

To: _ Citizen Task Force
From: Melinda Holland, Clean Sites
Subject: Summary of October 21, 1997, Meeting
Date: October 23, 1997

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Citizen Task Force (CTF) will be held on:

Date: Wednesday, November 5, 1997
Time: 7:00 p.m. - 9:30 p.m.
Location: Ashford Office Complex
9030 Route 219, West Valley, NY

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:

Nevella McNeil, Bill King, Elaine Belt, Eric Wohlers, Rich Tobe, Pete Scherer, Warren Schmidt, Joe Patti, Larry Smith, Ray Vaughan, Paul Piciulo, Tom Rowland, Murray Regan, John Pfeffer, and John Beltz for Pete Cooney.

Absent: Jana Rosler, Tim Simpson and Blake Reeves.

Regulatory Agency Attendees:

Blake Krajewski, NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC)

Attendees by video link: Jack Parrott and Tim Johnson, NRC.

Tuesday, October 21, 1997, Meeting Summary:

Tom Attridge began the meeting by addressing administrative issues. Melinda Holland reviewed the agenda and received comments on the October 1 meeting summary. A misspelling was corrected in the attached revised October 1 meeting summary.

The meeting began with a short presentation on the High-Level Waste Tank Closure Workshop held on October 7 and 8 in Salt Lake City. The West Valley site was represented at the

workshop by representatives from DOE, NYSERDA, the Seneca Nation, and Pete Scherer from the Citizen Task Force. Barbara Mazurowski, DOE, gave a brief overview of the Workshop objective and West Valley participants. Dan Westcott, WVNS, summarized information obtained at the Workshop on the status of high-level waste tank closures at Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, Savannah River Site, Hanford, and Oak Ridge National Laboratory.¹ Pete Scherer discussed the level of citizen involvement at these sites and noted that, in his opinion, the West Valley CTF appeared to have the best communications and relationship with its site. He also noted that the structure, goals, meeting schedule, composition, and success of the stakeholder groups varied considerably from site to site.

The following paragraphs summarize the discussion which followed the summary of the High-Level Waste Tank Closure Workshop.

At Savannah River, two high-level waste tanks have been cleaned to the extent possible and filled with grout (operational closure). They have not had groundwater problems yet as the water table is lower than at West Valley, but they are investigating the slurry wall concept for additional protection. The Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board only meets quarterly but their representative felt they are having meaningful input.

A CTF member questioned why DOE will remain at these site, like Oak Ridge. It was explained that DOE owns the sites and will remain at Oak Ridge because it is one of several active DOE national laboratories. A DOE representative stated that it is highly unlikely that West Valley would be considered as the site for a new national laboratory. No new labs are likely to be established at this time.

CTF members then discussed contacting Representative Amo Houghton about possible ways to keep DOE at the West Valley site. Representative Houghton has agreed to attend a CTF meeting via video conference. CTF members are requested to submit questions and issues for Representative Houghton to Warren Schmidt. A member suggested asking Representative Houghton how much we risk losing of the current Act by going to Congress.

DOE stated that funding for West Valley will probably remain stable through the year 2000. However, when vitrification is complete in 2001 or 2002, DOE's funding may change drastically. A record of decision for the remaining cleanup needs to be completed before that time.

Pros and Cons Exercise - WMA 3

Next the CTF divided into four small groups, one for each closure alternative for Waste Management Area 3. The small groups discussed and listed the positive and negative aspects (pros and cons) of each alternative for WMA 3. A spokesperson for each group then described the pros and cons developed by their group. During the discussion that followed, a CTF member

¹For a copy of materials distributed at this meeting please call Sonja Allen, WVNS, (716) 942-2152.

noted that some of the key issues were retrievable versus non-retrievable wastes, permanent versus temporary, and that, in his opinion, the group seems to be focusing primarily on Alternatives II and III.

The lists of pros and cons are attached to this summary. The lists were mailed to each CTF member to be ranked in order of importance. At the November 5 meeting, the CTF will identify why each of the pros and cons receiving the top votes are important to them. Out of this discussion we will develop a prioritized list of values for this WMA. We will repeat the pros and cons listing, ranking, and values discussion for additional WMAs until the CTF members feel they have described all the key pros, cons, and values. The CTF would then agree on a list of site closure values to submit to DOE and NYSERDA as an interim CTF product. The list of values which result from these exercises will be used in the next phase of CTF activity, which we propose to be working with WMAs 1, 3, 7, and 8 to explore cleanup approaches which might be acceptable to the CTF. Clean Sites is developing an exercise using a map of the site to facilitate this discussion.

The CTF concluded that the pros and cons exercise for WMA 3 was useful and that they would like to repeat it for WMA 8, the State-Licensed Disposal Area, at the next meeting. At the November 5 meeting, the CTF also agreed to list the values which underlie the pros and cons for WMA 3.

Observer Comments:

An observer requested information on how citizen advisory groups at other DOE sites conduct their meetings. Specifically, she wanted to know if observers are allowed to comment or ask questions during the meetings.

Action Items:

Prepare a brief summary of the structure and approach followed by the stakeholder groups at other DOE facilities.

