



**Conferencing to Attend Remotely**

1-877-873-8017

Access Code: 5827180

**WDO Committee Meeting**

Paducah CAB Office

111 Memorial Dr.

Paducah, KY 42001

**Thursday, 11/15/2012**

**7:00 - 8:30 PM CT**

**1. Introduction**

*WDO meeting intro - November 2012 - Page 2*

**2. WDO Educational Session Summary**

*WDO summary - Page 5*

*Attachment - Page 14*

**3. Waste Disposition overview discussion**

*WDO Education Presentation - Page 16*

**4. Review of actions/follow-up questions**

**5. Path forward**



# PADUCAH GASEOUS DIFFUSION PLANT CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

115 Memorial Drive • Paducah, Kentucky 42001 • (270) 554-3004 • [info@pgdpcab.org](mailto:info@pgdpcab.org) • [www.pgdpcab.org](http://www.pgdpcab.org)

## Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant Citizens Advisory Board Waste Disposition Subcommittee Meeting Summary November 15, 2012

*The Waste Disposition Subcommittee met at the Environmental Information Center (EIC) in Paducah, Kentucky on Monday, November 15th at 7:10 p.m.*

**Board members present:** Judy Clayton, Ken Wheeler, Richard Rushing, Ben Peterson, Jim Tidwell, David Franklin, Mike Kemp, Kevin Murphy and Tom Grassham

**U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and contractors:** Buz Smith, DOE; Elizabeth Wyatt, Kelly Layne, LATA KY; Jim Erickson, Stoller; Stephanie Fountain, Geosyntec; Charlie Martin, USEC; Eric Roberts, Jim Ethridge, EHI

### Waste Disposal Options Educational Session

**Roberts** started by reviewing what was discussed at the October 18<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Wyatt** continued the presentation titled “Waste Disposal Alternatives Educational Session”, October 18, 2012.

- Alternative Challenges
- D&D Cleanup Schedule
- State Equity
- Long-Term Stewardship
- Future Use
- Siting

<p><b>Kemp:</b> What types of materials are going into the U landfill?</p>	<p><b>Wyatt:</b> Right now materials for the D&amp;D projects. Things like transite, and soils. <b>Fountain:</b> We couldn't put any of the waste for the CERCLA cell into the U landfill unless the waste acceptance criteria was changed for the U landfill. We are pretty much projecting to send everything we can to the U landfill.</p>
<p><b>Wheeler:</b> Are there not new facilities being developed (to accept waste) at the same time?</p>	<p><b>Wyatt:</b> There are. There is a new one in Texas.</p>
<p><b>Wheeler:</b> Do we play a significant role in the national waste disposal picture or are we just a little dot?</p>	<p><b>Wyatt:</b> I think at this time we are more of a little dot, but as things progress and other sites are cleaned up, that may change. <b>Roberts:</b> I think that Washington is aware that Paducah and Portsmouth are here and what is</p>

	<p>going on. They know that we don't have a waste disposal site identified yet and we are considering an onsite facility.</p> <p><b>Martin:</b> From Kentucky's perspective, when you get into central Kentucky, Kentucky operated a waste disposal site for years, and it was the only disposal site for DOE for that type of waste. The state spent millions of dollars to remediate that site. You aren't going to get much sympathy about the fact that you want to ship that waste someplace else.</p>
<p><b>Clayton:</b> Are you talking about the entire site or just the mound of earth? (long-term stewardship)</p>	<p><b>Wyatt:</b> Until DOE could prove that there wasn't any danger to human health and the environment, and that there was not a need for long term controls, then it would have to be controlled by DOE. There could be areas within the plant that would have to be maintained long-term.</p>
<p><b>Clayton:</b> Once you have everything ground level though you still have to monitor.</p>	<p><b>Wyatt:</b> As long as we can prove that there is no problem at a certain location, that would not be required.</p>
<p><b>Peterson:</b> In the case of some of these other CERCLA cells that have been built, are there classified materials that have been put in them and if so, does security have to remain in place at those locations?</p>	<p><b>Wyatt:</b> As far as security, that is governed by the DOE orders and there are a lot of factors that go into determining that.</p>
<p><b>Peterson:</b> Let me rephrase that. If we build our CERCLA cell here and classified materials go in it, when I drive up to the gate, am I going to see a guy with a machine gun?</p>	<p><b>Wyatt:</b> Now that I couldn't answer.</p> <p><b>Roberts:</b> I think the plan is to release as much of the property as possible for reindustrialization.</p> <p><b>Smith:</b> There might be fencing, and they are monitored but I'm not sure there would be a machine gun.</p> <p><b>Martin:</b> More than likely you aren't going to see any armed guards.</p>
<p><b>Wheeler:</b> Could the waste acceptance criteria exclude any classified materials?</p>	<p><b>Wyatt:</b> Classified material would be treated like any other waste stream. It being classified would not make it any different.</p>
<p><b>Wheeler:</b> So there would be a separate review process to determine if classified waste would be accepted.</p>	<p><b>Wyatt:</b> That is actually in the RI/FS report.</p> <p><b>Fountain:</b> The RI/FS assumed that the classified waste volume would be considered as any other waste volume being generated. It is not excluded from consideration.</p>
<p><b>Wheeler:</b> I understand that. The point I am trying to make is as far as future use of the site goes, whoever might use the site might not want an armed guard around if one is needed for security because of the classified waste that is buried there.</p>	<p><b>Fountain:</b> That is understandable.</p>

**Questions:**

1. Is there any of the property that can be transferred now?
2. How does the D&D plan after closure relate to what properties that could be transferred at what time?
3. What shape is the infrastructure in, as far as water, waste water, power, etc.?
4. How big would the CERCLA cell be, what does it look like, and how does that impact future use of the site?
5. Looking at the proposed cell locations, would the state allow the cell to be put on top of an existing burial ground?
6. Could any of the existing buildings be reused for something else? What are potential uses for any other part of the site?
7. How quick can someone start using the site? What's the timeline?
8. Do the Kentucky brownfield standards affect cleanup and reuse of the site?
9. If the CERCLA cell is not filled at the end of cleanup, could a third party make use of any of the unused space in the cell?
10. Would there be any advantage, from a marketing standpoint, to be able to use the leftover space in the cell, having gone through the permitting process to use it?
11. What's the anticipated length of time to fill in this landfill before closure?
12. How can the aesthetics of the cell be maximized?
13. Could any of the lower contaminated parts of the cell be transferred to be used by cities in the area?
14. How will the alternatives for Shawnee Steam Plant affect reuse of the site?
15. If there is NOT any classified waste put in the cell, will there be any monitoring of the site?

The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 pm.

***Action Items:***