

Memo May 14, 2014

To: Moira Maloney, DOE and Lee Gordon, NYSERDA

From: Diane D'Arrigo (NIRS), Barbara Warren (CEC), Lynda Schneekloth (Sierra Club Niagara Group), Kathy Boser (Concerned Citizens of Cattaraugus County), Joanne Hameister, Orlando Monaco

RE: Request for Agenda items at May 2014 Quarterly Public Meeting (QPM)

The new Path Forward

We request a more specific and complete presentation with time for discussion of the new Path Forward presented at the February 2014 QPM, including questions placed in the virtual “parking lot.”

Specifically we want the opportunity to discuss:

- 1) The Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement SEIS
  - a. DOE and NYSERDA’s current vision of the scope and goal of the SEIS
  - b. How Probabilistic Modeling/Performance Assessment and the Studies will be incorporated
  - c. Did DOE do an environmental assessment to decide to do the SEIS?
  
- 2) The Probabilistic Modeling/Performance Assessment
  - a. Transparency – how will it be guaranteed; Provision for open understanding of methodology and data for every step
  - b. Contractor selection – public input
  - c. Scope of Work – public input
  - d. How will this contractor be directed to deal with “uncertainty”
  - e. Role in the SEIS
  - f. What contractors responded to the “sources sought” memo (the description of the proposed contract on Probabilistic Modeling which DOE published on [www.fedbizapps.gov](http://www.fedbizapps.gov) in April)
  
- 3) The Studies
  - a. Status of the 3 working groups studying Erosion, Exhumation and Engineered Barriers

Are they all proceeding since the halt to clarify “uncertainty” and good science? What is the new timeline for these teams? How will they deal with “uncertainty?”
  - b. Status of future studies

Will there be other Phase I studies? Which ones?  
Which ones could be completed prior to 2019?  
Have DOE and NYSERDA reached agreement on which studies will and will not be carried out including those suggested by the public?
  - c. Role of the studies in the

- i. Probabilistic Modeling/Performance Assessment and in the
- ii. SEIS

- 4) Characterization, Sampling and Analysis Plan (CSAP)  
of the primary waste areas about which the Agencies will be making Phase 2 decisions
  - a. What CSAP work will be done prior to or in conjunction with the SEIS?
  - b. Please provide a detailed update on the CSAP and how it is fulfilling its 4 goals listed especially the 4<sup>th</sup> one which is to provide data for phase 2 decision making.
  - c. How is it possible to complete all of the characterization work by 2019? Soil remediation will just be starting in 2019 and this is an prime opportunity for data collection.
  
- 5) Did the Science Panel (ISP) review the new Path Forward and if so what comments did they provide?
  
- 6) Phase I physical activities
  - a. Clarification on the agency decision to split the physical Phase 1 into 2 phases or parts:
    - 1. Facility Disposition-- expected completion in 2020 of decontamination and the dismantling of multiple buildings at the site.
    - 2. Soil Remediation-- Contract expected to be awarded in 2019. Has the commitment to excavation of the plume been scaled back to "remediation?"
  
  - b. Status of the outstanding Report on Sept 2013 Contamination under the pad.
  
  - c. Status of method development for moving high level radioactive logs from building to casks to pad.