

West Valley Citizen Task Force

Summary of Accomplishments – 2010

Introduction

This memorandum summarizes the accomplishments, activities, attendance and 2010 year-end survey results for the West Valley Citizen Task Force. New to the survey this year is a parallel survey of key staff from DOE, NYSERDA and WVES. This summary is intended to be an aid to discussion and decision-making for 2011 planning. Listed first are the accomplishments for the year. Following that is an analysis of attendance for the year.

Meetings, Presentations and Other Accomplishments

During the 2010 the CTF accomplished the following:

- Ten CTF meetings were held. Topics of presentations and discussions included:
 - Presentation and discussion of the Environmental Impact Statement, Record of Decision and New York Findings Statement
 - Presentations on from DOE/WVES on:
 - Regular updates on WVDP (Safety, Main Plant activities, waste processing, North Plateau Groundwater Plume, American Resource and Recovery Act / funding, et al)
 - Radiation safety
 - Characterization Sampling & Analysis Plan
 - North Plateau Groundwater Plume Permeable Treatment Wall design and installation
 - Proposed Phase 1 Studies Process (Joint NYSERDA/DOE)
 - Consent Decree resolving cost allocation issues (Joint NYSERDA/DOE)
 - Phase 1 Decommissioning - Facilities Disposition Contract Request for Proposals
 - High-Level Waste Tank Farm – Tank & Vault Drying System
 - Presentations from NYSERDA on:
 - Erdman Brook erosion mitigation & leachate tank removal
 - State-Licensed Disposal Area Focused Corrective Measures Study
 - General updates on: Repair to the SDA geomembrane cover, SDA Management and Monitoring, Property release at Western New York Nuclear Service Center
 - NRC presentation on Technical Evaluation Report
- Passed a Resolution May 26, 2010 Concerning Funding for West Valley Demonstration Project
- Several CTF members participated in the Quarterly Public Meetings
- Website maintenance and updates continued throughout the year

Correspondence

Sent

The following correspondence was sent by the CTF in 2010:

- May 26, 2010 Letter to DOE with accompanying Resolution concerning funding
- November 10, 2010 Citizen Task Force letter to DOE concerning project funding
- December 15, 2010 Citizen Task Force Letters to Congressman Reed, Senator Schumer and Senator Gillibrand concerning legislative representation on the CTF

Received

The following correspondence was received by the CTF in 2010:

- Courtesy recipient of December 2009 letters from Congressman Massa to DOE and NYSERDA
- June 29, 2010 letter from New York Attorney General concerning CTF comments on Proposed Consent Decree
- August 11, 2010 DOE response to CTF Concerning CTF Letter and Resolution of May 26, 2010
- Courtesy recipient of September 13, 2010 letter from Citizens Environmental Coalition et al to DOE & NYSERDA concerning Independent Panel & Phase 1 Studies Process
- Courtesy recipient of NYSERDA October 5, 2010 Letter to DOE concerning funding and DOE November 10, 2010 Reply to NYSERDA

All correspondence is available on the CTF website at www.westvalleyctf.org on the 2010 meeting materials page.

Press Coverage

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

Membership and Attendance

During the year, several members left the Citizen Task Force. Original CTF member Pete Scherer passed away. Dr. Tim Siepel, also an original member, and Joe Atkinson resigned. Warren Schmidt became representative for the 29th Congressional District after the resignation of US Congressman Eric Massa and until the special election held in November. In December Mr. Schmidt became the representative for State Representative Joseph Giglio replacing Mike Brisky who became his alternate. Pending more information on the Phase 1 studies process, topics and schedule the Citizen Task Force opted not to replace members with the exception of requesting representation from federal legislators.

An attached chart notes the attendance of members and alternates for 2009. 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.”

Year-end Survey

An online survey was distributed to members and alternates as of the end of the year. The survey was completed by 13 of the 15 members and alternates who received it. (The survey was sent to members or their alternate when the alternate is the regular/de facto attendee for the member.) The survey was replicated from the prior year's survey. A parallel survey was completed by 5 representatives of DOE, NYSERDA and WVES. Answers were based on a scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree plus open responses. The summary indicates the number of responses, the average score of those responses and a standard deviation representing the range of variation among answers. Detailed survey results are attached.

Planning for 2011

Review of Ground Rules and Mission

The CTF Ground Rules Section I. Objectives state in part:

“The Citizen Task Force process is being conducted in addition to the public comment process required by the National Environmental Policy Act and the State Environmental Quality Review Act. The Task Force will discuss the following specific topics and provide comments or recommendations to the agencies for consideration:

- Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Decontamination and Waste Management;
- DEIS for Decommissioning including the development of the preferred alternative;
- NRC Policy Statement for Decontamination and Decommissioning;
- Long-Term Stewardship; and
- Future Land Use Options.

Either the site managers or the CTF may propose additional topics, as amendments to the CTF Mission and Ground Rules (in accordance with Section IV. H).”

As a group the CTF, DOE and NYSERDA need to consider a number of difficult questions related to its role and responsibilities including:

1. Should the objectives of the CTF be refined?
 - a. If so how?
2. How should the CTF go about accomplishing those objectives?
 - a. What does this mean for meeting topics on Phase 1 and informing the final decision?
 - b. Are there any priorities among the tasks to be undertaken?
 - c. What work groups should be formed or reformed?
3. What do the answers to 1 and 2 above mean for:
 - a. Membership
 - b. Frequency of meetings and relationship to other public meetings (Phase 1 studies and Quarterly Public Meeting)

West Valley CTF 2010 Evaluation

Analysis of Responses

Multiple Choice

| Section / Question | Participants | | | | Agencies | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|------|---------|------------------|-----------|------|---------|------------------|
| | Responses | Avg | Std Dev | Disagree ↔ Agree | Responses | Avg | Std Dev | Disagree ↔ Agree |
| CTF PROCESS AND PARTICIPATION | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 13 | 4.85 | 0.36 | | 5 | 4.80 | 0.40 | |
| 2 | 13 | 4.92 | 0.27 | | 5 | 4.80 | 0.40 | |
| 3 | 13 | 4.54 | 0.50 | | 5 | 4.60 | 0.49 | |
| 4 | 13 | 4.15 | 0.66 | | 5 | 4.20 | 0.75 | |
| 5 | 13 | 4.31 | 0.61 | | 5 | 4.40 | 0.80 | |
| 6 | 13 | 4.54 | 0.63 | | 5 | 4.60 | 0.49 | |
| 7 | 13 | 4.00 | 0.68 | | 5 | 4.40 | 0.80 | |
| 8 | 13 | 4.23 | 0.58 | | 5 | 3.60 | 1.02 | |
| 9 | 2 | NA | NA | See attached. | 1 | NA | NA | See attached. |

Participants

Agencies

| Section / Question | Participants | | | Agencies | | |
|--------------------|--------------|-----|---------|-----------|-----|---------|
| | Responses | Avg | Std Dev | Responses | Avg | Std Dev |

CTF FACILITATOR

| Item | Text | Responses | Avg | Std Dev | Responses | Avg | Std Dev |
|------|--|-----------|------|---------|-----------|------|---------|
| 10 | The facilitator helps the CTF participants engage in the process. | 13 | 4.69 | 0.61 | 5 | 5.00 | 0.00 |
| 11 | The facilitator helps the CTF manage time well. | 13 | 4.62 | 0.62 | 5 | 4.60 | 0.49 |
| 12 | The facilitator has reached out to understand my interests, issues and concerns. | 13 | 4.69 | 0.61 | 5 | 4.80 | 0.40 |
| 13 | The facilitator is open to feedback and suggestions. | 13 | 4.92 | 0.27 | 5 | 5.00 | 0.00 |
| 14 | The facilitator understands the key issues and is prepared for meetings. | 12 | 4.83 | 0.55 | 5 | 5.00 | 0.00 |
| 15 | The facilitator upholds the ground rules and works in an impartial manner. | 13 | 4.77 | 0.58 | 5 | 5.00 | 0.00 |
| 16 | The facilitator helps the CTF deal with difficult issues in a constructive manner. | 13 | 4.92 | 0.27 | 5 | 5.00 | 0.00 |
| 17 | Other comments or suggestions for the CTF facilitator: | 2 | NA | NA | 1 | NA | NA |

CTF MEETINGS

| Item | Text | Responses | Avg | Std Dev | Responses | Avg | Std Dev |
|------|--|-----------|------|---------|-----------|------|---------|
| 18 | The presentations provided by agency staff meet the information needs of the CTF participants. | 13 | 4.23 | 0.42 | 4 | 4.50 | 0.50 |
| 19 | The format of the CTF meetings provides for open discussion of the key issues. | 13 | 4.54 | 0.50 | 5 | 4.60 | 0.80 |
| 20 | Other comments or suggestions on CTF meetings: | 1 | NA | NA | 0 | NA | NA |

Participants

Agencies

| Section / Question | Participants | | | Agencies | | |
|--------------------|--------------|-----|---------|-----------|-----|---------|
| | Responses | Avg | Std Dev | Responses | Avg | Std Dev |

CTF EFFECTIVENESS

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|----|------|------|---|------|------|
| 21 | The CTF is an effective voice for the surrounding community. | 13 | 4.23 | 0.42 | 5 | 4.00 | 0.63 |
| 22 | The CTF process provides a full and balanced exchange of views, information and advice: (Check all that apply) | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|----|------|------|---|------|------|
| 23 | I am able to provide input on significant issues in a timely manner. | 13 | 4.46 | 0.63 | 5 | 4.60 | 0.80 |
| 24 | I have developed positive relationships with the other CTF participants. | 13 | 4.69 | 0.46 | 5 | 4.80 | 0.40 |

CTF OUTREACH

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---|----|------|------|---|------|------|
| 25 | The CTF is effective at sharing information with members' constituents and the community. | 13 | 3.85 | 0.86 | 5 | 3.00 | 0.63 |
| 26 | I keep my constituents informed of the CTF developments and issues. | 13 | 4.08 | 0.92 | 5 | 4.60 | 0.49 |
| 27 | I participate in the WVDP Quarterly Public Meetings to keep current on the issues. | 11 | 2.55 | 1.44 | 4 | 4.50 | 0.87 |
| 28 | The local community understands the issues being addressed by the CTF. | 12 | 3.00 | 1.08 | 5 | 3.60 | 0.49 |
| 29 | Other comments or suggestions concerning CTF outreach: | 4 | NA | NA | 0 | NA | NA |

GENERAL

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|---|----|----|---|----|----|
| 30 | General comments and thoughts: | 2 | NA | NA | 0 | NA | NA |
|----|--------------------------------|---|----|----|---|----|----|

West Valley CTF 2010 Evaluation Participants

Open Ended Questions

9 **Other comments on process and participation:**

My answers to Q's 4,5 and 6 reflect my concern that the community interests are not being addressed adequately by CTF members, partly because of limited understanding/knowledge of members, and partly due to limited access to our constituents. The answer? Haven't a clue, except possibly a newsletter from the CTF to constituents.

Re #1 response: I am still learning. My response is due to my own feeling that I don't always know what to ask, not any failing on the part of the facilitator or other members or presenters.

17 **Other comments or suggestions for the CTF facilitator:**

Doing the best he can with a group that has such diverse interests. Sometimes prodding us re: time or decisions, other times patiently listening, he walks a fine line, much appreciated. Group seems to need encouragement to ask questions reflecting concerns. He needs to watch for puzzled looks!

Does a great job in keeping the meetings productive and focused.

20 **Other comments or suggestions on CTF meetings:**

Many of the group are fairly new. Facilitator needs to remind them now and then that no question is "dumb", that the answer to the question of one member might result in just what another member needs to understand.

29 **Other comments or suggestions concerning CTF outreach:**

re 25 & 26: I think my personal outreach has been inadequate... difficult to be timely. Re # 27 That has meant another meeting 30 miles away, so I don't usually go. # 28: I don't know, but I wonder if the locals understand the importance/significance of these meetings going on for so many years.

Question 22, asking yes/no for "full and balanced exchange," doesn't provide the opportunity for saying "somewhat" or otherwise qualifying the answer.

We need better press coverage for announcements, etc with the Olean Times Herald, Jamestown Post Journal (which covers nearby Gowanda) and the Dunkirk Observer.

Answering question #27 is odd given the answer choices. Most CTF members do not attend the Q meetings because the information given there is the same, but less in-depth and less technical than that provided at CTF meetings (i.e. more of a brief overview). Thus is of no intrinsic value for the time necessary to attend. Strongly suggest eliminating that question.

30 **General comments and thoughts:**

No one expected this to go on so long. Result: the nucleus of people here from the beginning has shrunk; that, and the percentage of relative newcomers, can be either good or bad news: good for bringing in fresh energy & different approaches; bad for loss of institutional memory so that important details fall in the cracks, so to speak.

West Valley CTF 2010 Evaluation Participants

Open Ended Questions

I and other CTF members are looking forward to seeing the Phase I studies get underway in a scientifically sound, prompt, and productive manner, the purpose being to address/resolve the major outstanding issues that need clarification for Phase II decisions. The process of getting these studies underway will likely provide a much clearer basis for next year's evaluation, compared to the relatively transitional and procedural activities of the past year that we're now evaluating.

West Valley CTF 2010 Evaluation Agencies

Open Ended Questions

- 9 **Other comments on process and participation:**
regarding comment 8 - the lack of coordination with the regulators is due to lack of involvement from the regulators.
- 17 **Other comments or suggestions for the CTF facilitator:**
Bill does a good job.
- 20 **Other comments or suggestions on CTF meetings:**
- 29 **Other comments or suggestions concerning CTF outreach:**
- 30 **General comments and thoughts:**
-

| Name | 27-Jan | 24-Feb | 24-Mar | 28-Apr | 26-May | 23-Jun | 25-Aug | 22-Sep | 17-Nov | 15-Dec | Present | Absent | Alt Present |
|---------------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------|--|--------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|-------------|
| Members | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Deb Aumick | y | y | y | n | y | y | y | n | y | y | 8 | 2 | 0 |
| Mike Brisky | a | n | a | a | a | a | a | a | n | a | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| Rob Dallas | y | y | y | y | y | n | y | y | n | n | 7 | 3 | 0 |
| Judy Einach | y | y | a | a | a | a | a | y | a | a | 3 | 0 | 7 |
| Chris Gerwitz | y | y | y | y | y | n | y | n | y | y | 8 | 2 | 0 |
| Mike Hutchinson | y | y | n | y | n | n | n | y | y | y | 6 | 4 | 0 |
| Kathy Konst | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | n | a | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| Steve Kowalski | y | y | y | n | y | n | n | n | n | y | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| Lee Lambert | y | y | y | y | y | y | y | y | y | y | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Anthony Memmo | y | n | y | y | a | n | a | y | y | n | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| Joe Patti | n | y | y | y | y | y | y | y | y | y | 9 | 1 | 0 |
| John Pfeffer | n | y | n | y | n | n | y | n | y | n | 4 | 6 | 0 |
| Warren Schmidt (Brisky) | y | n | y | y | y | y | y | y | n | y | 8 | 2 | 0 |
| Bill Snyder | y | y | y | y | n | n | n | n | n | n | 4 | 6 | 0 |
| Ray Vaughan | y | y | y | n | y | y | y | a | y | y | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| Eric Wohlers | a | y | a | n | a | y | y | y | y | a | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Alternates | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Chris Crawford (Wohlers) | y | n | y | n | y | n | y | n | n | y | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| Gladys Gifford (Vaughan) | n | n | n | n | n | n | n | y | n | n | 1 | 9 | 0 |
| Deb John (Memmo) | n | n | n | y | y | n | y | n | n | n | 3 | 7 | 0 |
| Deborah King (Snyder) | n | n | n | n | n | n | n | n | n | n | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Paul Kranz (Konst) | y | n | y | y | y | y | a* | y | y | y | 8 | 1 | 0 |
| Chris Pawenski (Konst) | n | n | n | n | n | n | n | n | n | n | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Kathy McGoldrick (Einach) | n | y | y | y | y | y | y | n | y | y | 8 | 2 | 0 |
| Bob Potter (Gerwitz) | n | n | n | n | n | n | n | n | n | n | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | | | | | * Darren Kempner attended for Paul Kranz | | | | | | | | |
| | y = | Present | n = | absent | a = | represented by alternate | | | | | | | |