



Portsmouth EM Site Specific
Advisory Board

Chair

Richard H. Snyder

Vice-Chair

Larry A. Parker

Subcommittee Members

Lindy A. Coleman

Martha A. Cosby

Ervin S. Craft

Val E. Francis

Brian F. Huber

Sharon E. Manson

R. Daniel Moore

Cristy D. Renner

Roger G. Scaggs

DOE Deputy Designated

Federal Officer

Joel Bradburne

DOE Federal Coordinator

Greg Simonton

**Future D&D and Recycling
Subcommittee
February 8, 2011 @ 4:30 p.m. Room 112
Agenda**

- Discussion -Kevin Ironside – Process Building PER Overview
- Path forward
- Public Comments

Adjourn



Support Services

EHI Consultants, Inc.

1862 Shyville Road

Suite 115

Piketon, OH 45661

Phone 740-289-5249

Fax 740-289-1578

www.ports-ssab.org

info@ports-ssab.org



Future D&D and Recycling Subcommittee

Meeting Summary

February 8, 2011 • 4:30 p.m.

The Ohio State University Endeavor Center

1862 Shyville Road, Piketon, OH 45661

Subcommittee Members Present: Val Francis, Brian Huber, Cristy Renner, Roger Scaggs, Martha Cosby, Daniel Moore and Ervin Craft

SSAB Members Absent: Lindy Coleman, and Sharon Manson

Board Members Present: Larry Parker

DOE Employees and Contractors: Dennis Carr, Fluor; Janie Croswait, RSI; John McCoy, Fluor; Chuck Bernhand, B&W; Tim Poe, Fluor-B&W; Lisa Burns, WAI

Liaisons: Melody Stewart, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (Ohio EPA) and Michael Rubadue, Ohio Department of Health

Support Staff: Eric Roberts, and Cindy Lewis, EHI

Public: Kyle Gumto, and Scott Miller, Ohio University; Geoffrey Sea, SONG

Scaggs, Chair, opened the meeting.

1. Discussion-Kevin Ironside-Process Building PER Overview:

- ***Ironside*** stated the DFF&O problem statement: Do sufficient data exist to support evaluation of whether to remove, reuse, or take no action to address the facilities being addressed under the Process Buildings and Complex Facilities D&D Evaluation projects and evaluation of anticipated potential remedial alternatives?

The scope has changed some, but for good reason. The PER (Pre-investigation Evaluation Report) report was just for the three large buildings X330, X333 and X336. There is a process of reports that has to be done, the first is the PER.

- Scoping document, defines scope of the decision to be made
- Establishes preliminary site condition, threat, and alternatives
- Evaluates the existing data (how old the buildings are, what materials they are made of, what work was done in the building.

When the first PER was written it only included the three process buildings and another RI/FS was to be done for the maintenance buildings. Now we will include about fifty-one buildings in the one PER and instead of taking forty-eight months to complete this task, it is going to take fourteen months. It will be streamlined in order to keep things moving. The decision whether to take the buildings down or reuse, or let them just sit there is not a complicated decision.

If no one wants the buildings because of the cost of making them energy efficient. If no one wants them, the default is to tear them down. We are screening the reuse early in the process.

- **Roberts** stated that the subcommittee needs a recommendation on whether or not to support this process.
- **Francis** stated the subcommittee needs an executive summary recapping the PER in order to give a recommendation. If Sea feels very strongly about it one way or the other he needs to recommend something to us as a subcommittee and to the full board.
- **Renner** stated that the summary and the PER Discussion sheet that was handed out at the meeting should be enough to make a recommendation. The subcommittee still needs to make a recommendation on what to do with the waste
- **Parker** stated I think the subcommittee is on the right path. I am curious to see how all this work will get done in 14 months.
- **Bradburne** stated there are site benefits to the expedited process.

Question/Comment:	Answer:
Francis asked how old are these completion documents?	Ironsides stated these completion reports go back to 1956, 1993 then again in 2006.
Who will be the principal to come to see if someone did want the buildings to reuse DOE or SODI? Has USEC already released all the buildings that they do not want to reuse?	Bradburne stated there are several different ways but that it would come to DOE in the end. They have stated their intent.
When would the SSAB need to have a recommendation submitted to DOE?	Carr stated they would like to have something before the public notice, which is in six months.
Can you get the subcommittee the facts on what is in the current landfills?	Parker stated that it is what you expect.

Scaggs asked what kind of statement does DOE need from us?	Ironside stated DOE would like to hear what the SSAB thinks about the changes in the PER with the 14 month timetable and including the fifty-one buildings and screen reuse process.
Roberts asked historical it saves money to change the timeframe from 48 months to 14 months. Is this the reason for the changes?	Ironside stated it will save a little money but, it's not a cost thing to speed things up. You will save many jobs by making the process faster, because the work will continue and won't be delayed which would put some out of a job.

2. Public Comments:

Question/Comment:	Answer:
Sea asked why they are only considering option a and b when there is another option, option c? Which would be to leave the buildings standing, fill them in with waste, and cover them? You do not have to fill the buildings in with waste you could just cover them whether there is waste or not.	Ironside stated that option cannot be made until there is waste to be dispose of, which would be after tearing the buildings down. The decision has not been made yet. I am explaining the process it takes to make that decision.
When can the public state their concerns or other options?	Carr stated the public can state their concerns now or at the public comment period. No decisions are made until after that time.

3. Action Items:

1. The Subcommittee requested a summary that recaps the new timeframe and adding the other buildings to the PER.
2. The Subcommittee needs to write a recommendation on what we think about the fourteen month timetable and including all the buildings and screen reuse process in the one PER

Scaggs motioned to adjourn meeting, **Motion seconded.**

- **Motion carried**

Meeting adjourned

SSAB D&D Subcommittee

February 8, 2011

Process Building PER Discussion

The DFF&O problem statement: Do sufficient data exist to support evaluation of whether to remove, reuse, or take no action to address the facilities being addressed under the Process Buildings and Complex Facilities D&D Evaluation projects and evaluation of anticipated potential remedial alternatives?

Pre-investigation Evaluation Report (PER)

- **Scoping document, defines scope of the decision to be made**
- **Establishes preliminary site conditions, threat, and alternatives**
- **Evaluates existing data**

RI/FS Work Plan

- DQOs (Data Quality Objectives), if needed (don't need if no data)
- Establishes sampling plans, if needed

Remedial Investigation

- Nature and extent of contamination
- Risk to human health and the environment
- Treatability studies, if needed

Feasibility Study

- Evaluation of alternatives

Proposed Plan

- Identifies preferred remedial alternative
- Allows opportunity for public comment

Record of Decision

- Documents the decision

Remedial Action Work Plan

- Implementation details

Original PER Scope:

- Three process buildings
- 4-yr schedule to ROD

Revised PER Scope:

- Added 700 Bldgs and 43 ancillary buildings and facilities
- 14-months to ROD
- Streamlining the documents because of recognized simplicity of decision
- Screening reuse earlier in the process

How?

- Parallel document submission
- Maximum use of existing data, volume, and cost information
- Working closely with OEPA to minimize document rework

Why?

- Need to initiate cleanup work and this is most efficient way to get there
- It is a simple decision – should the buildings come down?
- The waste disposition decision is more straightforward with this decision made

SSAB Recommendation Needed on:

- Expediting and streamlining the process
- Including more facilities in the RI/FS
- Early screening of reuse