

**PGDP Citizens Advisory Board**  
**Groundwater Operable Unit Task Force Meeting**  
**November 2, 2001 – Noon – CAB Office**

Task Force Members Present: Jim Smart and Gregory Waldrop  
Other CAB Members Present: Mark Donham  
DOE Representative: Gary Bodenstein  
Contractor Support Staff: Stacey Young, BJC  
One member of the public attended.

Bodenstein briefed the task force on the following topics:

A member of public addressed the task force and urge DOE to expedite clean up of the groundwater. He fears the contamination may reach his home in north central Marshall County.

**TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS:**

Permeable Treatment Zone: There is a potential for patent lawsuit involving DOE, a subcontractor and the other technology provider. A resolution and path forward are being considered.

6-Phase – DOE is waiting on EPA comments on the 90% design package. The field start has been delayed until April 2002 because of safety concerns with construction during winter. DOE and contractors conducted a safety review the last week of October and identified some areas that need to be improved and addressed before workers implement any action.

C-Sparge – A resolution between the Paducah Site Office and EM-50 (the arm in DOE that provides funding for pilot projects) has agreed to split to cost of implementation 50/50. Subcontract negotiations are in progress

Earth Saw – A technique, which provides for encapsulation of a burial ground, is being considered for a pilot project in Paducah.

**GROUNDWATER REMEDIATION**

The Feasibility Study has been approved.

The Proposed Remediation Action Plan for the C-720, Kellogg Pad, EPA and KDEP approved SWMU 1 on October 29, 2001. Public notice for the comment period is November 2 until December 17.

A scoping meeting to determine the data quality objectives for the remedial investigation at the S&T Landfill was conducted November 1.

#### COMPLIANCE ISSUES

As directed by KDEP, DOE replaced Monitoring Well – 90 and Monitoring Well – 95 at the S&T Landfill. Monitoring Well - 87 did not require replacement. The suspected areas of corrosion were removed during well rehabilitation.

s

KDEP has not agreed to discuss DOE response to comments on the U Landfill permit modification and work plan. Therefore no resolution between KDEP and DOE on the issue of the UCRS qualifying as an “aquifer.” KDEP contends the UCRS is an aquifer. DOE contends that the UCRS is not an aquifer by regulatory definition.

Meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.