



August 28, 2014

Chair
Ben Peterson

Vice-Chair
Ralph Young

Board Members

Glenda Adkisson

Renie Barger

Judy Clayton

Robert Coleman

Eddie Edmonds

David M. Franklin

Tom Grassham

Jonathan Hines

Mike Kemp

Kevin L. Murphy

Dianne O'Brien

Richard Rushing

Jim Tidwell

Ken Wheeler

Carol Young

Rachel Blumenfeld
DOE DDFO

Buz Smith
DOE Federal Coordinator

Board Liaisons

Todd Mullins
*Division of Waste
Management*

Jennifer Tufts
*Environmental Protection
Agency*

Mike Hardin
Fish and Wildlife Resources

Stephanie Brock
Radiation Health Branch

Support Services

EHI Consultants, Inc.

111 Memorial Drive

Paducah, KY 42001

Phone 270.554.3004

Fax 270.554.3248

www.pgdpca.org

info@pgdpca.org

Agenda for the WDA Subcommittee Meeting

Tour Overview

Core Values Advice

Next Meeting

- August 28, 2014
- Combined Notes



PADUCAH GASEOUS DIFFUSION PLANT CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

115 Memorial Drive • Paducah, Kentucky 42001 • (270) 554-3004 • info@pgdpcab.org • www.pgdpcab.org

Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant Citizens Advisory Board Waste Disposal Alternatives Subcommittee Session Summary August 28, 2014

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) met at the Environmental Information Center (EIC) in Paducah, Kentucky on Thursday, August 28th at 5:30 p.m.

Board members present: Ben Peterson, Ralph Young, Ken Wheeler, Mike Kemp, Judy Clayton, Tom Grassham, Jim Tidwell, David Franklin, and Dianne O'Brien.

DOE and subcontractors present: Buz Smith, Yvette Cantrell, Steve Christmas, Elizabeth Wyatt, Eric Roberts and Jim Ethridge.

Board Regulators present: Gaye Brewer, Todd Mullins (call-in), and Jennifer Tufts (call-in)

Public present: Donna Steele

Peterson opened the meeting. He then made a presentation summarizing what the Subcommittee had learned so far about the potential CERCLA cell at the site. He pointed out that the booklet titled, "A Guide to the U.S. Department of Energy's Low-Level Radioactive Waste", would be forwarded to everyone and was a good explanation of the types of waste involved.

Wyatt indicated that the more waste being disposed of, the more cost effective a waste cell would be. The projected volume of waste that would be generated at the Paducah site would be above the break-even point of making the cell economical as opposed to shipping the waste to an offsite facility.

Young suggested that contact be made to Jay Beach of Geosyntech to see if he had any contacts with his office in California to see if any of the waste cells there were affected by the recent earthquake centered outside of San Francisco. **Wyatt** said that could be done and took it on as an action. **O'Brien** indicated that she had found out from an expert in the field that the proposed cell here is closer to the New Madrid fault than the waste cells were to the center of the earthquake in California. **Franklin** asked where the number 7.6 (maximum credible earthquake strength prediction) came from. **Wyatt** said that it was based on earthquakes in the region over a period of years. **Kemp** said that the focus should be on the consequence of having an earthquake instead of if we would have one. He said that we needed to focus on what would happen to the landfill, what would be released, and how would it be controlled. **Peterson** indicated that it was really a matter of risk and how much risk were you willing to accept. He also indicated that having the buildings at the site just sit and not be torn down was a bigger risk than having them torn down and put into a waste cell. **Wyatt** indicated that with monitoring of the cell is how you determine any problems after a catastrophe affecting the cell. **Grassham** said that one thing that impressed him about the Oak Ridge cell was that it put people to work. He also stated that he was for recycling as much of the material as could be.

Wheeler requested some sort of presentation explaining how risk assessment is accomplished, as it pertains to the waste cell.

Peterson then reviewed items learned from the Oak Ridge CERCLA cell tour conducted on August 18-19. **Wheeler** indicated that if there was a problem at the cell that it would shut down not only the employees operating the cell but also the workers at the projects producing the waste that was going into the cell. He also suggested that he thought that KY needed more of a presence at the site if the waste cell was built. **Mullins** and **Brewer** both indicated that KY had two full time employees located at the site to handle their responsibilities. They also indicated that there could be more employees located onsite if a cell is built.

Peterson reviewed the capabilities of the GIS map of the site he developed and indicated that it was openly available online. He then showed areas around the site that might be used for future industry.

The Board then discussed each of the potential waste cell sites, with comments below:

- Site 1 – **Young** asked if any of the sites were a clear economic winner. **Peterson** suggested that they assume that all the sites were economically good. **Wheeler** indicated that this site still had rail spur access and that that might be a disadvantage to development by a future industry if the cell were to be located at this site destroying the spur. **Wheeler** also thought that this site would be the one that was most compatible with the D&D activities because it was removed from those areas.
- Site 3a – **Young** brought up the fact that this site has Porter’s creek clay under it. **Wyatt** said that originally it was thought to be an advantage, but discovered that it aided in migration of any contaminates. She also pointed out that this site was located adjacent to areas that would be used by the DUF6 conversion plant in the future, and that that this site had a rail spur next to it too.
- Site 5a – **Wheeler** indicated that if the power lines located on this site were removed to locate the cell here, might be an issue for future industry to locate at the site. **Peterson** said that the power lines could be relocated to accommodate any future development.
- Site 9 – **Peterson** indicated that he recently understood that SWMUs 2, 3, and 4 were to be excavated and that opened up the possibility for using this site for the waste cell. **Mullins** said that it was in DOE’s baseline assumptions that they would be excavated but that that did not necessarily mean that they would be excavated. **Tufts** indicated that Site 9 had a total of 45 SWMUs and they would have to be addressed if the cell was to be located there, and that would be a significant delay in the progress. **Wyatt** then reported that Site 1 had no SWMUs, Site 3a had 4, Site 5a had 8, Site 9 had 45, and Site 11 had 1. **Tufts** also said this site was located over the Northwest groundwater plume and if there ever was a release, it would be more difficult where it was originating from.
- Site 11 – **Peterson** said that if the logic used in Oak Ridge to determine a cell location were used here, that Site 11 would be the obvious choice. **O’Brien** asked is this site was the one closest to the river. **Kemp** indicated that since this site is the location of the existing landfill, that it should be good to build the waste cell in this location. **Wheeler** asked if this site would constrain the existing landfill to the point that it is no longer large enough. **Wyatt** said that the good thing would be the infrastructure that is already there could be used for the waste cell. She also said that locating the waste cell here would limit the capacity of the existing landfill and that would cause more waste to be put into the waste cell. **O’Brien** asked if we had a picture of the latest flood at that site. **Peterson** said that the maximum credible flood levels only barely skirted this site.

Roberts then called for an informal vote to see where the Board stood on the issue of locating a waste cell onsite or offsite, and also, if onsite, which proposed location they preferred. Of the nine members present, two indicated they preferred the offsite location and if choosing an onsite location, they voted for Sites 9 and 5a. Of the seven that indicated an onsite cell, six voted for Site 11 and one voted for Site 9.

Wyatt indicated that once a site is picked, if that is what is determined to do, that further investigations would have to be done on that one site. All of the analysis that has been done to this point related to all the sites in consideration.

The meeting adjourned at 8:23 pm.