

Draft Agenda
West Valley Citizen Task Force Meeting
Future Site Use Work Group

Ashford Office Complex
Tuesday, October 23, 2001
7:00 p.m. - 9:30 p.m.

Welcome and Administrative Announcements **Tom Attridge**
NYSERDA

Overview of NYSERDA's Mission and Programs **Hal Brodie**
Bob Callender
NYSERDA

Update on West Valley Center for Waste Management Idea **Ron Palmer**

Observer Comments

Adjourn

To: West Valley Citizen Task Force
From: Melinda Holland
Subject: Summary of September 18, 2001, Task Force Meeting
Date: October 15, 2001

Next Meeting

The next Citizen Task Force (CTF) meeting is scheduled as follows:

Date: Tuesday, December 4, 2001
Time: 7:00 p.m. - 9:30 p.m.
Location: Ashford Office Complex
9030 Route 219, West Valley, NY

The focus of the December 4th CTF meeting will be announced at a future date. 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.

The next meeting of the CTF's **Future Site Use Work Group** is scheduled for:

Date: Tuesday, October 23, 2001
Time: 7:00 p.m. - 9:30 p.m.
Location: Ashford Office Complex
9030 Route 219, West Valley, NY

CTF Attendees

Attending were: Bill King, Lee Lambert, Nevella McNeil, John Pfeffer, Paul Bembia (for Paul Piciulo), Pete Scherer, Tim Siepel, Ray Vaughan, Alice Williams, Joe Patti, Bridget Wilson, Eric Wohlers, and Warren Schmidt.

CTF Members not attending were: Pete Cooney, Lana Redeye, Larry Rubin, Paul Piciulo, and Murray Regan.

Agency Attendees

Attending in person: Tim Rice and Jack Krajewski, NYS Department of Environmental Conservation

Attending by video conference: Darrell Sims, Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analysis; John Greeves, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), Bob Nelson, NRC, Chad Glenn, NRC.

Administrative Announcements and Updates

Tom Attridge opened the meeting by briefly describing the written materials that were disseminated at the meeting. Melinda Holland then reviewed the agenda.

Paul Bembia mentioned that NYSERDA and DOE resumed negotiations today with a meeting in Washington DC between Robert Card, DOE's Assistant Deputy Secretary and Bill Flynn, President of NYSERDA. Paul spoke with Bill Flynn after the meeting in Washington. Mr. Flynn said the meeting had gone well. He said they reviewed areas of past agreement and identified issues still to be resolved. Mr. Flynn was pleased with DOE's commitment to resolving the remaining issues. They hope to have the next meeting on or near October 10th. [They met on October 10th]

Next on the agenda was Eric Wohler's presentation on the 2001 Long Term Stewardship (LTS) Workshop he attended in Grand Junction CO, in early August 2001. He noted that since he attended the 1999 LTS Workshop two years ago, considerable progress has been made on developing policies and approaches for

LTS. Eric said that over 300 people attended the workshop. The report from the workshop should be posted on the web¹ sometime in the near future. Eric was impressed with the workshop format which included numerous small break-out group meetings which focused on developing an LTS plan for a fictional site. A brief summary of the findings of these small groups is attached to this summary. Eric also suggested that CTF members review the workshop presentations given by four individuals he thought would be of interest to the Task Force (Dick Church, Jr., Mayor of Miamisburg, OH; Steve Tarlton, State of CO, Department of Public Health and Environment; Mario Ierardi, U. S. Department of Defense; Seth Kirshenber, Energy Communities Alliance). All presentations from the workshop may be copied or read on the web².

Eric also recommended that CTF members become familiar with the Energy Communities Alliance (ECA) which is an organization of local communities that have major DOE installations as neighbors. ECA was established in 1992 to bring together local government officials around DOE sites to share information, establish policy positions, and advocate community interests in the DOE arena. ECA is the only organization dedicated solely to meeting the broad-ranging needs of DOE communities. Copies of ECA's July and August "Energy Communities Alliance Bulletin" were distributed at the CTF meeting and can be found on the web³. Eric recommended reading the ECA/Environmental Law Institute report entitled "The Role of Local Governments in Long-Term Stewardship at DOE Facilities⁴."

Eric stated that one of the things he left the conference with was an understanding of the importance of thinking ahead about LTS measures and related record keeping while developing the preferred alternative. He also stressed the need for site decision documents to include provisions on LTS. He noted that a major focus for the conference was the need for a national policy on LTS. Dave Geiser, head of DOE's LTS office, stated at the conference that he hoped to have an LTS action plan by the spring of 2002 with LTS guidance to follow. The Table of Contents from DOE's latest draft of the LTS Plan Guidance is attached to this summary. CTF members noted the need to have site LTS plans developed in cooperation with stakeholders. A CTF member noted that NRC's D&D criteria will cap the total allowable dose and may limit what can be left in place and how LTS is conducted. He asked NRC representatives who were participating via video conference about the status of the NRC Policy Statement. John Greeves, NRC, responded that Commissioner Dicus had stated the goal was to issue it by the end of August, but he has not seen the document and does not have any new information on its status.

A Task Force member noted that the new 'war on terrorism' and relief funds for New York City may result in DOE's budget becoming even tighter.

Eric was very impressed with the presentation made by Dick Church, the Mayor of Miamisburg OH, which is where the DOE Mound facility is located. Mr. Church discussed how they used a successful consensus building process on future use of property at the Mound site. Eric asked if Mr. Church would be willing to speak to the Task Force about how the Miamisburg experience could be instructive to the CTF. Mr. Church is available on November 8th to attend the CTF Future Site Use Work Group meeting - the work group members present at the CTF meeting agreed to invite Mr. Church and the Erie and Cattaraugus County redevelopment agency representatives to attend a site tour and the Work Group meeting.

Site Future Use Work Group

Tim Siepel presented an update on the activities of the Future Site Use Work Group. The work group held meetings on July 17th and August 7th which included brainstorming and discussion of a national

¹ <http://www.doegipo.com/programs/ltsm/general/events/index.html>

² <http://www.gjo.doe.gov/programs/ltsm/general/events/01worksh/index1.html>

³ <http://www.energyca.org/ECABulletin.html>

⁴ <http://www.energyca.org/LTS.html>

research/educational center which could be done in partnership with a university such as Cornell or SUNY Buffalo. Mark Mitskovski and work group members have developed an outline for a report on future use options. Tim explained that due to the loss of the volunteer assistance from Ecology & Environment, the work group will need to work together to complete the report. Another work group member stated that Mark Mitskovski had indicated that there was a good possibility of obtaining some money from Erie County and that he would investigate the availability of grant funding from specific agencies in Cattaraugus County. He asked site officials to also consider providing funding for the project.

A CTF member suggested that the work group should consider starting a "West Valley Energy & Environment Institute" in the near future by initially using site resources and volunteer labor donated by current site employees and local residents. The proposed Institute would be focused on small research and development energy and environmental projects. A copy of his proposal is attached to this summary. This concept will be discussed further by the work group. A CTF member questioned who would manage the effort and pointed out the need for good management of such an endeavor. It was acknowledged that leadership and management would need to be developed for the volunteer project to succeed.

A Task Force member noted that the work group needs to know what parcels of land may become available for future use. A NYSEERDA representative stated that the process to assess site cleanup and closure alternatives is still ongoing and the remedial approach used will affect the options for future use of the land. The work group member stated that they will need that information to complete its recommendations. Another work group member responded that the report can proceed with recommended uses prior to remedy decisions.

A work group member asked NYSEERDA for more information about NYSEERDA's activities at the Malta site. NYSEERDA responded that they have recently opened a clean energy technology development park at the old Malta rocket test facility near Saratoga, NY. It is known as the Saratoga Technology Energy Park [STEP] and is a joint effort of NYSEERDA, University of Albany, and the Saratoga Economic Development Corporation. A copy of Governor Pataki's press release on this project is attached to this summary.

The next Future Site Use Work Group meeting is October 23rd and will feature a presentation by NYSEERDA on the breadth of projects conducted by NYSEERDA, how NYSEERDA does business, and any other topics that might be of interest to the work group, including the Saratoga Technology Energy Park [STEP]. November 8th is reserved for the next work group meeting and will include a presentation by Dick Church, the Mayor of Miamisburg OH. Currently, the work group members include: Mark Mitskovski, Bill King, Ray Vaughan, Tim Siepel, Joe Patti, Pete Scherer, Nevella McNeil, and John Pfeffer. All CTF members are welcome to attend work group meetings.

Geology and Erosion Modeling Presentations

The final half of the meeting focused on two presentations. First, Paul Bembia of NYSEERDA gave a brief presentation about the geology of the site area. Then Joe Price, SAIC, provided an update on the erosion modeling work that is currently being conducted as part of the environmental impact analysis process. Mr. Price compared the erosion modeling process used in the 1996 Draft EIS with the current erosion analysis model (SIBERIA). He also shared the plans for completion of the erosion analysis in the near future. A Task Force member questioned whether background levels in the creeks are being considered in the modeling calculations. Mr. Price responded that there is not much data on this, but he feels that the impact of any sediment coming from upstream would be small. Another CTF member provided an example where background levels of iron in the past have caused State Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit violations, thus background levels should not be ignored. He also pointed out that a shortcoming of the DEIS erosion analysis was its failure to look at the impact of the main channel of Buttermilk Creek. Mr. Price agreed, and noted that the DEIS erosion analysis focused on the areas closer to the site at that time, but the new analysis now considers Buttermilk Creek. In response to another question, Mr. Price replied that the models used in the 1996 DEIS were developed in the 1940's. A CTF member questioned when predicted impacts would be seen on the South Plateau, if erosion was left unmitigated. Mr. Price stated that the new modeling show potential impacts occurring within a few hundred years, though he reminded the group that

the result he presented was based on the assumption that no erosion control work was being done at the site during the time analyzed.

A member asked for background information on the Water Erosion Prediction Project (WEPP) model that SAIC is using to calibrate the SIBERIA model. WEPP was developed by Purdue University for the Natural Resources Conservation Service (U.S. Dept. of Agriculture). In response to a question about whether the Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) overestimated erosion, Mr. Price responded that comparing USLE and SIBERIA is like comparing apples and oranges. SIBERIA is providing a different result on down-cutting and stream shape than can be seen with the USLE.

A CTF member raised a concern over possible mis-calibration of the SIBERIA (and WEPP) model relative to the 1980 - 1990 calibration used in the 1996 DEIS. The fact that slumping of creek banks was not considered but is readily observable in area creeks causes him to question the accuracy of the model's assumptions. Mr. Price responded that processes like slumping are accounted for in the upper level modeling assumptions. Further questions included: whether bed-load was properly accounted for; whether the 10-year study using actual erosion data is a better basis for calibration vs. the use of a few grab samples of creek sediments; and the use of a longitudinal profile comparison. Mr. Price responded that they used actual information for sediment transport loss in the creeks, looked at whole system including Buttermilk Creek, and used conservative rates for down cutting of creeks.

A CTF member asked if this study considered any man-made erosion controls. A DOE representative responded that this initial model does not - it is to look at the worst case scenarios with no erosion controls in place. Later, when the preferred alternative is developed, they will look at all alternatives with use of erosion control measures and how they perform. She said that the results of this modeling are similar to what we have seen in past efforts; that erosion must be managed at the site if any wastes remain. Another member asked about the big storm in 1998 (8" of precipitation in 4 hours) and how this model includes large storm events. Mr. Price said that the model includes the 100-year storm and several smaller storms. Another member suggested additional things which should be considered in this modeling: the impact of global warming on storm variability/frequency; a larger model of Buttermilk Creek; and consideration of 'stream piracy' as described in a recent GSA Today article.

Task Force Member Vacancy

The CTF facilitator, Melinda Holland gave the Task Force an update on her activities in finding a candidate to recommend to the CTF, DOE and NYSERDA to fill the vacancy created by Larry Smith's resignation. Ms. Holland explained that she has interviewed a number of candidates and is following up on a few more before making a recommendation to the group. She expects to have a recommendation by the December Task Force meeting.

Next Steps

- ▶ The CTF Future Site Use Work Group agreed to meet on Tuesday October 23, 2001, 7:00 p.m. at the Ashford Office Complex.
- ▶ Topics requested for the December 4th CTF meeting include: an update on the results of the seismic study and the NRC Policy Statement.

Observer Comments

An observer noted that Governor Pataki's press release on the new technology park at Malta is available through the NYS web page⁵.

⁵ [Http://a.www.state.ny.us/](http://a.www.state.ny.us/)

**4th Annual Long-Term Stewardship Workshop
August 1, 2001**

SUMMARY OF COMMON ISSUES FROM THE BREAKOUT SESSIONS

Six Major Themes

1. The Guidance should clarify the purpose and audiences for the LTS Plan.
 - a. Need to establish a balance between stakeholder information needs and LTS implementation needs. Suggestions were made for creating a summary level document supported by more detailed documents.
 - b. Stakeholders are a key audience for the LTS Plan.
2. The current Guidance is far too prescriptive. It needs to generate a higher level of understanding of LTS planning and answer the key questions of what, why, who, and how.
3. The primary focus needs to be placed on the LTS planning process.
4. The LTS Plan needs to be designed as a "living document".
5. Creating clear links to supporting documents is important, assuring that these supporting documents are complete and accurate is really important.
6. Full stakeholder participation throughout the planning process is essential. In addition, a fully participatory process should be used to complete the Guidance.

Key Additions to Guidance/ Areas that Need Added Focus in the Guidance

Funding
Timing - How long is LTS necessary?
Legal basis for LTS (enforceability)
Who is responsible for what
Periodic review of Plan and LTS components
Emergency and contingency planning
Explaining uncertainty and assumptions
Stakeholder participation

Sections to Drop from the Guidance

No sections were specifically identified because all issues in the Guidance are seen as important to LTS planning. However, there are a number of suggestions for re-organizing and re-focusing the document. It was also recommended that many details be included by reference only.

Department of Energy

Long-term Stewardship Plan Guidance



Working Draft – April 17, 2001
Do Not Cite

Table of Contents

Note to Reviewers	2
Part I – Overview of Long-Term Stewardship	6
1.0 Introduction	6
1.1 Use of This Guidance Document	7
2.0 Posing the Relevant Questions: A Strategic View	7
2.1 Why Is LTS Needed?	8
2.2 Why Develop LTS Plans?	8
2.3 How Does this Guidance Apply to My Site?	10
2.4 When Should LTS Planning Be Initiated?	12
3.0 Key Definitions	12
3.1 What is Long-Term Stewardship?	12
3.2 When Does LTS Start?	13
3.2.1 Regulatory-Based LTS Start Date	13
3.2.2 Performance-Based LTS Start Date	14
Part II – Questions and Relevant Topics to be Addressed in an LTS Plan	18
Introduction	18
1.0 What is the Purpose and Scope of the Site-Specific Plan?	18
1.1 Objectives	19
1.2 Scope	20
1.3 Organization of the LTS Plan	20
2.0 Where will Long-term Stewardship be Required?	20
2.1 Describe the physical boundaries to which plan applies	20
2.2 Location of Residual Contaminants and Wastes in Place	21
2.3 Location and Description of Identifiable Portions	21
2.4 Legal Description	21
2.5 Offsite Locations	22

3.0 Why is Long-term Stewardship Required?.....	22
3.1 The History of Operations.....	22
3.2 The Regulatory and Institutional Framework for Long-term Stewardship	23
3.3 Site Characteristics and Setting	23
4.0 What Activities are Required to Maintain and Demonstrate Protectiveness of Human Health and the Environment?	25
4.1 Institutional Controls	25
4.2 Land Use Planning/Implementation.....	25
4.3 Operating LTS Systems.....	26
4.4 Maintaining Engineered Controls	26
4.5 Surveillance Activities	27
4.6 Emergency Response, Corrective Action, and Contingency Plans.	27
4.7 Health and Safety	28
4.8 Resource Management and Personnel Training.....	28
5.0 What Data are Available and What Data are Needed to Demonstrate Protectiveness?	29
5.1 Identifying and Preserving Long-term Stewardship Records.	29
5.2 Monitoring Program	30
6.0 How Have We Planned for Technical, Regulatory and Environmental, Health and Safety Uncertainties?	31
6.1 Assumptions and Uncertainty Management.....	31
6.2 Threshold Criteria, Contingency Plans	31
6.3 Science and Technology Review and Implementation.....	32
7.0 What are the Costs Associated with LTS at the Site?	32
7.1 Cost Estimating.....	32
7.2 Funding	32
7.3 Financial Management	33
8.0 When are LTS Activities Anticipated?	33
9.0 What are the Roles and Responsibilities for the LTS activities?	33

10.1 Site Steward	34
10.2 LTS Management Team	34
10.3 Regulatory Lead and Oversight	34
10.4 Delegated Parties	34
11.0 What are the Expectations for Community Involvement?	34
12.0 How Can LTS Activities be Integrated with Other Site-Wide Programs and Planning Initiatives?	35
Exhibit II-1: Model Template for Activity-Based LTSP Table of Contents	36
Exhibit II-2: Model Template for Location-Based LTSP Table of Contents	41

Mark--

Here's a little more detail on the "West Valley Energy & Environment Institute" idea that I mentioned to you. This would be an all-volunteer initial version of what we're trying to create as a permanent, self-sustaining West Valley operation.

The idea would be to create a small, versatile R&D facility at West Valley to create, develop, and evaluate energy- and environmental-related ideas and devices. Successful devices would be passed on to the marketplace. We would need:

1. Time volunteered by WVDP employees and/or local residents to develop, design, build, refine; and evaluate the inventions and devices.
2. Space and facilities made available by DOE and/or NYSERDA, including a shop area with basic hand and machine tools, welder, etc., and a desk area with computers, etc.
3. Ideas volunteered by inventors. (For example, I've got at least six ideas that I would volunteer, including three small-scale energy-generation ideas (one wind, one biomass, one natural gas) and three waste-remediation ideas.)
4. A review committee composed of volunteers to assess and prioritize projects that the "Institute" might work on, etc.

This is still very rudimentary, but it should give you a little better idea of what I was suggesting. Feel free to suggest additions or changes. We'll also need to run this past DOE and NYSERDA at an early stage to see if they'll give it serious consideration.

--Ray

P.S. -- Varity

GOVERNOR ANNOUNCES CREATION OF CLEAN ENERGY TECHNOLOGY PARK

Saratoga County to be Site of Nation's First Clean Energy Business Development Park



Governor George E. Pataki today announced that New York State will establish the first business park in the country that is specifically devoted to promoting the development of new, clean energy technologies.

Over the next five years, it is estimated that the new Saratoga Technology Energy Park or STEP will help attract between 1,000 and 1,500 jobs to the Capitol Region as emerging, environmentally friendly energy companies take advantage of the park's resources.



Governor Pataki announces the creation of the Saratoga Technology Energy Park in Malta as NYSERDA President William M. Flynn and University at Albany President Karen Hitchcock look on

"With this innovative new park, New York State will continue to set a national example in its support for the development of clean, environmentally sound energy sources," Governor Pataki said. "By providing these businesses with a broad spectrum of financial, technological, and business support, this initiative will create new job opportunities, increase our access to clean energy sources and promote a cleaner, healthier environment for all New Yorkers."

The STEP project is a joint effort of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA), the University at Albany, and the Saratoga Economic Development Corporation (SEDC). The park will be located on a 280 acre site in Malta and includes a 21,000 square foot facility built by NYSERDA in the mid 1970's. It is adjacent to the site of the former Malta Test Station.

The new business park will provide companies with technology development and prototyping support through the University at Albany, funding to support technology development and commercialization through NYSERDA, and expanded economic opportunities through SEDC. The project reflects the growing need for cleaner energy technologies that can address concerns over energy supply and reliability issues, as well as environmental impact concerns.

Senate Majority Leader Joseph L. Bruno said, "This project will further strengthen the local economy and give the Capital Region another foothold

in the development of groundbreaking, high technology businesses. In addition to creating new jobs, these businesses will also develop new, clean, efficient and reliable sources of energy that will benefit the entire nation."

Congressman John Sweeney said, "In more ways than one, this initiative represents New York's entrepreneurial approach to attracting businesses to the region. By focusing on the emerging business sectors of high technology and energy, the Capital Region is now primed to lead the way as a hub of job-growth and innovative businesses working to generate solutions that will protect our environment and conserve energy."

Assemblyman Bob Prentiss said, "I applaud the partnership efforts of the Governor, NYSERDA, UAlbany and SEDC to develop the Saratoga Technology Energy Park. This innovative park will not only encourage economic growth and create well-paying jobs in the Capital Region, but also help foster the development of new, clean energy technologies. As the nation struggles with the increasing demand for energy, it is vitally important to support entrepreneurial companies that are developing energy technologies aimed at protecting our environment and natural resources."

National statistics indicate that the energy technology sector grew by 134% in 2000 and the market for clean energy technologies is projected to grow from \$7 billion per year to about \$82 billion per year by 2010. New York State, already home to more than 20 leading energy technology companies, is well suited to take advantage of this rapid growth.

Saratoga County Board of Supervisors Chair Anita Daly said, "In some ways, this is just one more example of the successes that Saratoga County and our Economic Development Corporation have enjoyed by creating partnerships with Governor Pataki. Our constituents demand that we stay on the cutting edge of technology, and the development of this High Tech Park may well lead to the creation of thousands of high paying, technical jobs for all of the residents of the Capital District."

Malta Town Supervisor Dave Meager said, "The Town of Malta is pleased that the NYSERDA site will be used as a research and development tech park. This plan will bring the property back onto the tax rolls and provide high-paying employment for our county and community. This project also conforms to the Town Master Plan, and will be a positive enhancement to our town.

NYSERDA President William M. Flynn said, "The Saratoga Technology Energy Park is a perfect example of how the State can use its resources to partner with local communities and create opportunities for new jobs and new businesses. Working with the Saratoga Economic Development Corporation and University at Albany, we can attract new businesses and jobs to the Capital Region that can address the growing need and demand for clean-energy and energy-efficient technologies."

NYSERDA has invested more than \$60 million over the past three years to help businesses develop and commercialize new energy technologies that are more efficient or take advantage of renewable resources. Funding opportunities would be available to businesses moving into the Tech Park to reduce the risks associated with developing

these new technologies and create additional partnerships that will better enable these small businesses to accomplish their objectives.

University at Albany President Karen R. Hitchcock said, "We are delighted with the Governor's announcement of the Saratoga Energy Technology Park as one of the first of its kind in the nation to focus on energy technologies. This partnership between NYSERDA, the SEDC, and UAlbany builds on UAlbany's recent federal designation as a Clean Energy Incubator to provide cutting edge infrastructure to support energy industry-driven technology development and deployment, as well as company spin-off, attraction, and retention. We are extremely grateful to Governor Pataki, Majority Leader Bruno, and Congressman Sweeney for their proactive leadership and key investments in support of research universities and high technology industry in New York."

The University at Albany, which was recently designated by the U.S. Department of Energy as a member of the national Clean Energy Incubator Program, has extensive technology development and prototyping capabilities for small businesses and start-ups. The University at Albany's Center of Excellence in Nanoelectronics and its Energy and Environmental Technologies Applications Center will play large roles in helping businesses in the new park develop the new technologies.

The Saratoga Economic Development Corporation was instrumental in garnering local support and interest in the new Tech Park and will continue to market the park to help lure new businesses to the area.

President of SEDC Kenneth A. Green said, "The companies that will locate in the Saratoga Technology Energy Park will provide thousands of high-paying jobs for the people of Upstate New York. It is appropriate that the Malta site be the home to what is expected to become the nation's premier energy park because of the long history of scientific research conducted at this location. Saratoga County is located at the 'Technology Crossroads of Northeast North America.' We stand ready to serve the world. I want to thank Governor Pataki, Senator Bruno, University President Hitchcock, NYSERDA President Flynn, Saratoga County Chair Anita Daley and Malta Town Supervisor Dave Meager for providing the vision for creation of the Tech Park."