

To: West Valley Citizen Task Force
From: Bill Logue, Citizen Task Force Facilitator
Date: May 4, 2009
Subject: **Summary of the April 22, 2009 Meeting**

Next Meeting

The next Citizen Task Force Meeting will be:

Time & Date: **7:00 – 9:30 PM, May 6, 2009**
Location: Ashford Office Complex
9030 Route 219
West Valley, NY

Note: All participants must be United States citizens and must bring photo identification. If you have questions or comments regarding the upcoming meeting or about this summary, please contact Bill Logue (860-521-9122, bill@loguegroup.com).

CTF Participants

CTF Members and Alternates attending: Robert Engel, Mike Hutchinson, Steve Kowalski, Paul Kranz, Lee Lambert, Kathy McGoldrick, Anthony Memmo, Joe Patti, Bob Potter, Pete Scherer, Warren Schmidt, Tim Siepel, Bill Snyder, Eric Wohlers.

Agency Participants and Observers

Department of Energy (DOE): Bryan Bower, Ben Underwood.

New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA): Tom Attridge, Paul Bembia, John Kelly, Andrea Mellon.

West Valley Environmental Services, LLC (WVES): Sonja Allen, Charles Biedermann.

WSMS: Bob Steiner.

Observers: Joanne Hameister, Ken Margrey, Phyllis Margrey.

Introductions and Announcements

Bill Logue welcomed the group and reviewed the meeting documents.¹

CTF members reviewed the general comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). To better understand this summary, it should be read in association with the draft comments available with meeting materials for this meeting on www.westvalleyctf.org. Paul Bembia and Bryan Bower strongly encouraged the CTF to err on the side of submitting any and all comments the group felt it might make.

Comments on DEIS Chapter 4

General comments Chapter 4. Paul Kranz reviewed his general comment stating that the DEIS seems to address the biggest potential impact as the threat to human health and safety from uncontrolled radioactive releases but does not seem to adequately address this as it relates to the threat to the environment in general or other species in and of themselves. Other members concurred and spoke to the ethical concern for other species, the impacts on those species from exposure and the eventual potential impacts on humans. In addition, a member raised the question of whether the economic impact of contamination is sufficiently addressed, for example if fish stocks are contaminated the impact on recreational fishing and the economy it supports. Paul Bembia noted that the standards apply to

¹ The documents are listed at the end of this summary and may be found at www.westvalleyctf.org

dose limits to human receptors established by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). The dose limits are arrived at through calculations of dose concentrations which measure the amount of radioactivity in the environment.

The CTF agreed to add a general comment on the chapter suggesting that the ecological and cumulative impacts of a radiological release be addressed in the document. They also agreed that a comment asking if a radiological release below criteria would be considered an impact.

Specific Comments Chapter 4.

- The suggested comment on Table 4-1 on page 4-4 was withdrawn.
- The comment concerning tables on traffic volume impacts in Table 4-3 on page 4-11 and shipment projections in Table 4-52 on page 4-105 was accepted after discussion. The group discussed how the tables address two different aspects and how this might not be clear to the reader.
- The comment concerning the assumption that all shipments are by truck on page 4-12, paragraph 2, line 3, should be clarified that it is for roadway impacts and a question be added concerning how this is carried through the risk calculations.
- The comment on sedimentation risk on page 4-22, paragraph 2, line 2, will be revised to reflect that the draft should be clearer that non-radiological releases are being considered and that there may be differences between highest likelihood events and greatest impacts and that document should state how the conclusion was reached.
- The comment on the typo on page 4-23 was accepted and a new comment concerning a typo in section 4.1.4.2 paragraph 2 line 4 indicating that it should read “exposed.”
- The comment on page 4-26 section 4.1.4.4 was accepted.
- A new comment was added concerning the integrated ground water modeling on page 4-87 stating that, because no state-of-the-art model exists to integrate ground water and erosion models, to make the assumption that the impacts are cumulative is not necessarily a conservative approach. The analysis should also examine the possibility of exponential or other impacts from the combined interaction of groundwater flow and erosion.

Comments on DEIS Chapter 1

The edits to the previous chapter 1 comments were accepted.

Comments on DEIS Chapter 2

The edits to the previous chapter 2 comments were accepted. The following new comments to chapter 2 were added:

- On page 2-32 paragraph 2, the DEIS should describe the conditions or situations where a Supplemental EIS would be prepared.
- Page 2-43 section 2.4.3.1, second bullet, the term “‘defense’ determination” and its implications should be clearly defined. The fifth bullet should explain why the cleanup of contamination greater than 0.5 meters is deferred to Phase 2.

Comments on DEIS – General

Discussion of Paul Kranz’s comment concerning the inherent contradiction in assuming that all possible impacts have been identified in the DEIS and that Phase 2 will be based on some future impact analysis was deferred.

Tony Memmo’s suggested comments were accepted, they are:

- Institutional controls will probably not hold for as long as expected
- Dose modeling seems understated
- Erosion estimates seem understated
- Impacts to engineered barriers can be unpredictable
- There is an inherent danger when dealing with radionuclides and hazardous materials
- Any event that causes a major release of material from the site will contaminate the water supply for most of Western New York
- Monitoring should be increased as the work progresses

Upcoming Meetings

The CTF confirmed that it will meet on May 6 and May 27. A CTF member encouraged the group to set aside time see how the current comments match against the group’s 1998 report.

Observer Comments

An observer commented that, based on her experience with plume modeling, the CTF should be aware that releases into waters may be in low doses but the water action can re-suspend solids and re-concentrate them and the re-release them. Thus a low dose that initially appears not to be dangerous may not always remain so. She also noted that a release is added to background after a period of time thereby creating a new background level. Consequently, background levels may increase over time. She further noted that winter ice could have impacts on how contamination spreads downstream. In making comments, the CTF was strongly encouraged not simply to seek clarification but to state what the Task Force believes should occur.

Action Items

Action	Assigned To	Due Date
Edit comments in light of discussion	CTF/Logue	5/5/2009

Documents Distributed

Document Description	Generated by; Date
CTF individual member draft comments – general, revised chapter 1 and 2, chapter 4	Various CTF members; 4/22/2009
Newspaper clippings distributed at the meeting	NYSERDA; 4/7/2009