

MEMORANDUM

To: Citizens Task Force

From: Kate Whitby

Subject: Summary of March 17, 1998, CTF Subcommittee Working Session on the Draft Recommendations Report

Date: March 26, 1998

Next Meeting:

The next full meeting of the Citizens Task Force (CTF) will be on:

Date: **Tuesday, April 21, 1998**
Time: 7:00 to 9:30 p.m.
Location: Ashford Office Complex
9030 Route 219
West Valley, NY

As an alternative to the regularly-scheduled CTF meeting, the drafting subcommittee of the CTF will hold another working session from 7:00 to 9:30 p.m. on **Wednesday, April 1, 1998** at the Ashford Office Complex. The purpose of the working session will be to review and revise the next version of the Draft CTF Recommendations Report. Although April 1, 1998, will not be a formal CTF meeting, all members of the CTF and observers are invited to attend this informal working session.

The agenda for the **April 21 CTF meeting** is to revise the Draft Recommendations Report and discuss any unresolved issues from the March 17 or April 1 working sessions.

If you have questions or comments regarding the upcoming subcommittee or CTF meetings, the Draft Recommendations Report, or this summary, please contact Tom Attridge at (716) 942-2453 or Kate Whitby at (703) 739-1207.

CTF Attendees: In attendance at the March 17, 1998 working session were: John Beltz (for Pete Cooney), Bill King, Barbara Mazurowski (for Tom Rowland), Joe Patti, Paul Piciulo, Blake Reeves, Lana Rosler, Pete Scherer, Warren Schmidt, Larry Smith, Rich Tobe, Ray Vaughan and Eric Wohlers.

Regulatory Agency Attendees:

In person: Jack Krajewski, NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) and Todd Jackson, Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Region I

Videoconferencē: Jack Parrott and Tim Johnson, NRC; and Patti Swain, Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC).

March 17th Working Session Summary:

At the March 4, 1998, CTF meeting, John Pfeffer, Pete Scherer, Larry Smith, Rich Tobe, Ray Vaughan, and Eric Wohlers volunteered to serve on a drafting subcommittee and to prepare a Draft CTF Recommendations Report. The volunteer subcommittee met at Larry Smith's house on March 12, 1998, for this purpose and produced the initial Draft Recommendations Report that subsequently was circulated to the CTF members on March 13. It was that version of the document that was the subject of the March 17, 1998, subcommittee working session.

As a result of Melinda Holland's vacation, Kate Whitby from Clean Sites acted as the meeting facilitator. After confirming the informal nature of the subcommittee working session, and that the purpose of the meeting was confined to discussion of the Draft Recommendations Report, she turned the meeting over to the drafting subcommittee.

Rich Tobe initiated the working session discussions by summarizing the history of the Draft report. He then indicated that the members of the subcommittee were seeking input from the CTF members, site managers, and observers concerning the Draft report. After briefly reviewing the organization, structure, and purposes of the various sections of the Draft report, Mr. Tobe suggested that the attendees proceed with a line-by-line review of the document.

The participants accepted this suggestion and offered, discussed, and agreed upon numerous changes to the Draft report. These changes are shown in the revised version of the Draft report. Some of the issues that the subcommittee attendees raised include:

- Recognition in the Draft report that the local community will feel economic losses as a result of any reduced activities at the site.
- The sources of information underlying the Draft report's assertion that the site is not suitable for long-term or permanent storage or disposal of radioactive wastes.
- Characterization and/or lack of characterization of all or portions of the 3,000+ acre Center property for waste storage or disposal.
- Recognition of the differences in community positions regarding the continued or future use of the site for existing or new waste storage or disposal.
- Modification of the Draft language to recognize the concerns of the Seneca Nation regarding preservation and restoration of natural resources and conditions at the site.

- Clarification that wastes and contaminants are present at the site in both above- and below-ground structures and disposal areas, and affirmation that cleanup activities need to address all of these areas.
- Acknowledgment that the site managers should retain a degree of discretion regarding how and when to implement certain cleanup decisions.
- Recognition that a CTF preference for above-ground, retrievable storage of wastes and use of institutional controls will mean that intruders, trespassers and on-site personnel will face slightly increased risk levels, as compared to below-ground storage or transportation of wastes off-site.
- Identification of alternatives for future events or conditions, such as natural disasters, the emergency retrieval of waste materials, storage, management and funding needs and plans, as well as preservation of local capacities to deal with future events.
- The absence of references to the vitrified glass logs and spent fuel in the Draft, because of an assumption that these materials will be handled outside the context of the site manager's remedial decision making process, but the need to explain this status in the document's preamble or preliminary section.

The subcommittee reached tentative agreement on many of these issues, at least to the extent that they appear in the Draft report. Time and resource constraints, however, prevented the participants from thoroughly discussing or resolving other topics of concern. The participants agreed to identify and return to these topics at a later date, and listed them as unresolved issues on a "parking lot" flip chart.

March 17 Unresolved Issues (Parking Lot):

1. Draft CTF Recommendations document (Draft) Section III. Insert statement of opposition to bringing new waste to the site or changing laws, regulations and rules to allow the use of the site for new waste disposal activities.
2. Draft Section III, Paragraph 5. Think about indicating a preference to minimize waste spreading, and/or opposition to the creation of new waste.
3. Draft Section III, Paragraph 7. Consider including specifications for management and storage of waste after a retrieval event.
4. Draft Section III, Paragraph 9. Think about a new phrase or language that directs the site managers to plan for future waste excavation and storage options or needs.
5. Throughout the document, consider reflecting a multi-section concern about protecting local residents. Possibly insert new section or language at Draft Section III, Paragraph 3.
6. Draft Section IV. Consider reflecting a multi-paragraph or section concern about planning for and obtaining funding for emergency alternatives and events.
7. Draft Section IV. Possibly insert new paragraph or language requesting that DOE stays at the site forever, and at a minimum pays the same percent of the site costs as now ("stay & pay" concept).

8. Draft Section IV. Possibly insert new paragraph or language requesting funding for emergency response equipment and training, to ensure continued availability of resources and expertise.
9. Draft Section IV, Paragraph 8. Consider changing language to require a "Reliable" method to assure funding. Also same concern at Paragraph 9.
10. Draft Section IV, Paragraph 10. Consider specifying emergency storage alternatives. Think about providing for:
 - A. Planning.
 - B. Physical space.
 - C. Funding.
11. Section IV, Paragraph 9. Want to talk about inserting triggers for new actions at site.

Observer Comments:

An observer suggested that it would help to add a sentence or two describing the objectives of each part of the Draft report at the beginning of each section.

Another observer strongly objected to the use of the word "convenient" in the Draft report at Section III, Paragraph 9. She does not want the site managers to lose track of the site, and noted that with half-lived materials of 300 years or more, it is inappropriate to delay remediating the contamination until a "convenient" time. She also asked the CTF members if they had considered adding a section on institutional control preferences to the Draft report.

Additionally, she indicated some puzzlement with the Draft report's restriction of its recommendations to the site manager's "preferred alternative," and noted that the ultimate cleanup may not conform to that "preferred alternative." Nonetheless, the CTF recommendations presumably are valid for any cleanup alternative, not just the site manager's preferred choice. Finally, she directed the drafting subcommittee's attention to the "other materials" reference at Line 133-134, and offered that other materials probably should not include the contents of the drum cell storage unit.

The subcommittee session closed at approximately 9:45 p.m. with the participants' agreeing to reconvene for another working session on April 1, 1998.

Next Steps:

- The drafting Workgroup will meet again in an informal session on Wednesday, **April 1** at the Ashford Office Complex (from 7:00 to 9:30 p.m.), to discuss another round of revisions to the Draft report.
- The next formal meeting of the full CTF will occur on Tuesday, **April 21**, and will involve continued discussion of the revised Draft report, as well as discussion of any unresolved parking lot issues from the March 17 or April 1 drafting sessions.