

**PGDP Citizens Advisory Board
Waste Operations Task Force
January 8, 2003 * CAB Office**

CAB Members Present: Merryman Kemp
John Russell (via teleconference)
John Tillson

DOE Representatives: David Dollins
Glen Newtown

Support Staff Present: Kendra Payne

Public: Ruby English

The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m.

Solid Waste Permit Modification

Kemp stated the modification consisted of three significant changes to the permit. She reported the modification called for an increase from 2-4 trucks a day entering the landfill to 20-30 trucks a day, a decrease in the life of the landfill from 204 years to 13 years, and the increase of the annual tonnage to approximately 100,000 tons.

Tillson stated he is concerned the landfill is migrating toward becoming a pseudo-Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act landfill. He also stated the North-South Diversion Ditch (NSDD) waste will go into the landfill. Russell said it is his understanding the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is going to dredge the ditch, put on a layer of plastic, test the dirt, and put it in the landfill. Tillson asked what is the original risk of the NSDD soil. Russell expressed his concern that reducing the life and increasing the tonnage of the landfill could eliminate the need to re-modify. He is concerned that the public would no longer be able to comment on future modifications. Tillson said he is concerned the landfill will become a “catch-all” from other projects.

Tillson asked the current status of the permit modification. Russell said he is unaware of the outcome of the public hearing held on December 5, 2002. He said he thinks that DOE will start filling the landfill when they start excavating the ditch.

Dollins asked what was the main concern of the Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) regarding the C-746-U Landfill. Tillson stated the main concern is that the generic language of the permit modification will allow anything into the landfill, even from other projects. Newtown stated the permit only allowed disposal of waste from two projects, NSDD and Scrap Metal Removal. Dollins said there would have to be another public hearing if DOE wanted to add another project that used the landfill.

Kemp stated she would like for the Board to be able to make a statement regarding modifications being made without going through the permit process. Russell said the CAB could make a

statement that other waste streams not be permitted to dispose of waste in the landfill without a public comment period.

English stated she thinks the permit modification is just another way to keep plant neighbors from knowing exactly what is being put into the landfill. Tillson asked English if she has a list of items that have been put into the landfill. English said she does not have the list but would like a copy. Tillson said he would provide her with the list.

Tillson said he would like to see a list of everything that has currently been approved to dispose into the landfill. He asked if this modification was the first modification with a public hearing. Newtown reported it is the eighth modification and the first major modification since the initial permit application. Only a major modification requires a public hearing.

Dollins stated DOE's goal is cleanup of the site. He said once something is clean you have to do something with it. Dollins said this task is always a challenge and encouraged the task force to help DOE find alternative solutions. Tillson said he has no problem with a decrease in the life of the landfill because it means faster cleanup; however, he said the waste put into the landfill should meet the Waste Acceptance Criteria.

Russell asked why DOE wants to have their own landfill when they could dispose of the waste in a subtitle D independently owned landfill. Dollins said DOE has explored the cost alternatives and the public was given an opportunity to comment regarding the costs of on-site and off-site disposal. Kemp asked if she and Russell could be provided with those figures.

Russell said as the cleanup activities move outside the fence, the cost of disposal will increase. He asked if closing the landfill at that time would be a viable solution. Dollins said as DOE moves outside the fence they should start looking at other means of disposal.

NSDD – Future Phases

Dollins reported he would provide the data requested by Russell by E-mail or in the board meeting packets. He stated he would like to provide this information in advance of the next task force meeting to give members ample time to review it.

Future of the S&T Landfill

Since Mark Donham had requested this item be added to the agenda but was not present, the task force decided, in the interest of time, not to discuss the future of the S&T Landfill.

Nickel Ingots

Russell asked in what form is the contamination of the nickel ingots. Tillson said it is radioactive contamination. Newtown added the contamination is natural uranium. Russell asked if the nickel itself was contaminated. Newtown answered the nickel was not. Tillson said he might be able to obtain data on the subject.

Kemp asked where the ingots would be shipped. Newtown reported the ingots would go to Oak Ridge.

Future Issues

Russell asked how the Board can become better informed on actions and events regarding the future phases of the C-746-U Landfill. Tillson stated the task force should request a true cost analysis. Tillson said he would like to see how much it costs to build the landfill and construct cells. Russell agreed and stated he would work on the wording of the request before the January Board meeting. Tillson said the figures should be provided before DOE begins planning other phases.

English asked who has the license on the C-746-U Landfill. Newtown reported DOE owns the landfill and Weskem operates it for Bechtel Jacobs Company LLC. English asked who controls what is put into the landfill. Tillson stated the generator of the waste is legally responsible

English inquired about the investigation on the outstanding Notices of Violation (NOV). Tillson said Don Seaborg would probably address the issue at the January Board meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.