

To: Citizen Task Force
From: Melinda Holland, Clean Sites
Subject: Summary of March 4, 1998, Meeting
Date: March 10, 1998

Next Meeting:

The next full Citizen Task Force (CTF) meeting will be on:

Date: Wednesday, April 1, 1998
Time: 7:00 p.m. - 9:30 p.m.
Location: Ashford Office Complex
9030 Route 219, West Valley, NY

If you have questions or comments regarding the upcoming meeting or about this summary, please contact Melinda Holland at (864) 457-4202 or Tom Attridge at (716) 942-2453.

CTF Attendees:

Attending were: Ray Vaughan, Pete Scherer, Joe Patti, Warren Schmidt, Nevella McNeil, John Pfeffer, Barbara Mazurowski (for Tom Rowland), Paul Piciulo, Elaine Belt, Larry Smith, Pete Cooney, Blake Reeves, Eric Wohlers, Rich Tobe, Gayla Gray (for Lana Rosler), and Bill King. Not attending were: Tim Siepel, Tom Rowland, Lana Rosler, and Murray Regan.

Regulatory Agency Attendees:

Jack Krajewski, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC)

Attending via conference call:

Jack Parrott, Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
Patti Swain, Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)
Joe Price, SAIC

March 4th Meeting Summary:

Tom Attridge and Melinda Holland opened the meeting by reviewing administrative issues and the agenda. One edit was received on the last meeting summary. Amo Houghton's staff responded that the Representative would be available in the evening Monday through Thursday and suggested that the CTF forward acceptable dates for him to select from. A CTF member also suggested that Houghton's staff encourage participation by other congressional staff who are knowledgeable about West Valley site issues. Ms. Holland will contact Representative Houghton's staffer to inform him that any of the CTF's regularly scheduled meeting dates [the 1st Wednesday and 3rd Tuesday of each month] would work for a video conference.

As decided at the last meeting, the primary topic for this meeting is how the CTF can come to closure. Melinda Holland reviewed a process which she and site representatives recommend the CTF follow to develop its recommendations [see attached flow chart]. A CTF member proposed development of draft CTF recommendations using the following format:

Section 1. Broad Guidelines and Policies.

Section 2. Directions to Site Management.

Section 3. Specific Comments for each WMA.

He then summarized his initial concepts for the first two sections of the draft report.

Section 1 - Broad Guidelines and Policies

- ◆ The site is not suitable for permanent disposal of waste, due to damp climate, high groundwater table, geology, and surface water flowing into the Great Lakes.
- ◆ The Vitrification people have done a good job and should be commended. But when Vitrification is done, we want logs and rods out ASAP.
- ◆ Protecting public and workers is most important, intruders come second.
- ◆ Want waste out of contact with groundwater, isolated above-ground, if possible.
- ◆ Want waste easy to monitor.
- ◆ Want waste easy to be retrieved.
- ◆ Don't want to make it harder to move waste in the future.
- ◆ Above-Ground structures should be able to withstand natural events such as tornadoes and earthquakes.
- ◆ Cost should not be the driver for the decision.

Section 2 - Directions to Site Management

This section would direct site managers to put together a preferred alternative that maximally uses the policy statements in Section 1 of this report. It would request that the site:

- ◆ Deal with licensing and long-term site controls issues.
- ◆ Propose a reliable trigger to reopen clean-up for formal review.
- ◆ Provide security on long-term funding, daily operations and maintenance, and future emergency actions.
- ◆ Deal with erosion and North Plateau Groundwater Plume.

Section 3 - Specific Comments on Each WMA

He did not have specific recommendations on this section and recommended that the CTF work to develop these after the broad policy statements had been developed.

After some discussion, the CTF agreed to form a small workgroup to prepare a first draft of section 1 of the report for the full CTF to consider. The members who volunteered to be in this workgroup include: Rich Tobe, Ray Vaughan, Eric Wohlers, Pete Scherer, Larry Smith, and John Pfeffer. Rich Tobe will prepare an initial working draft which will be circulated to the CTF. The workgroup will meet on March 17th to discuss and modify Rich's draft with the goal of completing a draft Section 1 - Broad Guidelines and Policies. If the workgroup completes a draft on the 17th,

this draft will be sent to the CTF and will be the topic for the April 1st meeting. This schedule is subject to revision by the CTF and workgroup.

Next, CTF members who had prepared a list of criteria, values or considerations they want to see incorporated in the draft CTF report shared those items. Their remarks are summarized below without attribution.

One member's comments started with WMA #1 (Process Building) and #3 (HLW Tanks):

- ◆ The Process Building should be demolished and grouted after cleaning cells as much as is possible (Alternative III)
- ◆ Slurry wall should go around rubblelized building, HLW tanks, and North Plateau Groundwater Plume.
- ◆ Monitoring wells should be in place.
- ◆ Should consider the possibility of consolidating low-level waste from other parts of site to the building before rubblelizing.
- ◆ The final cap over the rubble should be fenced and long-term institutional controls in place.
- ◆ Make waste retrievable.
- ◆ If above can't be done, then put waste in above-ground storage (Alternative II).

His recommendations for WMAs #7 (NDA) and #8 (SDA) included:

- ◆ These two WMAs are tied together, what you do for one, you do for the other.
- ◆ Erosion is the biggest problem, stabilize lands if practical, but need to be shown it can work.
- ◆ Deal with and understand cost comparison between dig it up (Alternative II) and close in place (Alternative III) with erosion protection
- ◆ Institutional controls must be maintained indefinitely.

The next member stated that:

- ◆ His earlier preference was to see waste dug up for WMA #'s 1, 3, 7, 8, 2, 5, and 9, put in monitored retrievable until suitable off-site disposal becomes available. But he is now more open to Alternative III, as temporary interim solution, than he once was. For some WMAs, Alternative III may be better only if a strong trigger is in place to ensure waste will go to off-site disposal soon.
- ◆ Money held in a trust fund that can't be touched is the strongest trigger he can think of.
- ◆ If you do Alternative II, interim storage serves as its own guarantee and you wouldn't need additional funding set aside, although intruder risk remains.
- ◆ He agreed with another member that grouting the trenches could make it harder to remove waste in future. No grout unless it is very soft and easy to cut through.
- ◆ He disagreed with another member about adding low-level waste to the Process Building because he believes that it is illegal.

Another member summarized her preferences for: WMA #1 (Process Building.) and #3 (HLW Tanks):

- ◆ Still prefers Alternative I.
- ◆ All of waste should be out of contact with groundwater (including excavating North Plateau Groundwater Plume).

WMAs #7 (NDA) and #8 (SDA):

- ◆ Okay with Alternative II, but not Alternative III due to erosion.
- ◆ Uncomfortable with idea of a reliable trigger, can't think of how we could do that.
- ◆ We need a solution now, not sometime in future

The next member stated:

- ◆ Agrees with the ideas for general policy statements in a CTF report.
- ◆ The waste definitely should be isolated above ground, if possible.
- ◆ May need to rely on the new engineering under development - see what they can come up with.
- ◆ We need a sound preferred alternative from the site which incorporates regulatory input.
- ◆ As a Board of Education Member - need to consider further educational uses for the site, the tax base for local schools, and supporting and enhancing education for the entire area.
- ◆ Why is this site owned by NYS? Whole nuclear industry is the brainchild of the federal government. Why not make it federally-owned? Have all nuclear sites under one federal agency.

Another member summarized her comments:

- ◆ In the end, natural processes always win.
- ◆ Can't rely on long-term institutional controls. There is no guarantee that they will be reliable. Can't count on government being around or dealing with future problems.
- ◆ Site restoration should occur to the greatest extent possible.
- ◆ Uncomfortable with Alternative III as an interim step.

The final member comment included:

- ◆ Agrees with the need to develop basic principles.
- ◆ Alternative I is not feasible for many reasons.
- ◆ CTF should narrow the numbers to one potential alternative.
- ◆ Avoid the financial part of this until we get principles down, then agree on an alternative.
- ◆ Want NRC to say if alternative requires license or meets decommissioning criteria.
- ◆ Still concerned with North Plateau Groundwater Plume - Who's responsible?
Uncomfortable with lack of focused plan on the North Plateau Groundwater Plume.

The members of the drafting work group agreed to consider the above comments as well as information provided by CTF members in prior meetings in developing the first draft general principles report for the full CTF to review.

Observer Comments:

An observer disagreed with a CTF member's suggestion that public and worker risk should be given a higher priority than intruder risks. She feels that the next generation (who may become intruders) should not pay for our mistakes.

Next Steps

- ◆ First draft of general principles to be circulated by March 13th.
- ◆ Drafting work group to meet at the AOC on March 17th at 7:00 pm to work on a general principles draft. Draft to be circulated to the full CTF by March 23rd.
- ◆ General principles draft to be reviewed by the full CTF at its April 1st meeting.

CTF RECOMMENDATIONS

