

Summary of Accomplishments – 2008

West Valley Citizen Task Force

Introduction

This report summarizes the accomplishments, activities, attendance and 2008 year-end survey results for the West Valley Citizen Task Force. This summary is intended to be an aid to discussion and decision-making for 2009 planning.

Meetings, Presentations and Other Accomplishments

As of October 2008 the CTF accomplished the following:

- Nine CTF meetings were held. Topics of presentations and discussions included:
 - **Quarterly Public Meeting:** CTF members participated in a WVDP Quarterly Public Meeting (January) and in one general public meeting (April) held immediately prior to CTF meetings.
 - **Core Team:** Received a presentation by the Core Team Agencies concerning the Core Team Recommended Preferred Alternative and met with Core Team Agencies to discuss the proposed Preferred Alternative.
 - **WVDP Status:** Received presentations on safety, Interim End State, Environmental Monitoring Program, North Plateau Groundwater Plume Remediation Plans, NRC-Licensed Disposal Area cap, EIS schedule, Funding requests and budgeting, HLW tank drying, infrastructure reduction and removal; Environmental regulation at the Center; Core Team proposed preferred Alternative; Phase 1 Decommissioning Plan; Site Overview
 - **NYSERDA updates:** Overview of the NYSERDA Quantitative Risk Assessment and Deer Hunting Program.
 - **Other presentations/discussions:** NYSDEC presentations on Radiation Regulation Program at the Site and RCRA/Hazardous Wastes Regulation at the Site. US Department of Labor Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program.
 - **Environmental Impact Statement and Decommissioning Plan:** Received presentations on the structure and organization of the Sections and Chapters of the DOE Decommissioning Plan and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, including the NYSERDA “View”.
- Three Agenda Work Group Conference calls were held.
- Several CTF members participated as observers in conference calls/video conferences when NRC and DOE met concerning the Phase 1 Decommissioning Plan.
- Website redesign continued.

Correspondence

Received

The following correspondence was received by the CTF in 2008:

- Letter from NRC dated February 15, 2008 responding the CTF letter on November 28, 2007.
- Town of Concord Resolution requesting continuation of air monitoring in two locations.

In addition, the CTF received copies of correspondence which was directed to various agencies, regulators and others. That correspondence is available with meeting materials on the website at www.westvalleyctf.org.

Sent

The following correspondence was sent by the CTF in 2008:

- Letter to Bill King expressing appreciation for his years of service to the CTF.
- March 26, 2008 letter to Congressional Delegation concerning funding for WVDP.
- May 2 letter to DOE Deputy Assistant Secretaries Rispoli and Frei concerning DOE Environmental Management Budget for WVDP.

Press Coverage

Numerous press articles and coverage directly and/or indirectly mentioned the West Valley Demonstration Project and the CTF. These articles are available on the website at www.westvalleyctf.org.

Membership and Attendance

During the year, several members left the Citizen Task Force and others joined. Bill King stepped down as a member and was replaced by Chris Gerwitz as representative for the Town of Ashford. The following individuals resigned as alternates: Paul Salzler and Tim Lund. Chris Pawenski became a secondary alternate to Commissioner Holly Sinnott. The following individuals were added as alternates: Robert Engel for Tim Siepel, Gladys Gifford for Ray Vaughan, Deborah King for Bill Snyder, Paul Kranz for Holly Sinnott, and Kathy McGoldrick for Judy Einach.

The attached color-coded chart depicts the attendance at CTF meetings of members and alternates through October 2008. The Mission and Ground Rules Section II.A.1. states that “Members who fail to attend half of the scheduled meetings in a calendar year may be removed from the CTF by consensus of the CTF Members present at the first scheduled meeting of each year.”

Name	23- Jan	27- Feb	26- Mar	23- Apr	28- May	25- Jun	23- Jul	27- Aug	24- Sep	22- Oct	19- Nov	17- Dec
Members												
Joe Atkinson	y	y	n	y	y	y	n		y	y	n	R
Mike Brisky	y	y	y	y	n	y	y	N	a	a	y	E
Rob Dallas	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	O	y	n	n	P
Judy Einach	y	y	y	y	y	y	y		y	a	y	O
Chris Gerwitz	y	y	y	y	y	n	y	M	n	y	y	R
Mike Hutchinson	y	y	n	y	y	n	y	E	y	n	y	T
Steve Kowalski	y	n	y	n	y	y	y	E	n	y	n	
Lee Lambert	y	y	n	y	y	y	n	T	y	y	y	C
Anthony Memmo	n	n	y	y	n	y	n	I	y	y	y	O
Joe Patti	y	y	y	n	y	y	n	N	n	y	n	M
John Pfeffer	y	y	n	n	y	n	y	G	y	n	y	P
Pete Scherer	y	n	n	n	y	n	y		y	y	y	L
Tim Siepel	y	y	y	y	y	n	y	H	n	y	y	E
Holly Sinnott	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	E	a	a	a	T
Julie Sirianni	a	a	a	a	n	a	a	L	a	a	a	E
Bill Snyder	n	y	n	y	n	y	y	D	n	n	y	D
Ray Vaughan	y	y	y	a	y	y	y		y	y	y	
Eric Wohlers	y	y	n	y	y	n	n		y	y	a	B
												E
												F
Alternates												
Chris Crawford (Wohlers)										y	y	O
Robert Engel (Siepel)					y	n	n		y	n	n	R
Gladys Gifford (Vaughan)			y	y	y	n	y		n	y	n	E
Deborah King (Snyder)				n	n	n	n		n	n	n	
Paul Kranz (Sinnott)				y	y	y	y		a	y	y	M
Chris Pawenski (Sinnott)	y	y	y						y			E
Tim Lund (Kowalski)	n	n	n	n	n	n	n		n			E
Kathy McGoldrick (Einach)				y	n	y	n		n	y	y	T
Bob Potter (Gerwitz)	n	n	n	n	n	n	n		n	n	n	I
Paul Salzler (Snyder)	n	n	n						a			N
Warren Schmidt (Brisky & Sirianni)	y	y	y	y	n	y	y		y	y	y	G
Carol Scheibley (Hutchinson)	n	n	n	n	n	n	n		n	n	n	

Year-end Survey

An online survey was distributed to members and alternates as of the end of the year and was completed by 18 members and alternates. The survey was adapted and abbreviated from prior year surveys. Answers were based on a five point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The summary indicates the number of responses, the average score of those responses and a standard deviation representing the range of variation among answers. The survey also allowed for open responses.

Detailed survey results are attached.

West Valley CTF 2008 Evaluation

Analysis of Responses

Disagree ↔ Agree Questions

Section / Question	Response Count	Avg	Disagree ↔ Agree 1 ↔ 5	Std Dev
CTF PROCESS AND PARTICIPATION				
I am comfortable asking questions and speaking candidly about issues in the CTF process.	17	4.59		0.49
I am comfortable working with other CTF participants and discussing issues of concern with them.	18	4.61		0.49
The CTF is appropriately addressing its objectives as specified in the Ground Rules by:				
Providing a forum for open discussion of related issues by community representatives.	18	4.50		0.50
Identifying and understanding the various interests of the community and other interested parties.	18	4.06		0.91
Increasing the flow of information between DOE, NYSERDA and the Task Force Members (and their constituencies).	17	4.18		0.71
Expanding areas of agreement, clarifying differences, and exploring ways to establish mutually agreed upon recommendations among the Task Force Members.	18	4.33		0.47
Enhancing public involvement in the decision-making process.	18	3.89		0.74
Coordinating with regulators.	18	3.94		0.70
Other comments on process and participation:	NA	NA	See attached.	NA
CTF FACILITATOR				
The facilitator helps the CTF participants engage in the process.	18	4.72		0.45
The facilitator helps the CTF manage time well.	18	4.61		0.59
The facilitator has reached out to understand my interests, issues and concerns.	18	4.44		0.90
The facilitator is open to feedback and suggestions.	18	4.67		0.58
The facilitator understands the key issues and is prepared for meetings.	18	4.72		0.56
The facilitator upholds the ground rules and works in an impartial manner.	18	4.67		0.58
The facilitator helps the CTF deal with difficult issues in a constructive manner.	18	4.56		0.76
Other comments or suggestions for the CTF facilitator:	NA	NA	See attached.	NA
CTF MEETINGS				
The presentations provided by agency staff meet the information needs of the CTF participants.	17	4.24		0.42
The format of the CTF meetings provides for open discussion of the key issues.	18	4.44		0.50
Other comments or suggestions on CTF meetings:	NA	NA	See attached.	NA

West Valley CTF 2008 Evaluation

Analysis of Responses

Disagree ↔ Agree Questions

Section / Question	Response Count	Avg	Disagree ↔ Agree	
			1 ↔ 5	Std Dev
CTF EFFECTIVENESS				
The CTF is an effective voice for the surrounding community.	17	3.88		0.68
The CTF process provides a full and balanced exchange of views, information and advice: (Check all that apply)	NA	NA	See attached.	NA
I am able to provide input on significant issues in a timely manner.	17	4.18		0.62
I have developed positive relationships with the other CTF participants.	17	4.59		0.49
CTF OUTREACH				
The CTF is effective at sharing information with members' constituents and the community.	18	3.83		0.76
I keep my constituents informed of the CTF developments and issues.	18	4.06		0.78
I participate in the WVDP Quarterly Public Meetings to keep current on the issues.	14	2.43		1.45
The local community understands the issues being addressed by the CTF.	18	3.06		0.97
Other comments or suggestions concerning CTF outreach:	NA	NA	See attached.	NA
GENERAL				
General comments and thoughts:	NA	NA	See attached.	NA

Other comments on process and participation:

- I think the CTF is very good at bringing about the above objectives. In fact, other public input (it seems to me) is limited only by the availability of the public to come and present their views.

Other comments or suggestions for the CTF facilitator:

- I have been very impressed with the facilitator doing exactly what the job title describes.
- It is somewhat difficult for me to complete this survey as an alternate. I try to attend meetings when asked to by my member I represent as an alternate.

Other comments and suggestions on CTF meetings:

- I have been happy with agency presentations - they seem to be willing and wanting to provide information requested or of interest to the CTF. I see, however, that there are some CTF members who seem to have some minor issues with presented material, but I think the process is working well.
- Some discussions need more time to cover.

The CTF process provides a full and balances exchange of views, information and advice:

- Two respondents skipped the question. Of the 16 who responded:
 - With other members: 100% agreed
 - With NYSERDA: 93.8% agreed
 - With DOE: 56.3% agreed
 - With Core Team agencies: 43.8% agreed

Other comments or suggestions concerning CTF outreach:

- I don't have direct information on many of these, except through copies of newspaper clippings or other notices indicating information is getting "out there". I'm not sure who my constituency is (this isn't my primary role, as I see it).
- NRC wasn't mentioned as an agency with which we interact.
- Re full and balance exchange of views information and advice: we attempt that; whether we succeed is another question.
- When there is something to report I will inform my constituents.
- The CTF can reach out to the public but many times the public is unresponsive.

General comments and thoughts:

- (See above). I am looking forward to getting into the main issue of the EIS.
- It was hard to answer the question about a full and balanced exchange of views. Often we hear presentations and these are helpful but I don't feel that we really have a chance to fully exchange points or view and wonder if anything we say is ever discussed again within agencies. And there have been times when agency reps have been clear that they have a point of view that may color their perception of what we think.
- I believe the CTF is making some progress, at least comments are made and we are being heard. Not sure if we are really getting anywhere.
- As an alternate, it is difficult to complete this survey since I have been attending meeting when I am asked to represent the member.
- I hope we have found the right path forward this time.