



PORTSMOUTH EM SITE SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the January 6, 2011 SSAB Meeting • 6:00 p.m.

Location: The Ohio State University Endeavor Center, Room 160, Piketon, Ohio

Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Members Present: Richard Snyder, Larry Parker, Shirley Bandy, Gene Brushart, Lindy Coleman, Ervin Craft, Val Francis, Franklin Halstead, William Henderson, Brian Huber, Michael Lilly, Sharon Manson, Daniel Minter, Daniel Moore, Michael Payton, Cristy Renner, Roger Scaggs, and Terri Ann Smith

SSAB Members Absent: Martha Cosby

Board Liaisons and Related Regulatory Agency Employees: Maria Galanti, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (Ohio EPA); Mike Rubadue, Ohio Dept of Health

U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and Contractors: Joel Bradburne and Greg Simonton, DOE; Julie Galloway and Cindy Lewis, EHI; Rick Greene and Janie Croswait, Restoration Services, Inc. (RSI)

Facilitator: Eric Roberts, EHI

Public: Stephanie Howe and Scott Miller, Ohio University; David Manuta, Mc2; Mark Johnson, TSBTC; Vina Colley, PRESS; Geoffrey Sea, SONG; Ted Wyant

Call to Order:

Parker called the meeting to order.

Roberts welcomed everyone and stated he would be facilitating the meeting. There will be a public comment period after the administrative issues. The Board should stay within its defined Scope and follow the Meeting Ground Rules adopted.

November Minutes:

Roberts called for any modifications or proposed changes to the November Minutes.

- *Halstead* motioned to approve the November Minutes as presented, **Motion seconded.**
 - **Motion carried, Minutes approved**

DDFO Comments:

Bradburne gave a presentation on the following information:

- Transition Progress
- Engineering Evaluation and Costs Analyses (EE/CAs)
- SODI Contract
- AARA Update
- Public Outreach
- Closing - Next SSAB Subcommittee Meetings-Tuesday, January 11, 2011

A copy of the above-stated presentation can be viewed on the SSAB website.

Question/Comment:	Answer:
<i>Francis</i> asked when SODI resells the recycled material what percentage do they get?	<i>Bradburne</i> stated that 50 percent goes to SODI and 50 percent goes to the U.S. Treasury.
<i>Snyder</i> asked is D&D contact transition date extension a money issue.	<i>Bradburne</i> stated that it was the complexity of the contract not a financial issue.

Federal Coordinator Comments:

No Comments

Liaison Comments:

Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (Ohio EPA):

Galanti stated the OEPA has two other water projects going on right now. On the 701B project, we are attacking the source, which is mostly in the soil. Then we will be doing ground water monitoring for the next year or two.

Administrative Issues:

Future D&D and Recycling Subcommittee:

Scaggs stated the Subcommittee was presented a presentation of sequencing process and priorities by Jerry McGuire. In this presentation, the Subcommittee learned the primary driver of the process was to characterize the facility.

Community Involvement Subcommittee:

Brushart stated the Subcommittee discussed a Speakers Bureau Presentation. In the discussion, the Subcommittee stated that having printed materials to hand out to the targeted audience would be beneficial. The Subcommittee has set March timeframe of having the presentation completed for the full Board to view.

Historical Preservation & Legacy Subcommittee:

Manson stated that Brian Huber did an excellent job officiating the meeting in her absence. The Subcommittee should be ready for a submission of a recommendation to DOE by the next meeting.

Huber stated the Subcommittee would like to mock the Fernald Museum with green spaces, educational displays, etc. The path forward for this Subcommittee will be a recommendation.

Waste Disposition Subcommittee:

Minter stated that the Waste Disposition Subcommittee had two meetings where Kevin Ironside talked about site criteria, and regulation. The committee drafted the Recommendation 11-01 with this information; it has stated twelve parameters that should be considered if DOE makes a decision on having a CERCLA cell. This recommendation is not stating that we want a cell it is primarily for guidelines.

Board Discussion on Recommendation 11-01:

<i>Question/Comment:</i>	<i>Answer:</i>
<i>Brushart</i> asked is there any other off -site landfill besides the Pike County landfill.	<i>Minter</i> stated that Pike Co landfill is the only one and was used only for trash, no waste. Anything going to an off-site cell would go by truck or rail and the weather would be a factor on when to transfer.
<i>Smith</i> asked if a decision on number seven (No Off-site Waste Accepted) on the recommendation has already been made.	<i>Minter</i> stated that number seven on the recommendation is a factor to consider.
<i>Francis</i> asked what the recycling timeframe is.	<i>Bradburne</i> stated that the CERCLA process typically is two-year feasibility with this comes public input.
<i>Minter</i> stated there was a good discussion during the work session about shipping waste off-site, how large the cell should be, what material should go in the cell, etc.	

Public Comments on Recommendation 11-01:

<i>Question/Comment:</i>	
<i>Colley</i> stated we would like to state NO on-site cell. We know these cells leak.	
<i>Manuta</i> stated number seven needs to be made clearer. Number three (Reuse Existing Landfills if possible) I have done work with a team on this and maybe we should have them look at this for you.	
<i>Sea</i> stated the Draft of Recommendation 11-01 is drafted in a way that SONG can support it. People need to realize that off-site does not mean far away. We could use land closer like a quarry or we could turn a process building into a cell then cover it so that we don't have to dig up the ground.	

Henderson motioned to accept Recommendation 11-01. ***Motion to accept the Siting for a CERCLA Cell Recommendation, Motion carried (needed 2/3 vote) 17 yes, 1 abstention, Recommendation approved***

Public Comment:

Wyatt stated I am a retired teacher living in Chillicothe, my son is majoring in nuclear engineering serving in the military for twelve years and I was wondering when he returns home if he could get a job here or is the work at the plant going to go away.

Sea stated John Hancock, director of the Earthworks Project at University of Cincinnati was thru the area in late December and three of the SSAB board members attended the visit. I would like everyone to send support letters to have five sites around the area become a Historical trail and I hope that other sites like ours will be added later. If we support Ross County in this then they would be more likely to support Pike County when the time comes.

Manuta stated that when Wyatt's son returns to the area the plant might not have the amount of activity as it does now, but there should be something for him to come home too.

Colley stated that she hopes that her son never works in nuclear. Do you have a signed letter from the high school student's parents that it was ok for them to be exposed to radiation when they toured the plant site?

Final Comments from the Board:

Question/Comment:	Answer:
<p><i>Smith</i> asked who verifies that it is safe at the plant? Do they know how to read the detection devices? If it is so clean, then why do we have to have the detection badge? I want to make a motion to have an entire subcommittee meeting to talk about the students going to the plant. I want it noted again that I voted against tours at the plant, I do not want to be sued.</p>	<p><i>Roberts</i> stated that the community involvement committee would look into it or at least gain some information on this.</p>
<p>I have a complaint regarding the NRC Meeting that was held on January 4th. Why wasn't I notified of the meeting?</p>	<p><i>Bradburne</i> stated that DOE didn't even get a notice about it.</p>
<p><i>Huber</i> asks if any explanation of the history and people getting hurt and the millions of dollars that it takes to clean this up was given. I am concerned that the picture that was presented to the students was all positive when the whole world is not made up of roses.</p>	
<p><i>Snyder</i> stated that six months ago, the Board was briefed on the CERCLA process, maybe we should schedule that same briefing again for the new members.</p>	

Parker motioned to adjourn the meeting, ***Motion seconded.***

- ***Motion carried, Meeting adjourned***

Next Meeting Thursday, March 3, 2010, at 6:00 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS:

- EHI to contact NRS about getting on their public mailing list.
- EHI will schedule CERCLA process presentation