Working for the future
Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant
CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

PADUCAH GASEOUS DIFFUSION PLANT
CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

111 Memorial Drive • Paducah, Kentucky 42001 • (270) 554-3004 • padssab@apex.net • *www.oakridge.doe.gov/pgdpssab*

Chair
Mark Donham

Board Members
Nola Courtney
Judy Duff
Judy Ingram
Vicki Jones
Becky Lambert
Merryman Kemp
Ronald Lamb
Linda Long
Leon Owens
Douglas Raper
Craig Rhodes
John Russell, Ph.D.
Rosa Scott
Jim Smart, Ph.D.
Bill Tanner
John Tillson
Rev. Gregory Waldrop

Deputy Designated Federal Official
W. Don Seaborg, DOE
Ex-*officio* member

***Ex Officio* Members**
Carl Froede, Jr.
Environmental Protection Agency

Jim Lane, Jr.
Fish and Wildlife Resources
(Kentucky)

Tuss Taylor
Division of Waste Management
(Kentucky)

John A. Volpe, Ph.D.
Radiation Control Branch
(Kentucky)

DOE Federal Coordinator
Patricia J. Halsey

Additional information about contacting board members directly can be obtained from the CAB web site or by contacting the board at (270) 554-3004.

Site Specific Advisory Board
Meeting Minutes
May 17, 2001

The May 17, 2001, Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) meeting was held at the Information Age Park Resource Center in Paducah, Kentucky, at 5:30 p.m.

The following **board members** were present: Nola Courtney, Mark Donham, Judy Ingram, Merryman Kemp, Ronnie Lamb, Linda Long, Douglas Raper, Craig Rhodes, Rosa Scott, Bill Tanner, John Tillson, and Gregory Waldrop.

The following **board members** were absent: Kit Atkinson, Vicki Jones, Leon Owens, and Jim Smart.

The following ***ex-officio members*** were present: Carl Froede, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and Jim Lane, Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife.

The **Deputy Designated Federal Official** present was Don Seaborg.

The **DOE Federal Coordinator** present was Pat Halsey.

DOE-related employees present were: Greg Cook, Gordon Dover, Stacey Young, Dave Dollins, Jim Skirdulus, Steve Kay, Tom Wheeler, John Morgan, Bruce Ford, Mike Higgins, Bruce Gardner and Jill Holder.

Public: Kristi Hanson, Al Puckett, Warren Smith, Nita Rose, Vicki Jurka, and Charles Jurka.

Guests: John Anderson, Paducah Area Community Reuse Organization, Stuart Gilbert, Greater Paducah Economic Development Council, and Charlie Martin, USEC.

Agenda

Donham opened the meeting at 6 p.m. After introductions, he turned the meeting over to Kay to facilitate. Kay asked if there were proposed modifications of the May agenda. The board approved the May agenda by consensus.

Minutes

Kay asked if there were proposed modifications to the April minutes. The April minutes were approved by consensus.

Site Manager's Comments

Seaborg's comments included:

- There were no Occurrence Reports last month.
- Status of C-410. There is a water leak onto a DMSA. Workers are trying to get back in the C-410 building.
- The Core Team will meet in Nashville on Monday, May 21, 2001.
- Donham mentioned in the last meeting that governors of states with major sites had been sent a copy of a letter from Secretary Abraham. Seaborg said that the board should have now received a copy of the letter.
- Reported that Groundwater Task Force met May 4, 2001 and that Surface Water Task Force met May 11, 2001. Discussed the May 3, 2001 tour for the proposed CERCLA Cell.

Questions Regarding Site Manager's comments

Hanson said at the last meeting she had asked if an above ground facility for the CERCLA cell would be feasible. She wanted to know if Seaborg had looked at this possibility. Seaborg said DOE was looking at that option, but based on initial assessments, it may be cost prohibitive.

Tanner said that Seaborg has said previously that the goal was for BJC and DOE to be cost competitive in cleanup. He said if DOE is competitive and saves money, will those savings be used in Paducah or elsewhere? Tanner said his concern was that the board was being asked to comment on a facility that could save money, but it would mean storing waste at Paducah forever, with the savings realized being spent elsewhere. He said he would be less likely to support the idea of a waste disposal facility if the cost savings realized were not spent in Paducah.

Seaborg said savings typically go back to the site in the current budget year, but outyear budgets are up to Congress. Kay suggested Tanner draft a letter to DOE and come back to the board next month.

SSAB Recommendation Status

There were no recommendations pending.

Project Status Updates

Seaborg briefly talked about some of the projects:

- Because DOE saved money when moving the first rubble piles from the West Kentucky Wildlife Management Area to inside the PGDP fence, it will be able to move more piles than originally expected.

1) The public comment period for the C-746-U Landfill EA ended.
2) A draft Work Plan for the Small Mammal study connected to the Scrap removal Project is complete.

Dover gave an update on the PTZ project. He said the project is moving forward after delays caused by construction problems, weather and contractual issues.

Donham asked what issues need to be solved by the Core Team. Seaborg said there has been some disagreement between regulators and DOE, and some frustration because of budget cuts, but they have been working together and agreed to meet and address issues.

Donham asked about the dispute over the North-South Diversion Ditch project. Seaborg said the dispute was over temporary storage of material excavated from the ditch. DOE expects most of the material will meet the Waste Acceptance Criteria at the C-746-U landfill, but DOE cannot put it there until the Supplemental Environmental Assessment on the landfill is complete. Regulators have objected to temporary storage of the waste. Seaborg said regulators did not like the idea of indefinite storage, with which he agrees. Discussions between DOE and the regulators have led to a resolution that will involve waste storage for a predetermined length of time. If the C-746-U landfill EA is not resolved in time, the material will be shipped off-site for disposal. He said shipping the material off-site would take money away from removing dirt from the ditch. He said he did not know what the timeframe would be, but doubted that regulators would agree to a period of more than a year.

Tillson asked if placing material in the landfill could require a major permit modification. Seaborg said it may. Donham asked if the site's RCRA permit would need modification. Seaborg said DOE believes that will not be necessary.

Froede said he did not share DOE's view about using the C-746-U landfill. There has to be a significant level of work done to bring landfill up to CERCLA standards, he said. Froede told Tillson that if he thinks a public hearing is needed on putting CERCLA material in a RCRA-permitted landfill, he needed to "get it in writing." He said EPA was writing a letter to DOE expressing its concerns. Donham asked for a copy of that letter. Froede said he could not provide one to the board, but added that DOE could.

There was discussion about the plan to characterize the ditch as material was removed. Tillson asked about previous sampling. He said he wanted to see the data packets. Dover said the information is on the ORIS website, which is open to the public. Seaborg said he would get the address to the board.

Puckett asked where waste was being shipped off-site. He asked if it was being shipped to Indian reservation land. Seaborg said waste shipments could go to places like Envirocare, Nevada Test Siteo or Hanford.

Donham asked if the majority of cost was for shipping or disposal. He was told it was about half-and-half.

Froede commented that the regulators have not agreed with DOE's contention that it may have to leave things in the ground because it can not afford to ship it off-site. He said it was the government's responsibility to clean up the site. Donham asked if EPA would hold DOE to FFA requirements. He wants to know how long regulators would allow the deadline to get backed-up. Froede said if DOE needs more time, it can be negotiated with the regulators. He said such discussions are already underway.

Tanner said the Surface Water Task Force is looking at the NSDD and will send a letter to regulators so they may bring additional information to the board.

Board Discussion

Dave Dollins of DOE discussed the proposed CERCLA Cell. He talked about the site tour some board members took on May 3, 2001. During the tour, Board members offered suggestions to reconfigure two sites. Site 3 was reconfigured so it would not encroach as much on the proposed DUF6 conversion facility footprint. He said Site 5 could be changed two ways: 5A would be less intrusive to the wildlife area, but Dykes Road would have to be relocated; 5B moves into the industrial area. Seaborg said there was another potential conflict with Site 5. PACRO has requested USEC lease that land to the agency for a potential power plant. USEC has responded to a TVA Request for Proposal to build a gas turbine power plant. Charlie Martin of USEC and Stuart Gilbert of the Greater Paducah Economic Development Council were present to answer questions. Seaborg said DOE has to consider the request because it is required to turn assets into community economic development benefits where feasible.

Waldrop asked if the proposed sites would be 50 feet above the aquifer to meet the state standards for TSCA waste. Dollins said that Site 5 would. Site 3 would only be 20 feet from the aquifer. Waldrop asked about Site 9. Dollins said Site 9 would. Waldrop asked if Site 9 was over the northwest plume. Dollins said yes.

Froede said this was the first time he had seen the reconfigured sites. He asked about expansion capabilities. Dollins said there were none at Site 1. Site 5 could be expanded, but expansion of Site 3 would mean going into forested areas.

Tillson asked about the slope percentage. Dollins said they are looking at a 6-to-1 slope now, but may have to change the slope during the design phase because of seismic considerations.

Kemp asked if other stakeholders are interested in Site 5. Seaborg said he was not aware of other interests.

There was a question about relocating the cooling towers now used as the treatment facility for the Northeast Pump-and-Treat system. Dollins said the second phase of Site 5 would require relocating the cooling towers, but the pumping stations would remain.

Kemp asked how many acres of trees would have to be cut at Site 5 and would it increase if power lines had to be relocated? She was told 22 acres would be cut. Additional trees would be cut if power lines are moved.

Tanner asked what would happen to the Northeast Plume treatment system if USEC shuts down? He also asked if a plant closing would mean the power lines could simply be removed instead of relocated? He was told a new treatment facility would be needed. The power lines cannot be removed or cut because some of them are tied into the power distribution network.

Rhodes asked how tall a facility with a 6-1 slope would be. Dollins said 100 feet.

Donham said he was concerned about the whole idea of a CERCLA cell. He said a 100-foot-tall cell would be visible for miles and wondered why no one was looking at alternatives such as above ground concrete storage bunkers. He said the Central Midwest Compact was looking at using bunkers.

Seaborg responded that BJC is looking at several alternatives, which will be incorporated into a feasibility study. He said it was too soon to talk specifics about design, but that design and alternatives such as above ground facilities would be looked at should the seismic study clear the way for a facility. Donham said he was still concerned that DOE was so focused on a landfill that it wasn’t considering other alternatives.

Kay asked the board to focus on providing guidance about which site to pick for seismic evaluation.

Tanner said he thought that if a site fell through they would then go to the next site. Froede said the seismic investigation will not take place until next month and no one will see the results until 2002.

Hanson said that DOE has spent a fortune looking at landfill options. She said no landfill has been around for 500 years, so it is impossible to know if one will last. Donham asked if an alternative was out of the question? Ingram said the situation is worse today if the waste remains where it is and an earthquake occurs.

Donham said he was not comfortable making recommendations. Seaborg said, as a federal manager, he would be negligent if he did not look at options. He said he has to look at cost and make a decision with or without input, but would prefer having the board's advice.

Kay said it appeared the board would not reach consensus and it should move forward. Kemp said one thing the board should keep working toward consensus and requested more time.

Kay asked if it would be appropriate to preface a recommendation that says the board has concerns about a CERCLA cell on the site, but recommends proceeding with a seismic evaluation on one site.

After discussion on the pros and cons of the various sites, Tanner proposed the board recommend site 3A. Tillson supported the proposition. Donham said it was in 20 percent wet lands and forested land would be destroyed. He objected to the proposal.

Kay asked the board to consider Site 9. Donham asked Seaborg if unused buildings on site could be used as staging areas. Seaborg said it was unlikely because it will take years to decontaminate a building for other uses. Ingram asked if site 9 was contaminated to a point where studies would be more expensive. She was told yes. Tillson objected to Site 9 as the recommended site.

Tillson made a motion to vote. Raper proposed site 3A. Ingram supported the proposition. The board chose to recommend site 3A by a vote of 6-3, with two not voting. (Voting yes: Tanner, Ingram, Waldrop, Lamb, Raper, Courtney. Voting no: Rhodes, Donham, Tillson. Not voting: Kemp, Long.)

Presentations

Kay suggested moving the PACRO presentation ahead on the agenda and tabling the Lifeline Baseline presentation until the June meeting. The board agreed.

John Anderson gave a brief overview of PACRO's operations. Donham asked about a proposal from CVD, Inc. to use nickel ingots. He asked if the gas used to vaporize the metal was hazardous, what the waste streams were, and what potential emissions from the process there are. Seaborg said specifics will be addressed when and if DOE receives a formal proposal from CVD.

ATSDR Public Health Assessment

Courtney said she thought a study of residents of Bradford road was needed to determine if there was a cluster of cancers known to be cause by specific agents. She also said a doctor visiting the Western Baptist Hospital Tumor Registry noted the hospital had a higher-than-expected incidence of bladder cancer. She said she thought this anomaly needed to be investigated.

Froede said if the board has concerns, it should write a letter to Congress to ask ATSDR to do the study on Bradford Road or take a more in-depth look at the plant.

By consensus, the board decided to write a letter to ATSDR, with copies to Kentucky and Illinois congressional delegations. The letter will ask for a study of Bradford Road residents, note the possible high incidence of

bladder cancer and mention that the Public Health Assessment should have calculated the cumulative effect of exposure to various chemical and radioactive agents instead of on a one-by-one basis.

Administrative Issues

Workplan/June Agenda

The Lifecycle Baseline was moved to the June agenda.

SSAB Subcommittee and Task Force Reports

Public Involvement

Kemp gave the Public Involvement report. On May 2, the committee determined it wanted a newsletter published every other month. This will be a place for CAB announcements and related articles. A draft will be distributed for comment at the June meeting. Suggestions for names should be sent to Gardner or Young. The committee also discussed the taping of board meetings. After discussion, the board opted to begin taping in June. Meetings will be shown on Paducah Cable Channel 2.

Membership

Courtney gave the Membership report. She said new members should be verified by the next meeting.

Ground Water Task Force

Waldrop gave the Ground Water report in the absence of Jim Smart, who was elected chairman. The task force asked for an explanation of why construction has not yet resumed on the PTZ project. Seaborg said he asked Dover to answer that.

Dover said construction will resume following the completion of negotiations between BJC and its subcontractor. He said the contract had been issued as a fixed price contract, which may not have been the best choice for a technology demonstration. He said that once the technology is proven, a fixed cost contract would be the best way to go, but not while it is still experimental. He said a new method of installation has been developed and it will be tested before writers attempt to install the wall. He said BJC's technical staff was not optimistic because similar installations have been done to a depth of 60 feet, and the Paducah PTZ must go 100 feet deeper than that.

Surface Water Task Force

Long noted the Task Force Report was in the board's meeting packet.

DOE Federal Coordinator

Halsey mentioned there is a Nov. 8-10 workshop on groundwater contamination in Augusta, Ga., and encouraged board members to attend.

Meeting Adjourned