Future Land Use Committee
Meeting Summary
June 9, 2009
The Ohio State University Endeavor Center
1862 Shyville Road, Piketon, OH 45661

Committee Members Present: Lee Blackburn, Gene Brushart, Ed Charle, Andrew Feight, Val Francis, Sharon Manson, Dan Minter, Larry Parker, Terri Ann Smith, and Lorry Swain

Members Absent: Bobby Graff and Steve Martin

Board Members Present: Ed Charle

DOE Representatives: Greg Simonton and Dave Kozlowski

DOE-Related Employees: Marcia Bates and Sandy Childers, LPP; and Janie Croswait, ETS

Liaisons: Maria Galanti, OEPA; Michael Rubadue, Ohio Dept. of Health

Community Members: Geoffrey Sea, SONG

Support Staff: Julie Galloway and Eric Roberts, EHI

1. **Review of Agenda:**
   Brushart motions to approve the agenda, ***Motion seconded***.
   - ***Motion carries***

2. **Review of Previous Summary:**
   Manson motions to approve April and May summaries, ***Motion seconded.***
   - ***Motion carries***

3. **Review of Previous Action Items:**
   - Provide SSAB a footprint map of the Federal Site for Future Land Use, the map was provided at tonight's meeting.
   - Review of DRAFT of the Community Relations Plan, under DOE review.
   - Account of land previously transferred from the DOE.
     - There were 2 acres transferred to Scioto TWP Trustees for Bailey Chapel Cemetery use.
   - Provide Lindner Report to website.
     - DOE has submitted the report to its legal counsel to determine if this document can be placed on the SSAB website. The report was provided as a public document but

it includes information on private property owners and since DOE didn't produce the document, they are seeking legal opinion on whether DOE can post it to a website.

- ***Swain*** would like to add "Board Development" to the Action Items since we have talked about this in every committee meeting along with our Board meeting. ***Swain*** suggested that Doug Sarno and John Applegate help with our working relationships. I am happy with our facilitator Jim King but we need help with our work plans. The Executive Committee is supposed to look into getting someone to help us with developing our Future Use Principles.

Minter motions to add Future Use Principles under concerns/issues, ***Motion seconded.***

- ***Motion carries***

4. **340-Acre Transfer:**
There will be a second tour on June 18th, 2009 meeting at the OSU Endeavor Center at 4:30. The Committee discussed having the community members adjacent to the parcel be allowed to attend another tour. LATA/Parallax has to check into the budget and the availability of the archaeologist being able to attend the second tour.
Feight I tend to approach things from a historical prospective and the 340-Acre Transfer has caught my interest. I have been researching this parcel. It is a very important transfer because it is the first transfer from the reservation and the process on how this land is transferred is going to be a model for any further transfers. The agreements going into the transfer, any sort of determination of level of contamination allowed for this land is going to set the stage for anything else being transferred in the future.
Feight presents a paper "Promised Land Finally Here": The Story of 340-Acres and the Need for a Declaration of Future Use Principles".
   - Original Interest in the X-737 site
   - From a Proposed Nuclear Waste Dump to a Sanitary Landfill (1981-1995)
   - Promised Land: SODI and the Possibility of a Power Plant on the 340-Acres
   - DOE tests on the 340-Acres find Plutonium and Neptunium Isotopes
   - From a Coal-Fired to a Nuclear Powered Electricity Plant
   - DOE's 2005 End State Vision and the Future Use of the 340-Acres
   - GNEP, Interim Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel, and the 340-Acres (2006-2008)
   - Transfer Renewed and the Energy Parks Initiative
   - Future Use Veto Power: The Role of USEC's Lease in the Transfer
   - Conclusions and Unresolved Questions

Questions/Comments:	***Responses:***
Charle In your research did you uncover any reason why USEC would be holding out this parcel? They are located away from this tract.	***Feight*** What I have learned from talking to people is to prevent another company coming in and placing a competitor on the reservation.
Blackburn Can we get a copy of the USEC lease?	***Kozlowski*** We need to research this to see if we can release it as a public document.
Charle If you report back to us that you are unable to release this document we will immediately wonder why. You might want to supplement your explanation as to why you can't release it.	
Charle Dan would you say that Andrew's document is an editorial view and the information is accurate?	***Minter*** I think that it is an editorial view and some of the information may be accurate but it is more critical on what has been done with the 340-Acres

The Committee discussed the reasons behind Committee Chairman Andrew Feight doing the research of the "Promised Land"; some members didn't understand the reasoning behind it. Feight explained that he needed to understand "what is our future use?", how can we move forward when we don't have a plan? Some plans have been put out there and they are not being followed.

Feight stated that he feels that we as an SSAB Board are being ignored and he would like to build bridges. We need to figure out a process to help us become a whole community. If we carve up the reservation before we know what our Future Use Principles are, then we might invite trouble. We can't do it by ourselves. We need community help. The transfer is going to re-shape the reservation.

It was discussed that this is a starting point and we should not work in a vacuum. One document states that we don't have significant water supply for a nuclear power plant and other reports state something different. USEC has the ultimate say; we need to have a starting point. USEC needs to be engaged in whatever we do.

Swain I want to state my frustration, I want to be a part of the SSAB but if what we are doing isn't legitimate then I feel that I am wasting my time. Just look around at who is here and who isn't, SODI and the Steelworkers are not present. This is why I state at every meeting that we need Doug Sarno to help us with our Board Development and communications.

Minter states events that will go on outside of these meetings. I agree that we all spend time on these topics and I would like to see something productive and would like to see someone come in and help us with problem solving.

5. ***Public Comment:***

Michael Rubadue, Ohio Department of Health; USEC is required by the NRC to keep everything listed on what they are allowed to use because of the license they hold. USEC has to provide a financial assurance saying they do have funds.

Geoffrey Sea, SONG; states that USEC having to provide a financial assurance to the NRC is not true. I have followed up with people in Oak Ridge in their leasing office as well as the NRC. USEC has two different licenses and the operating license isn't in effect until six month prior to the D&D projects. DOE requires USEC to provide a financial assurance.

6. **Energy Parks Initiative:**

In our Board packets we received copies of support letters that involved the Energy Parks Initiative. These letters were from community members, local elected officials and Sherrod Brown. It was stated in this letter that Mound as well as the Portsmouth site should be considered for an Energy Park and it has all the alternative energies stated in the letter. The SSAB was in favor to this. We sent two Committee members to an Energy Park Workshop and we have had this on our agenda yet nobody came to us asking for our input or a recommendation.

Questions/Comments:	***Responses:***
Minter Energy Parks is a wide range of potential things and it brings a broad process to support this type of activity. There is a wide range of interest and once we get a closer look then we can pin point what we want but we need to get this type of thing going so other sites don't get the funding.	
Feight Would an Energy Park Initiative recommendation be appropriate?	***Kozlowski*** No, this is not an EM mission. We are not the one that is going to make the decisions on that recommendation. We are just looking at the cleanup perspective. Although EM is very

	supportive of Energy Parks, we are not the agency that deals with that. The recommendation would have to be forwarded to the appropriate organization in DOE.
Parker An Energy Park is not in our mission but maybe at a stand point of environmental issues. There needs to be a real strong educational interest for this to come off of the ground. We don't have much of a play in it but it does need a driver.	
Feight Why do these letters address Bill Murphie if it isn't in our purview?	***Kozlowski*** We will respond to these letters. Sometimes letters are sent to our office to see where our position is on a certain project.

6. **Preliminary Discussions of Future Use Principles:**
    - **No discussion**
7. **Concerns/Others**
    - **No Discussion**

Feight motions to adjourn the meeting. ***July meeting was cancelled***

Action Items:

<u>FLU Committee Meeting Action Items – 6/9/09</u>

1. Solicit interest in additional participants (including adjoining property owners) for 340-Acre tour
2. Requested copy of lease agreement between DOE and USEC, if publicly available
3. Committee members Dan Minter and Lee Blackburn will draft recommendation language on the Energy Park Initiative for review at next committee meeting

Next meeting: Tuesday, August 11, 2009 at 5:30 pm.