CELEBREZZE: My name is Tony Celebrezze. I am
15 Senator Robert Birch's Legislative Aide. Senator Birch
16 picked up Gurnsey County with the 1990 reapportionment and
17 redistricting. Unfortunately, he had a prior commitment
18 tonight and asked me to come out and listen. Tomorrow, we
19 will be giving him a full report on the different aspects
20 and the different opinions that have been voiced here. He
21 is deeply concerned about this issue. He was involved with
22 the low-level radioactive waste dump that the Governor said
23 is going to be slated to come into Ohio. He sat on the Blue
24 Ribbon Commission. He is very concerned with the
25 environment, yet we still need to look at the economic

1 aspect -- the economic impact that closing down Shieldalloy
2 can have on Gurnsey County.

3 As the Chamber of Commerce gentleman did say, the
4 new unemployment figures for Gurnsey County were not very
5 optimistic this past month and a half ago. So, we need to
6 look at the two different aspects, the environment and the
7 economic impact. There has got to be a medium ground. We
8 need to search it out and we need to work together. We will
9 come up with a solution.

10 Thank you.

11 [Applause.]

12 MS. STINSON: So, hopefully, this format has given
13 us an opportunity to concentrate a bit on the various
14 perspectives, but still give everybody an opportunity to
15 make a few comments. I think one of the things you could
16 say about everything you have heard this evening is there
17 are obviously some severe differences in viewpoint and the
18 problems I would say in many sectors in development of
19 trusting relationships and a real understanding of other
20 people's perspective. I think, above all, we can respect
21 that people here tonight have expressed a lot of passionate
22 care for the perspectives that they offered. That is
23 something that means that there is a lot of energy behind
24 the debate that is taking place now and the scoping process,
25 the actual factual information gathering process that the

1 NRC will be pursuing from this point on.

2 It is clear that more information needs to come
3 out as a result of the development of the EIS. So, I think
4 you all are in a good place. We heard a lot from different
5 folks around the room about cooperation and beginning to try
6 -- or continuing to try to work together in trying to better
7 understand what is going on on the site. So, I would put to
8 you that, in some ways, you are really an opportunity point
9 here for moving that whole process forward, if you choose to
10 do that. I appreciate, as a facilitator, all of the
11 tolerance that you all have had for each other's points of
12 view.

13 I hope that you have accumulated some questions
14 that either you have now or answers to questions that were
15 posed -- factual questions that were posed before that you
16 would like to address. We are going to open it up now and
17 ask folks to either -- well, if you have a question or
18 comment, initially, you are going to have to use the
19 microphone and then whoever -- if it is appropriate for
20 someone to respond to that and you would like to do that --
21 get recognized and go up to the microphone also.

22 So, we will open it up now for questions or
23 comments -- on comments made previously.

24 [Show of hands.]

25 MS. STINSON: Yes. Come on up. Let me say also,

1 time-wise, I will check back with at about 10:00 o'clock.
2 We may take a few extra minutes, if we are rolling with the
3 question and answer period, if people want to do that.

4 MR. GREENBAUM: Thank you. I have a question. I
5 have been hearing a repeated theme here tonight from several
6 sectors that say Shieldalloy is going to go out of business.
7 Now, I am just curious. I haven't seen the financial sheets
8 here or anything else, but I would like to ask the company
9 and the union -- and the Government officials have all
10 testified that Shieldalloy is going to go out of business.
11 Has the company told you that, if they have to do an
12 expensive cleanup here that they are going to fold? Is that
13 -- because I want to share with you something about that.
14 Okay. Again, I don't know the specifics of the bankruptcy
15 situation your company is in, which clearly puts you guys in
16 a nerve-racking position here. But, I do want to say to you
17 that there has been a history in American business, in other
18 sectors, of going into bankruptcy as a way of avoiding
19 environmental responsibilities.

20 I urge you, for example, to read something called
21 the Asbestos Papers, from many many years ago. In
22 particular, the union guys here may wish to contact the
23 Machinist Union, because about 12 years ago they put
24 together a series on that, where there were health studies
25 done on asbestos that were suppressed for 40 years that the

1 company knew about -- knew about, and it finally came out.
2 When they were called on to pay their share, they went
3 bankrupt. Now, I don't know if that is the situation here.

4 I also want to share with you another point of
5 view on that, and then I would like to hear from the Company
6 and the union about this thing. It sounds to me like a
7 threat of blackmail. We are going, if you guys make us
8 clean this thing up. That is what I have been hearing. I
9 hope I am wrong on that.

10 You hear these kinds of things. There is a
11 wonderful book out by a guy named Richard Grossman, who used
12 to head up a group called the Environmentalists for Full
13 Employment, out of Washington, that worked with a number of
14 cities and unions on this kind of thing. You have a
15 situation that is called job blackmail, which is that it is
16 likely that people will say to you, yes, either reduce your
17 wages, work in intolerable conditions, ignore the health and
18 safety threats of equipment or the stuff you are breathing.
19 Has anyone here had health studies? Do you know if you have
20 uranium in your lungs, like my friend Vina Colley from
21 Portsmouth does? Have those things happened here?

22 I guess my major question that I would really like
23 to know is has there been a threat that, if there is a real
24 cleanup here, and it is very expensive, this plant is going
25 to close? Has that happened? Thank you.

1 MS. STINSON: I would invite either
2 representatives from the company or a labor representative
3 to specifically answer that question, if you would be
4 willing. I am sorry, sir. Actually, I was pointing to this
5 gentleman up front. Did you have an answer?

6 MR. OLIVER: My question is is the gentleman a
7 resident?

8 MR. GREENBAUM: I am an out-of-towner. I am from
9 Cleveland.

10 MR. OLIVER: It seems like everybody is from out-
11 of-town. The local folk here, I am --

12 MS. STINSON: I am sorry, if you want to make a
13 speech, you are going to have to use the mike.

14 MR. OLIVER: I may not need the microphone. It
15 might not be necessary. I have got kind of a loud voice. I
16 am the appointed Recording Secretary of the Joint Safety and
17 Health Committee at the plant. I want to talk to the local
18 people here. Listen to the local people. We have been
19 referred to tonight as thugs, murderers and --

20 MS. STINSON: I am sorry, sir. You are going to
21 have to stay with the mike. And also, please keep the
22 comments related to the questions.

23 MR. OLIVER: I am just trying to talk to the local
24 people here -- that -- the local people are backing us all
25 up -- Mayor Valentine, Mayor Shaub, the business community.

1 The only people that seem to be against us are the out-of-
2 towners. That is my point, folks.

3 [Applause.]

4 MS. STINSON: Thank you.

5 Let's take other questions that you may have of
6 representatives here tonight or comments that you would like
7 to make an answer to -- previously stated questions.

8 [Show of hands.]

9 MS. STINSON: Yes. Please.

10 MS. HOWARD: Hi. I am local. I am Nancy Howard.
11 I have some information that I would like to submit to the
12 Nuclear Regulatory EIS study, if that is possible.

13 MS. STINSON: Okay. Sure. You can submit it.

14 MS. HOWARD: It is entitled the Phase I
15 Environmental Assessment. It covers everything from
16 watershed, our drinking water, to what is in the soil. I
17 believe there is a whole other -- there is a whole run -- I
18 am sure someone else could probably describe it a lot better
19 than I can. But, I really feel that this is critical. The
20 NRC needs to have this documentation.

21 MS. STINSON: Thank you.

22 I believe we have an SMC representative willing to
23 answer the previous question. Sorry I missed you, sir.

24 MR. FINN: My name is Michael Finn, and I am the
25 Corporate Secretary of Metallurg, Inc., which is the holding

1 company of Shieldalloy. In answer to the question whether
2 an expensive cleanup would put everyone out of a job, I
3 would just like to say a few words about the bankruptcy
4 system and the filing under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy
5 Code. We filed under Chapter 11 and the Court gives us --
6 gives anyone who files under Chapter 11 120 days in which to
7 come up with a business plan. And the business plan is an
8 analysis of what you would do to get on a profitable footing
9 again so that you could pay your creditors, perhaps not a
10 hundred cents on the dollar, but perhaps 80 cents on the
11 dollar or 60 cents on the dollar, whatever.

12 We are now in that period where we have to come up
13 with a business plan. In order to come up with a business
14 plan, you have to quantify, put a figure on your
15 liabilities. It suddenly becomes an emergency; whereas, in
16 the past, negotiations with the EPA and with the NRC could
17 have dragged out or be postponed until those organizations
18 came to decisions or until certain tests have been carried
19 out, et cetera, et cetera, the expenditure could be put off
20 and all of the work could be put off. That is no longer the
21 case. We have a short period of time in which we have to
22 say our liability to the NRC is X-million.

23 I can tell you that, if we had to meet an
24 expenditure like 350 million or 250 million or \$150 million
25 to cart all of the material offsite, there would be no

1 further existence of Shieldalloy or Metallurg, its holding
2 company. So, that I think answers that question.

3 If I could just mention -- just say one additional
4 point. That is you may not -- or certain speakers may not
5 like the idea of leaving material onsite, and they say it
6 must be much better to move it off somewhere else. I would
7 like you to bear in mind two things. First of all, if you
8 move it off somewhere else, you are perhaps polluting that
9 somewhere else. And the second thing I wanted to say was
10 that, if you are going to move it off somewhere else,
11 whoever is going to pay for it is not going to be
12 Shieldalloy or not going to be Metallurg, because those two
13 organizations will not exist. It will be paid for by the
14 taxpayer. Whereas, under an acceptable business plan, the
15 problem might be dealt with after one year or after two
16 years, if those companies didn't exist and the problem was
17 just left with the NRC, because I think the Shieldalloy site
18 must be comparatively low-priority, I think it might be 10
19 years, it might be 15 years, it might be 25 years before any
20 work was done on the site whatever by the Government
21 agencies. Thank you.

22 [Applause.]

23 MS. STINSON: Carolyn, do you have a follow-up to
24 that?

25 MS. ARNOLD: I just wanted to say to that that the

1 proposal to move it offsite would be sending it to a
2 facility that is licensed to dispose of low-level
3 radioactive waste, which would do it in a really different
4 manner than just leaving it piled with a grass cap.

5 I had a question about the posting of signs. I
6 went to the site this afternoon and I didn't see any signs
7 posted by the west pile. I also noticed that in the diagram
8 of the west pile and the cap it shows this cap that goes
9 across the whole thing. But, what I saw was that the top
10 was capped, and you could see the slag still at the bottom.
11 It looked like erosion was affecting that. I wondered what
12 proposals there were for managing that differently?

13 MS. STINSON: Okay. SMC, can you answer those
14 two?

15 MR. EAVES: The west pile has the signs on it. I
16 don't know what area you were in, but we also were out there
17 today and the signs are, as required, posted around the
18 pile.

19 As far as the NRC diagram and what it showed or
20 alleged to show, I am not sure I am really the person that
21 would be in a position to answer that at this time.

22 MS. STINSON: Can you just describe what is at the
23 site?

24 MR. EAVES: The west pile is not entirely covered.
25 There is a portion of it that still needs to be covered.

1 One of the things that will come out of this EIS is the
2 ability to go ahead with that continued capping.

3 MS. STINSON: That is the diagram you are
4 referring to. Did you have answers to questions?

5 MR. GLENN: This diagram is simply conceptual.
6 There is a cap. We tried to in the diagram show that there
7 is a cap on the one pile, and there is no cap on the second
8 pile. You are correct that the on the clay cap, there is a
9 riprap on the base of the pile. That riprap was placed
10 there for stabilization.

11 The capping is not complete. Decommissioning has
12 not been completed at the site. The whole question about
13 the type of cap is an open issue. The fact that there is a
14 cap on the west pile and -- it is probably not -- it doesn't
15 look exactly like that diagram. That diagram was intended
16 to be reflective.

17 MS. STINSON: Did you have a follow-up question?

18 MR. BAUMAN: First, I would like to say that the
19 Vice President's statements definitely sounded like a threat
20 to me. In other words, you -- in situ disposal or we are
21 popping out of here.

22 Two, in reference to your diagram, my follow-up
23 question to that would be why it is that the NRC is dragging
24 its feet in avoiding doing the proper and just thing of
25 ordering a fence around the site when in fact you had told

1 me personally a fence had not been ordered yet because the
2 pile was secure. We have just had testimony that the pile
3 is not secure, nor is the cap secure, thereby, that site
4 should be fenced until such time as it is decommissioned.

5 MR. GLENN: You know that that is an allegation
6 that has been made with the Agency, and the Agency is
7 processing that allegation.

8 Mike McCann, who is with the NRC Region III can
9 answer the question.

10 MR. McCANN: You are right. The inspection report
11 is not complete. I would hope that it will be completed
12 within the next two weeks.

13 One thing that I have mentioned to you earlier is
14 that we are waiting for the final sample analysis from Oak
15 Ridge, Tennessee. Typically, we analyze these samples in
16 our lab. We just relocated our office from Glen Ellyn,
17 Illinois to -- so our lab has been down basically for the
18 last four weeks. In addition, the sample types that are
19 being analyzed and average sample count takes a thousand
20 minutes to count, and then you have several days critical
21 preparation. So, there has been a delay in the analysis of
22 the sample.

23 In our inspection in October, we did look at site-
24 secured access control posting. I can't get into
25 particulars of what violations or concerns will be sited in

1 the inspection report, because we are precluded by
2 regulation until the report is signed and final.

3 We were at the site today and we did see five
4 "Caution Radiation" signs that have been added to the west
5 pile since last time --

6 I do have -- Our site inspection --we did -- I
7 will give you an idea of the samples that were taken. We
8 took soil sediment samples from around the complete
9 peripheries of both piles. We took water -- standing water
10 and low-level -- which would be considered run-off water
11 from the pile. During the period we were there, the river
12 beds were drier than they had been recently, so there was
13 standing water.

14 We also went back to the plant and looked at TLD
15 data, that is thermal luminescent dosimeters radiation
16 monitors. It is a little monitor that they place three feet
17 above the ground. What they have been doing is taking it
18 out at a quarterly period. We have that data now and we are
19 going to look at the summaries of that and compare it
20 against the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 21, for
21 unrestricted release, which right now is 500 millirem per
22 year. As of January 1994, it will become 100 millirem.

23 If you would like that complete -- we will let you
24 know when we are done, and you can officially request a copy
25 then. It should be done in two weeks.

1 The gentleman asked the question earlier about the
2 exposure rate -- was there a railroad track or something
3 going by.

4 MS. STINSON: Would you please speak closer to the
5 mike?

6 MR. McCANN: Sure. A gentleman has mentioned
7 earlier about his concern about the radiation to a railroad
8 track going by. I want to give you a general idea of what
9 we would be looking at. There are three real simple
10 principles in radiation protection. I teach a civil defense
11 course. One of the first principles that radiation health
12 physicists and radiation prevention people learn is distance
13 and shielding. I think the Chad had mentioned 23 micro-R -
14 - let's must make this even numbers -- 20 micro-R per hour.

15 These are the hand-held meters that were used.
16 Mike Weber has -- I would be willing to have one of my
17 inspectors, Ray Valinski, is here -- we would be willing to
18 show you some of the -- how the meters work and what the
19 radiation levels are.

20 But, to give you an idea of the value, let's start
21 with 20 micro-R per hour. That would be if you had -- say
22 you took a measurement at this microphone and say you went -
23 - just take a distance of three feet, and you went three
24 feet away and you measured 20 micro-R per hour, it follows
25 what is called an inverse flow. If you went another three -

1 - if you doubled that distance and you went another three
2 feet, it would be one-fourth of the value. So, in other
3 words, you would get five micro-R per hour. If you doubled
4 that distance, and said 12 feet, it would be one-fourth of
5 that value, and it would be 2.5 micro-R per hour. Now,
6 to put that in perspective, what the NRC -- used the new
7 Part 21 that is going to be effective in January of 100
8 millirem per year -- if a person was continuously present on
9 a pile -- at the Shieldalloy pile 168 hours a day, 52 days a
10 week, they would come up with approximately 100 millirem,
11 and have a radiation level of about 10 micro-R per hour. If
12 you were there 40 hours a week for 52 weeks, you would have
13 a reading of about four micro-R per hour. So, that gives
14 you some idea -- if I am not confusing it -- that gives you
15 some idea that the radiation drops off inversely
16 proportional to the distance.

17 MS. STINSON: That is okay. Do you have anything
18 else?

19 MR. McCANN: As far as shielding, we mentioned
20 earlier that there are many types of radiation that come
21 from radioactive material. Some are particulate, in other
22 words, actual solid matter that is emitted from the
23 radioactive material. Some of it is photon energy or gamma
24 rays or x-rays, which is part of light. Gamma rays do --
25 are affected by shielding. Each radioactive material has

1 different energy of photons or gamma rays coming off of it.
2 The primary shielding, besides concrete or lead or in
3 teletherapy units, which is used to treat cancer, is, in
4 fact -- around many shielding places.

5 MS. STINSON: Did you have a follow-up question?
6 Does anyone have a follow-on question?

7 [No response.]

8 MS. STINSON: Okay. Go ahead.

9 MR. BENNETT: Matthew Bennett. I am a member of
10 the Ohio Valley Greens. I have to call you on one of the
11 more offensive acronyms from Government agencies, this
12 ALARA, as low as reasonably achievable. I noticed it popped
13 up in page six. The criteria are applied on a site-specific
14 basis, with emphasis on residual contamination levels that
15 are as low as reasonable achievable. I was wondering if you
16 could tell me what the criteria are that determine what is
17 reasonable in this case and what is not?

18 MS. STINSON: Mike?

19 MR. WEBER: Just for clarification, you are
20 referring to page six of the --

21 MR. BENNETT: The Notice -- the Scope -- the
22 notice that I received in the mail from being on your
23 mailing list.

24 MR. WEBER: Right. That comes out of the -- in
25 this specific allocation, it comes out of the NRC's action

1 plan for ensuring timely decommissioning of the SDMP sites.
2 The SDMP is for site decommissioning and management plan.

3 The kind of process we would go through is to
4 evaluate whether there are reasonable steps that could be
5 taken -- and I will explain reasonable -- that could further
6 reduce the level of contamination at a site, using NRC
7 existing guideline values, which are set out in our action
8 plan at the back of the room.

9 The types of trade-offs that we would look at is
10 what is the cost, what is the benefit. Is there a social
11 benefit to the additional action? Would it allow the use of
12 the property for some application that would otherwise not
13 be allowable? It is a structured process. It often employs
14 things that are also considered just good practice. For
15 example, if you have a wall that is contaminated and, by
16 washing down the wall you can remove the contamination, thus
17 reducing that contamination and potential future exposures,
18 good practice would say, yes, go ahead and do it, as long as
19 you are not going to cause another problem like creating a
20 waste that couldn't be disposed of.

21 It is a case-specific evaluation. I know that
22 doesn't really help clarify it in great detail; but, ALARA
23 is used and has been used traditionally in the radiation
24 protection field.

25 MR. BENNETT: So, in this case, it might boil down

1 to what is reasonable, either the taxpayer is paying with
2 their health or with their tax money, in terms of the
3 difference between the different alternatives and saying
4 well, it would be nice if we could ensure public health and
5 keep the company open; but we don't know if we can do both,
6 so maybe we will do one or the other, which ever seems
7 reasonable. But, we have two competing factors here.

8 I have one other question. That is, if the
9 offsite alternative was chosen, is there a chance that this
10 would go -- that this material would go to the low-level
11 radioactive waste facility that is proposed for Ohio?

12 MS. STINSON: Can you answer that, Mike?

13 MR. WEBER: Sure. I think, in part, the answer to
14 your question is a function of timing. Also, I don't
15 believe, based on our earlier discussions with Ohio EPA,
16 that they would currently be planning to take this kind of
17 bulk waste at the kind of disposal facility that they would
18 eventually create in the state.

19 I think the alternatives that we will look at, as
20 to the comments to the contrary, or other suggestions, would
21 be disposal offsite and at a currently available licensed
22 disposal facility. We may also look at disposal at a
23 facility specifically created to take this waste for
24 disposal.

25 MR. BENNETT: Are there any facilities such as

1 those that are licensed, besides Barnwell right now, that
2 could take waste like this?

3 MR. WEBER: Yes. I believe one company was
4 mentioned earlier out in Utah that is presently licensed and
5 could take at least the bulk of the material at the site.

6 MR. BENNETT: Okay. Thank you.

7 MS. STINSON: Other questions from the audience?

8 [Show of hands.]

9 MS. STINSON: If you don't mind, I will take
10 someone who hasn't spoken yet.

11 MS. MILLER: My name is Barbara Miller. I am from
12 Cleveland. I am an outsider. I used to live in Byesville,
13 Ohio in 1987. I ate at restaurants in Byesville, and I am
14 concerned that -- was I exposed when I was here drinking
15 water? I know it was just a small amount, but, I am not
16 down here to try to help close a plant. I am not here
17 representing that. I am concerned about the people that
18 live here, the people that work here, because I have friends
19 in Ava, I have friends in Byesville, I have friends in
20 Woodsville. What is to say there aren't things going on
21 there like that that is going on here? I think this should
22 be an issue that is taken care of here so that those
23 communities don't have to go through this. I think it is
24 unfortunate that all of you people that live here are having
25 to under go this hardship. That is all I have to say about

1 that.

2 I do have a question for the NRC. Why can't you
3 put a fence up right now, instead of saying we have to wait
4 for results in two weeks? What if those results tell you
5 that you should have had a fence up in the meantime? Why
6 not do that now and protect these people? I know the one
7 gentleman said he walked around the slag and everything.
8 Have you been to the doctor to have your lungs checked? Do
9 you know? Okay. Good. I am glad. Does that mean everyone
10 that has been across that site has been tested. I hope you
11 have.

12 FROM THE FLOOR: Once a year we have to. Everyone
13 has to.

14 MS. MILLER: I am concerned about that. I care
15 about people.

16 FROM THE FLOOR: We are too. That is why we have
17 that --

18 MS. STINSON: If you want to make comments, it is
19 fine to answer, but you should come up to the mike.

20 MS. MILLER: Okay. I don't want people being
21 angry at the groups that are coming from the outside,
22 because we aren't down here to put you out of work. We re
23 down here because we care about people. That is why we are
24 in environmental groups. That is the point I want to make.

25 MS. STINSON: Thank you.

1 MR. McCANN: To answer your question, our
2 regulations do specify that radioactive materials have to be
3 accessible to them and have to be controlled. The degree of
4 that control depends upon what we consider the type of
5 material involved, the radiation hazard involved and what
6 type of other controls are in place to control. We look at
7 the riprap that is around the plant. We have inspectors
8 take measurements. The average value of the highest
9 location was about 35 micro-R per hour --

10 Most of the material we assert was material -- I
11 would question -- hold off -- The signs have been posted --
12 We won't encourage them to put a sign up. That has not been
13 decided yet. That is what we will -- I guess I have to say
14 we will follow due process. The regulations are clear. I
15 think the rules of law and process are the same, whether you
16 are being arrested for a traffic ticket or anything else.
17 Like I say, if that case came up, I could order that; but I
18 don't think you would want us to act as public officials,
19 without following due process law.

20 MS. MILLER: Thank you.

21 MS. STINSON: Thank you. We are running over
22 here. I see a couple more questions. We will go for at
23 least another 10 minutes. Bear with us. If you would like
24 to speak to anyone up here, especially after we conclude, I
25 think folks are going to be willing to stick around. So, we

1 will check back with you in about 10 minutes.

2 Did you have an answer to the question about
3 employee testing?

4 MR. EUBANIKS: My name is Melvin Eubaniks. I have
5 been an employee of Shieldalloy for almost 28 years. As far
6 as the lady is concerned about drinking the water and having
7 contamination, Byesville does not get their water from the
8 creek, they get their water from the well water, which is
9 far away from Shieldalloy. So, you do not have any
10 contamination, except maybe too much chorine that they put
11 in the water.

12 Also, as far as the testing that she was concerned
13 about, for the past two or three years, the company, at
14 their expense, has a portable lab come in and voluntarily,
15 you can have x-rays, blood tests, cardiograms, taken. And
16 the blood test will test for heavy metals, which they have
17 not had anybody who is over the limit in any category.

18 I have one comment. I see a piece in the paper,
19 one of our weekly free papers that we get, that this meeting
20 was called by the Wills Creek Committee, and this meeting
21 was set up and called by them, the water committee -- this
22 Wills Creek -- is that what it is -- this Wilis Creek Water
23 Committee? I was just wondering who actually called this
24 meeting -- whether this meeting was set up by this Committee
25 or by someone else?

1 MS. STINSON: I can't speak to you about what was
2 in the paper. This is a Nuclear Regulatory Commission
3 scoping hearing. So, it was called by the NRC.

4 MR. EUBANIKS: It was not in fact set up -- the
5 paper said by the Wills Creek?

6 MS. STINSON: I can't speak to that. No. I do
7 not know what the papers say; but, maybe Sherwood would be
8 willing to talk to that later on with you.

9 MR. EUBANIKS: Okay. Also, I would like to know
10 who is this Committee -- this Water Committee? How many
11 members do they have and who is on their Committee Board?

12 MS. STINSON: Can you address those questions,
13 Sherwood? Describe the publication or article it is
14 published in.

15 MR. BAUMAN: I believe the document he is
16 referring to is the Gurnsey Noble Courier, whereby we
17 released a press release to them. I believe, if he would
18 read a little carefully, what it says is, as a direct result
19 of our efforts and others, this meeting was being called.
20 We did not take sole responsibility nor credit for the
21 calling of this meeting.

22 Okay. Two. The Save the Wills Creek Water
23 Resources Committee is a group of concerned citizens
24 throughout Gurnsey County that are here to protect our
25 drinking water supply. When you look at the fact that, for

1 instance, in 1967 --

2 MR. EUBANIKS: All I want to know is how --

3 MR. BAUMAN: Excuse me, I am answering your
4 question. He asked me who it was and how many members we
5 had. Now, if you will allow me to answer the question?

6 MS. STINSON: Let's let him answer the question.
7 He can address whatever question he wants also.

8 MR. BAUMAN: When you look at the fact that in
9 1967 the Ohio Department of Health recommended against an
10 issuance of a permit for a dump over in Byesville that is
11 now a Superfund cleanup site called the False Landfill,
12 whereby Byesville does get its water indirectly from Chapman
13 Run, because it drops down into an underground coacquirer
14 that was polluted during the False Landfill fiasco, because
15 even though the Ohio Department of Health recommended
16 against it, our wise County Commissioners went ahead and
17 granted that license, and we are now spending \$20 million
18 cleaning it up. So, we are a group of concerned citizens
19 throughout Gurnsey County trying to protect our water supply
20 because we have got over 40 miles of interstate to develop
21 wonderful industry in this county, and the powers that be at
22 places like the CIA are doing the best to keep that growth
23 from coming.

24 As far as the number of members --

25 MS. STINSON: Okay. It is important -- I am

1 sorry, sir. I am sorry, Sherwood.

2 MR. BAUMAN: -- we have 19.

3 MS. STINSON: It is important not to make
4 references to specific organizations -- remember no
5 accusatory statements. Can you just mention the number of
6 members that you have?

7 MR. BAUMAN: Yes. We have currently 19 members.

8 MS. STINSON: Thank you.

9 FROM THE FLOOR: Boo.

10 FROM THE FLOOR: Boo. Boo.

11 MS. STINSON: All right. Enough of that.

12 [Show of hands.]

13 Sir?

14 MR. JEWEL: My name is James Jewel. I don't live
15 here. I don't work at your plant. I don't drink your
16 water. I don't even know what it tastes like. It sounds
17 like, from what the gentleman said from his walking around
18 the creek and stuff, it doesn't sound like there is any
19 really obvious damage to any of the living creatures there.
20 There have been a lot of things said, but no specific
21 numbers mentioned. There must be tests done on the amounts
22 and concentrations of any heavy metals or whatever. There
23 should be that information available by now, but nobody has
24 mentioned any of it -- no specific numbers. So, I can't say
25 anything specific, so I won't. I will just stick to a

1 general statement.

2 So, why should I be here and why should I care
3 about Cambridge and the water and stuff? Well, one of the
4 reasons is this is a national committee here, and the
5 decisions that are made here and the way it is done affects
6 everybody on a national level. So, I was curious to see how
7 that goes. That is not really enough to take me away from
8 the things I need to do.

9 Then I had heard that -- somebody that works with
10 a friend of mine had a death threat. That makes me a little
11 more curious. It comes to mind this whole issue of jobs
12 versus the environment. That is what I would like to say -
13 - something kind of general about that -- about people who
14 are stuck in a situation where their job involves byproducts
15 that are dangerous possibly, or have a potential to be
16 dangerous.

17 If you are in a water shed that feeds your water
18 supply, then you should be concerned about it, and you
19 should look into it for yourselves. Don't listen to what
20 all of these experts say, find out for yourself. If you are
21 doing the work, if your hand is in it, then find out for
22 yourself. If it is okay, then find out how to do the job
23 right, so that the drainage is taken care of and things --
24 there are all kinds of options out there. People are doing
25 studies on artificial wetlands.

1 When I was in Massachusetts a couple of years ago,
2 they were due to do the results of an artificial wetland and
3 how it absorbed heavy metals or not. If an artificial
4 wetland would absorb heavy metals, and then, if it would
5 stay in the plants, and then what would you do with the
6 plants that had these heavy metals in them? And this --
7 they did this -- so the results of that is out there. I
8 don't know what they are, but maybe I could find them and
9 send them.

10 The point is, if you are in a situation like this
11 and, if it turns out -- you know, if it turns out -- you
12 know, here is another what if -- but, that is what this
13 discussion is about. We are not making decisions. This is
14 what if. If it turns out that what you find out for
15 yourselves is not to the standards that you consider to be a
16 good job -- that would protect your water supply, what are
17 you going to do? If it turns out that it is not up to your
18 personal standards, are you going to become so fearful and
19 doubt yourself so much that you are going to overlook it
20 because you are afraid that you can't find some other way of
21 making money or making ends meet and continue, or are you
22 going to say this job is not up to my standards, what I
23 believe in, so to hell with it, you know, I can take care of
24 myself and I don't need to work for this company if this
25 company is going to ask me to do a job that is not up to my

1 standards?

2 So, generally speaking, as far as jobs versus the
3 environment, it is not going to go away because there is
4 more of a -- I mean, our population has not stabilized. We
5 are still growing, and the world is still the same size.
6 So, the jobs versus the environment is not going to go away.
7 It is something that needs to be looked at. You need to ask
8 yourself is my job -- and you have to know. I mean, you
9 can't let other people tell you, because, you know, they
10 have got their own biases. You have got to find out for
11 yourself, for your own satisfaction. Is my job safe? Do I
12 want to continue doing it? Can it be done safely?

13 So, those are the things we need to look at and
14 not get really fearful about, you know, I am so dependent on
15 this company and I am so afraid that I won't be able to make
16 it on my own or something that you are going to overlook
17 these things. That is my concern. On a national level, I
18 think that is the concern -- because jobs versus the
19 environment has been a big debate on a national level as
20 well.

21 Thank you.

22 MS. STINSON: Thank you. Other comments or
23 questions -- particular questions or clarification? Use the
24 opportunity that you have here with all of the resources we
25 have collected together in this room.

1 [Show of hands.]

2 MS. STINSON: Sir? We will take two more
3 questions, and then we will check in and see if it is time
4 to close.

5 MR. ELLISON: I have kind of a point of
6 information about exposure to low levels of radiation and
7 their affects on human beings and other living things. What
8 they found is that exposure to low levels of radiation
9 doesn't necessarily manifest itself in the first or second
10 generation, so that the people who are walking across this
11 pile of slag and being exposed to it, may not be adversely
12 affected at all. But, the cells which are dividing,
13 particularly reproductive cells can be affected, and it can
14 show up in their children and their grandchildren. So, we
15 may not see any effects right away from this stuff.

16 Some of the studies on this -- I think Deborah
17 Lorz referred to the doctors involved in studying it have
18 been marginalized and ridiculed by the Nuclear Regulatory
19 Commission and the establishment. My father worked in the
20 Atomic Energy Commission. I grew up in New Mexico, around
21 the Nuclear Laboratories there. His job was secret. He
22 couldn't tell me anything about what he did for a living.
23 This is the history of the nuclear industry -- of secrecy
24 and deception. It is in that environment that this whole
25 thing is happening. I really feel for the threat of losing

1 a job, because nuclear -- anti-nuclear activists have been
2 threatened with losing their jobs.

3 If a GE employee was to speak out against the
4 bombs programs they have going on in their plant, if they
5 were to have an accident of something in the GE plants, they
6 would lose their jobs. So, I feel for the threat of job
7 loss, but it sounds like Metallurg has filed Chapter 11 and
8 is in the midst of going bankrupt.

9 Thank you.

10 [Show of hands.]

11 MS. STINSON: Yes, sir. State your name.

12 MR. MACMURRAY: I am Michael MacMurray, and I live
13 in Cleveland. I am from Mississippi. But, I was wondering
14 -- I would like to address this to the gentleman -- I
15 believe he is the Vice President of the Company, with what
16 sounded like a British accent, it didn't sound like he was
17 from around these parts -- I would like to ask the name of
18 the holding company and where it is located that actually
19 controls the local plant that is about to shut down? Could
20 you tell me what the name of the holding company was again?

21 MR. FINN: Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corporation,
22 which is 17 -- 25 East 39th Street, New York.

23 MS. STINSON: Metallurg, Inc? 25 East --

24 MR. FINN: 39th Street.

25 MS. STINSON: 39th Street, New York, New York.

1 MR. FINN: 10016.

2 MR. MACMURRAY: Thank you.

3 MS. STINSON: That is the holding company for
4 Shieldalloy.

5 Any other final comments or questions?

6 [No response.]

7 MS. STINSON: Okay. I want to thank you all for
8 your participation this evening.

9 [Show of hands.]

10 MS. STINSON: Did I miss somebody? State your
11 name.

12 MR. LATCHIK: My name is John Latchik. I am the
13 son of a father who happened to walk across the contaminated
14 slag piles and may have inadvertently worked in some of the
15 products that they have produced. If it is a level of such
16 grades of radiation that causes some biological malfunction
17 that we are looking in the food chains and our reproduction
18 cycles, I feel like it hasn't affected me. I, too, work at
19 that plant. If it is, I don't have a doctor's degree of
20 something of that nature. I feel it is because have left
21 myself unexpanded in these areas. I feel the deficiencies
22 that some people may view as a byproduct of the Vanadium
23 Corporation -- I hope you don't see us unfavorably. I hope
24 you continue to let Shieldalloy work with the community and
25 the NRC to develop some techniques for plans that will help

1 this decommissioning process be completed. Don't be too
2 harsh in your judgment on the environmental impacts. We
3 need time. It is my livelihood. I am a generation. I have
4 another generation behind me. I have a son that is 15 years
5 old. I feel that he has progressed well. These are
6 stressful times, and our national economy does demand that
7 we take time to reach the proposed agreements to work these
8 things out. Give it time and let it work. Thank you.

9 [Applause.]

10 MS. STINSON: Thank you. We have just enough time
11 for a couple of closing comments. I was going to say how
12 much I appreciate people's comments and working in this
13 format. We would like to know what your feeling is about
14 this format. The NRC conducts scoping hearings of this type
15 all the time. Check in with us afterwards and let us know.
16 As well, I hope you all view this as the beginning of a
17 communication process between NRC, the other agencies, and
18 yourselves. We will take the opportunity to ask questions,
19 if you have them, tonight -- certainly to submit your public
20 comments, your written comments, and to be in contact with
21 the staff in the future.

22 Mike?

23 MR. WEBER: Let me just add my thanks to all of
24 you who stayed throughout the meeting and shared your views
25 with us. I want to assure you that those comments will be

1 taken. They have been transcribed. We will use them in
2 developing the Environmental Impact Statement. You will
3 probably see reference to them in the Scoping Summary that
4 will come out.

5 We have had a dynamic year of job concerns and
6 environmental concerns and some tension I am sure in the
7 community. I hope that we can all leave here tonight with
8 the expectation that over the next several years this issue
9 will be resolved.

10 I want to thank you again for coming out. Thanks.

11 [Whereupon, at 10:37 p.m., the above-entitled
12 meeting was concluded.]

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the matter of:

NAME OF PROCEEDING: Scoping Meeting on Environmental Impact Statement for Shieldalloy

DOCKET NUMBER:

PLACE OF PROCEEDING: Byesville, OH

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission taken by me and thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under the direction of the court reporting company, and that the transcript is a true and accurate record of the foregoing proceedings.

Anton Schuyt
Official Reporter
Ann Riley & Associates, Ltd.