

West Valley Citizen Task Force

Summary of Accomplishments – 2009 and Planning for Remainder of 2010

Introduction

This report summarizes the accomplishments, activities, attendance and 2009 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 2010 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:

- Fourteen CTF meetings were held. Topics of presentations and discussions included:
 - Presentation and discussion of the Full Cost Accounting Study prepared for Coalition on West Valley Nuclear Wastes; Citizens Environmental Coalition; Center for Health, Environment and Justice; and Nuclear Information Resource Center.
 - Nine meetings primarily devoted to commenting on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
 - Presentations on from DOE/WVES on:
 - Regular updates on WVDP
 - Updates on the American Resource and Recovery Act
 - High Level Waste Canister Storage Evaluation and Recommendation
 - Supplement Analysis guidance
 - Projected radionuclide inventory over time
 - Presentations from NYSERDA on:
 - Repair to the SDA geomembrane cover
 - Deer monitoring program
 - SDA Management and Monitoring
 - Quantitative Risk Assessment update for the SDA
 - Property release at Western New York Nuclear Service Center
 - Discussion with EPA concerning 40 CFR 191 and 40 CFR 197
 - Presentation and discussion on proposed Consent Decree resolving litigation between NYSERDA and DOE
 - Participation in an NRC public meeting concerning the Decommissioning Plan review process and schedule
- Several CTF members participated as observers in conference calls/video conferences with NRC and DOE.
- CTF members participated in the public meetings concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
- Website maintenance and updates continued throughout the year.

Correspondence

Sent

The following correspondence was sent by the CTF in 2009:

- February 4, 2009 Letter to congressional delegation concerning funding
- March 25, 2009 letter to NRC with comments concerning the Decommissioning Plan
- March 25, 2009 CTF Oral Comments and Press Release on DEIS
- May 27, 2009 Comment letter on DEIS
- October 28, 2009 letter to Congressman Massa on public participation

Received

The following correspondence was received by the CTF in 2009:

- February 18, 2009 Letter from Seneca Nation of Indians
- Responses from DOE and NRC to CTF 2008 Decommissioning Plan letter.
- NRC letter acknowledging receipt on Decommissioning Plan comments

All correspondence is available on the CTF website at www.westvalleyctf.org

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. Commissioner Kathy Konst replaced Commissioner Holly Sinnott. Deb Aumick replaced Warren Schmidt as representative for New York State Senator Catharine Young. Warren Schmidt became representative for US Congressman Eric Massa and Phil Quinlan became alternate for Warren Schmidt. The Ground Rules were amended to add a 19th member.

An attached chart notes the attendance of members and alternates for 2009. Not noted on the graph exceptions, such as Joe Atkinson being on leave and teaching in Asia or underlying information for members who served only a portion of the year. 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 and was completed by 18 members and alternates. The survey was replicated from the prior year's survey. 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 2010

Meeting topics for discussion:

A number of potential topics have been suggested for upcoming meetings. These include:

- Consent Decree
- ROD
- CSAP
- NRC Presentation on Technical Evaluation Report
- Studies to be conducted during ongoing assessment period/Phase I
- Erosion modeling related presentations/workshops:
 - Rainfall intensity-frequency distribution analysis
 - Future climate assumptions/extreme weather events/precipitation
 - Discussion of studies of WEPP, CHILD and SWAT models
 - Methods of verifying CHILD model using known data
 - Input on bedrock valley aquifer and its relationship to surface recharge and surface recontamination
- Information concerning occupational injuries and fatalities related to maintaining erosion control structures
- Ongoing operations and maintenance updates: DOE/WVES/NYSERDA

Before topics are selected it would seem prudent to address the mission of the CTF below. This will also inform questions about membership and participation.

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).”

A number of the elements of the mission of the group have been achieved; others are incomplete. Both NYSERDA and DOE support the continued participation of the CTF as work progresses. 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?
 - 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

West Valley CTF 2009 Evaluation Attendance Summary

Member Represented	Alternate	PCT Member Attended	PCT Covered by Member or Alternate	
Anthony Memmo		85.71%	85.71%	
Bill Snyder	Deborah King	64.29%	64.29%	
Chris Gerwitz	Robert Potter	35.71%	42.86%	
Deb Aumick		75.00%	75.00%	
Eric Wohlers	Chris Crawford	42.86%	78.57%	
Joe Atkinson		0.00%	0.00%	
Joe Patti		64.29%	64.29%	
John Pfeffer		21.43%	21.43%	
Judy Einach	Kathy McGoldrick	64.29%	100.00%	
Kathy Konst	Paul Kranz	0.00%	0.00%	
Paul Kranz	Chris Pawenski	50.00%	50.00%	
Leonore Lambert		85.71%	85.71%	
Michael Brisky	Warren Schmidt	7.14%	85.71%	
Mike Hutchinson	Carol Sheibley	28.57%	28.57%	
Pete Scherer		100.00%	100.00%	
Ray Vaughan	Gladys Gifford	92.86%	92.86%	
Rob Dallas		57.14%	57.14%	
Stephen Kowalski		28.57%	28.57%	
Tim Siepel	Robert Engel	78.57%	100.00%	
Warren Schmidt	Phil Quinlan	85.71%	92.86%	

West Valley CTF 2009 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.	18	4.56		0.70
I am comfortable working with other CTF participants and discussing issues of concern with them.	18	4.89		0.32
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	4.61		0.50
Identifying and understanding the various interests of the community and other interested parties.	18	4.28		0.57
Increasing the flow of information between DOE, NYSERDA and the Task Force Members (and their constituencies).	18	4.28		0.83
Expanding areas of agreement, clarifying differences, and exploring ways to establish mutually agreed upon recommendations among the Task Force Members.	18	4.33		0.49
Enhancing public involvement in the decision-making process.	18	4.00		0.91
Coordinating with regulators.	18	4.22		0.43
Other comments on process and participation:	NA	NA	See attached.	NA
CTF FACILITATOR				
The facilitator helps the CTF participants engage in the process.	18	4.78		0.43
The facilitator helps the CTF manage time well.	18	4.67		0.49
The facilitator has reached out to understand my interests, issues and concerns.	18	4.39		0.70
The facilitator is open to feedback and suggestions.	18	4.83		0.38
The facilitator understands the key issues and is prepared for meetings.	18	4.89		0.32
The facilitator upholds the ground rules and works in an impartial manner.	18	4.89		0.32
The facilitator helps the CTF deal with difficult issues in a constructive manner.	18	4.61		0.61
Other comments or suggestions for the CTF facilitator:	NA	NA	See attached.	NA

West Valley CTF 2009 Evaluation

Analysis of Responses

Disagree ↔ Agree Questions

Section / Question	Response Count	Avg	Disagree ↔ Agree	
			1 ↔ 5	Std Dev
CTF MEETINGS				
The presentations provided by agency staff meet the information needs of the CTF participants.	18	4.11		0.68
The format of the CTF meetings provides for open discussion of the key issues.	18	4.44		0.51
Other comments or suggestions on CTF meetings:	NA	NA	See attached.	NA
CTF EFFECTIVENESS				
The CTF is an effective voice for the surrounding community.	18	4.33		0.59
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.	18	4.00		0.77
I have developed positive relationships with the other CTF participants.	17	4.47		0.62
CTF OUTREACH				
The CTF is effective at sharing information with members' constituents and the community.	18	3.94		0.80
I keep my constituents informed of the CTF developments and issues.	17	4.06		0.75
I participate in the WVDP Quarterly Public Meetings to keep current on the issues.	15	2.53		1.41
The local community understands the issues being addressed by the CTF.	18	3.22		0.88
Other comments or suggestions concerning CTF outreach:	NA	NA	See attached.	NA
GENERAL				
General comments and thoughts:	NA	NA	See attached.	NA


West Valley CTF 2009 Year End Evaluation Information Exchange

Response Percent	Response Count
---------------------	-------------------

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

With other members	94.4%	17
With NYSERDA	100.0%	18
With DOE	72.2%	13
With Core Team Agencies	44.4%	8

answered question 18



West Valley CTF 2009 Evaluation

Open Ended Responses

Other comments on process and participation:

On points where I do not "strongly agree" it is mostly because I don't know; in some cases I think we could probably do better; e.g. (7) enhancing public involvement and (4) identifying and understanding the various interests of the community...

If my answers are contradictory, it's simply because I'm relatively new

The "openness" and transparency of the CTF Meetings this year, especially throughout the process of studying and formulating our comments on the Draft EIS, and the resulting communication between the CTF and the agencies has never been better since I have been a member.

Perhaps the CTF could conduct an outreach effort, to educate the public and their constituencies about the current situation at WVDP.

Other comments or suggestions for the CTF facilitator:

I believe your doing a good job. The issues are being delt with, and everyone has opportunity to comment.

Usually the need for more time on a subject is noted, but there are times when I feel rushed to get thru the agenda and feel that we haven't yet gotten at the nugget of the issue and CTF opinions on the subject.

Bill does a fantastic job with the CTF.

Other comments or suggestions on CTF meetings:

Again, I sometimes feel the need for more time to explore ideas/opinions of members when we have to move on; yet I understand that it might be a waste of time for some people (that is, there is a point where we've said enough and Bill is generally good at identifying our chief concerns and working toward amicable solutions.

There could be more effort to bring in an occasional speaker or expert who is not financed by the DOE.

Other comments or suggestions concerning CTF outreach:

West Valley CTF 2009 Evaluation

Open Ended Responses

I wish I knew the answer to that. Not having a spokesperson is somewhat good news/bad news! I would still like to see a press release after each meeting.

Communicating the issues at hand and the importance of these issues (especially the impact of some of the decisions or lack of decision related to some of these issues) continues to be a very important. The CTF needs to continue to build upon any type of outreach to the community in regard to important issues affecting the site.

Be mindful of the constituents that the CTF represents, and ensure that CTF members faithfully inform their constituents about current activities and issues.

? 22 would be better answer by nyserda,doe and the core team

General comments and thoughts:

For the most part I am excited about the progress of the CTF in the past couple of years regarding the agencies working together to overcome major issues to move the project forward.

Generally, the CTF has seemed to be a good way to reach out to the community, but the downside is that the bureaucracy that is necessarily involved makes it very difficult for the average person (CTF or other) to know his voice is being heard and makes a difference in decision-making.

I still have a tremendous amount to learn, but each meeting is very informative.

Each CTF member must commit to mentoring their replacement, for the future.

i think we have made move forward we still need a r.o.d. and a better plain for the sda and nda
