



*Portsmouth EM Site Specific  
Advisory Board*

**CHAIR**

RICHARD H. SNYDER

**VICE CHAIR**

VAL E. FRANCIS

**BOARD MEMBERS**

SHIRLEY A. BANDY

L. GENE BRUSHART

AL DON CISCO

MARTHA A. COSBY

ERVIN S. CRAFT

FRANKLIN H. HALSTEAD

ADRIAN C. HARRISON

CARL R. HARTLEY

WILLIAM E. HENDERSON II

BRIAN F. HUBER

SHARON E. MANSON

DANIEL J. MINTER

MICHAEL E. PAYTON

CRISTY D. RENNER

BRANDON K. WOOLDRIDGE

CONNIE E. YEAGER

KATHY J. ZIMMERMAN-

WOODBURN

**DOE DEPUTY DESIGNATED**

**FEDERAL OFFICER**

JOEL BRADBURNE

**DOE FEDERAL**

**COORDINATOR**

GREG SIMONTON

EHI CONSULTANTS

PHONE: (740) 289-5249

FAX: (740) 289-1578

EMAIL: JULIE@PORTS-SSAB.ORG

**RECOMMENDATION 12-03: Portsmouth Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board Waste Disposition Alternative for the Decontamination and Decommissioning Project at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant**

**BACKGROUND:** Since the inception of the Portsmouth (PORTS) Environmental Management (EM) Site Specific Advisory Board in (SSAB) July 2008, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and its contractors have provided information to the board to educate members on the complex issue of waste disposition. The Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D) of the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant forces the government, contractors, elected officials and other stakeholders to evaluate the management of more than two million cubic yards of waste and the consideration of an on-site disposal facility.

Beyond the issue of waste placement, the board also had to be mindful of cost and schedule impacts, job impacts, recycling impacts, and, most importantly to the board, the impacts this decision will have on reindustrialization and the future economic stability of the region. The PORTS EM SSAB can say with full confidence that members have worked diligently to understand the issue, and we are fully aware of the long-reaching effects this decision will have on our community. We have considered the various variables and are confident this recommendation reflects the values of this community and is in the best interests of the region as a whole.

The recommendation that follows is a compilation of years of hard work. During that time, we also believe DOE and its contractors have worked diligently to engage the PORTS EM SSAB, and we are thankful for their efforts.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The PORTS EM SSAB wants to first point out that a decision on whether the nuclear waste should be disposed of in our community seems simple on its face. For people unfamiliar with the complexities of the issue, having this waste shipped off-site and eliminating any risks associated with radiologically contaminated material would be an easy decision. However, as we all know, this is not easy. In fact, it is quite complicated.

The PORTS EM SSAB agrees with that simple premise, that there is no desire for nuclear waste to be disposed of in Pike County. However, in consideration of all the factors, the PORTS EM SSAB believes on-site disposal of *some* of the material is in the best interest of the community, provided it is accompanied by certain actions from DOE that will be explained later in this recommendation. The PORTS EM SSAB wants to be clear that it does not believe on-site disposal is in the best interest of the community unless these other factors can be executed. If the DOE believes any of them are not feasible, or for whatever reason cannot be accomplished, then the PORTS EM SSAB recommends all radiologically contaminated waste be dispositioned off-site.

The PORTS EM SSAB, like elected officials from throughout the region, endorses the Future Vision Plan, as outlined by FFE Consultants and sees it as the path forward that will give the community opportunity for future development and job creation. That plan calls for on-site waste disposition, but did not offer any information on Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC), which the PORTS EM SSAB addresses below. The plan also calls for the consolidation of all landfills and the removal of contaminated plumes within the developable area within Perimeter Road. However, we still feel strongly it is in the best interest of the community to consolidate all landfills on the property, with special emphasis on those within the perimeter road. Naturally, if reindustrialization is the finish line, DOE shall make the recommended industrial park attractive to future users, and that area must therefore be completely remediated.

It is in that light the SSAB also insists on an Administrative WAC that requires the plant's highly contaminated equipment be disposed of off-site. This characterization process must be accomplished by Bore Scoping, NDA and H.P. detailed survey, only equipment certified free of transuranics and other undesirable elements, introduced by using reprocessed fuel may be included in the onsite disposal cell. The PORTS EM SSAB has evaluated the risks with such a prohibition and understands there are cost impacts to DOE, and also understands the views of labor groups, fence line neighbors and other stakeholders which have participated in the debate. Simply, if DOE and community are working together to mitigate these issues and work in our mutual interests, the industrial park recommended must be as it has been marketed to us – as a first-class, large-scale industrial park. That simply cannot be achieved unless detailed Administrative WAC controls are maintained on equipment placed in the proposed onsite disposal.

As the PORTS EM SSAB has previously indicated, recycling is of utmost importance to the community. The PORTS EM SSAB would like to thank DOE for its engagement with our Community Reuse Organization (CRO) – the Southern Ohio Diversification Initiative (SODI). The shared proceeds from recycled materials has led to tangible development progress, and the community expects those efforts to continue in relation to efforts associated with nickel recovery and other recycling initiatives.

The PORTS EM SSAB is well aware this recommendation will not be viewed favorably by all parties. However, this is our group's determination taking into account the scientific data, public opinion and the economic redevelopment interests of the surrounding area as we reached this difficult decision. The PORTS EM SSAB stands firmly behind this recommendation and looks forward to its continued dialogue with DOE and its continued commitment to the well-being and quality of life for our neighbors for whom we serve.

We respectfully request this recommendation be included as one of the source documents as the Department of Energy develops the Record of Decision (ROD), and trust DOE will refer to our recommendations frequently as they develop the ROD. There is a lot more to this process than money and politics. The health and financial welfare of future generations of our friends and neighbors depend on it.

Thank you.