



September 19, 2013

Agenda for the September Board Meeting

Chair
Ralph Young

Vice-Chair
Ben Peterson

Board Members

Glenda Adkisson
Renie Barger
Judy Clayton
Robert Coleman
Eddie Edmonds
David M. Franklin
Tom Grassham
Kyle Henderson
Jonathan Hines
Mike Kemp
Maggie Morgan
Kevin L. Murphy
Dianne O'Brien
Richard Rushing
Jim Tidwell
Roger Truitt
Ken Wheeler

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.pgdpcab.org
info@pgdpcab.org

6:00

Call to order, introductions
Review of agenda

DDFO Comments

-- 5 minutes

Federal Coordinator Comments

-- 5 minutes

Liaison Comments

-- 10 minutes

Administrative Issues

-- 40 minutes

- Election of 2014 Officers
- Update Planning Session
- EM SSAB Chairs Meeting
 1. Top Issue
 2. Recycling Recommendation
 3. Attendees
- Recommendation 13-XX - DOE request an extension for the submission of the Proposed Plan for the Waste Disposal Alternatives Evaluation due October 20, 2013

Subcommittee Chair Comments

-- 10 minutes

- Burial Grounds – Mike Kemp

Public Comments

-- 15 minutes

Final Comments

-- 5 minutes

Adjourn



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 Meeting Minutes September 19, 2013

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) met at the Environmental Information Center (EIC) in Paducah, Kentucky on Thursday, September 19th at 6:00 p.m.

Board members present: Judy Clayton, Mike Kemp, Ben Peterson, David Franklin, Ralph Young, Robert Coleman, Jonathan Hines, Jim Tidwell, Renie Barger and Eddie Edmonds.

Board Members absent: Kyle Henderson, Glenda Adkisson, Roger Truitt, Dianne O'Brien, Tom Grassham, Richard Rushing, Ken Wheeler and Kevin Murphy.

Board Liaisons and related regulatory agency employees: none

DOE Deputy Designated Federal Official: Rachel Blumenfeld, DOE

U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) related employees: Buz Smith, Jennifer Woodard, DOE; Joe Walker, Bruce Ford, Mark Duff, Elizabeth Wyatt, Kelly Layne, Kelly Ausbrooks, Michelle Dudley, LATA Environmental Services of Kentucky (LATA); Gaye Brewer, KDWM; Jim Key, United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC); Eric Roberts, Jim Ethridge, EHI Consultants (EHI).

Public: Tony Graham, Elizabeth Fields, Mason Watkins, Gary VanderBoegh, John Henry, Mallory Panuska

Introductions:

Young opened the meeting at 6:00 pm, and asked for introductions and then reviewed the Agenda, which was approved by the Board. He then introduced **Blumenfeld** for comments. **Woodard** then provided comments.

Federal Coordinator Comments: None

Liaison Comments: None

Administrative Issues:

Young then introduced election of new officers calling for nominations. **Clayton** nominated **Peterson** for Chair, and was seconded by **Kemp**. **Peterson** was unanimously elected to the position of Chair. **Young** then asked for nominations for Vice Chair. **Kemp** asked for the rules for the current Chair being nominated for the Vice Chair position at the end of their term as Chair. **Roberts** indicated that according to the bylaws that that was possible. **Kemp** then nominated **Young** for the position of Vice Chair. **Tidwell** seconded the nomination. **Young** said that he had only one year left on the Board and

the position would have to be filled at that time. **Young** was unanimously elected to the position of Vice Chair.

Young then asked **Peterson** to provide an update on the CAB’s recent Planning Session.

Young then briefly explained what the EM SSAB Chairs meeting was and that it would be held at Portsmouth on October 15-17, 2013. He then asked **Peterson** to explain what the Paducah CAB’s Top Issue would be that would be presented to David Huizenga from DOE headquarters. It is as follows:

CAB discussions with local DOE have led the community to develop a future use plan that all parties seem to –at least tentatively- agree on. The Future use plan allows for DOE to accomplish its cleanup goals in a cost-efficient and timely manner, while staging the cleanup so that it best suits the community’s desire to reindustrialize the site and maximize site assets. In order for this very attainable plan to come into fruition, we need (1) committed, levelized funding from DOE, (2) action on the RFO, and (3) regulators to support restructuring of milestones to enable prioritized work to be completed.

Coleman: You mentioned a \$300 million something, is that for cleanup of the local site?	Peterson: Yes. That’s \$370 million per year.
Tidwell: I read in the paper today that PACRO had hired a company named FLUOR to help them lay out a plan and move forward. To what extent will the CAB be able to cooperate with these people to offer the information and services that we might be able to provide. You might already be in contact with them Ben and Ralph, but I’d like to know how we can help. We always seem to be going out to experts outside and I’m not being critical here. There’s a lot of expertise and knowledge here in this community. So, how can the CAB offer our services and the information of everything we have gained over the years to get the information to these people to move this forward.	Peterson: Certainly the invitation is there 100%. I reiterate every time the Community Action Team meets that the CAB is willing to help however we can to facilitate achieving the community’s goals. Young: Jim, I think we have turned the corner on PACRO. With the Mayor as chairman of that organization, she can help engage them and use that organization to our benefit.
Coleman: Now that the plant is closing, how long will this committee, the CAB, be functioning?	Blumenfeld: Our cleanup mission spans long after close of operations, so we’re here and you all are part of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, and it would be my expectation would be that the CAB would continue to be here.
Hines: Are the Community Action Team meetings open to the public?	Peterson: I don’t believe they are. The PACRO meetings are open to the public.

Young then explained that another item concerning the Chairs meeting was a recycling recommendation that would be presented to headquarters from all the CABs across the country, and was not for the local CABs to vote on.

Tidwell: Judy, this international standard, how objective is that, is it overly stringent or is it fair? Does it have in mind the commercial possibilities for jobs and all that sort of thing, in your opinion?	Clayton: Yes. The idea is that we accept metals from around the globe now that meet IAEA standards. But we have a more stringent standard than that. So my question is why don’t we adopt the international standards rather than having something that locks us down really tight?
---	--

	Because there is a delta of metals that could be reused that we are currently not, and it's to our detriment, our children's detriment, our grandchildren's detriment, and our national economy.
Tidwell: Where do our standards come from?	Clayton: It's a DOE standard.
Tidwell: What is the climate for changing to the international standard?	Young: Jim, I would say the climate is changing towards being more receptive to recycling materials.
Hines: Is this something you have already talked to Mitch McConnell about?	Clayton: No.
Coleman: In the process of establishing cleanup, has there been consideration given to something referred to as the New Madrid fault line, an earthquake fault line that runs right in this area?	Young: We have had at least a couple of educational sessions on how the New Madrid fault would affect cleanup, or waste cell. There is a lot of information out there about this.
Kemp: The University of Kentucky and the US Geological Survey just about weekly argue about the effect of the fault in this area. I think the issue is too complicated for us to fully understand. I wonder if DOE could develop an animation of what would happen to the liner and leachate collection system if we were to have an earthquake of a certain magnitude.	

Young introduced and then presented the following Recommendation:

Recommendation 13-09: DOE request an extension for the submission of the Proposed Plan for the Waste Disposal Alternatives Evaluation due October 20, 2013

September 19, 2013

Background

The Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) for the Waste Disposition Alternatives Evaluation was issued in May 2012. This document outlined the waste disposal alternatives for Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) waste that will be generated from environmental restoration of the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant (PGDP) site. The RI/FS document presented a technical evaluation of three waste disposal options that included the No-Action, Off-site disposal, and On-site disposal alternatives. Even though 11 locations were identified for the On-site alternative, only two of them were evaluated in depth and included in detailed analysis in the report.

Under the CERCLA process, DOE is required to submit a Proposed Plan for the RI/FS to KY EEC and US EPA by October 20, 2013. This Proposed Plan is required to include a recommended alternative for the disposal of CERCLA waste generated by the plant clean-up. If the on-site alternative is recommended, DOE is also required to recommend a specific

location on the PGDP site for a “CERCLA Cell” to contain the waste. In response to many inquiries about all the location of a potential CERCLA Cell, DOE is performing some additional evaluations of the five locations in the D2 RI/FS.

Since the RI/FS was published in 2012, there have been many changes at the site that will have a long term impact on the future use of the PGDP site, the clean-up of the site, and the surrounding community. With the recent termination of uranium enrichment operations at the site, the Waste Disposal Alternatives decision has grown in importance to have regional impact. Given the shutdown of enrichment operations and the pending decisions for the future use of the site, the Waste Disposal Alternatives Evaluation decision will have major implications for the economic viability of the region and future tenants for the site. Many of these economic decisions regarding future use of the PGDP site are evolving under the Request for Offers (RFO) process initiated by DOE.

Over the past year, DOE, KY DEP, and US EPA have recognized the importance of the Waste Disposal Alternatives Project by granting several extensions to the D1 Proposed Plan submittal date. With the current due date of October 20, 2013, the CAB feels that a Proposed Plan submittal will adversely impact the businesses decision-making process concerning future use of the site. The CAB also feels that an extension will not adversely impact the overall mission of site clean-up.

Recommendation

The CAB, therefore, recommends that DOE request an extension of 90 – 180 days for the date to submit the Proposed Plan for the Waste Disposition Alternatives Evaluation currently due October 20, 2013.

Woodard indicated that the D2 version of the RI/FS Proposed Plan was issued on July 25, 2013.

Kemp: I'm more that a little confused about the relationship between the possibility of redevelopment from GE/Hitachi and what FLUOR is doing for site reuse. And also FLUOR states that it's going to require 6 months. Don't we want to wait at least that long before a decision is made on the CERCLA cell?	Young: I think we put a window of 3 months to 6 months. I didn't necessarily want to have a Recommendation that would nail down DOE to a certain time, but give them some flexibility. Still, this is only a recommendation. The ball is still in DOE's court. They don't have to take our advice.
--	---

The Recommendation was proposed and seconded by **Coleman**. Recommendation 13-09 was passed by a vote of 10-0.

Subcommittee Chair Comments:

Kemp reported on the recent Burial Grounds Subcommittee meeting. He stated that the subcommittee had two questions.

- Would the regulators be opposed to excavation of the site?
- What harm would there be in delaying the decision of capping or excavating the burial grounds be?

Kemp went on to report that for the State, the decision to cap or excavate was more economic, because of the difference in the cost of the two options. Related to the second question, the State indicated there would be almost no harm in waiting to make a decision. EPA was more reluctant because of already agreed to milestone dates being pushed back.

Kemp also requested more information about the criteria used to make the decision to cap or excavate the burial grounds.

Hines raised the question that when the site is cleaned up, would it still be considered a Superfund site. **Blumenfeld** indicated that once the site is cleaned up, it would come off of the National Priorities List and not be considered a Superfund site at that point.

Public Comments:

Gary VanderBoegh: First of all I want to welcome Rachel. I haven't seen her for quite some time. I appreciate the opportunity to deliver my regular public comments. We've got a newcomer tonight. Mallory Panuska and I see Jim Key here so. We've been doing this here for quite some time now. I guess the first thing I'd like to, since Jim Tidwell, my former boss and city manager, and Robert Coleman here. You are all quite familiar with some of the board members that we've had, Jim is on the PACRO team and some of my friends are on the PACRO board, and I know Mallory has been looking through some of the financial issues involving PACRO, but quite frankly they are all the same people. I think the boards are called the PUPAU board, the PAD board, the PACRO board, the PED board, the PRADA (?) board just came up here recently. All I know about PRADA is I believe they make real fancy purses. But apparently, you know we've got these acronyms that nobody in the public can follow, so at the last PACRO meeting when the mayor was unanimously elected, I brought up several things and one of them is that you don't see any nuclear workers, with the exception of Jonathan and maybe Jim, now I think this is Jim's first visit here as far as I know. And we've got some of the, Kelly Ausbrooks, and Joe, so we do have some of the workers here in the audience, but it would be nice to look around and maybe see more of the people that worked at the plant on the board, I know it's tough to get them on the Board. But when you, Jim, bring up things like you don't like that last bunch but you like the new bunch, well they're the same bunch. And so, I don't know if you are aware of this but at the last PACRO meeting, I was the only member of the public that got up. Mallory was right there and I told them she wouldn't be writing anything down. Wasn't in the paper. Wasn't on TV. WPSD was there. But PACRO does do some good. The PACRO board members would not even answer the question that was there, that they do provide funding that DOE has provided PACRO. And if you want the information, I'll give it to you. I just gave it to a bunch of them today. So PACRO has been real busy, John Anderson, I have to say this. Mallory ran an article about everybody that is getting paid at PACRO. Quite frankly, if I was John, I wouldn't work that cheap. And nobody in this room that works for a contractor does, I'm sure Mark doesn't. Mr. Duff here. But what I think that you need to do is understand that if you want the truth, you need to at least let people come in. Robert is a friend of mine. And you heard the seismic comments. I will say one thing, when you talk about a radioactive dump site, it's not, I think you have see how they are using the word Mike. They just don't want Paducah to be dumped on, but anytime anybody uses a dump for a language for anything that I propose as I designed and presented to the people before Rachel, they're not dumps, they're illegal; you can't refer to anything in Kentucky as a dump. So that's just a misnomer that is easily corrected. Waste disposal landfills, and Robert you were there when we designed our own and operate, I helped to make sure, and Jonathan you were too. A dump label is illegal in Kentucky, I don't care wherever else it goes. Rachel has been with me, I interviewed with the young lady from WPSD, she's down in Nashville now. You all would know who she is. And people didn't know what to think of it. It's not a dump, it's a landfill. It's a contained landfill, and as I told you all, DOE now uses it as a defacto CERCLA cell. They actually got approval in the early days for CERCLA waste to go into the U landfill. But for fourteen years we operated that U landfill as a non-CERCLA cell, and Rachel knows

how good I operated it. I don't have to ask anybody for any publicity here, or any pat on the back. But go back to the CERCLA, all these people that are PACRO right now, you've got no communication. You're not going to get it Jim, I wish you could. But they basically have their own agenda and I've got to jump real quick to the FLUOR contract, I've got a copy of it. And Mallory was there when it was handed out. They're not talking about jobs, they're talking about inventory and equipment that the new contractor may use. So think about what's going on and maybe next time I'll give you a little more information if you care to hear it. But the equipment is valuable equipment. Rachel knows it. I know where it is. They've got the inventory. Why is Charlie proposing. Thank you.

Final Comments:

Hines reported on the status on the Cold War Patriots house that is being built for sick nuclear workers.

Smith presented Young with a plaque for his service as Chair of the CAB.

Young adjourned the meeting at 7:20 pm.