

**Site Specific Advisory Board
Meeting Minutes
January 18, 2001**

The January 18, 2001, Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) meeting was held at the Information Age Park Resource Center in Paducah, Kentucky, at 5:30 p.m.

The following board members were present: Nola Courtney, Mark Donham, Judy Ingram, Vicki Jones, Merryman Kemp, Ronnie Lamb, Linda Long, Doug Raper, Craig Rhodes, Jim Smart, John Tillson, and Greg Waldrop. *Ex Officio* members present were: Carl Froede, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Don Seaborg, Department of Energy (DOE), Tuss Taylor, Kentucky Division of Waste Management (KDWM), and John Volpe, Radiation Control Branch. The facilitator present was Steve Kay. The DOE federal coordinator present was Pat Halsey. Also present were the following members of the public and employees, contractors, and subcontractors of the DOE: James Amick, Greg Bazzell, Sheree Black, Gary Bodenstein, Judith Bradbury, Kristi Branch, Gaye Brewer, Donna Brumley, Jim Chestnut, Greg Cook, Chris Cramer, Jeff Crane, David Dollins, Dean English, Ruby English, Bruce Gardner, Mike Guffey, Kristi Hanson, Todd Hendricks, Mike Higgins, Chuck Jenkins, Craig Jones, Norm Jetta, Charles Jurka, Vicki Jurka, Janet Miller, Andy Parrish, Walter Perry, Al Puckett, James Rose, Nita Bean Rose, Jim Skridulis, M'balia Tagoe, Corrine Whitehead, and Ernest Whitehead.

Agenda

Donham called the meeting to order at 6 p.m. and asked for introductions. He said Steve Kay would facilitate the meeting. Kay asked if there were proposed modifications to the tentative agenda. Tuss Taylor asked if the CORE Team Process could be presented prior to the Project Updates so the regulators could leave. Courtney asked if the Membership Committee could present some issues before the *ex officios* left. Kay noted that the allotted time for the Administrative Issues needed to be extended to 30 minutes. **The modified agenda was approved by consensus.**

Minutes

Doug Raper changed the date of the Retreat to read March 9_10, 2001. **The amended November minutes were approved by consensus.**

Site Manager's Comments

Seaborg addressed the action items from the November meeting.

Seaborg introduced Pat Halsey. Halsey is with DOE and serves as the Oak Ridge Advisory Board Coordinator. Halsey will now also serve as the DOE Coordinator for the Paducah SSAB. Seaborg will be the Deputy Designated Federal Official.

He noted the CVD company information was in the handout material. DOE has not yet received their unsolicited proposal.

Seaborg said the Board had been given a copy of the Annual Site Environmental Report (ASER). He addressed the timeliness of the report and said the goal for the next report is to have the 2000 ASER issued in September of 2001. He suggested the Board email or fax comments or questions regarding ASER to the DOE Site office or Pat Halsey. He said they would address comments at the next Board meeting.

He covered the Permeable Treatment Zone in the updates. He said installation had been suspended until spring due to weather conditions. He read an excerpt from a letter regarding the 2001_2002 Vortec limited demonstration.

Seaborg introduced Greg Bazzell of his staff. Bazzell addressed the leaks that had been discovered in the C_410 building recently. Seaborg said the building was not normally accessed. The building is scheduled for D&D. Bazzell said tests had been run in the area but results were not available yet. Puckett asked about the water in the pit. Seaborg said the water was more than likely contaminated and would be dealt with as hazardous material.

Bazzell also discussed an unapproved addition to a DMSA and how it was being investigated.

Seaborg introduced Gary Bodenstein of his staff. Bodenstein covered the different types of institutional controls and how they work. A copy of the EPA Guidance, December, 2000, was included in packet. Bodenstein went through the four predominant institutional controls found in the guidance. Waldrop asked if there was money exchanged. Bodenstein said this would be addressed in the Feasibility Study.

Seaborg said that DOE was going to go to landowners and offer information regarding the maps that had been handed out recently. Kristi Hanson had questioned why this was not being done at the November meeting.

Board Recommendations

No comments.

CORE Team Process

Seaborg explained the agencies that are involved with the CORE Team. He said they had met this week and the Life Cycle Baseline had been discussed. He introduced the members that were present and said they were present for discussion.

Froede said that right now the team was working with money issues and trying to reach a common goal of clean up of the Paducah facility.

Taylor said prior to the CORE Team process there were documents submitted to State, the State would review, send in hundreds of comments, and it would be back and forth to DOE. The CORE Team works together to try to cut down on the amount of comments and streamline the process of documents.

Volpe said there was a project team for all areas. He said the project teams were actually the heart and soul of the team. The project team does most of the work. Taylor said the system was not perfect but it was working and was a much better process.

Crane said that Strategic documents were coming from the meetings that may be a real help for the Board members who do not have time to go through so many documents.

Bodenstein commented that it was a good process that gets everything on the table.

Donham asked if any of these documents were available to the Board. Crane said the Operable Unit Strategic document was completed. He recommended the Board be sent a copy.

Waldrop said that the Board needed to be involved before the final stages. Kay mentioned that earlier involvement has been an ongoing issue with the board.

Froede said that none of the teams were decision making teams. They try to work through the issues. The Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study would be where the public comments would be helpful. He said the CERCLA Cell with Seismic issues was biggest issue at present.

Tillson expressed concern that documents upon which a decision was based shouldn't be withheld from the board, and commented that he wanted to see how things evolved as decisions were made.

Membership Committee

Courtney explained how the membership subcommittee had met and decided on the new applicants. Pat Halsey said that Head Quarters was trying to insure diversity on the boards. Ingram said that Head Quarters needed to take the region into consideration in its recommendations. Courtney said that census data could be considered

The membership committee reviewed the six current applications that the Board has received. After consideration of the demographics of the region and the makeup of the Board the committee recommended that these three applicants be considered for submission to the Dept. of Energy; Rebecca Lambert, Judith Duff, and John P. Russell. A fourth application would be sent as an alternate if necessary. Courtney asked for feedback from

the agencies' exofficio representatives. Carl Froede (EPA), Tuss Taylor (KDWM), and John Volpe (Radiation Control Branch) all supported this recommendation. This would bring the membership to the bylaws maximum of eighteen. After the required public notice (as stated in the bylaws) the Board will finalize the membership recommendations at the February meeting. Ms. Halsey will publish the applicants in the usual papers for public comment.

Proposal was made to write a letter to Kit Atkinson regarding his membership. Proposal to remove Mr. Atkinson from the board was approved by consensus. Ms. Halsey will draft letter and send to Ms. Courtney to be sent to Mr. Atkinson. It was noted that he had only attended one meeting during the 2000 calendar year.

Project Status Updates

The Drum Mountain Removal was finished for approximately 10 million dollars.

Work would begin on DMSAs in the February timeframe. Waldrop asked about the Six_Phase Technology Demonstration. Seaborg said the project is evaluated at the 30%, 60%, and 90% design. Bodenstein said the 60% was near completion. Froede said DOE had taken an aggressive approach to sedimentation. Tillson asked if DOE had not already paid for sedimentation control. Seaborg said temporarily.

Rhodes said he had heard a subcontractor had rented materials to handle concrete and rubble. Seaborg said that was true to make gravel for use primarily inside the fence. Tillson said it would take years to scan and evaluate. Tagoe said it had been evaluated radiologically free of contaminants. Tillson asked for information on how the rubble was scanned. (Tagoe or Seaborg said they would verify how it was checked for the next meeting)

Donham asked if these rubble piles were addressed in the WAG 17 document. Dollins said it had been determined there were nine rubble piles that were low_level rad. These were subparts of these piles. Rhodes asked if they were going to be disposed of in 746_U. Tagoe said she expected that would be the decision.

Seismic Issues

Chris Cramer, of the United States Geological Survey, (USGS), gave a presentation on the New Madrid Fault and the projected effects in the region. He showed slides and explained the difference in intensity and magnitude. The USGS data indicated that a major earthquake occurred on the New Madrid fault about every 400-500 years, and that the majority of expected damage from earthquakes in our region would come from these major events. The last one was the 1811-12 earthquakes. Donham requested a copy of the presentation for the Board. Smart said the Board appreciated the presentation but questioned how the information would relate to the CERCLA Cell. Cramer said that would be an engineering question. He said how a structure would behave would be dependant upon the design. Design stage would simulate conditions and take the information into consideration. Tillson questioned costs. Seaborg said costs would be increased as controls were increased.

Donham asked if there was more chance of smaller magnitude earthquakes. Cramer said our area was overdue for a 5 or 6. He added that what is happening in the New Madrid is not completely understood.

Dollins said the presentations were to put the project into perspective. He said a potential on_site CERCLA Cell would be evaluated as part of a Feasibility Study (FS). He said the FS is due June 25 to the

regulators.

Proposal was made and approved by consensus to extend the time for an additional 5 minutes.

Amick, of SAIC, addressed some of the Seismic Design Criteria. His presentation was based upon a once in 2500 year major event cycle. Donham asked if Amick felt it was using best of available science to use 1993 data, especially in light of the information in the previous USGS presentation. Amick said this was done by qualified people and they had used available data. He said that they will base their decision to locate the CERCLA landfill on the conditions at the particular site, and not on regional considerations. Skridulis said the work was done to see if we should stop now. With the answers they had gotten they did not feel they needed to stop.

Agenda

The CORE Team will continue to be addressed in the Site Manager's Comments. Seaborg noted that Fred Butterfield had given a presentation at the Oak Ridge SSAB meeting. The Board would invite him for the March agenda. Donham asked for a Board presentation on the C_Sparge and Six_Phase Technologies by the time the 100% design was decided. Seaborg said 90% would be a good time. A place holder for Six_Phase was put on the April agenda.

Financial Report

No comment.

Retreat

Kay asked for a show of hands of the members who planned to attend. The members not present would be contacted by phone. Kay covered the proposed agenda and asked for any changes or suggestions to be emailed to him.

Community Concerns

Rhodes said they would have a report at the February meeting.

Ingram asked about the memo regarding Stewardship. Halsey addressed the Stewardship issue. She said the recommendation contains strong language and suggested the Board leave it. Ingram proposed that the proposal be approved. **The proposal was approved by consensus.**

Seaborg said the Oak Ridge SSAB would welcome representatives from the Paducah Board to their meeting.

Donham introduced Judith Bradbury and Kristi Branch and explained how they had met with most of the members during the week. Judith Bradbury read the wording of why they were doing the evaluation of the Board. She said the Baseline Report Draft would be issued in March. The second part of the evaluation would be doing a survey in the fall, possibly March 2002.

Meeting adjourned.