



Environmental Remediation Subcommittee

Thursday, February 18, 2016 @ 5:00 p.m.

Agenda

Chair
Renie Barger

Vice-Chair
Mike Kemp

Subcommittee Members

William Murphy
Nancy Duff
Tom Grassham
Mike Kemp
Kevin L. Murphy
Carol Young

Call to Order

Introductions

Discussion of Potential Recommendation on C-400 Phase IIb Treatability Study

Discussion of Potential Recommendation on Southwest Plume SWMUs 211-A and 211-B Final Characterization

Overview of Burial Grounds SWMUs 5&6 Proposed Plan

Next Steps and Actions

Adjourn

Jennifer Woodard
DOE DDFD

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



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 Environmental Remediation Subcommittee Session Summary February 18, 2016

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) met at the Environmental Information Center (EIC) in Paducah, Kentucky on Thursday, February 18th at 5:00 p.m.

Board members present: Bill Murphy, Carol Young, Mike Kemp, Tom Grassham.

DOE and subcontractors present: Tracey Duncan, Robert Smith, DOE; Eric Roberts, EHI Consultants (EHI).

Board Regulators present: Brian Begley, Kentucky Department of Waste Management (KDWM)

Public present: None

Roberts opened the meeting. **Murphy** asked if there had been any progress in discussions about the path forward for the C-400 groundwater investigation. **Duncan** indicated that all the parties had discussed the possibility of investigating the area under the C-400 building to see if there was any contamination there. She also said that now that the plant was given back to DOE, their focus was to address the groundwater contamination as a whole instead of addressing a smaller part at a time. **Murphy** said that there probably would not be any roadblocks to doing sampling work in the building. **Duncan** said that some of the building might not be conducive to allowing a drill rig to obtain samples, but a certain amount of the building would be accessible for sampling.

Murphy asked if trichloroethylene (TCE) was in the large vats in the C-400 building. **Duncan** indicated that it wasn't in all of the vats located in the building. **Murphy** then asked if that was any indication of leakage from the vats that did contain the chemical. **Duncan** responded that she had not seen any written indication of that. **Murphy** then said that to the best of DOE's knowledge, if there was contamination located under the building, it would not be expected to be a major source of the contamination. **Duncan** said that that was correct.

Grassham said that if the main TCE leak was from the tank at the southeast corner of the building, the major source would not be under the building but at that corner of the building. **Duncan** indicated that there were other spills located at spots inside the building also. **Kemp** asked if any resources would have to be withdrawn from another project and placed on this one for it to be considered a priority. **Duncan** indicated that work would have to be re-prioritized for work to be shifted to this project instead. She also indicated that if they performed the investigation under the building, they would put off the steam treatment of the plume until after it was completed.

Kemp asked if reasonable quality soil samples could be obtained by horizontal drilling. **Duncan** said that you could. **Kemp** then asked what the timeline was for the steam treatment would be along with the timeline for the under-the-building treatment. **Duncan** indicated that by June of 2017, they might

be ready to go to the field with the steam treatment. She then said that for the sub-slab work, they might be able to start by late 2017. **Roberts** asked what a ballpark amount would be to do the sub-slab investigation. **Duncan** said for up to about ten angled borings that it would cost in the neighborhood of \$3-4 million. Kemp asked how much it would cost up to the field work. Duncan indicated that it would probably run about \$400,000-\$500,000.

Murphy asked what cost so much on a boring. **Duncan** said that it wasn't so much the cost of the personnel running the rig, but the cost of everything to get to the point of drilling a boring. **Duncan** also said that she thought that if they were to proceed with the sub-slab work at C-400, some of the deactivation work that is not regulatory driven would have to be bumped.

Roberts said that he thought that asking Congress for additional funding to do the sub-slab investigation would be something the community could get behind and possibly get for the site. **Begley** said that additional funding to do this work would be preferable over putting off other work at the site in order to go this.

Murphy asked if there were any measurements that suggested a higher concentration of contamination under C-400 that is flowing downgradient. **Duncan** answered that the measurements that they had were from the dissolved phase and could be from one source or more.

Kemp asked how the site would get the funding to do the work. **Duncan** indicated that the budget cycle is two years ahead. **Roberts** suggested developing a recommendation to request additional funding to do the sub-slab investigation.

Murphy asked if a high concentration of TCE were to be found under C-400, how that would change the steam injection work. **Duncan** said that she thought they would expand the zone of influence of the steam and expand the extraction zone.

Duncan then introduced for discussion the work associated with SWMUs 211A and 211B, which is located on the east end of the C-720 Maintenance building. She indicated that remediation for these areas had changed because of a recent discovery that contamination was located at a greater depth for one of them and the planned remediation method would not treat it at the greater depth.

Begley asked if the deactivation of the plant would make use of the C-720 building. **Duncan** indicated that at first they thought that they might, but probably would not make use of it. The office space was what was needed. **Murphy** asked what the source of the contamination at that location. **Duncan** said that if it was from use of TCE for cleaning machinery inside the building, and also possible collection of TCE in the storm sewers. **Kemp** asked if the group recommended not doing anything with this area until the C-400 area is taken care of, what would KY's response be. **Begley** indicated that he would be concerned.

Roberts asked if this was the first time data had come back as alarming as this time concerning this area. **Duncan** indicated that the agencies involved had requested further investigation on this area and they found higher quantities of contamination than first thought.

Murphy asked what made the agencies think that there was a source of contamination under the C-720 building. **Begley** said that the results of the additional investigation indicated a better potential for that being true due to the much higher concentration than originally thought close to the building.

Kemp asked what the Subcommittee's goal was as far as this particular area goes. **Duncan** indicated that the subcommittee might want to wait and see what comments were from EPA and KY. She said

that she didn't think there was any kind of rush for a recommendation concerning this area. **Roberts** said that whatever the committee decided to do, it would be good for the Subcommittee be in line with the community and the regulators.

Duncan then gave a brief overview of SWMUs 5&6. She indicated that the dispute over this project had been resolved and the Proposed Plan that would be coming out for public comments, was going to recommend that there be a cap put on this area. **Murphy** asked what now would change the Board's previous recommendation. **Duncan** indicated that nothing had changed for DOE.

Roberts asked **Begley** where Kentucky thought about this project. **Begley** said that in the past they had supported a cap be put in place, but they were starting to re-think that decision. **Kemp** added that part of his thinking was to consider the possibility of capping other burial grounds close to SWMUs 5&6, and if that was going to be done, capping 5&6 would be more acceptable. But if those other SWMUs were going to be excavated, why not excavate them all to free up the area for future use.

Murphy asked what was needed from the Subcommittee at this point. **Duncan** indicated that they might want to look at their past recommendation on SWMUs 5&6 and see if any changes might need to be made to it for re-submission. Also they might want to submit any comments during the public comment period for the Proposed Plan.

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 pm.