



May 21, 2015

Chair
Ben Peterson

Vice-Chair
Renie Barger

Board Members
Cindy Butterbaugh
Victoria Caldwell
Judy Clayton
Robert Coleman
Colby Davis
Eddie Edmonds
David M. Franklin
Tom Grassham
Jonathan Hines
Mike Kemp
Kevin L. Murphy
William Murphy
Dianne O'Brien
Cindy Ragland
Richard Rushing
Jim Tidwell
Ken Wheeler
Carol Young
Ralph Young

Jennifer Woodard
DOE DDFO

Buz Smith
DOE Federal Coordinator

Board Liaisons

April Webb
*Division of Waste
Management*

Julie Corkran
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.pgdpcab.energy.gov
info@pgdpcab.org

Agenda for the Re-Scoping Subcommittee Meeting

Call to Order

6:00pm

Introductions

Topic - Re-scoping Subcommittee will begin work on educating themselves on benefits of potential baseline re-scoping and consider drafting a recommendation asking DOE to recommend re-scoping to all FFA parties

Path Forward



PADUCAH GASEOUS DIFFUSION PLANT CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

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

Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant Citizens Advisory Board Re-Scoping Subcommittee Session Summary May 21, 2015

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) met at the Environmental Information Center (EIC) in Paducah, Kentucky on Thursday, May 21st at 6:00 p.m.

Board members present: Ben Peterson, Renie Barger, Dick Rushing, Carol Young, Robert Coleman, Ralph Young, Mike Kemp, Judy Clayton, Bill Murphy, Cindy Ragland, Cindy Butterbaugh, Victoria Caldwell, and Dianne O'Brien.

DOE and subcontractors present: Jennifer Woodard, Buz Smith, Cory Hicks, Con Murphy, Steve Christmas, Yvette Cantrell, Eric Roberts and Jim Ethridge.

Board Regulators present: None

Public present: Gary VanderBoegh

Roberts opened the meeting. He then introduced the subject of re-scoping the baseline to the subcommittee. He explained that before the plant was turned back to DOE, the baseline was developed with the fact that the plant would be shut down and everything cleaned up by 2019. Now that the plant has ceased operations, DOE has had to push back that date to 2032, partly because of funding cuts. The idea of re-scoping the baseline might help to re-align projects in the future to meet that timeline. He asked if there was benefit for the site to re-scope their baseline. He then turned the meeting over to **Woodard** to explain to the Board what the baseline is.

Woodard started out by saying that, simply, the baseline was their budget. For a project DOE has to consider the cost of producing the regulatory documents, cleaning out the facility, characterizing the debris, and shipping it offsite. They also have to consider and schedule the steps to accomplish each of those larger steps. Examples of this would be deactivation and deconing of a building. She indicated that there were certain assumptions that had to be made about cleaning up the site in order to put together a budget request, which is done three years in advance. An example of this would be assuming that a certain burial ground would be dug up instead of putting on a cap. Also, not any of this process bypasses the CERCLA process.

Kemp asked if time was being wasted to come up with an integrated baseline if the regulators agreed to the original milestones. Woodard indicated that there was ongoing talks with the regulators dealing with this issue. She also said that the Kentucky regulators were very supportive of integrating the work. She said that the funding levels are what controls the length of time it will take to finish each project. DOE has to make assumptions about that too in its planning of the baseline. She indicated that the Triennial Report was not realistic in its end date of 2040, based on projected funding levels.

Woodard said that the baseline was understanding the sequence of work, understanding how much the activities cost, how it makes sense to integrate them, and then schedule them based on the funding constraints they believe they will have. She said she has to deal with scope, schedule, and cost.

Kemp asked what the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) viewpoint was on re-scoping. **Woodard** indicated that EPA prefers that soils, surface water, and groundwater issues be addressed first, but DOE has to look at what logically works in cleaning up the site.

Coleman asked what was placed in the burial grounds. **Woodard** said that the large burial ground just north of the plant site contained construction debris from the construction of the plant, and was not radiologically contaminated. She continued by saying that the other burial grounds at the site contained radiologically contaminated items of different kinds. **Murphy** asked if some of these areas could be cleaned up and disposed of earlier than originally thought. **Woodard** said that they could be cleaned up earlier. **Murphy** then asked if the budget was constrained, how DOE could schedule anything above what was already scheduled. **Woodard** indicated that is where sequencing comes in. Some of the lower risk projects might be pushed out in order to advance something else.

O'Brien asked if the advances in technology would help or hurt progress in the coming years. **Woodard** answered that it depends on how you look at it. If you have to delay projects because you have to pay more for a newer technology and shift the projects around, the results on one project may be better, but you have to delay the completion of another project. **O'Brien** asked if the work on the plumes could be put on a priority list. **Woodard** indicated that they were.

Roberts asked what the challenges were in re-baselining. **Woodard** indicated that they didn't have as much detail on some of the buildings that they would like to have. She also said that DOE was in the process of gathering information for a binder about the facilities at the site, and would be sharing that with the regulators and the Board. She said that they wanted the source actions to still be considered. **Woodard** explained the wants and needs that were being considered by the regulatory parties. **Young** asked if those items could be shared with the CAB. **Woodard** said that they would be, and they wanted the CAB's wants and needs also. **Roberts** said that he would like to see a meeting with the liaisons and have a similar discussion concerning their wants and needs.

Barger asked how difficult it was to keep the baseline moving with all the regulatory changes in personnel. **Woodard** indicated that it depended on the project itself, as well as the budget and technical issues that might be encountered. She indicated that any regulatory issues that might come up usually happened during the document phase before the project gets to the field.

Murphy asked what DOE needed from the CAB and when did they need it. **Woodard** indicated that she thought that DOE needs to educate the CAB on the buildings at the site first. Also, they need to help the CAB to understand the conditions that they have to deal with concerning the soils. She also said that DOE planned to re-sequence the work anyway, so a recommendation to that effect would be pointless. She suggested a recommendation focusing on certain areas or buildings. **Kemp** asked if the CAB needed to be more specific in their recommendations instead of being too general.

Roberts indicated that in the future, the subcommittee would be looking at the specifics that needed to be included in a recommendation. **Woodard** said that DOE prefers field work, and things going on throughout the year. **Cantrell** suggested setting up an educational session to educate the subcommittee on the status of the projects at the site and how best to re-sequence the work. **Woodard** added that a recommendation from the CAB did not have to cover the next forty years. It could cover just the next three years. **Cantrell** added that there would have to be consideration for the work presently being

done when looking at re-scheduling. **Peterson** made the point that the next three years were already planned, and that the CAB needed to look at the years past that.

O'Brien asked if there was still sampling being done on the burial grounds. **Woodard** indicated that there was sampling be performed at Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) 4.

The meeting adjourned at 7:25 pm.