

Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant Site Specific Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

May 21, 1998

The May 21, 1998, Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) meeting took place at the Executive Inn in Paducah at 5:00 p.m.

The following board members were present: Nola Courtney, Mark Donham, David Fuller, Vicki Jones, Ronald Lamb, Linda Long, Ray McLennan, Craig Rhodes, Bill Tanner, and Greg Waldrop. Ex officio members present were Carl Froede and Tuss Taylor. Representing ex officio member John Volpe was Todd Adams. Facilitator present: Steve Kay. The United States Department of Energy (DOE) federal coordinator present was Myrna Redfield. Also present were the following members of the public and employees, contractors, and subcontractors of the DOE: Jeannie Brandstetter, Edwena Crowe, Ken Davis, David Dollins, Shelley Hawkins, Raul Castaneda-Hernandez, Gary Hettler, Dennis Hill, Debora Jolly, Sylvia Kieding, and Kristin Reece.

The SSAB received information handouts as well as the minutes of the last meeting.

Steve Kay proposed the following items to be added to the agenda: report on the OCAW study and the Paducah Area Community Reuse Organization (PACRO) presentation. The two items were proposed to be added after the Bechtel Jacobs Company LLC presentation. The revised meeting agenda was adopted by consensus.

Ken Davis, a hydrogeologist with the Jacobs Environmental Management (EM) Team, was available again this month to answer questions and give an update on the Five-Year Review for the Northwest Plume as part of the EM and Enrichment Facilities (EF) project updates. Davis said that the Five-Year Review is a Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA)-mandated process that seeks public participation. He said the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Northwest Plume called for the installation of two extraction well fields and a treatment facility, or a pump-and-treat facility.

According to Davis, the goal for the treatment facility is to achieve less than 5 parts per billion (ppb) trichloroethene and less than 900 picocuries per liter of technetium. The goals of the ROD were to initiate control of the high concentration zone and mitigate the spread of contaminants along the Northwest Plume. Davis said the goals that have been set are being achieved. He said that the west and south sides of the plume are seeing improvements; however, the levels on the east side are not being affected. He said the core of the plume is at extraction well 229. There have been seasonal fluctuations of contamination in the monitoring wells. Davis said that contaminant levels started at 2,000 ppb and have been very steady, but the levels have returned to 2,000 ppb over the course of the project. Davis said the operating costs for the Northwest Plume are around \$1.9 million. David Fuller asked if the treatment facility started as a demonstration project. Davis said that the two-year time period for the facility has elapsed and it is now basically in a continuing operations mode; however, the Five-Year Review allows a chance for modification. Ray McLennan asked what data is available to show that seasonal fluctuations are not affecting contamination levels. Davis said that it is difficult to determine

levels due to fluctuations; however, the north well-field, being closer to the river, makes it difficult to determine any effect. McLennan said the operation seemed to be high-cost. Davis said that for the amount of contamination, the cost is rather minor. Debora Jolly, Bechtel Jacobs Company facility operator, said that the facility is an interim remedial action, and it is fulfilling its function of slowing the spread of contamination. Fuller asked for a breakdown of cost on the operations and Jolly replied about \$1.3 million. Ronald Lamb asked if \$1.9 million was taken from the project, would the money stay at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant (PGDP). Myrna Redfield said there was no guarantee that the money would stay at the PGDP, but it would stay in the Environmental Restoration program. Davis said there is a Water Policy in place and no one is drinking contaminated water. Lamb said that he knew of one family in the area that was not on the PGDP's Water Policy and was still using well water. Mark Donham asked how many barrels of waste have been created, both carbon and resin. Jolly replied that approximately 20 drums of ion exchange resin and approximately 20 drums of activated carbon have been created about every four months, for a total of about 80 drums a year. Fuller asked how this process could be done for less money. David Dollins said these costs are lower than what they once were. He said that the PGDP is just now spending what the original budgeted cost for the operation was four years ago. Fuller said that it is always good to cut costs when possible. Dollins said that they are looking for ways to cut costs without sacrificing quality. Craig Rhodes asked if the purpose of the project was to stop the movement of contamination. Davis said the purpose was to capture the high concentration zone and keep it from moving further north. Rhodes said that Jimmy Massey had once said that the contamination was moving a foot per day. Davis said that ground-water flow is about a foot per day; however, the contaminant or the plume itself is probably stable. He said the contamination is moving laterally as it moves north. Rhodes asked what kind of barrier the Ohio River was. Davis said the river is a natural discharge point for the aquifer. Davis said that below the river, there is a thick sand and silt deposit and that it is possible for some contamination to get through, but so far, only levels above drinking-water standards have been found. Kay asked for comments from the board on the Five-Year Review. Fuller said he would like to see cost figures on the operation. Donham asked if the Federal Facility Agreement had any consideration for the operation after the demonstration phase. Carl Froede said that the operation is an interim action. He proposed that the SSAB's comments consist of questions such as what can the DOE do to save money, what options in technology are available, and are there alternatives for the use of carbon filters. Jolly said she would come to the meeting next month to supply the cost information she had available to the public. There were no proposals made by the SSAB on the Five-Year Review.

The next item on the agenda was the approval of the April 19, 1998, minutes. Donham proposed that verbiage be added to Page 4, Paragraph 3, to reflect that information was to be provided to board members about a letter from the state related to the 2006 Plan on the uranium burial grounds. The minutes were approved as amended.

The DOE's response to SSAB comments was the next item on the agenda. Redfield said that all comments on the Vortec Environmental Assessment have been received by the DOE and it is in the process of reviewing the comments. Information will be relayed to the board when it is available.

Edwena Crowe, executive assistant to the president of Bechtel Jacobs, gave a presentation on the new management and integration (M&I) contract. Crowe said the five-and-a-half-year contract was awarded December 18, 1997, and has the option for a five-year renewal. Crowe said the challenge of the contract was to expedite cleanup, reduce cost, maximize subcontractors, and transition to M&I. She said

that Bechtel Jacobs is focusing on customer expectations. She said this contract would have very few management layers and the contract's mission was to have an end to projects and focus on completion. Crowe said that employee transfer has involved individual placement discussions with 2,100 Lockheed Martin employees. Approximately 1,525 employees were transferred to Bechtel Jacobs from Lockheed Martin. In addition, Bechtel Jacobs assumed about 400 subcontracts that were novated over from Lockheed Martin; these were reviewed in detail before being assumed. Another goal of the M&I was to align with the customers including Rod Nelson in EM, Joe Parks in EF, and Robert Brown in Reindustrialization. Crowe showed the board an M&I organization chart. Donham asked why Oak Ridge is divided into seven projects and Paducah and Portsmouth were divided in only two. Crowe said that Oak Ridge covers three sites and that Paducah and Portsmouth are together. Greg Waldrop asked if the support people are in Oak Ridge or onsite in Paducah. Crowe said they are onsite with the project manager. She said that another difference with the M&I is that the project manager is fully empowered and has cradle-to-grave responsibilities and manages the subcontracts associated with his or her project. Crowe said that 93% of the workforce would be subcontracted to perform all of the executed work. She said that there are 150 Bechtel Jacobs employees in Paducah and about 600 jobs are subcontracted already. There will be about 30 Bechtel Jacobs employees after the transition. Rhodes asked why this was cost effective. Crowe said that it was more competitive to subcontract work. Crowe said the M&I is encouraging its employees to support organizations that contribute to the quality of life. Donham asked who the customer was to the M&I. Crowe said the DOE and that Bechtel Jacobs is concentrating on making sure there is effective communication with the customer and that the customer is getting what is asked for. Fuller asked how many employees were laid off in Oak Ridge and if they were OCAW employed? Crowe said that no one was laid off due to this transition as of April 1; some of the people remained with Lockheed Martin Energy Systems in Oak Ridge such as with the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. She said there were some OCAW people at the Y-12 and X-10 plants. Redfield asked that Crowe explain where Jimmie Hodges fits into the organization chart. Crowe said there is a strong interface which includes Jimmie Hodges with the Enrichment Facilities, the program that Tom Tison manages for Bechtel Jacobs and Joe Parks managers for the DOE. Hodges reports directly to Parks. Jimmy Massey works directly with Jimmie Hodges.

The next item on the agenda was a presentation from Kristin Reece, president of the Greater Paducah Economic Development Council, who has been involved in helping create the PACRO. Reece has been in economic development since 1987. Reece said that community reuse organizations started in 1993 to provide local communities with federal money upon the closure of plants and to develop a transition plan to reduce adverse economic impacts. Reece said that Portsmouth is about a year ahead of Paducah with its reuse organization. Reece said that the Community Reuse Organization in Portsmouth found that for every one job lost at the plant, it can be expected that nine jobs would be lost in the community. The PACRO had its first meeting in August 1997 and looked at the initial impact area of the plant and chose people that represented each area for membership. The PACRO grew to about a 50-person general assembly. Workforce reuse is the primary goal of a community reuse organization. The PACRO received notification in April 1998 that a \$400,000 planning and startup grant was awarded and the next step was to write requests for proposals for consultants to perform studies for the transition plan to be written. Tuss Taylor asked if the transition plan will account for employees not picked up by subcontractors after Bechtel Jacobs and Reece said it would. Dennis Hill said the Bechtel Jacobs change does not affect Lockheed Martin Utility Services. Reece said the PACRO is not solely focused on either the Utility Services or Energy Systems side; it is putting strategies in place for any job lost. Donham asked if the primary focus was to get new industries at the site itself. Reece said that was to be

determined with studies. Reece said the workforce is the number one priority presently and economic development strategies would be next.

Sylvia Kieding was at the meeting to give a presentation on the OCAW Health Study of current and former gaseous diffusion plant workers. She said the OCAW project is at the three gaseous diffusion facilities to determine whether former workers should have medical screening due to past exposure. Kieding said the study has contracted local clinics to conduct the screening. She asked the members if the SSAB mission could embrace the OCAW mission and thought it would be a good idea for the two groups to work together. Donham asked if the OCAW was including older workers who had higher exposures. Kieding said they have trained people at the site to conduct risk mapping sessions to plot exposures. She said the study included screening for respiratory problems and hearing loss and blood tests for liver and kidney damage. She said no bladder carcinogens were reported here; however, the tests can be revised over time. Rhodes said he would like to have a copy of the assessment. There was an OCAW presentation being conducted at the Executive Inn at the same time of the SSAB meeting; however, Hill said that a full OCAW presentation was to be given at Kevil at 9:00 a.m., May 22. Kieding said the study was a health service and it needed community support for success. Waldrop asked how often the studies are conducted and Kieding replied twice a year in terms of the study's budget. Lamb asked if area doctors were used or doctors were brought in by OCAW. Kieding replied at least two clinics in each area were used in order to give the employees a choice in doctors. Waldrop asked how many people were involved and Kieding replied at least 3,000 in Paducah. She said they only tested for diseases where early intervention was effective. Kieding said this was a modest effort determined by budget and not intended to give workers false hopes. She said this could change over time and the more input received, the better the program could be.

The next item on the agenda was comments on the 2006 Plan. Donham asked if the state had changed its position on the uranium burial grounds. Froede said that the state made verbal comments to the DOE and said that the DOE did not consider the document a plan, but a strategy concept and the EPA does not review these concepts. Donham said this was the problem with the document in that the DOE is trying to say this is not a plan when it is. Taylor said that he had a problem with the budget being based on the document. Taylor said the concept came from headquarters, and nationwide, the plan might work okay. Froede said that the DOE is well aware of the state's position. Redfield said that the DOE requested funding for Fiscal Year 2000 and had to tell headquarters that some assumptions changed and more funding is needed. Redfield said the DOE is in the process of incorporating the extra need into the budget request. Donham said he did not like the blanket statement that the landfills will stay in place. Waldrop said that it seems that neither the DOE nor the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) would allow this to happen and wondered if the SSAB should comment. Froede asked the board to comment so that headquarters could see community interest. He said the SSAB is leverage for the DOE to provide funding. Donham asked if everyone had received the correspondence between the EPA and the DOE on the burial grounds. He said he wanted to object to Basic Assumption J on Page A11 of the 2006 Plan, which concerned landfills and burial grounds. Froede encouraged the board not to just object, but to provide a comment on what was specifically wanted. Bill Tanner restated the objection to a proposal concerning the Future Land Use section on Page A10 that capping the landfill is not satisfactory and other alternatives should be investigated. Tanner said that Assumption J is contrary to other items or proposed actions in preventing migration of contamination in the ground water and proposed that each landfill be studied individually and that capping all landfills may not meet the future-use scenario. The proposal was approved by consensus by the SSAB. Donham said the polychlorinated

biphenyl levels of 10 parts per million for unrestricted areas outside the fence seem high. Taylor said the state thinks this also. Taylor said the state concurs with the removal action but disagrees with the cleanup action. Froede said he supported the state in setting its own cleanup levels. Lamb said the SSAB should support the state risk numbers. Froede said the issue is basically that the state is proceeding along a risk-based number that can be supported in CERCLA, but the regulated Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) levels are higher than the state's recommended levels. Donham said that the TSCA standards are old. Kay asked if there was a proposal to object to the levels that have been indicated and if the SSAB wanted to suggest new levels. Lamb said it seems that the SSAB had to determine whether to support the state or TSCA levels, and he preferred the state's recommended levels. Donham proposed that in Section G, Federal TSCA Levels, based on existing data, that the SSAB support the state's position on the acceptable risk-based levels until evidence shows that they should be either more restrictive or less restrictive. Vicki Jones objected to the proposal stating that she feels the numbers are less than half of what is required by the EPA. The proposal was adopted with one objection. Taylor made a general comment stating that the most valuable contribution the SSAB had was to comment. He said the SSAB was not being very effective so far and suggested the board not wait until the last minute to comment and to make the comments more detailed as to why the board liked or did not like something. He said some boards use subgroups to comment on particular documents. Rhodes asked Taylor if he was paid to attend the meeting. Taylor replied yes. Rhodes said the board members are not, and it is difficult to find time for everything that needs to be done. Froede said the SSAB should make a general comment on how the plan is being used. Donham said he considered the 2006 Plan a major federal action that required an environmental impact statement. Fuller asked Donham if the board wanted to view this document as a plan and not accept it as a strategy. Nola Courtney asked what was the point of having these strategies, plans, and concepts when they were very expensive and time consuming. Redfield said that the DOE has some assumptions, and that the specifics for each of the waste area groups (WAGs) are not in this strategy. She said this document is a tool for projection and that the DOE is not closing the door to the public. Redfield did not want to discourage the members to comment because she said they may see things that the people who are so involved in the document do not see. Waldrop said that if this document is serving as a funding claim, it is very important that the board not count on anyone standing up for Paducah in claiming funds. Donham said that the DOE has split up waste management (WM) and environmental restoration (ER) in the document and wondered when they would be able to look at the whole picture. Redfield said that the 2006 Plan covers funding for WM and ER activities; however, the document does not cover the decontamination and decommissioning program and the cylinder management program. Tanner asked if this document was a true plan or just "fluff" to see who will get the money. Redfield said the Plan is a strategy in a way, but any changes to the assumptions that come after the cycle is over, additional funding would be difficult to obtain. Redfield said the budget cycle sometimes limits how the strategy works. Waldrop proposed that the SSAB disagree with the 2006 Plan serving as a funding plan because it seems to limit what can happen at Paducah. He said that viewing this as a funding plan heightens the fear that cleanup will stop at Paducah. Donham proposed to add that this plan is a major federal action as defined in the Council of Environmental Quality regulations. Waldrop proposed that this be added in the proposal as more of a question as to why the board's question of this plan being considered as a major federal action has not been addressed. The proposal was adopted by consensus.

The next item on the agenda was administrative issues. The SSAB draft work plan was discussed first. Kay said the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) was the only item on schedule for June. Dennis Hill asked if the board would like for David Allen to come back and talk about the NEPA

categorical exclusions (CXs), which were distributed to the SSAB last month. Donham said it might be helpful for the board to take one or two CXs and review, such as the one concerning the cleanup on the bursting barrels. Hill said that CXs are generated here, but Oak Ridge makes the decision for NEPA on when to do a CX. He said it is also possible to have a local NEPA representative to come to the meeting next month. Froede referred to the EMEF project updates and suggested the board choose some current projects to place on the work plan. Lamb said he would like to see fewer presentations. Hill asked if the board would like a project manager and a fact sheet available instead of a presentation and Lamb agreed. Waldrop suggested assigning people to look at different projects separately. Fuller said the board's problem seems to be not having documents in enough time to comment. At this point, some of the members volunteered to be responsible to the board for particular projects. Courtney agreed to be responsible for WAG 22 and Waldrop agreed to be responsible for WAG 6.

The office equipment and lease agreement was next under administrative issues. Hill said most of the office equipment had been ordered and received and they are still working on obtaining office furniture and a surplus computer for the SSAB. Hill said that he and Redfield have discussed the lease agreement with the DOE in Oak Ridge and said that the DOE would not allow the SSAB to be a signee on the lease and would not approve the lease because there was government space available to the board. He said that a purchase order for six months instead of a lease agreement was an interim solution and the order should be approved in the next few weeks for the office space at the Information Age Park for the SSAB. He said the board should have the office by the next meeting; however, the meeting would have to take place at the Executive Inn since the Federal Register notice requires a two-week advanced notification.

The next meeting will be held June 18, 1998, in the VanBuren Room at 5:00 p.m. at the Executive Inn. The meeting was adjourned.

Tentative agenda for the June 18, 1998, meeting:

- Minutes
- Information (Handouts)
- EMEF Project Updates
- DOE Response to SSAB Recommendations (15 minutes)
- Northwest Plume Pump-and-Treat Facility Costs (15 minutes)
- Local NEPA Representative on Categorical Exclusions (30 minutes)
- Waste Area Group 6 æ Fact Sheet and Q&A (30 minutes)
- Waste Area Group 22, SWMUs 7 and 30 æ Fact Sheet and Q&A (30 minutes)
- Administrative Plans for the Board
- Office Space, Computer, and Furniture (10 minutes)
- Review of the SSAB Draft Work Plan (10 minutes)

Action Items

- Provide the board with a breakdown of cost figures for the Northwest Plume pump-and-treat facility.