



Portsmouth EM Site Specific  
Advisory Board

Recommendation 11-01  
December 15, 2010

**Chair**

Richard H. Snyder

**Vice Chair**

Larry A. Parker

**Board Members**

- Shirley Bandy
- Gene Brushart
- Lindy A. Coleman
- Martha A. Cosby
- Ervin S. Craft
- Val E. Francis
- Franklin H. Halstead
- William E. Henderson II
- Brian F. Huber
- Michael J. Lilly
- Sharon E. Manson
- Daniel J. Minter
- R. Daniel Moore
- Michael E. Payton
- Cristy D. Renner
- Roger G. Scaggs
- Terri Ann Smith

**DOE Deputy Designated  
Federal Officer**

Joel Bradburne

**DOE Federal  
Coordinator**

Greg Simonton



**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

**RECOMMENDATION: Siting Criteria for a Potential CERCLA Cell**

**BACKGROUND:** CERCLA waste is expected to be generated throughout the cleanup process at the former Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant (GDP). There is a need to evaluate and compare each type of waste and its ultimate disposition as part of the total DOE Environmental Management (EM) study. These waste include demolition waste (concrete, rebar, structural steel, debris, etc.), process equipment with various metals, hazardous waste, low-level radioactive waste, mixed hazardous and radioactive waste, and contaminated environmental media (e.g., soil, sediment, and groundwater treatment waste). The accelerated D&D will generate an estimated 1 to 3 million cubic yards of waste.

The ultimate disposition of waste must consider such factors as protection of human health and the environment during clean-up, cost, availability of disposal sites, short and long term protection, reduction of volume and toxicity of the waste, and regulatory compliance. There are also many options to consider such as on-site treatment, waste stabilization, recycling, metal smelting, shredding, and on-site disposal cells, which meet community goals and values. The alternative to this is to ship all waste off-site, which has many disadvantages such as cost, timing and schedule delays (containers, transportation), safety, and availability of off-site disposal facilities.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The DOE EM SSAB recommends that DOE continue to study waste disposition alternatives. As a part of this study, DOE should look at general parameters that have been adequately addressed by the stakeholder concerns and issues during the siting study of a potential CERCLA cell. The PORTS EM SSAB suggests that DOE consider the following parameters if a CERCLA cell is considered such as, but not limited to:

1. Possible Use of Multiple Smaller Cells
2. Ensure Minimal Footprint/Waste Minimization/Recycling
3. Reuse Existing Landfills if possible
4. Areas not conducive for reuse should be considered
5. Consider Impact on Cultural Resources
6. Blend with Existing Terrain
7. No Off-site Waste Accepted
8. Community Benefit-Land Use Management Plans should be developed
9. Cells Should be Latest Cell Technology
10. Additional Education for Community Members
11. Complimentary Use of Cell Space (Solar Panels, Wind Farms, etc.)
12. Industrial Use Clean-up Standard