

To: West Valley Citizen Task Force  
From: Melinda Holland, Holland and Associates  
Subject: Summary of April 24, 2001, Task Force Meeting  
Date: April 25, 2001

**Next Meeting:**

The next Citizen Task Force (CTF) meeting is scheduled as follows:

**Date: Tuesday, May 22, 2001**  
Time: 7:00 p.m. - 9:30 p.m.  
Location: Ashford Office Complex  
9030 Route 219, West Valley, NY

The focus of the April 24 CTF meeting will be to discuss and develop comments on the “de-scoping” EIS proposal as presented in the March 26, 2001, Federal Register Notice. 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, Paul Piciulo, Mark Mitskovski, Warren Schmidt, Nevella McNeil, Bill King, Murray Regan, Alice Williams, Bridget , Pete Scherer, Lea Lambert, Joe Patti, Gayla Gray, Tim Siepel. CTF Members not attending:

**Agency Attendees**

Attending in person: Todd Jackson, U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

Attending via teleconference: Amy Snyder, NRC.

Amy Snyder, U.S. NRC asked CTF members if they’d like to meet with Chairman Meserve on the afternoon of May 15. Members to call Amy directly (301/415-7644).

Alice–Status of GAO Report–to Congress next 2-3 days, Congress will have the document for about 30 days. Anticipate the report will be issued near the end of May. DOE did a preliminary review of the draft (for factual accuracy) and first impression is that they were thorough.

Radionuclide table–Ray requested that a footnote be added regarding which definition of transuranic applies? Is the 10 vs. 100 curie taken into consideration for that...

Discussions followed regarding continuing the services of an independent facilitator. Most CTF members expressed their appreciation for the effective workings of the CTF as it is currently

configured.

Alice Williams stated that, although DOE would willingly support the CTF if they desire to continue using an independent facilitator, DOE is facing a substantial budget cut and will be interested in reducing spending wherever possible.

Current communications are above-board and direct now, so maybe we don't need the facilitators for now, but could keep the option open to use an independent facilitator later on if the CTF felt the need.

CTF members felt it would be helpful to know what the facilitator costs are, to which Tom Attridge replied that the service is currently costing between \$2-3000/meeting. That figure includes meeting preparation, meeting facilitation, and summary development.

Most CTF members expressed the potential willingness to test meetings using site facilitators, with the provision that it remains possible to retain facilitation services at a later date.

Mark—as indicated on the revised draft, upcoming discussions are going to get harder, not easier. It may be more important to have that independent assessment.

...possible to keep her on board for at least one-two meetings/year...

Ray—current ground rules state that the facilitator “serves at the pleasure of the Task Force”

N/D attempt revising language in the Ground Rules regarding the potential changes in meeting facilitation.

Joe—What is the status of negotiations? Bill and Susan have said they're ready to sit down at the table again, but it does take time to get key players in place and up to speed. Alice clarified that without some sort of impetus, merely filling the positions won't supply the force needed to resolve the impasse between the agencies.

The offer DOE put on the table was the best and final—a newly constituted DOE management negotiating team needs to understand why the agencies need to resume negotiations. CTF members asked how they could assist the agencies in providing that impetus, stating that the CTF has already requested support from elected officials and that was short-lived and ineffectual.

DOE responded that the GAO Report would help. Another CTF member asked if a CTF member could participate in a limited fashion in negotiations, to which DOE responded that there are no negotiation meetings currently scheduled.

A CTF member asked for clarification of Susan Brechbill's remarks at the last meeting she attended, asking if she stated that she felt that the differences were not insurmountable. Alice stated that Susan believes that there is an impasse. Elizabeth added that the offer submitted to NYS was a best and final offer.

The Task Force can write a letter of demand to the agencies

Tim, Joe, Pete, and possibly Ray to draft a letter to Bill Flynn and Spencer Abraham  
cc Susan Brechbill, three congressional reps from this area  
bcc Alice Williams

Bill King stated his concern that there was a \$10M cut in WVDP funding. Alice suggested one thing the CTF could do is request a brief explanation of how the budget is developed. Other CTF members agreed that such a letter should/could be drafted and addressed to members of Congress in the hopes of redressing the current budget proposal for the WVDP.

In response to Bill King's statement that he doesn't believe it is the responsibility of the CTF to draft such a letter, Elizabeth Lowes stated that DOE cannot lobby Congress. A CTF member stated that simply writing a letter to Congressional reps is not enough to effect change. He stated that real change would only come about through active lobbying—phone calls, etc.

At this point, a CTF member interjected that this is the first committee he has served on that doesn't have a structure in place for accomplishing work (i.e., chair, committees and subcommittees, etc.) He reflected that this seems to be evidenced by the discussions being held tonight.

#### Next Steps

- ▶ Letter should be drafted and sent out to CTF members for their review.
- ▶ Next CTF meeting is tentatively scheduled for May 22.