



## WASTE DISPOSITION & RECYCLING SUBCOMMITTEE

MEETING SUMMARY

MAY 8, 2012 • 4:30 P.M.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY ENDEAVOR CENTER  
1862 SHYVILLE ROAD, PIKETON, OH 45661

**SSAB Subcommittee Members Present:** Dan Minter, Subcommittee Vice-Chair; Martha Cosby, Frank Halstead, Brian Huber

**SSAB Subcommittee Members Absent:** Will Henderson, Subcommittee Chair; Shirley Bandy

**Other SSAB Members Present:** Dick Snyder, Board Chair; Stan Craft, Michael Payton, Cristy Renner, Sharon Manson

**U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and contractors:** Greg Simonton, Johnny Reising, DOE; Rick Greene, Restoration Services, Inc. (RSI); Karen Price, Dennis Carr, J.D. Chiou, Deneen Revel, Fluor-B&W Portsmouth (FBP)

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

**Support Staff:** Eric Roberts, Julie Galloway, Cindy Lewis, EHI Consultants (EHI)

**Public:** Margaret Hutzel, Bob Eichenberg, Ohio University; Mark Johnson, Tri-State Building and Construction Trades Council (TSBTC); Ricky Miles, Laborer's International Union North America (LIUNA)

**Minter** opened the meeting.

**1. SSAB Information Portfolio Process Gas Equipment presentation was delivered by Dennis Carr, FBP:**

- Gaseous Diffusion Process
- Process Buildings Breakdown
- Process Buildings Volume Breakdown
- PGE Components
- Gaseous Diffusion Process
- X-326 Cells
- X-333 Converters

- X-333 Converter
- PGE Component Volume Breakdown
- PGE Component Radioactivity Breakdown
- PGE Component Radioactivity/Volume Comparison
- PGE Component Total Radioactivity
- PGE Component U-235 Radioactivity
- PGE Component Tc-99 Radioactivity
- PGE Component Tc-99/Volume Comparison

**2. Discussion:**

<b>Question/Comment:</b>	<b>Answer:</b>
<p><b>Halstead:</b> What about the other contaminates like americium, and others? They are also present, just in different areas depending on if they are lighter or heavier.</p>	<p><b>Carr:</b> TC-99 is the biggest one that is why we chose it. We could do pie charts for the other contaminates, too. Which ones would you like to see?</p>
<p>What amount has been sent to Paducah?</p>	<p>Less than 5%, maybe even less than 1%.</p>
<p><b>Snyder:</b> How does this work fall into the WAC?</p>	<p><b>Carr:</b> It is a safety issue, as we move into disposal. The WAC will be focusing on transportation. JD is working on the transport models. The WAC is to determine the safety and what impact the waste would have. There is nothing on-site that cannot be stored at the Nevada site. The problem is the shipping. That is why we have been running the uranium 235, so it is shippable. Next week everything in the 326 will be shut down forever.</p> <p><b>Simonton:</b> You have listened to this for four years and your understanding is better than people on the street.</p>
<p>Will you take out the three million yards of soil all at once?</p>	<p><b>Carr:</b> No not all at once, but you will have a large hole to start.</p>
<p>Is there a plan to have a booth at the public meeting?</p>	<p><b>Price:</b> No, not at the May public meeting.</p>
<p><b>Roberts:</b> How comfortable are you as board members with all these numbers? What questions do you have?</p>	<p><b>Snyder:</b> No questions at this point. This is a lot of information at one time. This is good. The next step is to develop a WAC right. If we do not act soon we will lose our voice in this decision.</p>
<p>We have kicked this around for the last eight months. What information can we</p>	

<p>get for you?</p> <p>If you were to write a recommendation today, what would it say?</p> <p>I am hearing you say you are not crazy about an on-site cell. What goes into the cell, what are you comfortable with going into an on-site cell?</p> <p>OK, so it sounds like you could write 90% of a draft recommendation with the one hang-up being the process gas equipment. You need a fact sheet so everyone is on the same page. You need a better understanding of PGE, cost, and safety. If you have questions about the PGE let us know so we can get the answers.</p>	<p><b>Minter:</b> No one wants a cell, but there may be trade-offs.</p> <p><b>Mason:</b> The public still has a fear of a cell.</p> <p><b>Craft:</b> If we can clean up the landfills that are already here, then we might be willing to have an on-site cell in order to make the site safer.</p> <p><b>Renner:</b> We need jobs.</p> <p><b>Halstead:</b> The big plan is to have all of the dumps cleaned up. I think many people do not want any process equipment left on-site. That would be a hard sell.</p> <p><b>Huber:</b> I would like to see all the process equipment leave.</p> <p><b>Renner:</b> People are worried about the process equipment. Educate us why we should keep some of the process equipment on-site.</p>
<p><b>Minter:</b> I still have not heard anyone say I want a cell here. You have to have a balance. We need talking points so we all are saying the same thing.</p>	
<p><b>Huber:</b> One problem with cleaning up all the dumps is they would have to use dirt from the hills to fill the holes, making the land flat. I do not want that.</p>	<p><b>Roberts:</b> So you are saying you want the landscape to stay the same.</p> <p><b>Carr:</b> If you dig up the landfills, you will be able to put the caps back and the three million yards of dirt to build the cell could be reused to fill in the holes.</p>

**3. Plan of Action:**

- EHI will develop a fact sheet for the potential on-site waste cell.
- EHI will create a tab for discussion or potential recommendations on the web site.

**Minter:** Meeting adjourned

Next meeting: Tuesday, June 12, 2012 at 4:30 p.m.