JOHN SPELLMAN
Governor

WARREN A. BISHOP
Chair

STATE OF WASHINGTON
NUCLEAR WASTE BOARD
Mail Stop PV-11 • Olympia, Washington 98504 • (206) 459-6670

WM DOCKET CONTROL CENTER
'84 OCT 15 P12:34

NUCLEAR WASTE BOARD

Regular Meeting

WM Record File 101.3
WM Project 10
Docket No.
PDR ✓
LPDR ✓
Distribution:
REB/MJB/JDB HJM/GWKERR
JJS/DRM CFR/Kennedy
(Return to WM, 623-SS) Wright

October 19, 1984
1:30 p.m.
EFSEC Hearings Room
Rowesix, Building 1
4224 - 6th Ave. S.E.
Lacey, Washington

AGENDA

1.	Approval of Minutes	
2.	Report of Chairman	Mr. Warren Bishop
3.	Discussion of C & C Agreement	Mr. Warren Bishop
4.	Committee Reports Environmental Monitoring Committee Defense Waste Group	 Mr. Don Provost Mr. Warren Bishop
5.	Technical Program Report	Dr. Bill Brewer
6.	Repository Siting Schedule	Mr. David Stevens
7.	Preparation for Review of Draft EA	Mr. David Stevens Mr. Jerry Parker
8.	Administrative Matters Grant Status	Mr. David Stevens
9.	Other Business	
10.	Public Comment	

8411090178 841019
PDR WASTE
WM-10 PDR

JOHN SPELLMAN
Governor

DONALD W. MOOS
Director

STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY
Mail Stop PV-11 • Olympia Washington 98504 • (206) 459-6000

NUCLEAR WASTE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Regular Meeting

October 19, 1984
9:30 a.m.
EFSEC Hearings Room
Rowesix, Building 1
4224 - 6th Ave. S.E.
Lacey, Washington

AGENDA

1.	Approval of Minutes	
2.	Report of Chairman	Mr. Warren Bishop
3.	Report from Public Involvement Working Group	Ms. Anita Monoian
4.	Board Environmental Monitoring Committee Meeting/Tour Report	Mr. Lane Bray
5.	Board Defense Waste Working Group Tour/Meeting	Commissioner Sebero
6.	Council Hanford Tour	Ms. Marta Wilder
7.	Technical Program Update	Dr. Bill Brewer
8.	C & C Report	Mr. Warren Bishop
9.	Public Reference Center Report	Ms. Jeanne Rensel
10.	Repository Siting Schedule	Mr. David Stevens
11.	Administrative Matters	Mr. David Stevens
12.	Other Business (a) Request of public at September meeting to discuss USDOE procurement contract for exploratory shaft.	
13.	Public Comment	

OFFICE OF PROGRAM RESEARCH

House of Representatives

MEMORANDUM

SEPTEMBER 19, 1984

TO: Representative Dick Nelson

FROM: Fred Adair Fred

SUBJECT: Transuranics on the Hanford Reservation

The following tabulation is made at your request:

U. S. Ecology commercial repository

44.6 Kg. plutonium is recorded as disposed. (There could be somewhat, likely only a little, more than this from materials disposed that contain minute amounts - concentration of less than 10 nanocuries per gram - which would not be recorded.)

U. S. Department of Energy sites

-Wastes stored in underground tanks
500 KG - mainly plutonium

-Wastes in soil - consisting of transuranics disposed with low level waste up through about 1970.
...Buried as solid wastes
350 KG plutonium
10 kilocuries americium

...Liquid waste routed into soil
190 KG plutonium
5 kilocuries americium

-Retrievably stored and newly generated transuranic waste
335 KG plutonium
1000 kilocuries americium

House Office Building, Second Floor, Olympia, WA. 98504 • Telephone: (206) 753-0520

MINUTES OF NUCLEAR WASTE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING
September 21, 1984

9:30 a.m.
EFSEC Hearings Room
Rowesix - Building #1
4224 Sixth Avenue S.E.
Lacey, Washington

Council Members Present:

Warren Bishop, Chair
Councilman Lane A. Bray
Dr. Jerome Finnigan
Mayor Fred Jarrett
Gordon Kunz
Dr. Estella B. Leopold
Anita Monoian
Jim Worthington

The meeting was called to order by Warren Bishop, Chair.

There being no objection, the minutes of the previous meeting were approved as published.

Work Group on Public Involvement Report

Anita Monoian began her report by saying the Newsletter has gone to press. She asked Marta Wilder to display the colors, which will be gray-colored paper with black ink. Color samples were passed among the members. She said the date of issue is planned for October 10, with the second Newsletter published in December. Ms. Monoian emphasized the importance of having as much input from the members as possible concerning the content for the December issue. She remarked this first one is more of an introductory paper. She said she hoped that next year's budget would be known by the time of the next meeting in order to begin work on the Fact Sheets and perhaps a slide show. Mr. Stevens said it was questionable this would be known by October 1.

Ms. Monoian said the next meeting of the Work Group is planned for Tuesday, October 9 at the same time and location as the previous meetings. (The meeting was later postponed.)

Rough copies of the Newsletter were distributed to the members of the Council. Dr. Finnigan asked how many would be sent this first mailing, and Marta responded there were about 2400 names on the list. She said it was planned to send the first two issues to the entire list, then revise it as comments came in and some indicated no desire to receive it. Jeanne Rensel, Office Librarian, suggested an address be placed inside the Newsletter. This will allow the receipient to have it when sent.

Mr. Bishop inquired about distribution to educational groups. Marta Wilder replied normally 50 copies were provided to all public libraries, and universities and educational groups were on the mailing list. Jeanne Rensel inquired if the Newsletter would be sent to other interested states for their libraries, and Marta replied they were included.

Mayor Jarrett commended Marta and Pat for the time and effort spent on this first edition. Dr. Finnigan seconded the compliments, and noted the Newsletter published by the Joint Science and Technology Committee. He was somewhat concerned about the duplication of effort and resulting cost. Mr. Bishop said he felt the objective was to reach as many people as possible, and every effort would be made to compare notes and coordinate with the S & T Committee. Marta said Max Power of the S & T Committee had talked to her about their newsletter and showed her the first cut of copy and cooperative efforts will be continued. Marta said she thought it was distributed only to Legislators, but she would inquire about the extent of their distribution.

Preview of Hanford Tour

Marta Wilder said that since the Advisory Council had expressed an interest in touring the Hanford site, a tour was being considered on October 18, with a Council meeting to be held the following day at Richland. She said this was a tentative date and would be dependent upon the schedules of the Council members.

She invited Tom Tinsley of the USDOE in Richland to describe to the Council some of the highlights of a one-day tour. Mr. Tinsley described the items on a tentative Agenda which was passed around to the members. The schedule called for a 9:00 a.m. gathering in the lobby of the Federal Building, with transportation to the near surface facility Visitors' Center. He said it would be a full day of travel and observation, ending with a 4:00 p.m. adjournment back at the Federal Building.

Dr. Finnigan commented this was a good tour, and he would encourage those who had not visited Hanford to take the tour. Jim Worthington wondered if Battelle's Hydrology Modeling could be added to the Agenda. Mr. Tinsley said they could try to work this in.

Discussion followed. The problem appeared to be with the date of the 18th, and trying to have a meeting in lieu of the regular Advisory Council meeting scheduled for October 19.

It was agreed Marta Wilder would establish a date for the tour, which was tentatively set for Thursday, October 25, with the regularly scheduled meeting of the Council to be held on October 19. Mr. Tinsley said USDOE would need a two-week advance notice of the tour with the exact number of persons attending and their Social Security numbers for security reasons.

Mr. Bishop welcomed Dr. Leopold back to the Council following her six-month sabbatical.

Grant Request Status

Mr. Stevens reported that at the last meeting the Board authorized the Office to submit two grant requests to the U.S. Department of Energy for the coming fiscal year. One would cover all the activities of the Office, including the Public Information Program, and a separate grant request would be submitted to cover the Defense Waste issue. Both grants have been submitted, he said, and a letter has been received requesting further explanation and more elaboration on work intended to be done by the Office, including the Public Information Program. This information is being prepared and will be sent to USDOE. Mr. Stevens thought the amount requested was fully justified and there should be no difficulty with the Public Information portion. He said on the geotechnical and policy side of the grant request there may be some fluctuation because of the delay of the USDOE schedules. He continued that since the new fiscal year begins October 1 with no grant in place, the Office anticipates USDOE will extend the grant period at the same level as at present until the new grant is approved. (The Defense Waste grant request is still in process.)

Mr. Stevens said a Working Group on Defense Wastes had been established by the Board and was composed of Senator Al Williams, Representative Shirley Hankins, John Beare, Nick Lewis, Richard Watson, Commissioner Bill Sebero from the

Advisory Council, and Warren Bishop, Don Provost and David Stevens. Their first meeting is scheduled for the 27th of September.

Technical Update

Dr. Brewer reported on the meeting in Richland he and David Stevens attended. The meeting was called to discuss issues tracking systems and information systems in general. Representatives of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, U.S. Department of Energy, Yakima Nation, and the Confederated Umatilla Tribes also attended. He said the NRC people visualize an operational tracking system by next year which will far exceed in scope and complexity, because of their licensing responsibility, any system the Office is doing. The Indian Tribes requested that all information in all of these systems be accessible to them through modems and personal computers. There was general agreement that there should be an effort made to strive for machine compatibility and all parties should be involved in defining the issues. Another meeting is planned within a few months.

Dr. Brewer said a request for information was received from Congressman Edward J. Markey of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, which is presently looking into the relationship of the states and the Federal government as it reflects implementation of the NWPA of 1982. He said Representative Markey wanted a package of all activities of the Board and Council since they were formed, as the Committee plans to conduct hearings this fall on the role of the Department of Energy in repository development.

Dr. Brewer also reported the other technical activities have centered on technology in the Defense Waste Study and the predraft Environmental Assessment.

At this point in the meeting Mr. Bishop said an attempt is being made to avoid duplication of material, and beginning with this meeting any Agenda items sent to the Council prior to the regular meeting will not appear in the packets. He asked the members to bring with them these items which will be considered.

Dr. Leopold asked for more detail on the planned hearings on the role of USDOE by the Congressional Subcommittee.
Dr. Brewer responded that apparently Congressman Udall had some question on the procedures that the Department has been following in the various states for site selection.
Dr. Leopold wondered if they were asking for this information

from each site state and Dr. Brewer said he had the impression one staff member of the Subcommittee had been assigned to a state. Mr. Stevens added that Congressman Udall's Committee had taken a special interest in the process, with particular concern about the schedule.

Jim Worthington said he understood the interest of the Subcommittee was the schedule, and judging from previous discussion he believed USDOE is not on schedule. Mr. Stevens noted they were not on the Congressionally-mandated schedule and this is one of the questions Congress is concerned about since they went to great lengths in the Act to describe what seemed to be a a reasonable schedule. Therefore, he said, there are two alternatives: (1) the schedule is not being met because the Department is not doing a good enough job, or (2) the schedule is unrealistic because it assumes all parts of the program could be accomplished more quickly than reasonably possible. He mentioned that Congress will continue to monitor events closely, but probably amendment of the Act will not be easy.

The Chair suggested the Council should be aware of information obtained concerning the Environmental Assessment in a conversation last week with Ben Rusche, Director of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. Mr. Stevens said the Department was poised to adhere to the date of January 1, 1985 as the one date they could look to for nomination of sites for characterization. This was premised upon their ability to put before the public the EA, the basic tool from which conclusions will be drawn as to acceptable sites for nomination and recommendation for characterization. To aid that process, the Department decided to issue a Draft EA and anticipated it could be released some time this summer. The date has slipped from the target of August 19, and the expectation now is the Draft EA will be published in the middle of November. The original schedule for review of the document was 60 days. The state had asked for 120 days to review this massive document, and now Mr. Stevens said he understood a letter should be received shortly indicated a 90-day period for review. The review period would extend to mid-February. The Department anticipates about 60 days to review comments, bringing the final EA out in about mid-April, with the nomination and recommendation to the President roughly the first of May under the current schedule.

Commingling Study Comments

Mr. Stevens reported briefly on the state's draft comments on the Commingling Study, copies of which were sent to the Council. He said the Act mandates the President to undertake a study of the impact of the commingling of defense and com-

mercial wastes and to issue a recommendation within two years of the passage of the Act, January 7, 1985. He said the Act directs the President to see if there are any reasons why commingling should not take place. The states have until September 24 to send comments, and the draft comments sent to the Board and Council will be discussed at the Board meeting and authorization sought to send them to USDOE on Monday.

Some concerns were expressed about prospects of wastes that would be placed in a commingling facility, transuranic wastes which go to the WIPP site in New Mexico, transportation, and other technical issues.

Discussion followed, centering on the short period of time allowed for states to respond to documents resulting in less intense review. Mr. Stevens remarked this is a continuing concern.

Dr. Leopold said she did not understand the comparative proportion of radioactivity involved in defense wastes compared to commercial wastes, as presented in the report. Another point she said she failed to find was reference to hydrogeologic assumptions. Mr. Stevens replied it was another issue identified for comment. The report itself analyzes a number of different criteria, he said, and the question was would a decision be made on transportation, safety, technical, or licensing? In the view of USDOE all of these elements were essentially equal and the question came down to cost. The decision was justified primarily on the economic factor.

Dr. Leopold asked for elaboration on the statement that defense waste would add only 10% to the volume of stored wastes. Mr. Stevens said that was another element that requires clarification. It has been commonly held there would be 10,000 metric tons in defense waste compared with 70,000 metric tons of commercial wastes, which meant defense waste would need 1/7th of the amount of space in a repository than the commercial repository. Dr. Brewer stated the actual amount would be more like 5/7th because it would be metric tons heavy metal equivalent, which presents a different set of engineering problems. Because it is unknown, this is another issue, he said, that needs identification and elaboration.

Dr. Brewer referred to the first part of Dr. Leopold's question and said it has been identified as a very important element because the work done by the contractor overlooked the fact that per cannister defense waste is much bulkier. They failed to consider storage space, transportation required, and other factors involved, so it is being pointed out it must be approached not just as a matter of dollars. Because defense

waste has its own engineering problems, he said, some of the savings they project may be overstated.

Dr. Leopold questioned the possibility of a Presidential veto of the commingling, and Mr. Stevens said the question was not one of the concept of commingling, but a concern for opening the defense waste process as a possible threat to national security.

In response to Dr. Leopold's question regarding public hearings on the commingling decision, Mr. Stevens replied that none were called for in the Act.

Jim Worthington asked for clarification on the commingling of the defense waste and commercial waste, and wondered if they would be placed together in the same repository, or be placed in a separate storage area. Mr. Stevens replied it would be the latter with different packaging, and presumably some (depending upon cannisters used) different handling requirements.

Mayor Jarret reiterated he was bothered about the speed of going through the Defense Waste process and questioned if even the technical people involved thoroughly understand the issue, although he recognized without moving ahead nothing would get done.

Mr. Lane also stated his frustration with the question of to commingle or not to commingle being based on a technicial basis of national security when a site is not yet known. He was concerned about transportation and safety for the entire population, which he thought should be considered first.

Mr. Stevens agreed and said if the commingling decision holds, it will unlock a whole series of decisions yet to be made, such as cost allocation. He added it goes back to one basic question on the whole repository question in that many of the sites being considered are in areas away from the main production of spent fuel.

Futher discussion brought up the subject of an MRS facility being built before the first repository, in which case a repository could not be located on the same site. The MRS Study must be submitted to Congress by June of 1985, with an Environmental Assessment due around the end of the year, although there is no firm schedule.

Administrative Matters

There were no administrative matters discussed.

Public Comment

Eileen Buller of the Hanford Oversight Committee suggested to the Council that it do what it is mandated to do and glean from the public of Washington State the direction of public opinion, perhaps by going back to their constituents in the form of public meetings, town halls, or whatever means possible. She said she did not expect them to be technical experts. She was also concerned how much of the public comment would be integrated. She said she would like the body to clarify where to send comments--to the Board, the Council, or should she go to her Legislators.

Mayor Jarrett felt by considering opinions and suggestion, passing resolutions, and making recommendations to the Board, the Council did have the mechanism in place, if not completely clear. Mr. Bishop added he shared her concern and pointed out it was difficult in the time span allotted for the Board and Council to incorporate comments in a meaningful way. He did suggest she direct her comments to more than one body, and to the Legislature as well. Mr. Worthington noted the Newsletter would be one vehicle for the public to express opinions. Mention was also made of the Public Opinion Poll conducted in November of 1983, which covered a large section of the public.

Ms. Buller also suggested that should the Advisory Council take a tour of the Hanford operation, the members could make themselves available by giving notice to the press and letting the people know. Mayor Jarrett suggested the press could be alerted to the tour being conducted by the Council letting the public know there is a Council interested in the whole issue. Mr. Bishop suggested that should Hill Williams of the Seattle Times, who was present at the meeting, care to make arrangements to go on the tour with the Council, he would be welcome.

Larry Caldwell of the Hanford Oversight Committee reinforced the comments made by Ms. Buller. He said he was concerned if the public was being heard by the Council and referred to the letter distributed at the last meeting by WashPIRG concerning the C & C Agreement and suggestions made by HOC. He said he wanted official input, making proposals, and wanted to see them acted upon. Mr. Bishop replied that all suggestions made on the C & C Agreement were to be considered in the deliberations of the Board at the afternoon meeting.

Mr. Caldwell also inquired if the public would be allowed to accompany the Council and to participate in the debriefing session that followed. He said HOC would also like to see some discussion on the specific procurement contracts on the exploratory shaft, and the status of other procurement in the

debriefing session. Mr. Bishop responded by saying the tour was planned with USDOE for the Council and he could not comment on the procurement process. Mr. Stevens said it was his understanding the public could be accommodated on a tour to see the same things the Council would see.

The question was raised whether the meeting back at the Federal Building was a public meeting, and it was assumed the public could attend since this was being held in an unsecured area.

Mr. Caldwell continued to ask about the procurement process and if it could be placed on the Agenda as he understood USDOE had already purchased some of the lining material for the exploratory shaft.

Discussion followed on the question of having a public meeting at Richland and the availability of adequate space. Mr. Tinsley said he would check the space and report back to the Chair.

Also discussed further was the procurement issue, and Dr. Leopold expressed her opinion the procurement issue should be placed on the Council Agenda--whether on the date of the tour, or a regular meeting of the Council.

Dennis Arter, 1923 W. Sylvester, Pasco, WA 99301, said this was his first attendance at an Advisory Council meeting and he had learned of the Council through a newsletter from Representative Ray Isaacson. He commented that in his opinion the members of the Advisory Council should not be technical experts, but they should be looking more closely at the larger issues as they affect the state of Washington. He referred to the Defense Waste Study and the institutional aspects of the issue. He inquired who prepared the Defense Waste Study and was informed it was the Mitre Corporation under contract with USDOE. He then requested a copy of the Charter of the Council, and Mr. Bishop said he would be sent a copy of the Role of the Council. He also said he thought each member of the Council should memorize the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

MINUTES OF NUCLEAR WASTE BOARD MEETING
September 21, 1984
1:00 p.m.

Hearings Room
Building #1 - Rowesix
4224 Sixth Avenue S.E., Lacey, WA

Board Members Present:

Warren A. Bishop, Chair
Senator Max Benitz
Senator Sam Guess
Senator Margaret Hurley
Representative Shirley Hankins
Representative Dick Nelson
Representative Nancy Rust
Donald W. Moos
Richard H. Watson
Ray Lasmanis, DNR Designee
Dr. John Beare, DSHS Designee
Dr. Royston H. Filby, Water Research Center Designee

The meeting was called to order by Warren Bishop, Chair. Mr. Bishop announced that beginning with this meeting all documents forwarded to members for Board consideration would not be duplicated in the members' packets. He suggested all Agenda documents be brought to the meeting for any necessary discussion or action.

Mr. Bishop also announced that future meetings would begin at 1:30 p.m. He said this return to the original time was being made because airline schedules had changed for Spokane members, and the extra time would allow staff to prepare for the Board meeting following the morning Advisory Council meeting.

The minutes of the August meeting were discussed and Representative Miller offered one change in wording referring to her remarks on page 6. The change was noted and the minutes were approved as corrected.

Report of Working Group and Discussion of Newsletter

Anita Monoian reported that the Public Involvement Group met once since the last Board meeting to put the finishing touches on the first Newsletter which has now gone to press. She said

the Board would be receiving copies about October 10. She briefly explained the format of the introductory Newsletter, and asked for comment and input by Board members after they receive the first copy. She also requested they send her or Marta Wilder any suggestions for future acticles.

Ms. Monoian indicated that because of funding limitations, the efforts of the Committee have been limited to producing the Newsletter. When the grant amount is known for the next fiscal year, she said, the Public Involvement Group would go forward with the other planned projects, again asking the Board members if they had specific or high-priority items to be developed.

Senator Guess said because of the recent issue of the newsletter by the Legislative Joint Science & Technology Committee, planned as a bimonthly letter, he hoped the efforts of the Office and the S & T Committee would not be duplicated. Ms. Monoian said the subject was discussed in the Council meeting that morning. Mr. Bishop assured the Board and the Office staff would meet with the S & T Committee in an attempt to coordinate the newsletters without duplication of effort. He believed it was important to dissemate information to reach as many people as possible within a short period of time.

Senator Guess expressed his support for developing slide shows and video tapes and suggested they might reach a larger audience than the newsletters would. Senator Hurley said she hoped the Newsletter would be interesting and less technical to make it more appealing to the average reader. She continued by mentioning there was a new organization in the Spokane area called Hanford Education Action League (HEAL), which planned to publish a newsletter in the Spokane area. She said she would like to have all those members on the mailing list. Following further discussion, it was agreed there should be concentration on the writing style to make the Newsletter readable to the public. The Public Involvement Group plans to meet again in November.

Low-Level Waste Program

Don Moos, Director of the Department of Ecology, explained that although the legislation setting up the Nuclear Waste Board alludes to areas other than high-level waste, only high-level is handled in the section of the Department headed by David Stevens. The low-level waste part is handled in the Office of Hazardous Substance and Air Quality of the Department. He introduced Lynda Brothers, the Assistant Director who administers that office, whom he asked to give a brief overview of responsibilities concerning low-level wastes in

the Department of Ecology to give the Board members more background.

Ms. Brothers reported briefly on the recent meeting of the Northwest Interstate Compact Committee, which she chairs. The meeting was held in Richland, Washington, on August 28, 1984, the states of Utah, Oregon, Idaho, Alaska, Hawaii, Montana and Washington were in attendance. Discussion centered on national events and, in particular, progress toward Congressional ratification of the Compacts. She stated Congress has not yet consented to the Compacts that have been introduced in accordance with the 1980 Federal Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act. There had been some meetings in the last quarter with some Congressional members and staff, including Senator Strom Thurmand, Senator Joseph Biden, Congressman Udall and Richard Ottinger.

Lynda Brothers stated the other major activity at the Compact Committee meeting was the passage of a Resolution putting the Northwest Compact representatives on record as supporting the Congressional process and mapping a process by which the Compact feels the state's interest in managing the Hanford disposal site can be protected by encouraging the use of interregional agreeements for access to the state's disposal sites. The next meeting of the Compact Committee will be held November 30 in Salt Lake City, Utah.

Senator Guess inquired how many states had ratified the Compact. Ms. Brothers replied the Northwest Compact has been ratified by all the member states. She added that the Congressional holdup was because not all 50 states have entered into Compacts. There are currently four Compacts before the Congress and a fifth one, the Midwest Compact, approved by all the eligible states, should be submitted to the Congress this fall. The principal states not in Compacts now include California, Massachusetts, New York, and a few others. She said Illinois had decided to go into a two-state Compact.

Representative Nelson remarked he had attended the Compact meeting and recalled some discussion about a legal basis for an agreement. He wondered if there were a legal opinion covering disposal from out of the region before other regions have their compacts. Charlie Roe, Assistant Attorney General for the Department, replied he had discussed this issue briefly with Lynda Brothers, and they would be meeting with her staff the following Tuesday to pursue the subject. He said there is power vested in the state to enter into agreements outside the formal federal constitutional Compacts, but the question is of the elements in the types of agreement of a long-term nature and those were topics to be discussed.

Representative Nelson said he noted that numerous activities in the low-level waste area impact our state, such as submarine wastes that may come into the state, Manhattan Project waste, and decommissioned reactor components, and he wondered if the Board could have a report on those other areas and how the Department is going to approach them. He said he felt there should be some consistent response and a way to comment on the Environmental Impact Statement and other documents. He also wondered if the Board should have a position on these issues.

Ms. Brothers replied that the Department did comment on the EIS issued by the USDOE for their use of that facility, and from her experience in the USDOE she knew these comments were considered. However, she pointed out that the land is federally owned so the ultimate decision is usually theirs. Concerning the submarine reactor parts, she commented only the low-level decommissioned submarine components are being shipped to Hanford. The high-level reactor components are going to Idaho for temporary storage.

Mr. Bishop responded to the question regarding the response the Board should make, by saying this is a subject that should be discussed. He suggested the Department of Social and Health Services might give the Board some indication of their dimensions of the programs administered by that Agency--perhaps at the next meeting of the Board.

Mr. Moos said he thought the part of the statute that refers to low-level waste is cloudy, and for this reason the Department decided to give a line responsibility in this area to the Department of Ecology. He thought it would be appropriate for Ecology and DSHS to bring to the Board periodic reports on all activities in the low-level area. He continued by stating in the area of jurisdiction of administration and policy setting in the low-level area, an examination of the statute would be in order. If this area proved cloudy, he thought it should be an agenda item for legislative clearance to perfect the statute. He indicated that at the present time low-level is the responsibility of WDOE, but the Department needs to be accountable and reportable to the Board.

Mr. Bishop asked Dr. Beare and Mr. Moos to be prepared to give routine reports to the Board.

Draft Comments on Commingling Decision

Jerry Parker outlined several points relating to: The study of the Draft Comments on USDOE Defense Waste Commingling Study prepared by Envirosphere; the proposed revisions to the com-

ments prepared by the staff; and the draft Letter of Transmittal to David B. Leclaire, Director of the Defense Waste and Byproduct Management Office of the U.S. Department of Energy.

Mr. Parker mentioned the only written comments received in the Office were from Dr. Beare. These were considered in drafting the proposed revisions. He added comments from Ted Hunter would be available today for consideration.

As Mr. Parker summarized the five-page list of suggested major and minor changes, extensive discussion was held on each major point. Rearrangement of points to reflect importance of issues was made; considerable re-wording to claify or emphasize concerns was done; and certain deletions and corrections in wording were also made. General agreement was reached on the changes.

Senator Guess moved to accept the first amendment suggested, then changed his motion to accept the whole package of amendments. Mr. Moos seconded the motion.

Representative Nelson asked to have placed in the record his concern for the necessity of seeing the EIS before adequate comment could be made on the defense wastes at Hanford. He felt it should be pointed out to the federal government it is too early to accept their decision on commingling of defense wastes before first seeing the EIS.

Mr. Moos said he felt going through this process should not eliminate the opportunity to expressing Representative Nelson's concern. He said he did not know how it could be written into a comment of a study, but it should be made known to the federal offices. He suggested this expression be made either in a separate letter or an augmentation to the Letter of Transmittal.

Senator Guess felt this was already adequately covered in the Draft Letter of Transmittal, and this concern could be brought out when comments would be due on the EIS after it is issued.

Public Comment

Dr. Estella Leopold (Advisory Council member) said the manner in which the Board resolves these questions discussed should maintain as much strength as possible. She felt elimination of some of Envirosphere's statements made it weaker. She referred to page 7 and the statement that "...commingling recommendation is premature..." was stronger than the suggested revision. She also suggested that it might be pointed out that there may not be enough space of unfaulted rocks to achieve a commingling burial, either at BWIP or another site.

David Stevens referred to Representative Nelson's comments, and suggested some possible language could be inserted to convey Representative Nelson's concerns on page 1 of the amendatory material: "Data defining the retrievable waste volumes and characteristics at Hanford developed for this Enviromental Impact Statement must be contained in the revised commingling report since it provides the basis for determining the wastes from Hanford that require geologic disposal..."

Mr. Moos moved this amendment.

Jerry Parker said this amendment should address Dr. Leopold's first comment, and he referred to page 4 of Envirosphere's comments which covered her second concern.

Dennis Arter from Kennewick, Washington, stated he considered the study by the U.S. Department of Energy was a "shoddy" study and he questioned their releasing such a document. He thought this should be pointed out to the Department.

The motion to adopt the preceding Amendment was called for and adopted unanimously.

The original motion to adopt the modifications to the Envirosphere Draft Comments, including the adopted Amendment, was called for and adopted unanimously.

Dr. Beare then moved to adopt the basic document from Envirosphere with amendments. Motion was adopted.

Ray Lasmanis suggested a specific statement be added to the Letter of Transmittal in line with Representative Nelson's concerns. The Board agreed to allow the staff to construct such a sentence to be added to the letter to USDOE, which will be sent on Monday, September 24, the deadline for submission of comments.

Dr. Beare commended the staff for the hard work on the review of the USDOE Defense Waste Commingling Study, but suggested any changes to future major documents be presented in a better form to enable the members to give meaningful consideration to all the changes. He suggested presenting it similar to bills being considered in the Legislature with full text and indicated changes before the members. Mr. Bishop assured him every effort would be made to incorporate this method of presentation.

Representative Nelson wonder what documents are anticipated in the near future, and whether the Board would deal with the NRC

draft site technical position dealing with the whole hydrology question, which he understood is close to closure on comments.

Dr. Brewer explained this document, NRC Site Technical Position 1.1 on Hydrogeologic Testing Strategy for the BWIP Site, recently published in the Federal Register, is the document which was published in December, 1983. Dr. Brewer said he briefed the Board on this document at the April meeting, and the fact that it is published now opens it for public comment, although no comment was ever solicited by the NRC. Publication now simply gives it the effect of rule-making, he said, and in fact it has been implemented since February. He added he had no adverse reactions to it when first reviewed.

Representative Nelson wondered if a list could be produced giving expected documents and dates of issue. David Stevens responded that to the extent the Office is able it would be done. He said the next major event will be the issuance of the Environmental Asessment which will call for extensive review. The state, as well as other states, has attempted to get the U.S. Department of Energy to give a more uniform and consistent time frame for response to all documents. He said some gain had been made in the case of the EA as 60 days for comments were scheduled, the state requested 120 days, and the indication is they will allow 90 days. He continued saying Representative Nelson had asked what the actual schedule of issuance of the EA was, and Mr. Stevens' information from Ben Rusche indicated that although the EA was originally scheduled for the summer of 1984, the best estimate now that it would be received in mid-November. Following the 90-day comment period, they anticipate a 60-day comment review period, which would bring a recommendation date for five sites with recommendation of three to the President about the first of May.

Mr. Bishop referred to a memorandum to Representative Nelson from Fred Adair of the House Progrma Research Staff, concerning Transuranics on the Hanford Reservation. Copies were distributed to the Board (see attached).

Representative Nelson explained the memorandum summarizes the amounts of Transuranic wastes which are a part of the defense and commercial wastes at Hanford. He felt it was important to point this out as it gives a perspective on the problem of dealing with Transuranic wastes the same as high-level wastes. He said these transuranics are finely divided in his opinion and reside within 40 feet of the surface spread throught low-level waste dumps and trenches. Combined, they amount to more than a ton of plutonium.

He continued that amount poses a different, but substantial, risk from the plutonium in the commercial waste that would be

buried 3,000 feet under the basalt. He thought the Defense EIS should address the long-term risk of leaving that material in a vulnerable position near the surface, and it should be given all the same consideration as the burial of commercial wastes.

Status of C & C Agreement

Mr. Bishop said that following the State C & C Negotiating Team's final report to the Board several meetings ago, comments were received from WashPIRG, Hanford Oversight Committee, Representative Nelson, Dr. Beare, and others. The Team met to review the C&C Agreement and to consider the comments received. He said the intention is to meet again as soon as staff has completed a new draft and try to finish in time to mail to the Board before the next meeting on October 19.

Should the Board agree to the basic provisions of the draft Agreement as changed, public hearings could be scheduled. The intent would be to have at least four public hearings during the first week in December at different locations in the state. Following the hearings, the comments received would be heard by the Board for their consideration at either the December meeting or the January meeting, if it is desired to present the Agreement to the Legislature early in January.

Representative Miller raised the question of a December 21 meeting date since it is so close to the holidays and she wondered if there would be good public participation at that time of year. Mr. Bishop said this would be considered.

Representative Nelson asked if further discussions were contemplated with USDOE on the draft. Mr. Bishop replied that following the next meeting of the State Team, a decision would have to be made to seek USDOE's position either by a full-team meeting or contact with the principals. Mr. Nelson recalled Mr. Rusche had commented he was going to take another look at liability, and wondered if that might be integrated into the deliberations. Mr. Bishop replied that since this is the most difficult issue in the document, the Team may present three options to go out for public hearings.

Monitoring Committee Report

Don Provost reported that a visit to Hanford is scheduled next week (September 25th) for the Monitoring Committee. The Committee will look at the monitoring devices, their location and relationship to each other. He said the full group will be in attendance, with Nancy Kirner substituting for Dr. Beare.

Defense Waste Working Group

Mr. Bishop said pursuant to the Board authorizing the Chair to (1) establish negotiations on an Agreement with USDOE on Defense Wastes, and (2) submit an application for a grant for funds to study Defense Wastes, both requests have gone forward. No response has yet been received from USDOE and he said it was realized both requests are heavy policy issues. He felt the most likely possibility would be authority to proceed with an Agreement would be granted, but the funding issue is a question as USDOE has previously taken the position that the Defense Waste issue does not fall within the purvue of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

Mr. Bishop said a Working Group had been established, composed of Senator Al Williams, Representative Shirley Hankins, John Beare, Nick Lewis, Richard Watson, Commissioner Bill Sebero, Advisory Council members, Warren Bishop, Don Provost, David Stevens from the staff. The first meeting is scheduled for September 27.

Technical Report

Dr. Brewer reported a request for information was received from Congressman Edward J. Markey of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, which is presently looking into the relationship of the states and the Federal government as it reflects implementation of the NWPA of 1982. He said the question will be examined in hearings this fall. Dr. Brewer thought the Board should be aware there may be other requests for Board positions on technical and policy issues as well.

Dr. Brewer said a significant meeting was held in Richland, August 27, covering information systems with NCR, USDOE, the Yakima Nation, and the Confederated Umatilla Tribes. He remarked the "Issues Tracking System" is now ready to be established by the Office. This will allow the Office to establish a very clear trail on the issues and the actions that have been taken. He said NRC is planning a far more extensive system that will enable them to recall for review all material pertinent to any issue or concern connected with the licensing process. They plan to use an interim system for perhaps five years while they develop the full-blown system.

USDOE/Rockwell system is more limited to make sure that everything contained in the final version of the Mission Plan is being done. It will be a smaller system than NRC, but much larger than the one planned for the Office. The Yakima and Umatilla people said they wanted to be able to access via

modems and personal computers all of these systems for information. The general agreement was that there should be an effort made to strive for machine compatability. Another meeting is planned in the next few months and Dr. Brewer said he would report back to the Board after that meeting.

Dr. Brewer went on to say the Office had been working very closely with Envirosphere on two major documents, the Defense Waste Commingling Study, and deciding on the amount of work to be done on the pre-public Environmental Asessment. The Contractor will start on necessary work on this document before the draft document is issued. This will allow us to save resources for the new EA.

Dr. Filby inquired if the pre-public report was available to the Board, and Dr. Brewer replied there are two copies--one in the Reference Center and one in the Office. Since the document is well over 1,000 pages, it was felt impracticial to make copies available at this stage. Mr. Bishop inquired if additional copies were available from USDOE, and Mr. Tinsley from that office responded by saying USDOE does not want to distribute anymore of that version. He said the document which will come out in November has been significantly changed. Because the document is so huge, he said USDOE is evolving a plan, with the cooperation of the Board, to come before the Board to present a summary pointing out the issues, references, and its relation to other documents. This would be a four- to six-hour session. Also in preparation is an Executive Summary of each Chapter. He said it was felt by USDOE that with the planned training session for the Board, Council, Consultants, or any interested parties, a head start could be gained on the review process.

Mr. Tinsley also said Rockwell is compiling sets of references and USDOE hopes to be able to provide a copy to the Reference Center and the Indian States' Library to make the review more efficient. He added BWIP is going to try to pull out a copy as it enters the printing process (which will take at least six weeks) in order to get the technical review started.

Mr. Tinsley said he would like to hear from the Board how it would like to arange the proposed briefing session, or if they wanted it at all. In response to Mr. Bishop's question, Mr. Tinsley said he hoped to have an outline of their proposal sent to the Board as soon as possible. Mr. Bishop said this would be shared with the Science & Technology Committee and the Legislative staff.

Ray Lasmanis said he would appreciate receiving the final geologic/geochemical sections as soon as they are printed, rather than waiting for them to be collated of a period of six weeks.

Mr. Tinsley said he would do what he could to provide at least one document.

Dr. Brewer stated the Office could furnish Dr. Filby the section in which he is interested by reproducing that geotechnical section of the pre-public draft.

Office Grant Request Status

David Stevens said the grant request was submitted to USDOE in good time, but a letter from their office received this week requested some elaboration and explanation on some points, and that information is being prepared at the present time. He said part of the delay is due to the slippage in the USDOE schedule, and some projects planned for the Office are dependent upon their schedule. He felt certain by the next meeting of the Board the Office would have an approved budget upon refinement of the Grant request.

Mr. Bishop inquired if the Joint Science & Technology Committee were having the same delay in their grant request. Max Power replied they were having a similar experience. However, he felt the signals were positive.

Senator Guess inserted he had the opportunity of sitting in on two meetings of the Council of State Governments last Sunday and Monday in connection with a nuclear waste study. He said Nevada and Utah were also represented, and Utah thinks the repository is going to be there, and Washington doesn't have a chance of getting it. He added he thought Washington was ahead of Utah in the public eduction, saying he thinks the slide presentation will be the way to reach the public. He said Nevada particularly wanted to receive copies of what we are doing. He continued the former Chair of the Council of State Governments Nuclear Waste Study, and incoming Vice Chair of the Council, Larry Jacobsen, will be making a strong effort to stay on top of the issue. The Council adopted a Resolution expressing the concern of states about the issue. He said he learned they are at least as concerned about the transportation across the country as the state of Washington. He felt the technical elements of the problem have been pretty well worked out, and only the political that remains to be done. He wondered if the discussions in the Board meeting are being disseminated to the whole political body. He hoped the Science & Technology Committee would be able to accomplish this. Senator said he would secure a copy of the Resolution for the Chair, who advised copies would be sent to all the members.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.