

**PGDP Citizens Advisory Board
Waste Operations Task Force
July 17, 2002, 5:30 p.m., CAB Office**

CAB Members Present: Mark Donham (ex-officio)
Merryman Kemp
John Russell (via teleconference)
John Tillson

Contractor Support Staff: Kim Crenshaw, SAIC

Public: Charles Jurka
Vicki Jurka
Al Puckett

Kemp called the meeting to order at 5:50pm.

WASTE SHIPMENTS

Tillson reported that material shipped to Utah was found to be misclassified. Donham stated that only the Nevada waste was confirmed.

NORTH-SOUTH DIVERSION DITCH

Donham stated that he had received a letter from DOE to the regulators in which they proposed to put much of the excavation of the NS Diversion Ditch on hold (other than a few administration type things) as part of the accelerated cleanup. Tillson said the Division of Wildlife has expressed some concern as to why the entire ditch needed to be excavated. This concern was shared by all. These questions were posed:

- 1) What data exists that indicate that any of the NS Diversion Ditch should be excavated? It was noted that there are only three or four distinct sources to this ditch.
- 2) To what level of hazard would the ditch need to be excavated? Excavation would be 35 feet wide with 3 feet of "clean soil" on top. Then the sampling would take place. This Task Force is concerned that DOE is attempting to mix material that is known to be contaminated with material that is clean. Donham asked about the basis for excavating the entire ditch. Tillson said that it is because of all the sampling and data collected through the years.

Russell expressed his concern about questions not answered pertaining to economic decisions and costs. Tillson agreed they should have access to that data. Jurka commented that if they can't find out the dollar amount,

they would at least like to know how the costs are structured. She believes the cleanup ends when the pilot project ends. Donham stated that there is a clause in the M & I contract that stipulates that all procurement documents between the contractors and subcontractors are not considered agency documents. The board cannot get their own contracts because they are not agency documents. It states in the contracts that the costs cannot be revealed. Tillson said there is nothing that can be done about the current contract, but suggested that if they are given an extension or enter into new contract negotiation, this clause be removed.

TRANSPORTATION OF WASTE

Kemp reminded the Task Force that Andrew Smith with Envirocare is scheduled to speak at the August Task Force meeting. Kemp also stated that she thinks there will be more public opposition about moving materials offsite when the public becomes aware of what is being moved. The general public doesn't like for this waste to be moved through "their area" or to be dumped in their area.

CERCLA CELL

Russell stated that Don Seaborg had said that it looks as though they are not going to build a CERCLA cell. Tillson said when the real numbers are studied, things are going to fall apart. Jurka indicated that she received a different impression from DOE's Bill Murphie. Donham said that he thought he remembered hearing that DOE had found evidence of seismic activity in the surface layer at site 3A during their seismic study that they did not find at Barnes Creek. They were also going back to review the cost estimates in the GAO study from September, 2001. The waste volumes were exceeding the cost estimates. Russell said according to the Kentucky regulations, a CERCLA cell cannot be built in the wetlands. Tillson commented that the locations here are definitely wetlands.

DOE had said that it was going to review the cost estimates of off and on site waste disposal in response to the 1991 GAO study which found that in most cases, costs and waste estimates were higher when the cleanup actually began than the estimated costs in planning, thus possibly changing the cost benefit analysis of on and off site disposal. Donham suggested that we need to find out what the results of that review were.

C-746-U LANDFILL

Russell said that there is a 30 year agenda to create waste management sites that require 30-year post closure monitoring and maintenance. They seem to be determined to reactivate and expand the C-746-U Landfill. It seems they want to fill it up and move into the post closure for the plant, Russell

stated. Tillson said DOE was completely led to believe that they would be able to do all kinds of cleanups on this site and put the waste in the U landfill. They would be able to expand the usage of the C-746-U landfill.

OTHER ITEMS

Donham said if the PTZ is cancelled that DOE has a lot of procedural problems to deal with since it relied so heavily on the PTZ technology in its overall groundwater feasibility study.

Donham also suggested that a recommendation be made as to our dissatisfaction and frustration with DOE not being at our meetings. All members agreed. Vicki Jurka made the suggestion to ask for information on a certain issue for the next meeting and then it could be put on the agenda.

Meeting night was discussed again. Three of our members can meet only on Wednesday night so it was decided that we would continue to meet on the second Wednesday at 5:30pm.

The meeting adjourned by consensus at 7:05pm.