



Portsmouth EM Site Specific
Advisory Board

WASTE DISPOSITION AND RECYCLING SUBCOMMITTEE

TUESDAY, JUNE 12, 2012 @ 4:30 P.M.

AGENDA

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

ADJOURN

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

SUPPORT SERVICES

EHI CONSULTANTS

PHONE: 740-289-5249

FAX: 740-289-1578

EMAIL: JULIE@PORTS-SSAB.ORG



WASTE DISPOSITION & RECYCLING SUBCOMMITTEE

MEETING SUMMARY

JUNE 12, 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; Martha Cosby, Frank Halstead

SSAB Subcommittee Members Absent: Shirley Bandy, Brian Huber

Other SSAB Members Present: Stan Craft, Michael Payton, Sharon Manson, Connie Yeager

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

Liaisons: Mike Rubadue, Ohio Department of Health (ODH)

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

Public: Steve Shepherd, Southern Ohio Diversification Initiative (SODI); Bob Eichenberg, Ohio University; Mark Johnson, Tri-State Building and Construction Trades Council (TSBTC); David Manuta, Manuta Chemical Consulting (MC2)

Minter opened the meeting.

1. Discussion of Waste Disposition:

Question/Comment:	Answer:
<p>Halstead: The bottom line is the plant has been closed for more than 10 years and we have not even had one acre turned over. Except SODI did receive some steel. We take one leap forward and two leaps backwards. We need to do something.</p> <p>The OU study came out and said that the community wants to re-industrialize. They do not want to have a place like</p>	<p>Simonton: There have been a couple of small areas turned over. The cemetery area is one. We are working on turning over an easement for the county to extend its sewer, and we are leasing some property to SODI.</p>

Fernald's big green field where you cannot even graze cattle.

I think this draft recommendation is good as written, except the prairie area cannot be used for anything industrial.

We should mention in the recommendation that we are going to exclude the prairie area and work only on the area inside of perimeter road. If we do not get a political commitment this year to turn the site into an industrial site before the elections, we will never get one. I think the candidates running for President could be pressed into making a commitment to turn it into an industrial site. Several people at the public meeting expressed concern with the processed gas equipment. I think anything that had a stream flowing through it is considered process gas equipment.

At the public meetings, we were told by represents of DOE that all the equipment in the X-326 building was going to be shipped to Nevada. At the last meeting we found out that was not the case. The only thing going to Nevada is the converters.

The FFE work really focused on the land inside perimeter road. This is a large area and will take time to fill up.

Murphie: Are you expecting the department to make a political commitment to make this into an industrial site? That is not for us to do, that is not this board's place? What is the recommendation asking, DOE to turn the site into an industrial park? That is not what EM does. You are referencing information in this recommendation that I have never seen before. What is the definition of process gas equipment? Is it your intent that anything that was connected at any time to the process gas equipment be considered processed gas equipment? How do you make that decision from a safety issue? OK. What is processed gas? We would like to hope that we are providing you the information you need to determine the differences in the equipment.

Please understand no decisions have been made yet. We have said that the converters from the X-326 building will most likely go off-site. Our gut tells us that this is the right decision. We are not backing away from that. However, at the same time to go from that extreme to what is in this recommendation, you are saying any piping and connections of processed gas related should go off-site. That is a huge difference for us with huge consequences for us.

Bradburne: Frank, you mentioned process gas equipment. We ask that you consider, since 2006 we were not running to make uranium, but running to clean up some of

<p>We need to teach the public, not let the public teach us. We are representing the community. We need to balance our needs and what the community needs.</p>	<p>the contaminants. Give us the opportunity to provide you information that is focused on the process gas equipment at the next couple of meetings. Our general thoughts are if it is clean keep it here.</p> <p>Murphie: We would cut the converters to get the nickel out. A lot of them have been disconnected. I do not know what or how much you have been told.</p>
<p>Minter: I am passing out a couple of letters. First, the one Halstead wrote and handed out at the June board meeting, then a letter from Herman Potter and recommendation 11-1 for you to look over.</p> <p>When we say process gas equipment, we are referring to the 14.2% of processed gas equipment from the charts that were given to us.</p> <p>Having a no real value of having a disposal cell, it does not do a lot for the community. Maybe there is more information on processed gas.</p> <p>After an on-site cell is covered, you cannot change your mind and say; “oh, we will take that out”. It is here forever.</p> <p>How to try to find a balance for the community and the department of Energy as well. How do we find a balance?</p>	<p>Murphie: What you are saying is not what I am reading on the draft recommendation. There are critical facts that we all need. The technical container, we have a safe place to put it. The concern is the workers putting the materials into the cell. After a cell is covered, it is safer than the landfills are now. We want you to think about the factors. We have a model to look at. We do not know enough yet for you to draw a line. You already have cells on-site. However, this recommendation will be a hard one to defend.</p> <p>It is not EM’s focus to create, but that is not the same as saying we are not interested. We have to have a balance. It is not an easy decision to make.</p>
<p>Henderson: I think instead of saying process gas equipment. We should use the level of radiation.</p> <p>I look for OEPA to come back and say</p>	<p>Murphie: It is possible that we could find results in values that are higher than any values that we have on-site.</p> <p>You are not going to get the EPA to say just</p>

<p>everything can go into an on-site cell.</p> <p>I would feel better with more information, in order to make an educated decision. I want the scientific data. We take our role very seriously. We do not want to say no cell. As long as we do not let the board split hairs, I do not want to mislead anyone on this committee. It will be a hard sell.</p> <p>The community does not have all the information that we have had.</p>	<p>because you have a cell that the standards for acceptable waste are set high up here when it has been set low everywhere else.</p> <p>Bradburne: There is a process that anything that leaves the site has to go through testing. We have to follow a general process.</p> <p>Murphie: Just because it meets the WAC, does not mean it will stay on site. EM is not in the reindustrialization business, but we can make sure that we leave a nice site. We just cannot say we are doing this for reindustrialization.</p> <p>Simonton: FFE's work laid out several scenarios' including road and sewer. If we build a cell we will need roads and other things that could be used for reindustrialize after the cleanup is completed.</p>
<p>Manson: People do not understand why it takes so long to make these decisions. I would like to see us move along a little faster.</p>	
<p>Craft: If stuff is too hot to go into a cell then EPA will say it cannot go in an on-site cell.</p>	

2. Plan of Action:

- DOE/Fluor provide more information on process gas equipment
- EHI to set up a working session
- Fluor will have the model display out at the next board meeting
- Subcommittee to lay out the information it needs from Fluor to make an educated decision at the next meeting

Minter: Meeting adjourned