

To: - Citizen Task Force
From: Melinda Holland, Clean Sites
Subject: Summary of February 4th, 1998, Meeting **Revised**
Date: February 10, 1998

Next Meeting:

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

Date: Tuesday, February 17, 1998
Time: 7:00 p.m. - 9:30 p.m.
Location: Ashford Office Complex
6935 Route 21, 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:

Attending were: Ray Vaughan, Pete Scherer, Joe Patti, Warren Schmidt, Nevella McNeil, Elizabeth Lowes (for Tom Kowland), Paul Pirinola, Pete Conroy, Tim Siegel, Blake Keeves, Rich Tobe, Eric Wohlers, Lana Rosler, and Bill King. Not attending were: Elaine Belt, Larry Smith, Tom Kowland, John Pfeiffer, and Murray Regan.

Regulatory Agency Attendees:

Attending via conference call:
Jack Parrott, Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
Tim Johnson, NRC
Joe Price, Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)

February 4th Meeting Summary:

Tom Attridge and Melinda Holland opened the meeting by reviewing administrative issues and the agenda. Based on edits received by telephone, corrected versions of the summary of the January 20 CTF meeting, the December 16 and January 15 technical workgroup meetings were distributed.

This CTF meeting was dedicated to working with the site cleanup exercise or game, called *Consensus Site*, developed by Clean Sites. Tom Attridge explained the rules for the exercise. The exercise consists of a large site map with "puzzle" pieces representing each of the alternatives for the four key Waste Management Areas (WMAs). For the purpose of this exercise, members evaluated WMAs 1, Main Plant; 3, High-Level Waste Tanks and Vitrification Facility; 7, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission-Licensed Disposal Area (NDA); and, 8, the State-Licensed Disposal Area

(SDA). The puzzle pieces contain key information from the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for each alternative. The object of the exercise is to reach consensus with the other player on a configuration of alternatives for these four waste management areas. The results of the exercise are not binding, it is merely a means to stimulate discussion over what is important to each participant and to attempt to reach agreement on an approach for cleanup for the purposes of the exercise. Participants were encouraged to note on their score sheets any special considerations or conditions they devised to allow them to reach agreement and to also note the key site closure principles or values that drove their decisions.

Before beginning the exercise several CTF members discussed their concerns about institutional controls. Some were reluctant to assume for the purposes of the exercise that institutional controls would work over extended time periods. Others wanted more information on what institutional controls really entails and how they would be applied at this site. The CTF agreed that institutional controls should be the topic of the next meeting.

The CTF members separated into pairs and worked with the exercise for approximately one hour. After that each pair reported on their results. Those outcomes are listed below without attribution.

- ◆ This pair did the exercise as a non-binding game starting by putting all of the Alternative I puzzle pieces on the map. They noted that choosing Alternative I cost \$6.4 billion and caused 10.5 deaths based on the numbers used in the exercise. They concluded that this result was probably politically unsaleable so they explored the use of Alternative III A and B for all four units. They noted that based on the numbers on the pieces, that Alternative III resulted in lower cost and less danger if institutional controls are maintained. They had no special considerations noted.
- ◆ The next team did not reach complete consensus. One player preferred Alternative II and the other player preferred Alternative III. They agreed they would choose Alternative II for WMAs 7 and 8 if it could be shown that the above-ground storage structure would be able to withstand all forces of nature, such as tornados. If this could not be demonstrated, they favored leaving the waste in the ground under Alternative I. In other words, if adequate erosion controls could be incorporated. For WMA 1, they agreed on Alternative IIIB with a slurry wall, if the interior of the building is cleaned to the maximum extent possible before it is rubbleized. For WMA 3, one preferred Alternative II, the other favored Alternative IIIA with a slurry wall, a cap to prevent erosion, monitoring, and institutional controls.
- ◆ This pair analyzed what would happen if Alternative II were selected for all the WMAs. They calculated that the cost of Alternative II spread over the number of years it will take to implement, is \$179 million per year, which they believe is not too far beyond what is currently being spent on the site per year. They found that Alternative II has the lowest human health impacts and felt it would not be too difficult to implement. They noted that the worker risk projections in the DEIS were low for Alternative II. They questioned the accuracy of the DEIS figures for post implementation jobs.
- ◆ The next team first looked at Alternative I, but concluded it was not feasible because there is no place to send the waste. They selected Alternative IIIB for WMAs 1 and 3 if the interior of the building is cleaned as much as possible before it is rubbleized. They would also like to keep open the option of future retrieveability. For WMA 7 and 8, they choose Alternative II but were concerned over increasing the size of the site footprint to accommodate all the storage

facilities that would be necessary. They favor getting these wastes out of the ground because they are concerned that the burial grounds will be forgotten over time unless they are in above-ground storage.

- ◆ This team selected Alternative IIIA for Burial of WMA's. This was based on the assumption that institutional controls would be maintained. They felt strongly that institutional controls need to be clearly defined for this site. If they do not like what is proposed for those controls, they would favor Alternative II, above-ground storage.
- ◆ The last pair decided on Alternative IIIB for WMA 1 and IIIA for WMA 3 if the funds needed to implement Alternative II were placed in an interest-bearing account to allow future retrieval of stored wastes, if necessary. For WMA's 1 and 3, they choose Alternative II with the condition that the cost of Alternative I be put in an interest-bearing account to remove the stored wastes at some future date if needed. Concerns over erosion on the South Plateau were the main basis for choosing Alternative II. They were also uncomfortable with reliance on institutional controls for the long term and favor only an interim use of Alternatives II or III. They felt it would be good to allow time for the gamma emitting substances to decay for WMA's 1 and 3 before exhumation.

7/25/98

During the discussion which followed the exercise, one member noted that most teams did not choose Alternatives I, IV and V. He felt the CTF needs to deal with concerns over institutional controls and investigate hybrid remedies between Alternatives II and III. He noted that reliance on institutional controls is what allows Alternative III to be the lowest in cost and risk. Other members noted that they felt the exercise was very useful.

A site representative explained to the CTF that the government must consider risk reduction achieved per dollar spent in its decision making. A CTF member responded that if the site had already decided that there is only one acceptable answer they should inform the CTF so as not to waste the group's time. The site representative questioned whether the CTF wanted to develop recommendations in concert with DOE and NYSERDA with the goal of having the site attempt to get agreement on those recommendations "up the chain" as provided in the CTF ground rules. A CTF member responded that he felt the CTF should base its recommendation on what it feels should be done, not on what the agencies can sell up the chain of command.

The CTF concluded that the next step is to have the site provide more information on what constitutes institutional controls as proposed for West Valley.

Observer Comments:

An observer noted that she did not feel that using Alternative III leaves the wastes retrievable. Another observer expressed concern about the CTF going forward with recommendations before NRC provides its guidelines on decommissioning. An NRC representative responded that they do not have a date for issuance of the Commission paper on the West Valley site.

Next Steps

The next meeting will include a presentation on institutional controls and discussion.

