WILDLIFE HABITAT COUNCIL

Case Study 13

Fernald Case Study	
Name and Location	**Site Name:** Fernald **Site Location:** Southwest Ohio
Site Description	Formerly produced uranium metal for the USDOE Nuclear weapons complex. It is currently listed on the National Priorities list (NPL) and is undergoing CERCLA remediation. The site covers 1000 acres and the entire site will undergo natural resource restoration following remediation
Site Reuse Description	The end use is designated as an educational Park focusing on site history and ecology. Restoration is well integrated with remediation by taking advantage of post-excavation topography to determine the habitat type. Deep excavation and stormwater retention basins are readily converted to ponds and wetlands. Excavations into subsoil are being converted to native grasslands due to their ability to compete well on low nutrient soils. The federally listed endangered Indiana Bat has been documented on-site and restorations are intended to improve that habitat. Infiltration basins are being developed adjacent to wetlands to aid in groundwater remediation (i.e. natural injection wells) The decision to implement restoration on the site was and combination of public participation and the state of Ohio NRD claim
Stakeholder Involvement	A 30 day public comment period will be held on two separate documents. One of the documents is the NRRP. The second document for public comment is DOE's *Environmental Assessment for Proposed Final Land Use* (EA). This NEPA document presented DOE's preferred final land use for the Fernald site. The preferred alternative is natural resource restoration for the majority of the site with the exception of 115 acres occupied by the On-Site Disposal Facility and 23 acres for potential commercial development. The public comment period on both the NRRP and the EA ended October 20, 1998. Who were the stakeholders/partners in this site and were their roles/contributions? What were the concerns of these stakeholders and how were these resolved? Did any of these stakeholders/partners make a financial contribution to the

	project? Were any local, state, federal funding sources used?
Site Assessment Approach and Cleanup	Briefly state the results of the site assessment. Did the site assessment approach take into account end use? What is/were the sources of contamination? What are/were the contaminants of concern? The cleanup is being performed under CERCLA Examples of past impacts include releases of contaminants to Paddys Run and the Great Miami Aquifer. Future impacts are based upon planned remedial actions. An example of a future impact is the removal of trees and habitat associated with the Southern Waste Unit excavation. The information contained in the impact assessment was used in a model (Habitat Equivalency Analysis) to provide an estimate of the required restoration actions. The estimate was then used in conjunction with planned remedial actions to develop the restoration plan. Describe any long term controls (e.g., institutional controls) associated with the site. Was a closure letter obtained for the site? If so what was issued and when? If not, are you currently seeking a closure letter?
Reuse	The end use of the site is an educational park focusing on site history and ecology. The NRRP provides conceptual restoration plans for the post remediation landscape at Fernald. It maximizes the benefits of existing natural features such as the Paddys Run stream corridor and forested wetlands. Additionally, the plan accounts for the post-excavation surface which includes many deep holes and large areas stripped of topsoil. The NRRP focuses on the use of native plants to develop habitats representative of those historically expected in southwestern Ohio. The plan also includes a ground water education component yet to be determined. **Restoration Plan** • expand Paddys Run corridor • re-forestation and enhancements • open water habitat with connecting wetland systems • native prairie grasslands and savannas • aesthetic barriers • ground water project

WILDLIFE HABITAT COUNCIL

Fernald Case Study	
Obstacles	What problems did you encounter during the corrective action? What was the nature of the problems encountered (e.g., regulatory, community perception, etc.) and how did you overcome these problems? Describe any other obstacles related with this project (funding, etc.)
Costs and Funding	How was this project funded, i.e., were there any redevelopment funds or other resources used? What was the total cost of the project? If an ecological enhancement was used in the remediation, were there cost savings associated with the selection of this remedy?
Economic and Other Incentives	What were the economic incentives (e.g., conservation easements) associated with this project? Were there any other incentives (e.g., public relations) associated with this project?
Time	How long did it take for this project to be completed? If the project has not yet been completed, is there a time estimate for completion
Other	List any other information that may be of value for this case study. This can be used to insert a "lessons learned" section, or highlight other information of interest. Also, you may add additional sections as needed, if additional information does not fit in the categories above. Further information http://offo2.epa.state.oh.us/FERNALD/Restoration/restoration.htm
Contact Information	Thomas A. Schneider Office of Federal Facility Oversight Ohio EPA T 937-285-6466 F 937-285-6404 http://offo2,epa.state.oh.us tom.scheider@epa.state.oh.us