



# PORTSMOUTH SITE SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD

---

•OSU Endeavor Center • 1862 Shyville Road • Piketon, Ohio 45661 • (740) 289-5249 •

## Future Land Use Committee Meeting June 9, 2009 • 5:30pm

### Co-Chairs

Val E. Francis  
Richard H. Snyder

### Board Members

Shirley Bandy  
Lee A. Blackburn  
Gene Brushhart  
Dr. Edwin G. Charle, Ph.D.  
Dr. Andrew L. Feight, Ph.D.  
Bobby E. Graff  
Franklin H. Halstead  
Sharon E. Manson  
Stephen Martin  
Daniel J. Minter  
Larry A. Parker  
Michael E. Payton  
Cristy D. Renner  
Terri Ann Smith  
Lorry Swain

### Agenda

1. Review of Agenda (5 minutes)
2. Review of April & May summaries (5 minutes)
3. Review of Previous Action Items (5 minutes)
4. 340-Acre Transfer (30 minutes)
5. Energy Parks Initiative (15 minutes)
6. Preliminary Discussions of Future Use Principles (15 minutes)
7. Concerns/Issues (10 minutes)

### Deputy Designated

**Federal Official**  
Dave Kozlowski

### DOE Federal Coordinator

Greg Simonton

### Support Services

EHI Consultants, Inc.  
1862 Shyville Road  
Piketon, OH 45661  
Phone 740-289-5249  
Fax 740-289-1578



## **Future Land Use Committee**

Meeting Summary

June 9, 2009

The Ohio State University Endeavor Center  
1862 Shyville Road, Piketon, OH 45661

**Committee Members Present:** Lee Blackburn, Gene Brushart, Ed Charle, Andrew Feight, Val Francis, Sharon Manson, Dan Minter, Larry Parker, Terri Ann Smith, and Lorry Swain

**Members Absent:** Bobby Graff and Steve Martin

**Board Members Present:** Ed Charle

**DOE Representatives:** Greg Simonton and Dave Kozlowski

**DOE-Related Employees:** Marcia Bates and Sandy Childers, LPP; and Janie Croswait, ETS

**Liaisons:** Maria Galanti, OEPA; Michael Rubadue, Ohio Dept. of Health

**Community Members:** Geoffrey Sea, SONG

**Support Staff:** Julie Galloway and Eric Roberts, EHI

1. **Review of Agenda:**

*Brushart motions* to approve the agenda, ***Motion seconded.***

- o ***Motion carries***

2. **Review of Previous Summary:**

*Manson motions* to approve April and May summaries, ***Motion seconded.***

- o ***Motion carries***

3. **Review of Previous Action Items:**

- Provide SSAB a footprint map of the Federal Site for Future Land Use, the map was provided at tonight's meeting.
- Review of DRAFT of the Community Relations Plan, under DOE review.
- Account of land previously transferred from the DOE.
  - o There were 2 acres transferred to Scioto TWP Trustees for Bailey Chapel Cemetery use.
- Provide Lindner Report to website.
  - o DOE has submitted the report to its legal counsel to determine if this document can be placed on the SSAB website. The report was provided as a public document but

it includes information on private property owners and since DOE didn't produce the document, they are seeking legal opinion on whether DOE can post it to a website.

- o **Swain** would like to add "Board Development" to the Action Items since we have talked about this in every committee meeting along with our Board meeting. **Swain** suggested that Doug Sarno and John Applegate help with our working relationships. I am happy with our facilitator Jim King but we need help with our work plans. The Executive Committee is supposed to look into getting someone to help us with developing our Future Use Principles.

**Minter** motions to add Future Use Principles under concerns/issues, **Motion seconded.**

- o **Motion carries**

4. **340-Acre Transfer:**

There will be a second tour on June 18<sup>th</sup>, 2009 meeting at the OSU Endeavor Center at 4:30. The Committee discussed having the community members adjacent to the parcel be allowed to attend another tour. LATA/Parallax has to check into the budget and the availability of the archaeologist being able to attend the second tour.

**Feight** I tend to approach things from a historical prospective and the 340-Acre Transfer has caught my interest. I have been researching this parcel. It is a very important transfer because it is the first transfer from the reservation and the process on how this land is transferred is going to be a model for any further transfers. The agreements going into the transfer, any sort of determination of level of contamination allowed for this land is going to set the stage for anything else being transferred in the future.

**Feight** presents a paper "Promised Land Finally Here": The Story of 340-Acres and the Need for a Declaration of Future Use Principles".

- Original Interest in the X-737 site
- From a Proposed Nuclear Waste Dump to a Sanitary Landfill (1981-1995)
- Promised Land: SODI and the Possibility of a Power Plant on the 340-Acres
- DOE tests on the 340-Acres find Plutonium and Neptunium Isotopes
- From a Coal-Fired to a Nuclear Powered Electricity Plant
- DOE's 2005 End State Vision and the Future Use of the 340-Acres
- GNEP, Interim Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel, and the 340-Acres (2006-2008)
- Transfer Renewed and the Energy Parks Initiative
- Future Use Veto Power: The Role of USEC's Lease in the Transfer
- Conclusions and Unresolved Questions

<b>Questions/Comments:</b>	<b>Responses:</b>
<b>Charle</b> In your research did you uncover any reason why USEC would be holding out this parcel? They are located away from this tract.	<b>Feight</b> What I have learned from talking to people is to prevent another company coming in and placing a competitor on the reservation.
<b>Blackburn</b> Can we get a copy of the USEC lease?	<b>Kozlowski</b> We need to research this to see if we can release it as a public document.
<b>Charle</b> If you report back to us that you are unable to release this document we will immediately wonder why. You might want to supplement your explanation as to why you can't release it.	
<b>Charle</b> Dan would you say that Andrew's document is an editorial view and the information is accurate?	<b>Minter</b> I think that it is an editorial view and some of the information may be accurate but it is more critical on what has been done with the 340-Acres

The Committee discussed the reasons behind Committee Chairman Andrew Feight doing the research of the “Promised Land”; some members didn’t understand the reasoning behind it. Feight explained that he needed to understand “what is our future use?”, how can we move forward when we don’t have a plan? Some plans have been put out there and they are not being followed.

**Feight** stated that he feels that we as an SSAB Board are being ignored and he would like to build bridges. We need to figure out a process to help us become a whole community. If we carve up the reservation before we know what our Future Use Principles are, then we might invite trouble. We can’t do it by ourselves. We need community help. The transfer is going to re-shape the reservation.

It was discussed that this is a starting point and we should not work in a vacuum. One document states that we don’t have significant water supply for a nuclear power plant and other reports state something different. USEC has the ultimate say; we need to have a starting point. USEC needs to be engaged in whatever we do.

**Swain** I want to state my frustration, I want to be a part of the SSAB but if what we are doing isn’t legitimate then I feel that I am wasting my time. Just look around at who is here and who isn’t, SODI and the Steelworkers are not present. This is why I state at every meeting that we need Doug Sarno to help us with our Board Development and communications.

**Minter** states events that will go on outside of these meetings. I agree that we all spend time on these topics and I would like to see something productive and would like to see someone come in and help us with problem solving.

**5. Public Comment:**

**Michael Rubadue, Ohio Department of Health;** USEC is required by the NRC to keep everything listed on what they are allowed to use because of the license they hold. USEC has to provide a financial assurance saying they do have funds.

**Geoffrey Sea, SONG;** states that USEC having to provide a financial assurance to the NRC is not true. I have followed up with people in Oak Ridge in their leasing office as well as the NRC. USEC has two different licenses and the operating license isn’t in effect until six month prior to the D&D projects. DOE requires USEC to provide a financial assurance.

**6. Energy Parks Initiative:**

In our Board packets we received copies of support letters that involved the Energy Parks Initiative. These letters were from community members, local elected officials and Sherrod Brown. It was stated in this letter that Mound as well as the Portsmouth site should be considered for an Energy Park and it has all the alternative energies stated in the letter. The SSAB was in favor to this. We sent two Committee members to an Energy Park Workshop and we have had this on our agenda yet nobody came to us asking for our input or a recommendation.

<b>Questions/Comments:</b>	<b>Responses:</b>
<b>Minter</b> Energy Parks is a wide range of potential things and it brings a broad process to support this type of activity. There is a wide range of interest and once we get a closer look then we can pin point what we want but we need to get this type of thing going so other sites don’t get the funding.	
<b>Feight</b> Would an Energy Park Initiative recommendation be appropriate?	<b>Kozlowski</b> No, this is not an EM mission. We are not the one that is going to make the decisions on that recommendation. We are just looking at the cleanup perspective. Although EM is very

	supportive of Energy Parks, we are not the agency that deals with that. The recommendation would have to be forwarded to the appropriate organization in DOE.
<b>Parker</b> An Energy Park is not in our mission but maybe at a stand point of environmental issues. There needs to be a real strong educational interest for this to come off of the ground. We don't have much of a play in it but it does need a driver.	
<b>Feight</b> Why do these letters address Bill Murphie if it isn't in our purview?	<b>Kozlowski</b> We will respond to these letters. Sometimes letters are sent to our office to see where our position is on a certain project.

6. **Preliminary Discussions of Future Use Principles:**

- o **No discussion**

7. **Concerns/Others**

- o **No Discussion**

**Feight** motions to adjourn the meeting. *July meeting was cancelled*

**Action Items:**

**FLU Committee Meeting Action Items – 6/9/09**

1. Solicit interest in additional participants (including adjoining property owners) for 340-Acre tour
2. Requested copy of lease agreement between DOE and USEC, if publicly available
3. Committee members Dan Minter and Lee Blackburn will draft recommendation language on the Energy Park Initiative for review at next committee meeting

**Next meeting: Tuesday, August 11, 2009 at 5:30 pm.**



# U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office, 1017 Majestic Drive, Suite, 200  
Lexington, Kentucky 40513

**Media Contact:**  
**Ted Theopolos: 859-219-4010**

**For Immediate Release**  
**June 4, 2009**

## **DOE ISSUES REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR FACILITY SUPPORT SERVICES AT OHIO PORTSMOUTH GASEOUS DIFFUSION PLANT**

**LEXINGTON, KY** – The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) today issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Facility Support Services at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant (GDP) near Piketon, Ohio. This acquisition is set-aside for small businesses and will result in a cost-plus-award fee (CPAF) contract with an estimated range of \$25 to \$50 million. The contract will have a five-year performance period.

The Performance Work Statement for the Portsmouth Facility Support Services includes:

- janitorial services
- computing and telecommunication
- personnel and cyber security
- training
- grounds, roadway maintenance and snow removal

The Portsmouth GDP is located in south central Ohio, approximately 75 miles south of Columbus and 22 miles north of the Ohio River. It is a DOE-managed, contractor-operated site of 3,777 acres, with about 1,200 acres within seven-mile perimeter road.

The Portsmouth GDP was built in the early 1950s as part of the Nation's nuclear weapons complex. Uranium was enriched from 1954 until 2001. Today, it is part of the world's largest cleanup program under DOE's Office of Environmental Management.

Proposals in response to the RFP are requested by August 4, 2009. The facility support services RFP will be posted on the *Federal Business Opportunities* webpage ([www.fbo.gov](http://www.fbo.gov)) via DOE's Industry Interactive Procurement System (IIPS) as well as to the D&D Project web site at: <http://www.emcbc.doe.gov/Portsmouth%20FSS/index.html?OpenDocument>

Point of contact for the RFP is: Ruby Sugg, Contracting Officer, 513-246-0050, [ruby.sugg@emcbc.doe.gov](mailto:ruby.sugg@emcbc.doe.gov)

**-DOE-**



**U.S. Department of Energy**  
**Public Notice**  
**Administrative Record File Availability**  
**for the CERCLA Non-Time Critical Removal Action for the former**  
**X-746 Shipping & Receiving Building at the Portsmouth Gaseous**  
**Diffusion Plant**

An Administrative Record File is open and available for public inspection for the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) Non-Time Critical Removal Action to evaluate options for the removal of the former X-746 Shipping & Receiving Building at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant.

The Department of Energy is informing the public of the availability of the record file and encourages the public to comment on documents as they are placed in the record file. Comments on the X-746 Building Removal Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis report should be sent to David Kozlowski, U.S. Department of Energy, P.O. Box 700, Piketon, Ohio 45661 no later than May 8, 2009.

The alternatives evaluated included:

- Alternative 1 – No action  
In this alternative, the facility would be left in its current condition.
  
- Alternative 2 – Remove Contents, Remove Structure, and Dispose of Wastes  
In this alternative, the building contents would be removed and the building structure and foundation demolished and disposed.

The Administrative Record is the collection of documents that form the basis for making a decision on how to solve a specific environmental problem. The file contains all documents related to the project and will be updated as new information is available. Access to the Administrative Record File may be obtained by contacting:

**DOE Environmental Information Center**  
**Ohio State University Endeavor Center (Room 220)**  
**1862 Shyville Road – Piketon, OH 45661**  
**(740) 289-8898**