



D&D/Facilities Subcommittee

Thursday, February 4, 2016 @ 6:15 p.m.

Agenda

Chair
Renie Barger

Vice-Chair
Mike Kemp

Subcommittee Members

Basil Drossos
Victoria Caldwell
Judy Clayton
Shay Morgan
Ben Peterson
Richard Rushing

Call to Order

Introductions

Initial D&D Planning and Decision Tree

Next Steps and Actions

Adjourn

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



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
ENERGY

OFFICE OF
**ENVIRONMENTAL
MANAGEMENT**

U.S. Dept. of Energy Paducah Site Citizens Advisory Board D&D Planning Subcommittee

Jennifer Woodard, Paducah Site Lead

February 4, 2016

- Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D) at PGDP are being performed under two regulatory approaches:
 - **Atomic Energy Act:** Use of DOE independent authority using NEPA documentation [e.g., Categorical Exclusion (CX)] - maintenance
 - **CERCLA:** Use of “Removal” and “Remedial” actions under CERCLA subject to EPA/KY review & approval under the FFA
- There are criteria that is used to determine which approach is utilized.

- DOE is currently updating its list of potential “Fly-Wheel” Projects should additional funding become available through either:
 - “Plus-up” funding allocated by Congress as part of our budget process,
 - Internal reallocation of unused funding from other PGDP-projects, or
 - Reprogramming of funding by DOE-HQs transferred from other DOE sites.
- Criteria to define candidate as “Fly-Wheel” Projects typically includes:
 - Concise, well-defined scope of work without a high-degree of complexity
 - Easily “Tee’d-up” for immediate implementation and can typically completed in the same year the funding is available:
 - ❖ Work is not FFA-related scope and can be implemented using DOE AEA authority (e.g., NEPA Documents), or
 - ❖ If FFA-related, the regulatory documentation is in-place and already approved by EPA/KY, or can be quickly prepared/approved.
- Development of a “Generic EE/CA” is under consideration to help expedite the CERCLA documentation/approval process for certain decommissioning activities that could be used for “Fly-Wheel” projects

Current D&D Maintenance Actions



All current D&D is being performed as maintenance activities (under DOE AEA Authority)

- C-601-D (Fuel Oil Storage Tank) – 4,000 ft³
- C-616-G (Sulfuring Acid Tanks) – 1,800 ft³
- C-408 (Truck Scale Building) – 500 ft³
- C-746-M (Askarel Storage Facility) – 1,600 ft³
- C-229 (Post 229) – 800 ft³
- C-215 (Portals 17, 18, 19, 20) – 1,000 ft³
- C-216 (Post 47) – 1,500 ft³
- C-746-B (South Warehouse) – 45,000 ft³
- C-801 (Bus Shelter) – 1,800 ft³
- C-212-A (Old Main Guard Post) - 2,000 ft³
- C-212 (Office Building) - 20,000 ft³
- DOE is considering D&D for other facilities
 - C-746-A (Maintenance)
 - C-727 (Maintenance)
 - C-415 (CERCLA)
 - C-728 (CERCLA)

C-746-B Demolition



C-601-D Demolition



C-215 Demolition





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 D&D/Facilities Subcommittee Session Summary February 4, 2016

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) met at the Environmental Information Center (EIC) in Paducah, Kentucky on Thursday, February 4th at 6:45 p.m.

Board members present: Judy Clayton, Ben Peterson, Renie Barger, Basil Drossos, Shay Morgan, and Victoria Caldwell.

DOE and subcontractors present: Jennifer Woodard, Buz Smith, DOE; Eric Roberts, Jim Ethridge, EHI Consultants (EHI); Eddie Spraggs, Pro2Serve (P2S).

Board Regulators present: Julie Corkran, U.S. EPA; Brian Begley, Stephanie Brock, KY Division of Waste Management.

Public present: none

Roberts opened the meeting. He then turned the meeting over to **Peterson** to explain the online GIS map of the PGDP site that he had developed and how to show different data.

Woodard then gave a presentation on the decontamination and decommissioning work at the site.

Peterson asked how long the Engineering Evaluation Cost Analysis (EECA) would take to implement. **Woodard** said that it would take about a year and a half. This process allows DOE to group buildings for D&D. **Corkran** asked if the EECA that was started previously could be picked up and continued now. **Woodard** indicated that she thought it would have to start over because the regulators that were involved before were no longer associated with the site.

Woodard said that there were eleven facilities slated for D&D as maintenance actions. She said that they were advantageous for DOE to remove because it saved money by not having to maintain them, and was not a big expense to tear them down. She indicated that it would cost just under \$1.4 million for all of the buildings.

Roberts asked what determined using the different type of removal actions for a facility. **Woodard** said that contamination was the driver that determined whether to use the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process or DOE's Atomic Energy Act authority.

Drossos asked out of the list of facilities, which were completed. **Woodard** indicated all but two were completed and down to slab. **Clayton** asked if there were other facilities already identified that could

be added if funding became available. **Woodard** indicated that there were a few very small items that would be considered.

Peterson asked if the generic EECA would allow DOE to categorize facilities to group them and better prioritize the D&D. **Woodard** said that it would do that.

Corkran asked to be sent a copy of the presentation. **Woodard** indicated that it would be sent to her.

Woodard said that no facilities were taken down under a remedial action. She added that it was a removal action.

Drossos asked if Fluor was working on removing some of the major structures. **Woodard** said that they were working on a life cycle plan that would include all the facilities. She also said that DOE had that document for review at the moment and it was used to plan the budget. **Drossos** asked what was expected from the Subcommittee. **Woodard** indicated that suggestions of how to proceed on projects was what she expected from the subcommittee. She also said that she would expect more from the subcommittee in the next two years because of the need to get the members up to speed on the facilities and the process of tearing them down first. **Drossos** asked if the site was inventoried according to contamination. **Woodard** answered that it was, for the most part.

The meeting adjourned at 7:45 pm.