



Portsmouth EM Site Specific
Advisory Board

WASTE DISPOSITION AND RECYCLING SUBCOMMITTEE

TUESDAY, JULY 10, 2012 @ 4:30 P.M. ROOM 165

AGENDA

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR

WILLIAM E. HENDERSON II

SUBCOMMITTEE VICE CHAIR

DANIEL J. MINTER

BOARD CHAIR

RICHARD H. SNYDER

BOARD VICE CHAIR

VAL E. FRANCIS

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS

SHIRLEY A. BANDY

MARTHA A. COSBY

FRANK H. HALSTEAD

BRIAN F. HUBER

DOE DEPUTY DESIGNATED

FEDERAL OFFICIAL

JOEL BRADBURNE

DOE FEDERAL COORDINATOR

GREG SIMONTON

- DRAFT RECOMMENDATION 12-03 WASTE DISPOSITION DISCUSSION
- PLAN OF ACTION

ADJOURN

SUPPORT SERVICES

EHI CONSULTANTS

PHONE: 740.289.5249

FAX: 740-289-1578

EMAIL: JULIE@PORTS-SSAB.ORG



WASTE DISPOSITION & RECYCLING SUBCOMMITTEE

MEETING SUMMARY

JULY 10, 2012 • 4:30 P.M.

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

SSAB Subcommittee Members Present: Will Henderson, Subcommittee Chair; Dan Minter, Subcommittee Vice Chair; Shirley Bandy, Martha Cosby, Frank Halstead, Brian Huber

SSAB Subcommittee Members Absent: None

Other SSAB Members Present: Dick Snyder, Board Chair; Val Francis, Board Vice Chair; Gene Brushart, Stan Craft, Michael Payton, Sharon Manson, Connie Yeager

U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and contractors: Catherine Alexander, Vince Adams, Joel Bradburne, Johnny Reising, Greg Simonton, DOE; Rick Greene, Restoration Services, Inc. (RSI); Dennis Carr, Mark Jewett, Karen Price, J.D. Chiou, Rich Abertz, Fluor-B&W Portsmouth (FBP)

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

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

Public: Steve Shepherd, Southern Ohio Diversification Initiative (SODI); Mark Johnson, Tri-State Building and Construction Trades Council (TSBTC); Geoffrey Sea, Southern Ohio Neighbors Group (SONG); Steve Kucera, Vetco

Henderson opened the meeting.

1. Discussion of Recommendation 12-03 Waste Disposition Discussion:

Question/Comment:	Answer:
<p>Henderson: We would like to present recommendation 12-03 to the full board Thursday, July 12, 2012. Therefore, I would like the subcommittee to discuss it tonight.</p> <p>Do we have any pros for the</p>	<p>Roberts: We need a consensus from the subcommittee. Some might like less verbiage, and some might prefer more.</p> <p>Minter: A couple of points I would like to</p>

<p>recommendation in its current form?</p> <p>Let us break down into bullet points. Go over the high points of the recommendation. I think they are still working on the technical WAC. I would much rather know and have the data available and make an educated decision rather than deciding by emotion and fear.</p> <p>We are going with what we currently have regarding WAC. If the information changes or we get additional</p>	<p>throw out there for discussion. The Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC) is coming up for review. It is important that we submit our recommendation for the Administrative WAC. We need to be clear on what we want. This is a very important decision. If there is, an on-site cell we need to weigh in early to make an influence. Weighing in our recommendation does have some value.</p> <p>Halstead: The WAC is kind of an open subject because what we need to know is how much is going to be allowed? A pound, 10 pounds, five oz. there has not been a value put out there, to my knowledge, about what can go into a disposal cell. The amount of removable on that item. How much alpha, how much beta? 7,000, 700 how much is going to be allowed? We do know that there is such a thing as decon, but it creates a secondary problem because there is waste. You can take care of one problem and make a bigger one. The WAC will have controls on contaminants.</p> <p>Francis: The proposed plan is being written now. I think it is important that we put it on the table. We just do not want any of the process gas or anything else we determine to be a long-term hazard to our area.</p> <p>Halstead: Mr. Murphie did say they spent almost 10 years cleaning the cylinders trying to get all the contaminants out. In some places, there may not be any contaminants left. I used to be just like (Francis) and think that all Process Gas Equipment (PGE) should go off-site. Now I think that maybe some could stay on-site. The most hazardous places would be the traps, and most of the traps are in the 326 building and will be shipped off-site.</p>
---	--

<p>information, we can change the recommendation later.</p>	
<p>Snyder: I would like to know what the status of the WAC is and address Halstead's concerns.</p> <p>Everything has numerical values. Do we have an activity value for everything going in the WAC?</p> <p>Trichloroethylene 99 is going off-site.</p> <p>Does the model include the three landfills outside of the perimeter road? Does it include the lime sludge lagoon?</p>	<p>Chiou: Several components make up the overall WAC. The Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) part of the WAC is just about ready for EPA review.</p> <p>The values will come after the design stage. You have to select a site to simulate what could be put into a potential on-site cell. That allows us to regulate the rest. We are checking the water and wells to see how they react.</p> <p>Yes, 99.97% of the Trichloroethylene will go off-site.</p> <p>Yes, that is why we will use 11 small cells instead of one cell. No, we are not including the lime sludge lagoon.</p> <p>Halstead: The lime sludge lagoon would make a bigger problem.</p>
<p>Minter: How much of the debris can go into the cell? 90%? 100%? Many people do not realize that there are already landfills on-site. I do not think anyone wants an on-site disposal cell.</p> <p>They were going to ship all the 326 off-site, then it changed to just the compressors. The pipes and fixings would stay. It would be helpful if someone gave us an update on that.</p> <p>Is there a benefit/value of making the recommendation now?</p>	<p>Chiou: All the building debris can go into the cell, as far as I know.</p> <p>Carr: From the beginning, we were shipping everything off-site from the 326. We are still shipping all the converters off-site so the traps will go also. We will do a measurement on the floor to see if we can move it to the next floor, then it will test behind some shield walls. Each piece will be tested by itself in a low background area. Compressors will be next, if they have a significant amount, they will be shipped off-site, but if it is a small amount, they can stay.</p> <p>Bradburne: We take what you say to heart. You do have time to submit a recommendation later. You can submit this</p>

	recommendation now and 15 more before March.
Francis: Does your model include the consolidation of the landfills?	Chiou: Yes, the model does include the consolidation of the landfills and the plumes.
<p>Roberts: I think we have four key points in this recommendation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Open to the idea of an on-site disposal cell and it would include the consolidation of the existing landfills. 2. At one point in time, the recommendation listed PGE and that has been changed to say all highly contaminated equipment should be shipped off-site. 3. Recycling as much as possible. 4. This recommendation as well as other recommendations that have been submitted are considered as the ROD is created. 	<p>Minter: Many people did not realize that there are already landfills on-site. I do not think anyone wants an on-site cell. I would like to see some assurance too.</p> <p>Francis: We have no assurance right now. This is concerning to me. I think we need some stronger words. We need to put the pressure on and make sure we get the best for the community. However, we are not getting any assurance that anything will happen.</p> <p>Halstead: A video just came out from the Ohio University (OU) group and what the community said was the site is going to be a nuclear site. Therefore, the fact that a cell is there does not mean anything.</p>
Huber: I feel uncomfortable with some of the process gas equipment staying on-site. I do not see any reason, not to ask them to ship it all off-site. It is not our job to cut the cost. It is our job to do what is best for the community.	
Payton: Everyone has done a good job, the last several months. I can go with recommendation 12-03 the way it is written now.	
Bandy: It is early in the game, but we do not know if they will still be here to follow it through. I agree that we need some assurance. Is it going to make a difference? If so, then let us go with this recommendation. This is just the first step. On the back of the first part on the recommendation, 2 nd line change logical to acceptable. Then take out, DOE must make –get rid of that sentence. I do not want any more information. I want action.	
Cosby: I can live with the	

<p>recommendation the way it is now. It is a recommendation; they can use it or not use it. We can always write another recommendation later, if we get more information.</p>	
<p>Craft: I can go forward with the recommendation. If something else comes up we can write another recommendation. This is not the end, there will be more recommendations.</p>	
<p>Manson: I am split. I can go with it this way, but I do have concerns.</p>	
<p>Yeager: I think we have to trust DOE, but verify. I think this is the first step, like a floor plan.</p>	
<p>Brushart: This is one of the best meetings. I keep hearing everyone talk about assurance. The commissioners do not come to our meetings. They may want to see employment too. The workers who are in the field do not want a cell. I like some things in this recommendation better than the one before. I am still in the decision making process. I would be probably be more inclined to go with a disposal site based on this newer recommendation. As I said before I am pro taking everything off-site. I hear the fence-line neighbors do not want the PGE here at all.</p>	
<p>Halstead: Could some of the potential hazards be cutting up the converters to get them in a condition to put in a car?</p>	<p>Carr: In order to ship them and mean the weight and mass requirements, we would have to cut the converters up. Which means you would have to send people in, so there would be potential for exposers. My biggest concern is the mechanical hazards associated with it. My second concern being the radiologic exposure. It does concern me when you start cutting things up there is always a chance for exposure.</p> <p>Adams: The assurance part is we cannot guarantee anything, but every site needs an end state.</p>

2. Plan of Action:

- Henderson will present Recommendation 12-03 to the full board on Thursday July 12, 2012

Henderson: Meeting adjourned

Next meeting: Tuesday, September 11, 2012 at 6:30 p.m. (no meeting in August)