

**Site Specific Advisory Board
Meeting Minutes
March 15, 2001**

The March 15, 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: Kit Atkinson, Nola Courtney, Mark Donham, Judy Ingram, Merryman Kemp, Linda Long, Doug Raper, Jim Smart, and John Tillson. *Ex Officio* members present were: Carl Froede, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and Don Seaborg, Department of Energy (DOE). Gaye Brewer was present for Kentucky Division of Waste Management (KDWM). 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: Greg Cook, Gordon Dover, Bruce Gardner, Todd Hendricks, Jill Holder, Janet Miller, Walter Perry, Shirley Speer and Stacey Young.

Agenda

Donham opened the meeting at 6 p.m. and asked for introductions. He then turned the meeting over to Kay to facilitate. Kay asked if there were proposed modifications to the tentative agenda. There were two proposals to modify the agenda — add an informal presentation on task forces and add discussion of a proposed letter to the Secretary of Energy concerning funding for DOE environmental programs. **The modified agenda was approved by consensus.**

Minutes

The February minutes were approved by consensus.

Site Manager's Comments

Seaborg addressed the status of the action items from the February meeting.

1. February 28 crushed concrete rubble.
2. He said five proposals had been received for the UF6 Conversion Project.
3. He noted the Environmental Information Center would be open the first Saturday in April instead of the second because of the Easter holiday.
4. He gave an update on occurrences since the last meeting: one regarding an oily sheen at Outfall 1: a summary of Technetium-99 contamination of clothing at 746Q; the February 27 unauthorized addition to a DMSA; a Notice of Violation issued March 2nd by the State of Kentucky, and that work is suspended in building C-410 waiting resolution of a problem with two valves.

Kemp asked why there is a seasonal high reading of zinc at the outfall. Seaborg explained that there is an ongoing problem at Outfall 1 related to runoff from cylinder yards. He said the zinc likely is coming from the painting DOE did on the cylinders at the request of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

Donham asked if a bid had been accepted for the conversion project. Seaborg said there is a great deal of material to review before deciding which contractor is selected. Donham asked who would be responsible for doing the environmental assessments required by NEPA and when they would perform it. Seaborg said the contractor would be responsible for the NEPA study.

Tillson asked if the conversion project contract would allow the public to see various costs. Seaborg said the board might want to make a recommendation to that effect.

After discussion, a proposal was made to have a subcommittee bring a suggestion for a recommendation back to the board regarding structuring future DOE contracts to be open to the public. The subcommittee will consist of Donham, Ingram, Smart, and Tillson.

Proposal was approved by consensus.

Seaborg explained how proposals are evaluated and procurement is handled according to the Procurement Integrity Act of 1991. He explained the concept of ranking bids according to criteria set up by DOE. Atkinson asked if the proposal evaluation criteria could be given to the Board. Dover said that the information is possibly on the Website but could be given to the Board.

SSAB Recommendations Status

No recommendations are pending.

Project Status Updates

The board was given a copy of the C-746-U Landfill Environmental Assessment (EA) and told public meeting would be held March 29 at a location to be announced later. The board also was told the Waste Disposition EA, an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis on Scrap Metal and a Focused Feasibility Study/Proposed Plan on the North-South Diversion Ditch project would all be issued soon. Froede commented on how the regulators had been “binning” the SWMUs related to the Groundwater Operable Unit. He said they had also they had met regarding the CERCLA Cell. He said DOE should get siting material out soon. He offered to bring more information to the Board next meeting regarding this discussion.

Seaborg said that he had told the Board at the retreat that the cell would more than likely be inside the fence. He asked Froede if this was correct. Froede said there have been about 10

sites under consideration. Those will be narrowed down to three in the draft document. Regulators are meeting in Nashville next month to discuss the possible sites. He said there would be more information to share at the April SSAB meeting. **The board said it would like such a presentation in April.**

Donham commented that he had received the CD on the Lasagna evaluation. He suggested the Board read at least the Executive Summary. He asked where the regulators stood on the Lasagna project. Froede said a Record of Decision had been signed to run the project two to five years. He said EPA is confident that Lasagna is cleaning up the site.

Donham asked what the difference is in Lasagna and 6-Phase. Dover explained that 6-Phase uses heat to vaporize the TCE and pull it from the ground for treatment, while Lasagna uses electricity to 'drive' TCE toward treatment zones buried in the ground. He said Lasagna is better in clay soils.

Atkinson asked if these were pilot studies. Froede said that the Lasagna was a Record of Decision. Seaborg commented that permeability of the soil is a big factor in using 6-Phase and is site specific. That is why a treatability study is being done.

Brewer noted that EPA is performing an unannounced RCRA inspection at the site this week but there was nothing to report.

Tillson handed out information regarding the North/South Diversion Ditch. He had two recommendations he wanted the Board to make. (*See attached*) After much discussion of the issue, there were objections to submitting the recommendations.

Donham asked if, in view of the objections, if this could be brought back to the Board after the members had a chance to read the information. He commented how Martha Crosland had said at the retreat that if recommendations were reached by consensus they were more effective. Froede and Seaborg said they would pass on the information provided by Tillson to others. Kay noted that any document at the meeting was a public document. Kay said this would be brought back to the Board next meeting.

Workplan

Halsey explained the two different options on the Workplan and presented the board with a 12-month Workplan and a three-month Workplan broken into subgroups. She asked for input from the board. Kay said some things are not of immediate interest, but the Board had kept them on the Workplan so they would not be missed.

Kemp said the Board needs the plan to address 12 months. Raper suggested a plan covering six to 12 months. After additional discussion, the board selected a 12-month Workplan organized into subgroupings. The decision led into a discussion on task forces and Halsey noted

the proposed new Workplan was broken into subgroupings by task force. She discussed a handout in the board packets to explain how the concept would work. Task force and subcommittee differences were discussed. Kay proposed the Board include in the minutes of this meeting that the Board intends to create task forces to concentrate on certain areas of work. The Board members should consider which area they would like to serve and return in April with their requested assignments. **Proposal was approved by consensus.**

Long commented she would like to consider the surface water task force.

Review of Agenda

A presentation on possible locations for a CERCLA cell was added to the April agenda. Time was allotted in April for discussion of Tillson's proposed recommendations concerning the North-South Diversion Ditch.

Retreat Follow Up

Kay said the need for a subcommittee to bring to the Board a recommended set of bylaws had been discussed at the retreat. Courtney, Long, and Raper agreed to serve on the subcommittee. Halsey said if members had comments on any of the bylaws to get them to one of the subcommittee members. She said they could e-mail their comments or suggestions to her.

Kay said the proposal to allow another DiG employee work on the minutes before they are sent to the chairperson had been suggested. **Proposal was approved by consensus.**

A proposal for the Board to have a quarterly newsletter had been discussed. The staff was instructed to create a draft. **Proposal was approved by consensus.**

Young covered the action items that had been taken at the retreat.

1. Maps that John Morgan had used will be provided to Board.
2. John Morgan will be invited to May SSAB meeting to make a presentation about Lifecycle Baseline and budget issues.
3. Technical experts supporting presentations will be asked to set in front for ease in answering questions.
4. Rowton Sound will be contacted regarding taping/amplifying meetings.
5. Channel Two would be willing to air parts of the SSAB meetings, but Board would have to hire taping. Young will obtain cost estimates.
6. Copy of Common Values provided for Board office.

Proposed Letter to Energy Secretary from DOE EMSSAB

The national Sites Specific Advisory Board wants to send a letter to Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham urging DOE to provide adequate funding for cleanup programs. Young noted there

were two versions of the proposed letter in the packet for review. Donham said he was more comfortable with the February 28 version. Young noted that the subject would be discussed on the chairs conference call one week from today. The board supported the concept of the letter and a proposal was made to allow Donham to decide on what wording the letter would use. **Proposal was approved by consensus.**

Subcommittee Reports

Community Concerns

No comment.

Community Relations

No comment.

Consultant

No comment.

Membership

Courtney said Young is compiling the membership packet. She said the committee had discussed the maximum length of time a member should serve. They also had considered the attendance issues. She noted that an attendance sheet was included in the meeting packet and asked for comment from the Board. After discussion, it was decided to place this sheet in each month's meeting packet. Attendance requirements were discussed and Seaborg commented that whatever the Board did in regard to attendance requirements, DOE needed it to be consistent.

Finance

Raper commented that progress was being made on the financial information provided to the board.

Meeting adjourned.