



Waste Disposition Committee

Meeting Summary

June 11, 2009 • 4:30 pm.

The Ohio State University Endeavor Center
1862 Shyville Road, Piketon, OH 45661

Committee Members Present: Lee Blackburn, Lorry Swain and Larry Parker

Members Absent: Shirley Bandy and Terri Ann Smith

Board Members Present: Michael Payton

DOE Representatives: Greg Simonton, Dave Kozlowski, and Melda Rafferty

DOE-Related Employees: Marsha Bates, Sandy Childers, and Bill Franz, LPP; Janie Crowwait, RSI;

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

Support Staff: Julie Galloway and Eric Roberts, EHI

1. Review of Agenda:

Parker motions to approve the agenda, **Motion seconded.**

- **Motion carries**

2. Review of Previous Summary:

Blackburn motions to approve May summary, **Motion seconded.**

- **Motion carries**

3. Waste Disposition Project Updates:

DDFO Comments:

- Introduction of Joel Bradburne, new DOE site lead for PORTS site
- RFP issued on June 4, 2009, Facility Support Services (FSS) contract
- Committee requested USEC lease in redacted form
 - GDP Lease and amendments on EM Consolidated Business Center (CBC) website
- Covered the Press Releases dated June 4, 2009
 - Stimulus Hiring
 - DOE RFP

Franz, covered the monthly status report.

- Total Waste Shipments for May
- Excess Materials Disposition
- Lube Oil/Pyranol Disposition
- Small Cylinders Disposition Phase II
- DOE Material Storage Areas 11 and 12
- Polybottle Disposition

4. **Public Comment:**

Melody Stewart OEPA; We offer any support for any issue or question that the subcommittee might have.

Michael Rubadue, Ohio Department of Health; We offer the same support. We have historical records of WAC's and data related to Fernald.

5. **Recycle Metals**

Parker discussed the Green Initiative Recycling Recommendation Letter; the letter was drafted as a consensus product of the EM SSAB Chairs meeting at Savannah River. The intent of the letter was to ask the Assistant Secretary to look at recycling issue. Roberts believes that 7 of 8 boards have passed this letter.

Swain states, "I am not in favor of signing the letter for the following reasons:

" There is movement within the DOE to weaken the moratorium and/or do away with the suspension. It could be perceived that this letter contributes to an effort to disregard the suspension or that this letter could be seen as demonstrating consensus among all the SSABs to undo the suspension or weaken the moratorium or to use the loopholes in these policies. Such a consensus does not exist."

"We have not had a public discussion at Piketon on the issues of the suspension and moratorium policies, their background and their loopholes. It's possible that our community members-at-large are not even aware of the suspension policy, its background and its loopholes and of the ramifications of weakening these policies. Also, during this past month I spoke with various people living around Paducah and was informed that many citizens there are opposed to this attempt to "recycle" the contaminated nickel and other metals from the Paducah site."

"The suspension was put in place in the year 2000 to prevent potentially contaminated metals from being sent to recyclers. But there are large, unintended loopholes in the suspension policy. For instance, potentially contaminated metals could be moved to non-control areas and later released. That loophole was suggested by one of our SSAB members at a previous meeting when we were discussing SODI taking possession of metals from the DOE reservation and then having SODI recycle the metals. Also, contaminated materials may be present outside the currently designated radiological control areas. Also, there is an assumption that surface radioactive contamination can be removed, but it cannot be fully removed, and therefore, during recycling-melting the final products could all be volumetrically contaminated."

"Although restricted release for use within the DOE complex might sound like a logical possibility for contaminated materials, I would argue that the contaminated materials should not be released at all. If they are no longer regulated, but used within the DOE complex, they could subsequently be released out of the DOE complex. In other words, restricted release could become a middle step to allowing release into the regular marketplace."

"Regarding a new steel mill dedicated to recycling contaminated metals from the DOE complex (which is an unspoken element of the letter) the potential for such a facility was studied in the year 2000. The study concluded that because there were too many uncertainties in the extremely high estimated costs, the lack of demand for recycled contaminated metals and uncertainties about methods for recycling the

contaminated metals, the concept of such a facility could not be accepted or rejected. That conclusion about high costs and low market demand was made long before our present financial and environmental crises became so clear.”

Blackburn, How does DOE protect the public from “free-lease” and what are the efforts of control?

Parker motions to write up reasons to provide to the full Board on why the committee will not support the Green Initiative Letter and provide this at the August full Board meeting,

Motion seconded

o **Motion carries**

The committee will decide via email whether or not to have a July meeting.

Meeting Adjourned

Next meeting: Thursday, August 13, 2009 at 4:30 pm.