

**PGDP Citizens Advisory Board
Waste Disposition Task Force
March 10, 2004 * CAB Office**

CAB Members Present: Rhonda McCorry
John Russell, Chair
Dorothy Starr
Bill Tanner

DOE Representatives: Glen Newtown

**Commonwealth of Kentucky
Representatives Present:** Gaye Brewer

BJC Representatives Present: Bryan Clayton (via telephone)

Support Staff Present: Kim Crenshaw
Kendra Payne

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

Burial Grounds Operable Unit

The questions and statements regarding the Burial Grounds Operable Unit (BGOU) information provided at the previous Waste task force meeting are as follows:

1. Russell stated the draft Risk Based End State (RBES) document separates the BGOU into two phases. Phase One identifies three of the burial grounds as suspected sources of groundwater contamination. Russell asked the identity of these three burial grounds so the Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) could be made aware if these are considered a greater priority. Payne said the draft RBES Variance report states two of the burial grounds are C-749 Uranium Burial Ground and the C-747 Contaminated Burial Yard. Clayton said he would research the third burial ground in Phase One. Tanner said he would ask this question at the March 11, RBES Public meeting.
2. Russell stated Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) 2 mentions synthetic oils as being buried with the waste but does not mention polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). He asked if the synthetic oils include PCBs. Clayton said yes, uranium metal filings were saturated in PCB oils. Russell asked during what time period was SWMU 2 modeled. Clayton said the answer could be located in the Waste Area Group 22 Proposed Remedial Action Plan. Clayton said he would refer to this document for the modeling period. Russell asked for the corrosion rates of the drums holding the disposed waste. Clayton said this has not been discussed. Tanner asked if failure rates of the drums were not considered, what is the purpose of the modeling. Clayton believed when the modeling was conducted, the assumption was the material had already been released from the drum. Clayton said he would research this.

3. Russell stated SWMU 3 was used as a sediment basin for uranium wastewater and the leachate analysis suggests the presence of PCBs. He asked where the leachate analysis originated. Clayton said since the closure of the surface impoundment in 1986, there has been a collection of leachate at the spill point periodically and the leachate is then sampled and released. Russell asked what other materials were identified in the leachate analysis. Clayton said he would research this matter. Tanner asked if the testing of leachate was conducted at the bottom of the pit or ground level. Clayton said the spill point is above ground. Tanner stated that below ground leachate was not being collected.
4. Tanner stated most of the contamination in the Upper Continental Recharge System (UCRS) is directly beneath the burial cells in SWMU 4. He asked if the contamination has saturated to the Regional Ground Aquifer (RGA). Clayton said SWMU 4 is believed to be a source area for the Southwest Plume containing trichloroethylene, technetium 99, and other volatiles. He said the Southwest Plume Site Investigation will be looking at the SWMU 4 area this summer.
5. Russell said SWMU 7 and SWMU 30 risk statements contain inconsistent information regarding the level of contamination in the UCRS and the RGA.

Clayton asked that the task force provide Payne with additional questions that they would like answered. Tanner said once the task force is educated, a substantial presentation could be given to the full Board.

S&T Landfill Recommendation Update

Russell stated a response had been received from the Kentucky Department for Environmental Protection (KDEP) declining the CAB's recommendation to discontinue the S&T Landfill Site Investigation. He said KDEP believes the investigation is warranted and provided additional information to the CAB regarding the investigation. Tanner said the letter states a corrective action would be implemented if the landfill is found to be the source. Russell reported the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) response is still pending.

NSDD Sections 3, 4, and 5 Recommendation Update

Payne stated DOE would provide a response to the North-South Diversion Ditch (NSDD) Sections 3, 4, and 5 recommendation before the sampling plan is released.

C-746-U Landfill Update

Newtown stated 100 percent of the burrito bags, containing excavated soil from Section 2 of the NSDD, has been disposed in the C-746-U Landfill. Russell and Tanner expressed their concern with DOE disposing of soil from a ditch that was hazardous enough to excavate into a "non-hazardous" landfill.

Brewer reported waste characterization sampling is complete on Section 1 of the NSDD and results will be received in approximately two weeks. Russell asked how samples were taken. Brewer said some samples were taken at targeted areas influenced by C-400 and the C-404 leachate, others were randomly selected. All samples were taken at the center of the ditch.

Russell asked if the task force could review the results. Brewer said the task force could see the Commonwealth of Kentucky's data, but would have to ask DOE to obtain their data.

Retreat Follow-up

Russell stated the decision was made at the retreat to change their name from Waste Operations to Waste Disposition. He said the task force is responsible for the following project areas:

- Waste Disposition
- NSDD
- Scrap Metal
- DOE Material Storage Areas
- BGOU

Tanner stated DOE would be supplying the CAB a list of project deliverables for the next 12 months to assist the CAB in setting its workplan.

Other

Payne asked Russell if he would like for Resource Conservation and Recovery Act training to be made available to the task force members. Tanner suggested organizing a training class the following month after new members are appointed.

Tanner stated that Laura Schachter, DOE Public Affairs Specialist for the Lexington office, is checking on the possibility of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or another entity offering training to the CAB on risk based strategy, which is a different perspective than DOE's.

Next Month's Agenda

1. Burial Grounds Operable Unit
2. NSDD Section 1 Sampling
3. Workplan
 - A. NSDD
 - B. Scrap Metal
 - C. DMSAs
 - D. BGOU
4. Next Month's Agenda

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Action Items

Clayton: Provide answers to questions regarding BGOUs.

Brewer: Provide results from Section 1 of the NSDD sampling at next task force meeting.

Schachter: Research possibility of training for CAB on risk-based strategy.