West Valley Demonstration Project
Summary of Quarterly Public Meeting – February 26, 2014

Members of the Public and Others Present
Deb Aumick*, Rob Dallas, Diane D'Arrigo, Jim Day (WXXI), Judy Einach, Joanne Hameister, Lee James*, Eric Lawton, Rick Miller (Olean Times Herald), Kate O'Connell (WXXI), Joe Patti, Paul Siepierski, Ray Vaughan, Barbara Warren, Eric Wohlers*.

Agency and Contractor Participants
Department of Energy (DOE): Bryan Bower, Moira Maloney, Marty Krentz*, Ben Underwood, Zintars Zadins, Sandra Szalinski.
New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA): Paul Bembia, Lee Gordon, Elizabeth Lowes, Andrea Mellon, Allyson Zipp.
CH2M Hill B&W West Valley, Inc. (CHBWV): Lynette Bennett, Dan Coyne, John Rendall.
Enviro Compliance Solutions, Inc. (ECS): Dhananjay Rawal*.
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC): Ken Martin.

INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS
The facilitator, Bill Logue, welcomed all present and reviewed the meeting protocols and documents[1].

PHASE 1 DECOMMISSIONING UPDATE
Dan Coyne of CHBWV provided a project update for the four contract milestones.

Milestone 1 – High-Level Waste (HLW) Relocation Project. Status: The HLW pad and apron are complete. Eight storage casks have been fabricated and eight multi-purpose canisters (MPC) ordered. The canister haul path through the building to the storage pad is being evaluated. Design and specifications for the storage casks MPCs and haul path are under review by NRC for a Certificate of Compliance. Remote cleaning methods are being tested on HLW canister tops. The load-lowering device to move canisters into casks has been tested and workers trained.

Milestone 2 – Waste Operations. Status: Sixty transuranic (TRU) waste drums in the Interim HLW Storage Facility have been placed in overpacks and relocated. The 2013 Waste Processing Area processing of Legacy Waste containers is complete. The pre-decisional report evaluating options to manage TRU waste and non-HLW drums located in the CPC is complete. There is no permanent disposal facility for TRU at this time; however, the Greater-Than-Class C EIS could resolve this issue.

The Vitrification Melter, Concentrator Feed Make-up Tank and Makeup Feed Hold Tank grouting operations and technical review are complete and transport award recommendation has been submitted to procurement. The schedule and transportation plan to Waste Control Specialists in Texas is expected in mid-March. The vessel sizes will prevent use of the rail spur; therefore, a trailer will move them to a rail line; the transportation vendor is developing proposed transportation details.

The Nevada National Security Site (NNSS) completed the Annual Independent Self-Assessment with no findings reported.

Legacy waste shipment status: Low-Level Waste (LLW) 53% complete; Mixed LLW, Industrial and Hazardous waste shipment is complete.

Milestone 3 – Demolition and removal of the Main Plant Process Building (MPPB) and the Vitrification Facility. Status: MPPB preparation for demolition continues with facility characterization, asbestos removal and Liquid Waste Cell "tell-tailing" of piping and sampling. The Vit Facility equipment and debris removal is complete with preparations underway to vacuum the floor.

Milestone 4 – Complete all work described in the Performance Work Statement. Status: Completed waste load-out of the expanded Environmental Lab, completed backfill of new Cooling Tower and Counting Lab areas, and initiated demolition of sheds and old trailers. To-date: 141,561ft^3 of newly generated industrial debris has been shipped to

1 Meeting documents and materials may be found at www.wv.doe.gov in the public meetings pages. All are listed at the end of this summary.
* Attended by phone.

McKean, PA. Disposal costs depend on waste characterization. Clean industrial waste costs $500 to ship and $350 to dispose of. LLW waste costs $15,000 per truckload to ship to Nevada Test Site where there is no disposal fee. Mixed waste is shipped to Permafix in Oak Ridge TN, LLW to either EnviroCare or the Nevada Test Site.

WVDP Decommissioning Status

Bryan Bower of DOE presented an overview of the decommissioning status of each of the Waste Management Areas (WMAs). The presentation concerning the 10 WMAs is self-explanatory; please view it with the February 26, 2014 meeting materials at www.wv.doe.gov/.

Questions/Responses & Comments

The following provides a summary of questions, comments, and discussion following the presentation.

- The Liquid Waste Treatment Plant can be removed because a smaller facility will suffice as the capping of the NDA reduced the volume of water needing treatment by 90%.
- In response to being informed that the Administrative Building was 50 years old and scheduled for removal because it is past its useful life, a stakeholder suggested that this could be said of the HLW tanks. Mr. Bower noted that offices could be moved to the Remote Handled Waste Facility.
- A number of questions were raised about the North Plateau Groundwater Plume (NPGP).
    - The Permeable Treatment Wall (PTW) was located inside the leading edge of the plume to capture 99% of the curies. Placing beyond the leading edge would have been inefficient, as zeolite binds with other materials besides Strontium 90 and its usefulness can be decreased. The expected design life is 20 years. The Phase 2 decision will address what will happen with the wall material.
    - The pump and treat system, a previous attempt to remove contamination, was marginally effective and not cost effective when funds are needed for high risk area waste cleanup and shipment.
- A member of the public questioned what existing site infrastructure could be needed for Phase 2

DOE/NYSERDA Path Forward to Phase 2 Decommissioning Decisions

Paul Bembia of NYSERDA presented DOE and NYSERDA's integrated approach for making the Phase 2 decision for the WVDP and the Western New York State Nuclear Service Center (Center). The approach includes:

1) Framework for analyzing the entire Center;
2) Addressing uncertainty in the Phase 2 analysis;
3) Decision for all facilities; and
4) Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS).

Mr. Bembia noted that the WVDP is about 200 of the 3300 acres of the Center. The entire Center, with the exception of the State-Licensed Disposal Area (SDA), is under license from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

Framework for Analyzing the Center: The agencies have agreed to use the NRC License Termination Rule (LTR) to analyze *all* site facilities, including the SDA, to provide a consistent integrated approach.

Addressing uncertainty in the Phase 2 Analysis: Uncertainty in the long-term analysis was at the heart of many of the technical issues raised with respect to the 2010 FEIS. Uncertainty will be identified and reduced through the Phase 1 Studies on specific technical issues, as well as through other data collection efforts. These will build on the 2010 EIS deterministic performance assessment and incorporate probabilistic analytical methods. Sensitivity studies will be used to identify key uncertainties and provide focus for data collection and model development. A probabilistic performance assessment will evaluate uncertainty and estimate the uncertainty in the long-term site analysis.

In response to a question regarding probabilistic and deterministic methods, Mr. Bembia offered that a probabilistic analysis uses a range of parameter values and results in a range of outcomes and measure of likelihood of that range. A deterministic analysis uses one set of input values and produces a single value outcome, for example a dose limit. In response to a question, DOE indicated that the 2010 FEIS Long-Term Performance Assessment results can be found in Appendix H of the document.

A member of the public suggested a qualitative analysis be considered and cautioned about moving quickly to a quantitative analysis. Another commented that very low probability but high consequence events might not be sufficiently accounted for in the studies. Mr. Bembia stated that the probabilistic analysis, by looking at ranges, should address this. A third stated that deterministic analyses rely on historical data that can limit the analysis. They

added that a deterministic analysis may be the only option at times, but all should be aware of the limitations of model assumptions.

Mr. Bembia reviewed and showed a graphic of the facilities subject to the Phase 2 decision: the HLW Tanks, NDA, SDA, CDDL, NPGP non-source area, surface water streams, cesium prong and balance of the Center property. He noted that the cesium prong was the result of a release through the air stacks in the 1960's.

Supplemental EIS: DOE and NYSERDA will prepare an SEIS to support the Phase 2 decision under a jointly managed contract with costs equally shared. The SEIS analysis will incorporate a probabilistic performance assessment and estimate of uncertainty. Those present expressed their appreciation to the agencies for reaching the decision to conduct a Supplemental EIS.

Timeline: Mr. Bembia reviewed the timeline: probabilistic modeling contract executed in 2014 with model development through 2017; simultaneous data collection efforts and Phase 1 Studies; execution of a SEQRA/NEPA contract in 2017; issuance of the draft SEIS for stakeholder review and comment in 2019 and Final SEIS, ROD and NYSERDA Findings Statement in 2020.

QUESTIONS/RESPONSES & COMMENTS

In response to a question about how a final decision could be made in light of future technologies and lack of a national repository, Mr. Bembia stated that wastes could be stored on an interim basis. In response to a question regarding the potential need to verify that a closure approach is effective, Elizabeth Lowes of NYSERDA offered that the LTR requires a review be performed every five years for those sites that cannot demonstrate that they meet the 100 mrem/year dose criterion upon loss of institutional controls.

A question was asked about the contract for probabilistic modeling and how it would address the relationship of uncertainty and LTR dose limit criteria for different types of closure. Mr. Bembia stated that further discussions would be needed with the regulators on several issues, including how the alternatives would be structured and how a probabilistic analysis would be compared to deterministic regulation. The person responded that the public's goal was to have wastes removed rather than meeting release criteria with conditions.

Mr. Bower stated that study budgets had not been set, adding that risks need to be balanced such as the environmental risk of having wastes in place with the risk to workers and others in removing and transporting wastes. A member of the public noted risk minimization should be considered. Another person noted their concern was for future generations through the potential loss of institutional controls.

A person suggested that public input in the selection of contractor would create sensitivity to public concerns. While expressing appreciation about the SEIS decision, another person expressed concern about the work delay of three years and studies not yet underway. They questioned whether there will be enough information from the studies for the SEIS. Mr. Bembia stated that the sensitivity analysis will help the agencies focus on the important studies and that they believed they would complete the SEIS process by 2020.

A member of the public thanked the agencies for reaching agreement on the SEIS process and the probabilistic analysis methods. This person suggested another study group be put together to determine what existing facilities may be needed for Phase 2 so that these facilities are not unnecessarily removed in Phase 1.

Topics for Next and Future QPM(s)

Before concluding the meeting, Mr. Logue mentioned the various topics for coming QPMs that had surfaced throughout the meeting:

- Presentation of path sequence for relocating HLW multipurpose canisters to the pad
- Presentation of the schedule and transportation plan for the melter, CFMT and MHFT to Texas
- Revisit presentation on location of the Permeable Treatment Wall (PTW), location and contamination concentrations in the plume
- Presentation by NRC regarding Final Policy Statement and LTR

The next Quarterly Public Meeting will be held on May 28, 2014.

DOCUMENTS DISTRIBUTED

Document Description	Generated by; Date
Meeting Agenda	2/26/2014
WVDP Project Update	CHBWV; 2/26/2014
WVDP Decommissioning Status	DOE; 2/26/2014
Phase 2 Decision Process	NYSERDA & DOE; 2/26/2014

NOTE:
Following the meeting, the Coalition on West Valley Nuclear Wastes informed the agencies that the archived materials of the Coalition on the site in the library of the State University New York at Fredonia are now accessible to the public. There are handling and access restrictions to preserve the collection; people may contact Joanne Hameister of the Coalition with questions. (jhameister@roadrunner.com)