



PORTSMOUTH EM SITE SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the Thursday, April 5, 2012, SSAB Meeting • 6 p.m.

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

Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Members Present: Chair Richard Snyder, Vice Chair Val Francis, Shirley Bandy, Gene Brushart, Martha Cosby, Ervin Craft, Franklin Halstead, William Henderson, Brian Huber, Sharon Manson, Daniel Minter, Michael Payton, Cristy Renner

SSAB Members Absent: Terri Ann Smith

U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and contractors: Joel Bradburne, Greg Simonton, DOE; Rick Greene, Joe Moore, Restoration Services, Inc. (RSI); Julie Galloway, Cindy Lewis, EHI Consultants (EHI); J.D. Chiou, Deneen Revel, Dennis Carr, Fluor-B&W Portsmouth (FBP)

Board Liaisons and Related Regulatory Agency Employees: Maria Galanti, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Facilitator: Eric Roberts, EHI

Public: Stephanie Howe, Ohio University (OU); Mark Johnson, Tri-State Building and Construction Trades Council (TSBTC); Geoffrey Sea, Southern Ohio Neighbors Group (SONG); David Manuta, MC2; David Brettschneider, Jim Jenkins, FFE Inc. (FFE); Kim McClurg, David Hurd, Operating Engineer; Adrian Harrison, Laborers 83; Lloyd Crabtree, David Ingles, Dave Williams, Darren Burke, Lean Kaaeff, David Snyder, Danielle Nameth, Senator Sherrod Brown's Representative, Brian Dean, James Jenkins, Clint Weekley, Johnny Reising, Jim McGraw, Carl Henderson, Jody Crabtree

Approved by Richard Snyder, Board Chair

Richard Snyder

Call to Order:

Snyder: I would like to call the meeting to order.

Roberts: I would like to welcome everyone and I will be facilitating the meeting. There will be a public comment period after the presentations. The board should stay within its defined scope and follow the meeting ground rules adopted.

April Agenda:

Roberts: Are there any modifications or proposed changes to the April agenda?

- *Halstead:* I make a motion to approve the April agenda , *Renner:* I second the motion
 - *Motion carried, agenda approved*

March Minutes:

Roberts: Are there any modifications or proposed changes to the March minutes?

- *Manson:* I make a motion to approve the February minutes, *Halstead:* I second the motion
 - *Motion carried, minutes approved*

DDFO comments provided by Joel Bradburne, Federal Coordinator

- Agenda
- Plant Updates
 - D&D: Process Building
 - D&D: Balance of Plant
 - Asset Recovery
 - Waste Disposition
 - Environmental Remediation
 - DUF6 Conversion Plant
- Budget Breakdown
- Regulatory Progress
- Public Outreach
- Upcoming Events

A copy of the DDFO presentation is available on the SSAB web site (www.ports-ssab.energy.gov)

<i>Question/Comment:</i>	<i>Answer:</i>
<i>Francis:</i> Do they work with OEPA on how long they can leave recyclables on site.	<i>Galanti:</i> The site is pretty clean.

Federal Project Coordinator comments provided by Greg Simonton, Federal Project Coordinator:

Simonton: I will save my comments for my presentation.

Liaison Comments provided by Maria Galanti, Ohio EPA

Galanti: The Final Action Memorandum for the Plant Support Buildings and Structures at PORTS was signed and issued by DOE.

Presentations:

Defining Piketon’s Future Vision presentation delivered by Greg Simonton, DOE Federal Project Coordinator

- Historic Partnership
- Finding Commonality
 - DOE/Community
 - Bridging The Gap
 - Communication
 - Cooperation
- The Big Picture
 - Vision Building
 - All Building Blocks Lead to Future Vision
 - What We Have Heard

Chartered as an EM Site Specific Advisory Board under the Federal Advisory Committee Act

- Critical Decisions
 - Process Building D&D Decision
 - Waste Disposition Decision
 - Cleanup Level Decisions
 - Considerations
- Path Forward
 - Establish A Clearly Defined Future Use Vision
 - Steps Toward Future Use Vision
 - Implementation
- Questions?

A copy of the Information Portfolio presentation is available on the SSAB web site (www.ports-ssab.energy.gov)

Question/Comment:	Answer:
Minter: Didn't OU do a future vision study and do 5 different industrial scenarios?	Simonton: Yes, OU did future use scenarios.
Craft: Beautiful presentation. Great layout of where we are and where we are going. As a board member, this layout really helps. Thank you.	
Francis: Thank you Greg for this presentation it brings a different discussion.	
Halstead: Thank you Greg, Think about how New Boston was contaminated and now the site is cleaned up and the area is prospering.	Simonton: I worked with the New Boston project. It takes a long time to develop. However, we should start marketing now.

Development planning presentation delivered by David Brettschneider, FFE Engineering and Technical Services

- Project Scope
- Report Development
- Objective
- Assumptions
- Positive Existing Conditions
- Negative Existing Conditions
- Existing Topography
- Possible End State
- Typical Utility Layout
- Possible Development Plots
- Suggested Remediation
- Possible Grading Plan
- Wastewater
- End Result

A copy of the Information Portfolio presentation is available on the SSAB web site (www.ports-ssab.energy.gov)

Question/Comment:	Answer:
Francis: What did you mean when you said the pipelines might disappear?	Jenkins: The pipelines might disappear because of the D&D.
Is it your understanding that this presentation followed the scope of DOE and could become reality?	Bradburne: You might be able to make the case to dig up the plumes if you needed soil for an on-site cell.
All the details we need to make these decisions. I want to make sure that there is a reality. If there is an on-site cell what is going to go into it. Is OEPA	Jenkins: We found many places where you can save money. Save some piles, tunnels, sewer lines, we might be able to use them and save money.

<p>going to sign off on this?</p> <p>We have no money. For recommendations, we make in the future we need to know, is this in general what people want?</p> <p>I want to ask Dennis does our recommendations, need to have specific wording.</p>	<p>Bradburne: With any project, you have to know what the finished product looks like. Make things fit together, attempt to get things started with what we think we have heard.</p> <p>Carr: We have to start with a plan for the end result. What we need to know is: do we rip it out or leave it. It is achievable; we have to have an end state vision.</p> <p>Bradburne: It is important that we have some vision of where we want to go.</p>
<p>Brushart: As a board member, I have sat here many times on this subject. Why not take all the waste off site? Is it cost and time? I find it hard to believe that any business would come and build here with a waste cell. The employees and the community do not support an on-site cell. Is it cost prohibited, to consider. I was told the time would take four times longer to ship everything off site.</p>	<p>Jenkins: If anything is shipped off-site, then the landfills will not be cleaned up. A cell is the only way to get the whole site cleaned up.</p> <p>Simonton: A vision from afar as a former employee of OVRDC, when you look at what Ohio's development has. I am not saying anything is dead. You have to make assumptions. We need to look where we want to go in the future and where we are now. These decisions are not easy.</p> <p>Bradburne: No one wants waste left on-site. Some of the landfills are officially closed and it would take some time to get approval to open them. If you had to consolidate everything, you might be able do something where you could dig up the plumes and use that dirt.</p>
<p>Minter: How do you assure what occurs with any project? We have to have a vision and then decide how to get there.</p>	<p>Simonton: The concept is if we are going to have an industrial site, we will have to have water and roads. If a recommendation were to go forward. You will need to come together on a vision.</p>
<p>Craft: Step forward with a vision that we can make something here.</p>	
<p>Halstead: If you go up north, what use to be the Rickenbacker Airport is a large industrial site and I think we can have that here too.</p>	

Administrative Issues:

Environmental Cleanup & Land Preparation (ECLP) Subcommittee Update by subcommittee chair Cristy Renner

Renner: The ECLP subcommittee met on March 13, 2012. Dr. C.R. Buzz Canup and Jim Bruce of Canup & Associates presented a presentation on Regional Economic Development. We had a good meeting. There is some hope in the future; we have one chance to get it right for our community.

Huber: I was disappointed on how they blew off the tourism. All we have to do is look to our neighbor counties and see that it is one of the biggest industries in Adams County.

Waste Disposition & Recycling Subcommittee Update by subcommittee chair Will Henderson

Henderson: The Waste Disposition & Recycling subcommittee met on March 13, 2012. We had several presentations. Marc Jewett, FBP presented on the Tar Creek Vehicle Accident, J.D. Chiou, FBP presented

on the Waste Acceptance, and Dennis Carr, FBP on the Landfill Disposal Area Assessments. Our plan of action is to continue working on several recommendations.

Executive Subcommittee Update by chair Dick Snyder

Snyder: The Executive subcommittee met on March 29, 2012. We discussed the top issues for the Chairs meeting in April. We also talked about Nickel Expression of Interest, the SSAB Habitat tour, and elections for leadership for 2012-2013. I am stepping down at the end of this fiscal year, I feel I have spent enough time as chair and now it is time for someone else to experience it.

Henderson: We also talked about some of the current board members become mentors to the new members, so we will need volunteers.

Public Comment:

Roberts: Mr. Chair we have several members of the public that would like to make comments so with your permission we would like to extend the public comment period to two minutes each if that is OK with you.

Snyder: Yes, that is fine.

Sea: My name is Geoffrey Sea. I am with the Southern Ohio Neighbors Group. Dennis Carr mentioned we need to have an end state vision in mind. This kind of proposal is coming out of the fact that enormous mistakes were made in the planning of the cleanup of this site and they were made by the politicians and DOE. Mainly the fact that the cleanup was accelerated and funding was increased at the front end before any of the important decisions or the public process to make decisions about what the end state or cleanup options would be. So now there is an attempt to backfill and invent an end state vision that has not existed. The plan that was proposed tonight is corrosive to community trust, disruptive of any authority and was insulting to Appalachia. Insulting to Appalachia because it presumes that people in this community are dumb enough to believe that if you build it they will come. The other industrial parks in the area are largely vacant. Why would you build another industrial park knowing that?

McGraw: Resident of Scioto County, and I am an elected township trustee. I represent 750 labors. We do support of the on-site waste cell. We know it will create good paying jobs and be a cost savings to the taxpayers as well and prepare the site for the new industrial park.

Henderson: My name is Carl Henderson. I am glad you are taking a group to Fernald. After you see it, it will alleviate some of your fears. I worked at Fernald. This landfill looked to me like it would be a mile away from the industrial site. I cannot image that someone would want to leave the landfills in the ground as they are now.

Johnson: My name is Mark Johnson. I reside in Ross County and represent the Tri-State Building and Construction Trades Council. We support an on-site cell. You want a site that you do not have to engineer around the landfills. You would want to be able to build anywhere on the site. The community wants the site to be reindustrialized.

Hurd: My name is David Hurd. I represent the operating engineers. From what I understand, the unemployment rate is high here. What would help is to reindustrialize the plant site and the quicker the better. An on-site cell would be a cost savings of a billion dollars and up to four years quicker.

Crabtree: My name is Lloyd Crabtree, I live here in Pike County. I am in full support of the cell. It is time to clean the site up. I think the cell would be well supervised.

Williams: My name is Dave Williams. I live four miles from the plant. I am in support of the on-site cell. Mainly for the fact that the regulations are higher now than they were when the other landfills were capped. I would rather have all the small landfills all consolidated into one. It does not seem feasible to ship to Nevada.

McClurg: My name is Kim McClurg. I am for the cell. I worked on the cell in Fernald from 2006, it was a good process. They are right on top of it, they know what they are doing and will do it right.

Anderson: My name is Cheryl Anderson. I worked at Fernald for 15 years. Yes, we do need the work here and Fluor and DOE's standards are a lot higher than other construction companies are. I did many different jobs in Fernald. An on-site cell is a lot safer than an open landfill and it will provide many jobs. It will be a lot safer and produce many more jobs. We need this.

Knauff: My name is John Knauff. I am a lifelong resident of Highland County. I have been employed here since 1972. This is a clean DOE site. My workforce is opposed to having an on-site cell. DOE and Fluor is not taking care of the workforce with the slicing of wages. I do not see how DOE and Fluor is going to take care of the community when they cannot take care of the workforce. I do not see how having a landfill is going to do anything for the workers.

Manuta: Dick congratulations! You have to maintain what is important and do not delineate from it. The issue here is going to depend on Federal appropriations, and I have not heard any discussions on that here tonight. In most cases, it is easier to have storage on-site, than to have to have transportation off-site.

Final Comments from the board:

Huber: I want to talk about the habitat tour. I was very pleased with what we saw. I was disappointed that only two board members were able to attend, but I understand it was a weekday and hard for people to get out. The woodland was some of the most impressive. Closest to a virgin forest that I have ever seen. There is more of that kind of land out there. There is more acreage on that western slope of that type. I was disappointed the southwest access road was newer and ran right up that creek and hollow. Did they run that road through that forest? Was there any consultation with NHPA before the road was build? There was damage to the property. Does anyone else believe we should go through the national declassification of what the details are of what happened here? Shouldn't the public know what has happened here? I think it is important for people to know.

Galanti: There is a public document of some of the information.

Bradburne: I cannot talk about classified information. The information that is classified is in our best interest. Technology that is my understanding you do not want to get into the wrong hands for someone to use against us and the other stuff is personnel information. We do not have anything to hide. There is a process you can go through if you want information and to ask questions.

Huber: I would like to ask for a tour of the waste cell site and what habitats are on and around the site. We walked over one little corner, we did not walk around the proposed site.

Snyder: OU has an annual site and environmental summary report and would like to have a couple of board members sit in the class. They would like to present their findings to the Community Engagement subcommittee.

Snyder adjourned the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

Next Meeting Thursday, May 3, 2012, 6 p.m.

Action Items:

- Keep the board informed on where the cylinders are going.
- Try to arrange a tour of the entire proposed site.

The Paducah site will be hosting the National Chairs meeting April 16-19.