



*Co-Chairs*

Val Francis  
Richard Snyder

*Board*

Thomas Allen  
Shirley Bandy  
Lee Blackburn  
Gene Brushhart  
Edwin Charle  
Andrew Feight  
Bobby Graff  
Franklin Halstead  
Sharon Manson  
Stephen Martin  
Thomas Martin  
Daniel Minter  
Larry Parker  
Michael Payton  
Cristy Renner  
Terri Ann Smith  
Billy Spencer  
Lornita Swain

*Deputy Designated  
Federal Official*

Dave Kozlowski,  
DOE

*DOE*

Greg Simonton

1862 Shyville Rd.  
Piketon, Ohio  
45661

ports-ssab.org

740-289-5249

*Support provided by  
EHI Consultants*

The Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) met at the Ohio State University South Center Auditorium in Piketon, Ohio, January 8, 2009, at 6 p.m.

**Board members present:** Shirley Bandy, Lee Blackburn, Gene Brushhart, Edwin Charle, Andrew Feight, Bobby Graff, Franklin Halstead, Sharon Manson, Stephen Martin, Daniel Minter, Larry Parker, Michael Payton, Cristy Renner, Terri Ann Smith, Lorry Swain  
Dick Snyder, Val Francis

**Board members absent:** Thomas Allen, Thomas Martin, Billy Spencer

**Board Liaisons and related regulatory agency employees:** Marcia Galanti and Ken Dewey, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency; Mike Rubadue, Ohio Department of Health; Tim Walker, Ohio Department of Health.

**Deputy Designated Federal Official (DDFO):** David Kozlowski

**U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) related employees:** Greg Simonton, Jud Lilly, Bill Murphie

**U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Contractors:** Paul Mohr, Fluor; Rex Norton, Fluor; Jeff Pinkerton, Lata Parallax; Jim Thomson, Marc Hill, Eric Roberts, EHI; Kate Timmons, EHI; Jim King, facilitator

**Public:** Jim Thompson, Eric O'Neil, Melissa Hubber, Brian Huber, Brad Sherman, Vina Colley, David M. Manuta, David Green, Tressie Hall, Geoffrey Sea

**Call to Order**

Francis called the meeting to order and turned over to facilitator Jim King. Introductions were conducted.

**Agenda**

King asked for modifications to the agenda. Discuss election of co-chairs and a draft recommendation from one of the committees to the board. The Agenda has 2 public comment sections, you need to discuss if two comment periods are needed or if one will suffice. Swain likes the idea of two public comment periods to allow the public ample time to comment on things that come up in the meeting. There were no objections to having two public comment periods during the meeting. The motion was made and seconded by Minter to accept the changes to the agenda. The motion carried.

King asked for modifications to the November minutes. Motion was made and seconded. The November minutes were approved.

**Deputy Director Federal Officer’s Comments**

Kozlowski presented project updates to the Board. The presentation will be included in the minutes as Attachment 1. All presentations are available on the SSAB website at [www.ports-ssab.org](http://www.ports-ssab.org). Questions and answers (paraphrased) appear below.

| Questions/Comments   | Answers  |
|--|--|
| Francis: Where will these (poly bottles) be shipped?   | Kozlowski: These will be shipped and stored at the Nevada Test Site  |
| Swain: will you talk about a timeline for this process and the public comment period?  | Kozlowski: The public comment time is always 30 days, with the option of a 15 day extension. It will identify a general intended use for the property.   |
| Minter: The DUF6 RFP has a public comment period is relatively short, end of the month.  | Kozlowski: Let me confirm that.  |
| Minter: The RFP is incomplete, making it difficult to make comment on it.  | Sometimes that is pretty tough. We will table that for now.  |
| Snyder: It was mentioned a few meetings ago that the DOE Environmental Report was running a couple years behind. What is the status of the next one? | Kozlowski: They are running about a year and a half behind. We are working to try to get the 2007 report early this calendar year. We won’t have all the information for the 2008 report until June of this year. We’re on the fast track to get this report out to you and we recognize the timely issues surrounding this. |

**Federal Coordinator Comments**

Greg Simonton will be assuming the Federal Coordinator position at the PORTS site. Kozlowski: it’s a role that helps facilitate activities for the board.

**Liaisons Comments**

The board liaisons had no comments to make at the meeting.

**Public Comment Period**

Eric O’Neil attended to urge the SSAB to advocate for an accelerated clean up like the one that was so successful at Fernald. This cleanup work would create good jobs here. Public works money might be available because of the stimulus affect, and in the long term the community benefits. I worked at the cleanup at Fernald that finished early and under-budget and that project, by all accounts, was a great success. It benefited workers, contractors, the community and the environment and I would like to see something similar here.

Vina Colley, from Porstmouth Piketon Residents for Environmental Safety and Security, and a co-chair National Nuclear Workers for Justice, wants to see the site cleaned up as much as anyone, but I don’t want us to hurry up and do some of the dumb things they did down at Fernald. I also want to ask that we have an independent oversight person that we want to recommend, plus the EPA can do their testing and the DOE can do their testing. I’d like to recommend Marvin Rezacough who’s already done a pretty good, I heard of

someone who was going to review documents of the facility and I'd like you to recommend his documents because his documents are the plant documents that talk about the contamination at the plant. And I'd like Warren Buskey to come in and do samples, and has split samples with the EPA and the DOE. But the citizens want Warren Buskey and Marvin Rezacough. I'm concerned about the 340 acres that you want to sell or give to the SODI, the Community Reuse Organization. It said in the press release in February of 2002 by PRESS and Radioactive Waste Managements and he reviewed you're documents from the plant has said that moreover the contamination may be greater than is now realized. Traces of neptunium and plutonium have been found on the 340 acres that the DOE may transfer to the Southern Ohio Diversification Initiative (SODI). Groundwater in the 340 acres is contaminated with the radioactive-nucleis, plutonium and neptunium and these 340 acres are quietly distanced to the north of the incinerator and conversion facility. It says the land to the east of this facility in the direction of the prevailing winds is likely to be more heavily contaminated with these radioactive-nuclei but has not been seriously monitored yet. So this is a press release and I would be glad to give this to you to make copies for the committee. And I have another document. This is the needs assessment from of you all you can get and make a copy to each one of the committee people that talks about what is in and around the buildings. I don't think it talks much about the plutonium and neptunium, but this is the assessment the DOE did when they scored us for the Superfund list, though we've never been placed on that Superfund list. This is a good document for this committee to look at to see what the problems are at this site. I've been told they are calling back welders to decommission the buildings, they want them to start cutting. I have another document the EPA requested from Martin Marietta that says pine needles five miles from this plant are radioactive. I brought these documents so you could write down these document numbers and I request that you give it to this committee.

David Manuta, from Manuta Chemical Consulting Inc. I want to make a comment about what Ms. Colley is talking about where there are apparent locations at the site where radioactive material has been identified and possibly outside of areas where it's supposed to be. The analytical techniques that are used today, you can practically get to single-particle detection. I think the trade-off that the committee needs to be aware of is that just because you can identify it doesn't mean that there's enough of it there to constitute a health rise. I think we have to understand that just in the soil there is a certain number of parts per million that are there anyway, so the question is that the uranium that is inherited in the soil is a result of billions of years of natural processes or from something that went on at the plant. I don't know that we can come up with an answer to that. It's important that we put that into perspective. A quick hitter from Mr. Kozlowski, because its more for clarification, when you were talking about some of the activities at the X-701 B and the 740 places like that, you would mention low parts per billion concentrations of the contaminants found. But in the world I live in, we need to identify what was actually detected. My guess is that it would be trichloroethylene or other degreasing solvents. But I think it would be important rather than me dragging in 30 years of experience on what went on at the site, for you to tell us that its not radioactive, because you were talking about classification. If you could identify what was found, I would appreciate it.

Melissa Huber. I live outside of Waverly. I have been around Pike County my entire life. I moved here in 1997. I had no idea that the DOE site existed here. It wasn't until I moved out here that I started trying to learn more about it, started hearing about it and started trying to learn more. It was about that time that things were being shut down, 2001 I think was when the uranium enrichment process was ceased. I rested easy, but I was very uneasy about living in an area with this sort of facility. We are now trying to raise our young family and I have a lot of fear about what is to come of the area as well as a lot of hope of what will come. But, some of the things that have been involved with some of the proposals have been frightening to me. The most frightening this is the idea of SNF being brought here. I worry with the possibility that we would end up with interim fuel storage. I understand that something is being drafted that we would oppose the idea of spent nuclear fuel being indefinitely being stored here. What I would really like to see is for the site to be cleaned up as quickly as possible. We need to somehow find the funding to allow for a quicker clean up and open up the site to industry that will benefit this community. The kind of industry this community deserves, something that is safe and will bring jobs to this area. WE have what seems to be a unique opportunity with the way things stand with energy and all the possibilities that could be opened up with renewable energy industry. If we continue to hold this site open for nuclear, we will lose that potential. I also just worry that we continue on this path that not only will we not open the site for other industry, but I worry how this community will be perceived in the future whether or not we're limiting the opportunities for other industry.

Geoffrey Sea will be submitting to the SSAB two letters from the archeological society from John Hancock and William Romain. Both have studied the earthworks of this site and have submitted letters to the DOE regarding the works here. Much of this information has been submitted to either the DOE licensing process or the GNEP public scoping process. I urge the DOE to retrieve the public comments from the public hearings and to make this information public information that can be available to the SSAB.

## **Administrative Issues**

### *Subcommittee Updates*

Turned over to the meeting Francis and Snyder to discuss the summaries. Minter requested that the summaries be reviewed prior to the meeting. King emphasized the importance of election of committee chairs. Roberts stated that since there are no committee chairs that Francis and Snyder are acting as committee chairs and reviewing them once they are completed.

Feight stated that we have had two committee meetings now, one in January and one in November. Most of the business from our most recent meeting was a presentation from Jennifer Chandler, executive director of SODI. Ms. Chandler announced to us that the SODI board met in December and voted to withdraw from SONIC, which was behind the GNEP proposal and the spent nuclear fuel storage. That was an important piece of news to hear at this recent meeting. WE also discussed the role of Mr. Simonton as the coordinator of the SSAB and there were some concerns of his prior relationship with SODI and SONIC. Swain will be drafting a recommendation against spent nuclear fuel storage to be forwarded to the DOE. The recommendation will be available at the next meeting. Swain added that it was requested that SODI make a public declaration not to support spent nuclear fuel storage.

Snyder reminded the board of its scope and GNEP issues are outside the scope of the board, rather the mission of the board is environmental clean-up. Feight stated that this was not in reference to GNEP and that it does not cover spent nuclear fuel storage. Swain mentioned that there were forces at work to bring interim storage to Piketon.

### *Recommendation 09-01*

King reminded the board of the procedures and is assuming that they have been followed. King inquired if everyone had an opportunity to review the recommendation. Swain indicated that the e-mail came this afternoon. King went back to the operating procedures and reviewed the procedures. It was determined that the procedures were not followed, and King indicated that a board motion be made to set aside the procedures. Snyder emphasized the need to address this recommendation with the release of the D&D RFP. Minter can't imagine that there would be any controversy as the recommendation has community investment provisions that are in place at other sites across the country. Snyder makes a motion to suspend the operation procedures. Francis seconded the motion.

Renner was upset about receiving the recommendation this afternoon as well, but in listening to Minter, she's for suspending the procedures for this recommendation. Parker emphasized his concerns for suspending the procedures that the board worked hard to put in place. Feight feels that the board is not receiving the documents. He feels that the work has not been done for the board. Motion to suspend the procedures passed. Minter understands where Parker is coming from, but feels that the timing of the RFP makes it a pressing issue. Francis doesn't feel that EHI can be held responsible for the action, and agrees that the timing is bad but this issue must be dealt with at this meeting. Swain is concerned with dispensing with the guidelines, and knows that this is a really important recommendation. She feels that the board should have time to review this before having to make a decision on it. Board is reminded that this is just a draft RFP, and that this isn't the only opportunity to make comment. Minter stated that the comment periods are typically 30 days, and that there wouldn't enough time should the RFP be released the day after the board meeting for the board to make comments and recommendations within the time frame of the procedures.

King asked for any more comments prior to taking a vote on the motion. Motion to suspend the procedures passed.

Swain inquired if the DOE would provide funds to the contractors, who in turn, would fund the community initiatives. Minter stated that it could go either way, just depends on how something like this would be structured. Swain inquired about a clause that mentioned programs that supported on-going programs at the site, like the centrifuge. She wondered how clean-up funds could go to support the centrifuge. It was

pointed out that the clause in question was under the educational training section. Martin stated that there has been some education investment from the DOE at Los Alamos and feels that this type of investment is desired here. Feight and Blackburn feel that the educational scope is too narrow, and feel that educational support should be open. Minter stated that a scholarship fund that is requested is not program-specific, allowing for flexibility. Feight would be in favor of striking any language that specified on-site operations. Minter feels that it is important to train the current workforce to fit the jobs that are needed at the DOE and develop curriculum that can be used in the future. Minter stated that the language could be changed to an “including but not limited to” statement. Francis inquired how Feight interpreted the last bullet points under the education section. Feight stated that with the third bullet addresses his concerns in a general sense, but feels that the language can be cleaned up overall. Feight feels that the separations in the language do not need to be there. Feight continued that it is unclear what could develop as this project could entail. Minter stated that this can work, it has worked at other sites, and this is an opportunity for the board to fall in step with the community organizations. Francis stated that this gives the board an opportunity to get on board and state that other communities are getting the benefits of hosting the DOE, and that this community deserves the same benefits.

The board proposes the following changes to the recommendation:

- Add “in part” and “should” in the third paragraph to read “Currently the D&D of the PORTS GDP is funded in part by fees...monies beyond that currently planned should funds be made available...”
- Remove “optimum” from the first paragraph under the “Recommendation” paragraph. Add “strengthen the workforce” to the first bullet point to read “DOE supplement its current revenue stream to accelerate the cleanup schedule for the PORTS GDP to strengthen the workforce and bolster the economy of Southern Ohio.”
- Under the “Regional Purchasing Program” heading, include “direct contractors” to read, “...US DOE shall direct contractors to provide substantive preferences to southern Ohio businesses...”
- Make the second bullet point under the “Regional Purchasing Program” heading a second recommendation.
- Remove “US DOE PORTS” from
- Add “support to the economic development community” to the first bullet point under the “Economic Development support” heading.
- Remove the term “Matching” to read “Funds for Economic Development Projects valued at \$800,000 per year for the length of the contract.”
- In the third bullet point under the “Education Outreach heading,” remove “DUF6 Conversion, Centrifuge Enrichment and D&D.”
- In the fourth bullet point, remove “engineering, construction, and business that will” to read “Local secondary and higher education programs and training modules that focus on preparing local students for tomorrow's global and technical workforce.”

Minter made the motion to make changes and forward the recommendations on to the co-chairs to pass on to the DOE. Payton seconded the motion. Motion passed.

#### *Co-Chairs*

Snyder and Francis were elected co-chairs in July for the remainder of the year.

Minter made motion to continue the appointment of Snyder and Francis through end of fiscal year. Manson seconded motion. Motion passed.

#### *USEC Recommendation*

Halstead drafted a recommendation to relax the moratorium. It will be sent to the D&D committee for review and to make recommendation for board consideration.

#### **Public Comment Period**

Geoffrey Sea thinks the community package is fantastic, however, if this was distributed to politicians why couldn't it had been sent to the SSAB? It would have been nice to have historic preservation included in this recommendation. Sea feels that this has to be addressed and is necessary and that the SSAB is overlooking this facet. Sea questions who will be spending and overseeing this money. If it is SODI, Sea doesn't believe that this is a wise decision as they have not been forthcoming with information. Sea asks the board to give serious thought to the agency that will oversee the funds and look into the problems of having SODI handle the funds.

Vina Colley inquires how far the clean-up will extend and how much spent nuclear fuel was sent to Piketon between 1954 and 2000. She also questioned if anyone has looked at the water table here and wonders how much contamination is coming off site.

David Manuta is impressed with some of the comments made by the board. Manuta feels that STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) is an important facet that he was happy to hear further training in this area be addressed.

Buditz is surprised that the board suspended their own procedures to push through a recommendation. Feels that this is causing community distrust what is going on at this site. Encourages the board to adhere to their procedures. Also encourages the board to stand up for

**Final Comments**

No final comments were made.

**Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 8:38 p.m.