

Surface Water Task Force
March 13, 2002, Noon, CAB office

Members present: Mark Donham
Judy Ingram
Linda Long
Bill Tanner

DOE staff present: Raul Castaneda
David Dollins

Support staff present: Chris Marshall, BJC
Stacey Young, BJC

Castaneda briefed the task force on the status of the site wide sediment control project and the revised Engineering Evaluation/ Cost Analysis. The revision includes Outfalls 001, 008, 010, 011 and 015. The remainder of the outfalls will be addressed using localized controls.

Castaneda said DOE does not have enough information to take action on other outfalls surrounding the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant.

Tanner asked if the other outfalls could be blended. Marshall said that there are considerations based on such things as current conditions and prospect of future work that would be assessed before an action would be taken.

Tanner said he plans to make a presentation to the full board in April to discuss how the EE/CA does or does not address the board's recommendation.

Tanner questioned the numeric value set for surface water discharge. Castaneda said 10⁻⁴ was selected. Tanner asked if DOE has been able to work with the regulators to deal with what is in the discharge. Castaneda said the regulators were very involved in putting the numbers together.

Donham asked how 10⁻⁴ compares with the Kentucky Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit. Tanner said the KPDES permit and soils are not comparable.

Castaneda said the EE/CA address sample points relevant for this project. Samples are screened because they are not relevant or are being addressed in other actions. Samples greater than one foot deep are addressed in groundwater.

Tanner said originally the task force had a concern that the regulators and DOE could not reach agreement on these types of issues.

Castaneda said DOE has the answer on how to identify whether or not a remedial action is required, but there are other questions that are still being addressed.

Tanner said he believes the revised EE/CA moves closer to addressing a truly “site wide” sediment control plan.

Another concern the board’s recommendation addressed is the separation of sewers and the focus on suspended solids. Castaneda said because of costs and Nuclear Criticality Safety issues, the revised EE/CA does not deal with the separation of sewers. He also said the EE/CA does focus on suspended solids and the dissolved phase solids would be addressed in a later action.

Tanner also said that the task force continues to have an interest in seeing something from DOE to establish a policy or procedure that addresses the issue of storm water management in upcoming contracts. He used the potential Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Conversion Facility construction as an example. He said whoever the construction firm is should be responsible for its own storm water management plan.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.