



## Environmental Remediation Subcommittee

Monday, May 2, 2016 @ 2:30 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 Comments to the Burial Grounds SWMUs 5&6 Proposed Plan**

**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.pgdpca.energy.gov](http://www.pgdpca.energy.gov)  
[info@pgdpca.org](mailto:info@pgdpca.org)



## 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.energy.gov](http://www.pgdpcab.energy.gov)

### Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant Citizens Advisory Board Environmental Remediation Subcommittee Session Summary May 2, 2016

*The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) met at the Environmental Information Center (EIC) in Paducah, Kentucky on Thursday, May 2nd at 2:30 p.m.*

**Board members present:** Bill Murphy, Mike Kemp, Renie Barger.

**DOE and subcontractors present:** Tracey Duncan, April Ladd, DOE; Eric Roberts, Jim Ethridge, EHI Consultants (EHI).

**Board Regulators present:** none

**Public present:** None

**Roberts** opened the meeting. He asked where discussion were between DOE and EPA/KY. **Duncan** indicated that everyone seemed to think that the capping of Burial Grounds SWMUs 5&6 should be postponed. She also said that she wanted to request a 90 day extension before having to issue a Record of Decision and EPA wanted to wait and see what the comments were from the Public Comment Period before delaying the project. **Duncan** also said that DOE's preference was to re-prioritize the order that action be taken on the Burial Grounds to rank SWMUs 5&6 lower on the list. She said that the idea was to first work on the areas that were potentially contributing to the groundwater contamination.

**Murphy** asked how deep the groundwater was during a recent flood to the area. **Duncan** indicated that that level varied across the whole plant site. **Murphy** said that he asked that question because he wondered what affect that kind of thing would have on a potential waste cell. **Duncan** said that she understood that the waste in the cell would be above ground. **Murphy** said that because of the higher water level during a flood, it might fill up the leachate collection system of the cell. **Kemp** indicated that SWMUs 5&6 was considered as a potential site for the waste cell but did not make the cut due to the potential comingling of contaminants should the waste cell have a breach.

**Roberts** questioned the location of the intake water line from the river being close to the location of SWMUs 5&6. **Ladd** said that it was closer to SWMU 4. **Duncan** agreed and said that it was really southeast of SWMUs 5&6.

**Kemp** asked if a formal CAB Recommendation would be better than just issuing comments to the Proposed Plan for SWMUs 5&6. **Roberts** indicated that historically the CAB has submitted a recommendation as public comments.

**Murphy** asked about the status of the CERCLA cell at the site. **Duncan** said that DOE was still in dispute with EPA and KY on the RI/FS. She also said that they were starting to think that money could be better spent on other projects that need to be done before the waste cell would be needed, than build

the cell and it sit relatively unused. She also indicated that the soonest that the waste cell could be in operation would be 2022. **Duncan** continued by saying that most of the waste that is being generated right now is going into the C-746-U Landfill. **Murphy** asked what the initial funds for the cell would be used for. **Duncan** said that the majority would be used for the design of the cell. **Murphy** then asked how long it would take to design the cell. **Duncan** said that it would probably take about two years.

**Kemp** asked what was the latest information concerning the C-400 groundwater remediation project. **Duncan** said that the C-400 project was probably DOE's priority project because it was the largest contributor to offsite groundwater contamination. She also said that they were looking to come up with a plan to treat the whole area instead of just the Phase IIb area. **Kemp** said that that might be one of the reasons of postponing treating the SWMUs 5&6 area.

**Kemp** asked what the difference in cost for disposing SWMUs 5&6 between onsite and offsite. **Duncan** said that to dispose all of the burial grounds offsite would cost \$300-400 million. She added that if 5&6 were postponed now that after the waste cell was constructed, it might be better to dispose of that material in the onsite waste cell because it would cost substantially less.

**Barger** asked if there was enough of a workforce to perform the remediation at C-400. **Duncan** said that the remediation work would be performed by a specialty subcontractor with support from onsite workers. **Murphy** asked if there was work being done at C-400 now. **Duncan** said that there was. **Murphy** then asked if there were plans to provide funds to do the work in the future in the budget. **Duncan** said that that was being considered in future budget requests.

**Roberts** asked how the subcommittee wanted to proceed with the recommendation. **Kemp** suggested combining sections from the two previous recommendations that had been made about SWMUs 5&6 and the Burial Grounds. **Murphy** agreed to put together a DRAFT recommendation for the subcommittee to review. **Barger** said that it would be good to point out in the recommendation to treat the site holistically. **Duncan** indicated that EPA wanted to see what the comments were from the Public Comment Period before agreeing to delay work on SWMUs 5&6. She also indicated that it was her opinion that EPA paid more attention to the comments than a Recommendation from the CAB. **Roberts** asked if it would help for other parties to make comments also. **Duncan** said that it couldn't hurt.

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 pm.