



**PORTSMOUTH EM
SITE SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD**

Minutes of the Thursday, May 3, 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; Shirley Bandy, Gene Brushart, Martha Cosby, Ervin Craft, Franklin Halstead, Brian Huber, Sharon Manson, Daniel Minter, Cristy Renner, Terri Ann Smith

SSAB Members Absent: Vice Chair Val Francis, William Henderson, Michael Payton

U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and contractors: Joel Bradburne, Vince Adams, Greg Simonton, Johnny Reising, DOE; Rick Greene, Restoration Services, Inc. (RSI); Ed Holmes, Julie Galloway, Cindy Lewis, EHI Consultants (EHI); J.D. Chiou, Deneen Revel, Dennis Carr, Karen Price, Jim Thompson, Fluor-B&W Portsmouth (FBP)

Liaisons: Maria Galanti, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); Mike Rubadue, Ohio Department of Health (ODH)

Facilitator: Brad Hughes, Porter and Wright Associates

Public: Bo Henderson, Maureen Fischels, Joey Crabtree, Dave Williams, John Knauff, Herman Potter USW President, Mark Johnson, Tri-State Building and Construction Trades Council (TSBTC); David Manuta, MC2

Approved by Richard Snyder, Board Chair

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Richard H. Snyder".

Richard Snyder

Call to Order:

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

Hughes: I would like to introduce myself. I am Brad Hughes from Porter and Wright Associates. I will be facilitating the meeting.

May Agenda:

Hughes: Are there any modifications or proposed changes to the May agenda?

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

April Minutes:

Hughes: Are there any modifications or proposed changes to the April minutes?

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

DDFO comments provided by Joel Bradburne, Deputy Designated Federal Official (DDFO):

- Agenda
- Process Buildings
- Balance of Plant
- Waste Disposition
- Asset Recovery
- Environmental Remediation
- DUF6 Conversion Plant
- Regulatory Progress
- Site Acknowledgements
- Public Outreach
- Upcoming Events

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

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

Simonton: I will hold my comments until my presentation.

Liaison comments provided by Maria Galanti, Ohio EPA

Galanti: We started the X-100 Complex reviews today. We are working hard on waste disposition options. We are still looking at putting in additional groundwater-monitoring wells, which we are still doing pump and treat.

Liaison comments provided by Mike Rubadue, ODH

Rubadue: The department is continuing to support OEPA.

Presentations:

Community Commitment Plan Update presentation delivered by Jerry Schneider, Fluor B&W:

- Four Categories of Commitment
- Educational Outreach
- Contributions to American Red Cross Comes in Several Ways
- Regional Purchasing
- Economic Development Work On Track
- Community Commitment Plan Revised, Updated
- Regional Planning Process Progressing
- Regional Economic Development Strategy
- Community Commitment Plan Report

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

Question/Comment:	Answer:
Manson: I met with Representative Rosenberger last Friday where he was announcing they are forming an economic development task force. This is the very thing that we have been talking about in our meetings.	Snyder: This is wonderful news. That is the kind of support we have been wanting for a while.
Smith: Who are the owners of Fluor and B&W? Is it two companies? Who is Fluor's CEO? Who is B&W's CEO?	Snyder: Yes, two companies, stockholders own Fluor. David Seaton is Fluor's CEO. I am not sure about B&W's, however you can find that on its web site.

Waste Disposition Considerations Vision presentation delivered by Greg Simonton, DOE Federal Project Coordinator:

- Introduction
- The Big Picture
- Waste Materials
- WAC Considerations
- Path Forward To Recommendation
- Questions

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

Question/Comment:	Answer:
Minter: In the first set of board meetings we talked about waste	Simonton: Yes, the issues are still the same.

<p>disposition path and how clean is clean and what's the end use. That has not changed a whole lot.</p>	
<p>Brushart: At this point, what is the estimate of waste that has already been moved?</p>	<p>Simonton: We will check on that and let you know at the subcommittee meeting Tuesday.</p>
<p>Halstead: Will it be possible for contaminated asbestos material to go into the cell?</p> <p>I think everyone would agree that all the sidewalks could go into an on-site waste cell. The 14% processed gas equipment is the issue.</p>	<p>Chiou: Yes</p>
<p>Smith: I want to see the whole DOE site completely gone out of here. If everyone agreed and we said, take all the waste off-site would it all go?</p>	<p>Simonton: It is the department's decision, but you are part of the process, along with other groups.</p>
<p>Bandy: We were told the estimated waste is 2.2 million in comparison how much is already in the existing landfills?</p>	<p>Simonton: Two million is in the existing landfills plus the additional estimated 2.2 million.</p>
<p>Huber: Interesting quote here, "decide what you want, decide what you are willing to trade for it." People are asking if we get a bribe, if we take the cell, then we get a better cleanup.</p>	<p>Simonton: There has to be a balance. If you build a cell, then it gives you justification to dig up the landfills. It is a decision you need to weigh out.</p> <p>Adams: There is no trade-off. All we are saying is if there is an on-site cell we have the opportunity to dig up the landfills for fill dirt.</p>

National Chairs Conference Overview by Dick Snyder and Cristy Renner:

Snyder: We had an interesting time at the Chairs meeting. We heard from Senior Advisor for Environmental Management, David Huizenga, waste disposition strategies from Frank Marcinowski, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Technical and Regulatory Support, and a budget update from Terry Tyborowski, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Budget and Program Planning. The EM SSAB Chairs developed a recommendation to thank David Huizenga. This document is an up or down vote.

Public Comments:

Knauff: My name is John Knauff. I have worked here for 40 years. I do not get here in time to hear the whole letter, but in my view, I do not see this board representing the opportunity for this community to have comment. As a member of the public, I am not seeing the value of this board right now.

**Board Comments on EM SSAB Chairs' Recommendation 2011#
 David Huizenga, Thank You Letter:**

Brushart: Who composed the letter, was it a joint effort?	Snyder: Yes, it was a joint effort with all the chairs together.
Smith: The letter is useless. Taxpayer funding for the board is useless. This is a useless board. It does not represent any decisions by the people. The public would be more served by doing their own research on the internet and lobbying and voting on their own behalf and get into positions where their vote counts because decisions through this board do not count. It is a waste of taxpayers' money. That's why I voted no.	Mason: The members of this board and other boards from across the states, none of us are paid, we are all volunteers. We give up our own time, which is valuable. I do think it is a value with all the hours we put in to this board. If you cut the funds then we might not be able to do the things we need to do to provide information to the public. Therefore, I do think the hours we put into this board are valuable.
	Simonton: Your board was represented very well. They were front and center. They stepped up and asked the tough questions and the most questions. They had a very important role. You did a great job.

Manson: I would like to make a motion to approve the EM SSAB Chairs' Recommendation 2011# - David Huizenga, Thank You Letter. **Craft:** I would like to second the motion.

The vote is 10 approvals, 1 opposed, we need 8 to approve, motion approved.

Administrative Issues:

Recycling Recommendation 12-01:

Public Comments on Recommendation 12-01: None

Board Comments on Recommendation 12-01:

Smith: The letter should have a list of specific materials that are being recommended to be recycled. Are you going to recommend recycling depleted uranium? The public should know what materials are going to be recycled. It is all contaminated. It would just be one more paragraph.	<p>Snyder: No, the recommendation is broad enough.</p> <p>Halstead: Anything contaminated will not be recycled OEPA and Fluor are required that nothing contaminated can be recycled.</p> <p>Renner: It would be things that you would recycle at your own household. This is just a recommendation not an article that lists everything. There would be thousands of items. Then if we forget something, we have to go thru this whole</p>
--	--

	<p>process again. I would highly recommend you (Smith) to come to more meetings and learn this stuff instead of getting everything off the internet.</p> <p>Rubadue: Every steel mill in Ohio has contaminated waste. The landfills are not allowed to take anything contaminated if we find contaminated materials. It would be sent back to the originator.</p>
<p>Huber: 150% per ton seems like a lot. I do not know if I would want to pay this much. I do not support materials from other sites coming here.</p>	
<p>Brushart: How does that work if you have recycling materials from other sites?</p>	<p>Renner: That is why we want to bring in the Edison group and Battele to tell us what new technology is out there. We want to make it safe and create jobs.</p>

Craft: I would like to make a motion to approve Recommendation 12-01. **Halstead:** I would like to second the motion. **Minter:** I abstain from this vote.

The vote is 8 voted approvals, 2 opposed and 1 abstained. Motion approved.

Site Legacy Subcommittee Update by subcommittee Vice-chair Brian Huber:

Huber: The Site Legacy Subcommittee met on April 10, 2012. We had a presentation on National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) item salvage delivered by Marc Hill, Fluor-B&W. It was a very interesting presentation.

Executive Subcommittee Update by Chair Dick Snyder:

Snyder: The Executive subcommittee met on April 26, 2012. Will Henderson asked to be excused because of military duties for the summer. It had been suggested we move the public comment period to the beginning of the meeting. The board is following the same practice, as across the complex, so public comments will stay at the end of the meeting.

Environmental Cleanup & Land Preparation (ECLP) Subcommittee Update by Subcommittee Chair Cristy Renner:

Renner: The ECLP subcommittee met on April 10, 2012. **Simonton** talked to us about the WAC. We would like to have a presentation to the full board on the WAC.

Waste Disposition Subcommittee Update by Cristy Renner.

Renner: The Waste Disposition subcommittee met on April 10, 2012. We talked about the Nickel Expression of Interest.

Public Comment:

Henderson: My name is Bo Henderson. This project is going to fall by the lack of compromise. The facts are this summer we will lose jobs. I lost my health insurance just this week. Can you start any of this now?

Crabtree: My name is Joey Crabtree. I want to thank all the board members here that represent us. Whatever the future brings hopefully my kids will get money from this land. I can see the water tower from my house. Having the knowledge I have and living in the area, I support an on-site cell. I hope that as my representatives you will support it, too.

Johnson: My name is Mark Johnson. I represent the Tri-State Building and Construction Trades Council. Jobs are very important to this area. We have the opportunity to create 250-300 additional jobs here to build an on-site cell here now. We have members who are struggling to make it. I think it is very important to get this decision moving no matter if it is on-site or off-site. I encourage DOE to get the board members the information they need to make a recommendation. I would also like to thank the board members for what they do. They try to represent us the best they can, but everyone has different ideas. It is a thankless job. Thank you for your time.

Manuta: I would like to second the compliments to the board. It is a tough job and you do it well. Some quick points for Terri. DOE EM is tasked with dealing with issues associated with gaseous diffusion. To the best of my knowledge, it has nothing to do with the ACP. In addition to that, if the ACP is ever implemented, the enrichment level by NRC licensing will not exceed 20%. So where the rumor comes from about high assay are coming from I do not have a clue. In addition, believe me if that were to take place I would have found out about it long before coming here tonight.

Knauff: My name is John Knauff. I have signed up for information for months and not getting anything. Maybe you have not sent anything out. I am also not getting the information I ask for and been promised. At the subcommittee meeting last month Future Land Use I heard we already have a landfill so get used to it. Therefore, what you are saying is since you have already buried stuff you should let us bury more stuff. If we approve of an on-site cell then DOE comes back and says because of the budgets we do not have the money to dig the other stuff up, you cannot clean up and then we have both. I do not see how we can trust DOE to bury anything here.

Potter: I am Herman Potter USW President. Look into the future past the decision of whether we have a cell or not. We need to reindustrialize. We would like to see Congress reduce the footprint, in order to prepare for the future. We would like permanent structures instead of temporary ones so that once the D&D is complete; those buildings could be turned over to the public. Reindustrialize the site 10 to 15 years down the road. I would like to submit a draft comment to DOE and to the board.

Final Comments from the board:

Manson: To hear a board member say that we are a do-nothing board, I take offense to that. When we first started this board we did not know anything. I think we have learned a lot. Our public knows more about things now than ever before. We have had tours and even have a waiting list. We have the Science Alliance. We go into the schools and talk. We do ask questions. Come to the subcommittee meetings and see for yourself. I am offended that people would sit here and say that about our board and not come to our subcommittee meetings to see for themselves.

Huber: When we first started the board, we had two public comment periods, one in the beginning and one at the end. I would like to see that again. I would also like to recommend that when the board has a recommendation the public get to see it ahead of time, maybe put it in the paper to review before the meeting.

Brushart: I like to hear what the public has to say and I wish more members of the public would come, but how do you get them here. I agree with what Sharon said. The public knows more now than ever before. Yes, we do have a difference in opinions with a common goal.

Minter: A lot of information is provided on the web site. After all, the studies OU did were interesting because the public said the same things we said as a board. We have made some progress. I hope that we can continue to have a balance.

Snyder adjourned the meeting.

Next Meeting Thursday, June 7, 2012, 6 p.m.

Action Items:

- DOE will check the total of percentage of waste that has already been shipped off-site and report to the subcommittees on Tuesday.
- EHI will send out Recycling Recommendation 12-01 to the mailing list.