

WM DOCKET CONTROL CENTER OF NUCLEAR WASTE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING
October 19, 1984

84 NOV 26 A11:28

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
- Ron Greenen
- Mayor Fred Jarrett
- Gordon Kunz
- Anita Monoian
- Commissioner W.H. Sebero

WM Record File
101.3

Wim Project 10
 Docket No. _____
 PDR
 LPDR

Distribution:

RFB/MSB/MSM CFR/WREG/HT
SOB/DRM/ROM Kennedy/KERR
 (Return to WM, 623-SS) KUNZ AIR 3-V

The meeting was called to order by Warren Bishop, Chair. *Rec'd w/o comment A. Miller from Dept of Ecology*

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes be approved as published. Motion carried and the Minutes were approved.

Work Group on Public Involvement Report

Anita Monoian, Chairman of the Public Involvement Working Group reported a meeting had been held that morning with Pat Serie of Envirosphere, who will give a report. The first issue of the Newsletter was released and she said at this time Pat and Marta Wilder are working on the drafts for the next one. She said because of the holiday schedules the next Newsletter may be mailed before the Advisory Council or the Board meet again. The Committee will thus have to make the decision on the final copy. The drafts will be sent to the Council members the first part of next week and there will be time to make comment by phone or by letter, with a deadline of a week from this Friday.

She reported the Committee had also reviewed some rough drafts of the preliminary Fact Sheets. Pat Serie gave a brief view of the activities in the month of October. She said they are developing four Fact Sheets to cover the basics, including one on the overall program, the State and the Federal Programs, and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. A second one will discuss the nature of high-level nuclear waste and define its relationship to other kinds of wastes. A third will cover the repository concept itself, giving a description and method of operation. The fourth Fact Sheet will indicate key decision points such as the schedule for the next several years and where decisions need to be made by the Federal government, the State government, and where people can become involved in those decisions. Drafts of these Fact Sheets are being prepared.

B501070528 B41019
 PDR WASTE
 WM-10 PDR

1066

Also being prepared is an Information Kit that will be a folder containing the first four Fact Sheets, and others as they are developed, the Newsletters, a list of technical resources, etc. This will be used as a distribution item and also in working with the media. In addition, a Program Press Release is also in preparation, which will become part of the Information Kit, that is suitable for use, especially for local and smaller papers.

Other activities in October includes preparation of the newsletter, and movement is started on developing a slide presentation. It is planned to prepare a script and begin looking at available slides and what new photography might need to be done to complete the project in November.

Marta Wilder added that Fact Sheet designs were considered at the morning meeting and it is hoped the four Fact Sheets can be finished by the end of October, as well as the slide show outline. She said drafts of the Newsletter would be sent to the Council, with a publication target of December 10. Marta said the next meeting of the Work Group will be December 4 at 10:00 a.m. at Sea-Tac in the same meeting room.

Mr. Bishop mentioned that because of the holidays, he was asking the Council and would ask the Board to consider a November/December meeting to be held on December 14. (This was later confirmed by the Board, and the next regular meeting of both bodies will be held on December 14 in the usual place and at the regular times.)

Council Hanford Tour - November 1

Marta said the arrangements had been made for the Council to tour the Hanford Near-Surface Test Facility at Richland on November 1. To date eight of the Council members have indicated they could attend. The Council members attending will meet at 9:00 a.m. at the Federal Building in Richland. She advised warm clothes and comfortable shoes be worn as the weather has turned cooler. She also said clearance has been arranged. Lunch will cost \$4.00. She asked the members to send this amount to her in advance, with checks payable to USDOE.

Mr. Bishop mentioned another factor in changing the meeting dates for November and December was the effort to hold public hearings on the C&C Agreement, should it be approved by the Board, during the first part of December. Should these hearings take place, the effort would be made to hold the five hearings in various parts of the State: the Tri-Cities, Yakima, Spokane, Seattle, Olympia and Vancouver were mentioned as possible locations. Since there is no decision yet by the Board on the C&C Agreement, he said, this was a tentative plan.

Lane Bray inquired how information would be distributed to the public concerning the C&C Agreement, and why the public should attend such hearings. He noted there had been no mention in the press that he had seen. Mr. Bishop said that would be the responsibility of the Council and the Office and press releases, etc. are being prepared, once the decision by the Board is made. Ms. Monoian then asked if those first four Fact Sheets would be distributed to the entire press, or just those press people who had shown interest. Pat Serie responded the intent was to send it to the entire media list, and on request from others. A letter would be sent along with the Fact Sheets, explaining further information was available. In response to Ms. Monoian's question about the release date of that packet, Pat said since they are operating on a monthly basis, the concept should be available in draft form by the end of October. She said no final date has been established, but it should be some time in November.

Since the public hearings would overlap the proposed meeting of the Public Involvement Work Group on December 4, Ms. Monoian said she would consult with Marta and Pat and communicate with the rest of the Committee on the decision reached. Mr. Bishop agreed as he said he would like the Council available in those areas at the hearings, should they be held. Ms. Monoian said she would make no change until the hearings are actually scheduled.

Mr. Bishop asked what the magnitude of the Fact Sheets would be and if the distribution would be to the same audience which receives the Newsletter. Pat Serie said they anticipated "X" number of each Fact Sheet as it was developed. No numbers have been set, she said, but there would be sufficient supply to go into the media kits, with a supply to be used perhaps at public workshops, plus requests received in the Office. She said the original plan in the budget called for eight Fact Sheets. Four are being prepared, and it is anticipated four more will be developed when the additional resources are these, and as needed. She added that should enough requests be made about a particular issue, another Fact Sheet might be developed on that issue. Mr. Bishop observed it would be very important to develop a Fact Sheet on the C&C Agreement and attempt to have that available as early as possible, and to be used as handouts at the hearings. He said Fact Sheets should be available in advance on the events scheduled.

Pat Serie continued it was planned that the December Newsletter would really highlight the Environmental Assessment. Mr. Bishop suggested there could even be a Fact Sheet on the Schedule of Events, and Pat said that is being covered under "Key Decision Points". Marta suggested another use for the Fact Sheets could be for school presentations and other organizations. In response to Ms. Monoian's question as to whether the special interest and overall community groups' list were in place, Pat Serie said there is a good start on the mailing list, but there is still

material to be included. She added that in contacting groups she learned they also had a newsletter and were interested in receiving announcements or articles which they could place in their newsletter.

Ms. Monoian wondered if Mr. Bishop felt the Fact Sheets should be sent to the entire mailing list receiving the Newsletter. He replied he was not sure they should go to the entire list, but to an identified network of organizations and media. Ms. Monoian pointed out the requests won't be received unless the examples are out in public view. Marta mentioned she is already receiving requests for more information and more involvement, so Fact Sheets will be sent to them. Pat suggested putting a notice in the December Newsletter to let people know there is an information packet available, including information on following issues, with a place to request the packet.

Mr. Bishop asked that any innovative ideas the members might have to help reach various groups throughout the State be sent along to Marta in the Public Information Office.

Mr. Bishop asked if any of the members were seeing articles in their local papers about this subject, and the response was that although some had appeared in the Yakima papers, the PI, the Times, and the Spokesman Review. Ms. Monoian did remark she did not see much awareness that there was such a thing as the "Board" or the "Advisory Council", but she felt the subject matter is being covered.

Mr. Bishop pointed out that an effort is being made to prevent any duplication or overlapping of the Joint Science and Technology Committee newsletter. He said S&T would be issuing a newsletter in November, and had sent a list of the subjects they intend to include, and this should enable the Office to broaden the scope of the Newsletter.

Anita Monoian proposed that the Fact Sheets automatically be distributed to the school network that is set up, together with a note explaining the availability. Both Pat and Marta requested any criticism or comment on the Newsletter, as well as any suggestions for articles.

Mr. Kunz added he considered the first issue of the Newsletter to be very good.

Public Comment on Public Information Program

Larry Caldwell of the Hanford Oversight Committee asked if a final plan would be issued for the Public Information Program. Ms. Monoian replied a plan has been developed, but it is contingent on funding. She said the focus was placed on the Newsletter until funding is known. Mr. Bishop added the plan has not been finalized as comments and suggestions are still being received,

and he was of the opinion the plan should be flexible. Mr. Caldwell said Hanford Oversight Committee felt a final plan should be published, even if it were to change. He said they also were concerned about having an 800 number for public use, and would like to see it implemented as soon as possible. Mr. Bishop inquired if USDOE had an 800 number, and Mr. Caldwell said they did have one in Washington, D.C., but it was mainly for meeting information.

Mr. Caldwell also commented on Battelle's plan to go into the Tri-Cities schools, commissioned by USDOE, to present a program and he would like the State to monitor that program. Ms. Monoian said she would raise that question. Mr. Caldwell also asked if the mailing list were secure, and not distributed, divulged, or sold. Marta Wilder replied no, it was the mailing list for the Council. He asked if there had been a number of comments on the first Newsletter and Marta said comments are just beginning to come into the Office. She estimated there had been approximately eighteen or twenty, and most had been positive.

Eileen Buller of the Hanford Oversight Committee asked how many dollars of the grant money were given to the Public Information Program - \$20,000 until December? Mr. Stevens said at the moment the Office was operating on a continuing resolution allowing expenditure of monies not used through the fiscal year 1984. Word has been received this week the grant has been approved for fiscal year 1985, but no written information explaining the detail has yet arrived. Ms. Buller said the Oversight Committee strongly suggested that the State be aware of what the U.S. Department of Energy in their information programs has subcontracted. She added it was her opinion it would not be out of line to inquire what the dollar figure is on the subcontract to Battelle. Mr. Caldwell thought it was just a part of their original contract with Battelle and did not involve extra money. Ms. Buller continued by saying she thought this was the responsibility of the Advisory Council, which could do a much more credible job of public information in the eyes of the people. Mr. Stevens observed this was a very important point and there is a mandate in the Federal law for the Department of Energy to carry out a public information program, but the State certainly wants to know what it is and how it touches the State's program. He pointed out there is a clause in the C&C Agreement calling for the Federal government to recognize the responsibility and right for the State to conduct such a program with close coordination between the two.

Board Environmental Monitoring Committee Working Group - Meeting/Tour Report

Lane Bray, a member of the Working Group, reported the Group met twice at Hanford for two full-day sessions. The first meeting, July 26, was spent in the Federal Building with USDOE officials and subcontractors reviewing the federal program. He said

Battelle does the monitoring for R/L and does the monitoring of the 500 square miles of property at the Hanford site, as well as off-site. The contractors monitor on the limited area where their plants are located, such as Rockwell Hanford at the 200 area, etc. He said it was learned the State has only two monitoring areas on the Hanford Reservation, one for the WPPSS through an EFSEC contract, and one on the low-level waste site. The second meeting on September 25 took the Group out in the field to observe monitoring equipment and practices. Air sampling stations, soil and vegetation monitoring with effects on the animals on the Reservation, springs entering the Columbia River, the weather station first initiated in the early 40's by the University of Washington, and groundwater monitoring were all viewed by the Working Group. They also visited the Purex Plant to see some of the monitoring equipment inside the building. The Group went to the major stack which has been of major concern to the State in the earlier release experienced with the startup of the plant. Mr. Bray said they went into the monitoring station at the base of the stack to observe the monitoring equipment there. The Group talked to various people about the quality assurance program and how they protect each of their samples, how they looked for variances in the samples to detect off-standard conditions. He said this was a very elaborate program and the overall program for the Hanford plant was a multi-million dollar ongoing venture.

Mr. Bray said the two trips were very useful and the Group would continue to meet to discuss their observations and what recommendations should be taken back to the Nuclear Waste Board.

Don Provost added that looking ahead, money had been reserved in the grant to provide money for continued monitoring. He said the U.S. Department of Energy indicated they would approve this sort of monitoring. The Working Group planned to meet following the Council meeting to discuss the first draft of a Monitoring Plan developed by the Department of Social and Health Services to be presented to the Board for implementation.

Board Defense Waste Working Group - Tour/Meeting

Commissioner Sebero, a member of the Defense Waste Working Group formed by the Board to determine state policy regarding the existing defense wastes on the Hanford Reservation, reported on the first meeting which was held on September 27 in Olympia. Through the discussion it was determined that for the Group to be able to report to the Board efficiently and effectively it would be necessary to visit the site and work with USDOE to get a first-hand feeling of the problem. He said in a personal comment that as a Commissioner of Benton County he had been out on that project many, many times, but on each visit he learned more.

Mr. Sebero said a letter was sent to Mike Lawrence, Manager of the Richland Operations Office, stating that the existing Hanford

defense wastes are a key element in the Federal decision to commingle defense wastes in a civilian repository, and the request was made to tour the facility, if it could be warranted. The date of October 10 was suggested and this was agreed to by USDOE. The Group was looking for what wastes are stored at Hanford, how the wastes are stored, what wastes are at other sites, what options are available, and what is the scope of the EIS. He said Mr. Stevens would comment on the EIS later. On October 10th the Group met for approximately an hour's overview of the defense wastes at the Federal Building, then toured the site. He said they went to the 300 area, the vitrification facilities, and the glassification plant. He continued that they now have mock-ups of it and are doing many experiments and he recalled they would start on a low-level basis next week. He said it was an extremely interesting tour through the vitrification facility. He said they also went into the computer monitoring facilities and had an overview of the "Hot" areas of how they will handle nuclear waste. From there they went out to the storage facilities of the low-level waste repository sites. He said they only had an overview of the Department of Ecology site, but had a visual tour by bus of the defense waste area, and it was very impressive to see how they have handled the wastes over many years, and the protective measures they have taken.

Following this they toured the tank farms and had a very long presentation and visual tour of the new eight double-walled tanks under construction. Each tank will have a capacity of a million gallons of liquid materials. There was quite a discussion, he said, of the single-wall tanks which will be stabilized and their use will be discontinued.

Completing the tour, the Group met with Mr. Lawrence. Mr. Sebero said Mr. Lawrence left him with the impression that USDOE was willing to work with the Group and the Advisory Council and would give them any information needed. Mr. Bray said Mr. Lawrence was aware of the scheduled tour by the Advisory Council on November 1, and was looking forward to it. Mr. Sebero said he was concerned that to date only eight members of the Council had indicated they could go on the November 1 tour. He strongly recommended that each and every member of the Council who physically can plan to go on that tour. He said as an Advisory Council each member should be as well educated as possible, and this was an opportunity not to be missed.

Public Comment on Defense Waste Group Report

Eileen Buller of the Hanford Oversight Committee commented that there are occupational doses being emitted in the 200 areas and she felt it was important for the Advisory Council to be aware of the existing occupational dose to which they will be submitted in these areas and near the Purex Plant at this time. Mr. Sebero explained the Defense Group did not walk around the 200 areas. He said they were bused through these areas.

Udell Fresk of Exxon said she used to work at the Hanford Project as an engineer for Vitro Engineering. She said she had frequent occasions to visit the tank farms and had been in Purex and some of the other areas out there. She wished to testify to the precautions taken by USDOE to keep the occupational dose as low as obtainable. She said she first started working for Vitro eighteen years ago and felt she had been out there long enough to testify. She said she had no symptoms of cancer, and felt one should not be too overly concerned about the level of dose that might be received on one visit to the Hanford site.

Larry Caldwell of the Hanford Oversight Committee commented that if the Subcommittee meets at Hanford they should meet in an open arena, with meetings open to the public. He said the HOC would like notice of any meetings with USDOE to enable them to be there to observe. Mr. Sebero pointed out the Group was meeting with Mike Lawrence at his invitation.

Mr. Bishop said a letter was received from USDOE in response to a resolution adopted by the Board to submit a grant proposal to assist in the state examining existing defense waste. The grant request was denied. Also requested in that letter was an opportunity to develop some sort of an agreement with USDOE with regard to defense waste, and their response, he said, did leave the door open for discussions on an agreement or Memorandum of Understanding. A recent letter has just been received from Mike Lawrence, agreeing to this discussion, naming a negotiating group. Mr. Bishop said he would name a group today at the Board meeting to develop a Memorandum of Understanding with the USDOE group. This team will report back to the Board for comment and any necessary action.

Comments on the Defense Waste EIS

Mr. Stevens said an attempt has been made to get information previously on when the Environmental Impact Statement would be available since it is several months beyond its original date. He said it was learned there is now a firmer, but no precise, date for release in the spring of 1985, probably March or April. In that document a series of alternatives will be set forth in how to deal with the existing wastes which range from keeping everything in place to taking everything out. He said the alternative should fall somewhere in between.

Technical Program Update

Dr. Brewer reported the tectonic analysis has been completed. This regional analysis of the structural geology of the large region surrounding the Hanford site. It is now in the hands of the contractor for critiquing and peer review. This will be

discussed, he said, with the Department of Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission at the next geological workshop.

All of next week, Dr. Brewer continued, will be devoted to geological field trips based in Richland, both on and off the Reservation, going into the region area where there is discussion, controversy, or alternative interpretations of seismic hazards in particular. He will be joined on that tour by a geologist from the Department of Natural Resources. He said these are high-level, professional, educational sessions that provide an opportunity which could pave the road to better consensus among the technical community.

Dr. Brewer referred to material from the contractor in the members' packets covering the preliminary draft of the EA. The public draft, or second version, he said, will be very different from the original draft and is in the process. Since this is to be such a massive technical document, USDOE is preparing a "Working Draft" of the geotechnical part of the report which will enable the Office to begin analysis and transmit to the contractor to set up a formal examination of the printed version. He added for the record, the State is grateful to USDOE for making this available.

Public Comment

Larry Caldwell of the Hanford Oversight Committee asked Dr. Brewer the status of the Washington State contract for the geophysical well-logging. Dr. Brewer stated it was denied twice by the Department of Energy. The Board, he said, is still on record as favoring it, and will probably want to make another attempt to have it approved. He said some of the in-house work being done now support re-opening the question and would recommend this be pursued by the Board.

C&C Report

David Stevens briefly reviewed the progress of the C&C Agreement and the areas of unresolved issues. The principal one is the issue of liability. He said various positions had been presented over the course of the more than one year of negotiations, which had now gone to the Board for its consideration. The purpose of giving the Board the draft was to have the Board make a determination in terms of getting an instrument to public hearings for public review prior to legislative review before taking final action. He said the document before the Board this afternoon highlights the liability issue with several options, plus other issues to be considered. Comments received from the public, the Council, and from Board members were incorporated in a cover memorandum to the Board from the State Negotiating Team. He said the Board would be considering several options, such as moving forward with the Agreement, renegotiating the Agreement, holding the hearings, or other positions that might be offered.

Public Comment

Larry Caldwell of the Hanford Oversight Committee asked if the proposed alternatives on liability were offered after Mr. Rusche had taken another look at the question of liability, which he said he would do. Mr. Stevens said Mr. Rusche had said was looking to see if there was any particular way in which they could advance in resolving the issue. The federal position indicated (1) an extension of Price/Anderson, and (2) developing a commitment above that authority in which Congress would take the responsibility of dealing with situations that might happen beyond that limit. Mr. Stevens said basically these are identified in the options to be presented to the Board. Mr. Caldwell then asked if Mr. Rusche had done as much as he thinks he can do, and Mr. Stevens replied in the affirmative.

Public Reference Report

Jeanne Rensel, Librarian in the High-Level Nuclear Waste Reference Center, reviewed the activities and acquisitions of the Center for the period January 1 through September 30, 1984. The Reference Center is located at the Office of High-Level Nuclear Waste Management, 5826 Pacific Avenue in Lacey.

Jeanne said the goal in setting up the Reference Center was to concentrate on securing materials on nuclear waste, and not try to include everything available on nuclear power, nuclear arms, and other facets of the nuclear scene. She said there is close cooperation with other libraries, such as the Washington State Library, the Rockwell-Hanford BWIP Library, Battelle Library, and many others. As a member of the Special Libraries' Association, Jeanne said she has been able to spread the word that there is such a thing as a Nuclear Waste Reference Center.

About three quarters of the holdings in the Center are Federal documents and contract reports, Ms. Rensel continued. Most of the remainder are Rockwell-Hanford BWIP items. Access to them is through an accessions list, which is sent to the Center monthly. She said she has access to the other documents catalogued by author, subject, and title. It is hoped the Center will eventually have a computer dedicated to the library to give computer access to the various Federal data bases.

Jeanne said few books are currently in the library as she is not trying to duplicate other libraries. Federal reports and documents, periodicals, microfiche and viewer, news clippings indexed in detail, a reprint file of authors, articles, and speeches, a few maps and some pamphlets make up the bulk of the material in the Center. There are some hand-out materials, she said, and this should grow as the Public Involvement Program develops. She

said she works closely with Marta Wilder, the Public Information Officer for the Office.

Jeanne said the library has been used to date by staff, members of the Board and Council, Legislators, libraries, students, media and some individuals. She said she answers telephone inquiries on various subjects, such as costs and risks, radiation standards, spent fuel, and lately quite a few queries on transportation and questions related to the Hanford Project. She said she anticipated receiving a number of documents on defense wastes, the Environmental Assessment, and there should be 500 or more documents on the Site Characterization Plan. This may necessitate additional space and clerical help as the program unfolds, and depending upon decisions that are made, she said.

Jeanne said she welcomed any suggestions for the Center.

Mr. Bishop asked what the relationships were between the various reference centers, such as other first-year states, Federal agencies, etc. Jeanne said she has had phone contact with Wisconsin, but most of the others are funded by the U.S. Department of Energy and receive their materials from the Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation - Battelle in Columbus. She said she had not contacted all of the other first-state libraries, although she was in contact with Utah, but not Texas and Mississippi. Jeanne added that, although many documents are from Federal sources she tries to get as much material as she can from diverse sources, such as The Concerned Scientists for Nuclear Energy, The Audubon Society, The Sierra Club, Environmental Policy Institute, etc. She said the other states she has contacted do the same thing.

Mr. Bishop was concerned about how information on the program goes out to the various libraries in the State to give them some indication of the Nuclear Waste Reference Center. Jeanne said the Washington State Library has a documents distribution system that goes to all the libraries in the State, including the universities. She said any of our publications go through this system, such as the Semi-Annual Report and the Newsletter. She said other libraries would contain most of the Federal Energy documents contained in the Reference Center, but probably not the BWIP and NRC documents in the Center. The State Library knows these documents are in the Center and could refer interested parties to the Center. She thought a brochure about the Reference Center would be valuable to circulate to the other libraries in the State. Mr. Bishop suggested this be explored.

Mr. Stevens said when duplicate documents are received they are available for distribution, and he complimented Jeanne on her excellent job of organizing a complicated and technical set of material.

Mr. Bishop asked how the Environmental Assessment document could be available in various places in the State to give access to the public. Mr. Stevens said one would be placed in the Reference

Center for public use, but he would have to refer requests for copies to USDOE. Mr. Tinsley of USDOE in Richland said currently the Department is working on a straw man for the EA interaction plan which will be sent over for review. Part of that plan, he said, deals with how USDOE is going to distribute not only personal copies of the EA, but to make the EA available to the public. The present plan is to have it in all public libraries and in the BWIP Reading Room. Ten copies will be sent to the Office, as well as copies of the other EAs. In addition, he said, there would be a more easily distributable document, i.e., Executive Summaries of each of the EAs which are being prepared by Headquarters which would be more readable and distributable than the 1500-page document.

Mr. Tinsley said regarding the references, there are literally rooms of references cited in the EAs, and the plan is to make that available either in hard copy, or microfilm/microfiche at libraries, Nuclear Waste Office Reference Center, BWIP Reading Room, etc. These plans are not final, he said, but should be within the next week. At that point a copy of the Plan will be given to the Office for comment and suggestions to assist in distribution of the information.

Public Comment

Larry Caldwell of the Hanford Oversight Committee said it was his understanding that anyone who writes and requests a copy of the document should get it. Mr. Tinsley said this was not true. He added that again due to the logistics the mailing of several thousand entire documents is not an instantaneous thing. The Summaries, he said, would be released immediately upon release of the EA, within the first seven days of the 20th of December. Anyone who submits a request through the proper channels for a copy of the EA, he said he understood at this time, will be given a copy of the EA. He added it was due to be published on December 20th in the Federal Register.

Pat Serie added an item was published in the Newsletter covering the EA and giving the U.S. Department of Energy address and it was anticipated the same thing would be done in the December issue.

Mr. Caldwell asked if USDOE had agreed to extend the comment period to 90 days. Mr. Stevens responded the State had requested 120 days, and he understood that USDOE is preparing a formal response that there would be a 90-day period for review. Mr. Stevens added that should the State find this time period inadequate, the State would let USDOE know.

Repository Siting Schedule

Mr. Stevens remarked that in a meeting with USDOE recently, program directors from the interested states asked for a periodic

update on events in the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management by issuing a monthly bulletin. He said the first draft of the OCRWM Bulletin was received a few days ago and Mr. Stevens distributed copies to the Council.

Of particular interest was the OCRWM Short-Term Program Milestones, as follows:

- Issue Final Siting Guidelines 11/84
- Issue Draft EAs for Public Comment and begin Public Comment Period 12/84
- Submit Mission Plan to Congress 1/85
- Defense Waste Recommendations 1/85
- Evaluate fee adequacy 1/85
- Issue Project Decision Schedule 2/85
- Public Comment Period Ends 3/85
- Issue Final EAs 6/85
- Issue Comment Response Summary 6/85
- Submit Monitored Retrievable Storage Proposal to Congress 6/85

Administrative Matters

Mr. Stevens reported the Office had received a telephone call from Senator Gorton's Office, informing us that the Office grant request had been approved. Subsequent calls by the Office to USDOE indicated a letter was being prepared confirming this information. To date the letter has not been received in the Office, so he could not give any detailed amounts allowed for the Public Information Program.

Concerning Item 12, Mr. Bishop said at the last Council meeting Dr. Estella Leopold requested the matter of the request of the public at the September meeting to discuss USDOE procurement contracts for the exploratory shaft be included on the Agenda. Since Dr. Leopold was not present at the meeting, Mr. Bishop suggested the Council authorize the staff to send a letter to USDOE asking them to respond to the inquiry received during the public comment period of the Council meeting of September 21. There being no objection, Mr. Bishop instructed the staff to draft such a letter to USDOE.

Larry Caldwell of the Hanford Oversight Committee, who had requested discussing the procurement issue, said their concern

was they wanted USDOE to address that question of the planning and procurement contract for the exploratory shaft as they felt the procurement and planning is in advance of normal planning before designation as a site to be characterized. He said they wanted the problem addressed by USDOE at a Council and Board meeting.

Mr. Bishop said he would prefer to send the letter to USDOE at this time to give them an opportunity to respond.

Public Comment

Udell Fresk of Bellevue suggested the public be furnished a packet of information similar to that which is given to the Council. Mr. Bishop said he understood the request and pointed out the enormity of the task of supplying the Board and Council with necessary information considering size of the staff. He said every effort was being made to have extra copies of the material available at the meetings for the public. Mr. Stevens explained many items about which the Council is informed need Board action, and only after the Board has been given the materials would they be available for the Council.

Mr. Bishop asked Marta Wilder to explain the tape she had available for view by any interested members. Marta said she had a television tape that illustrates how to work with television media. She said it was part of a training program in the State of Michigan for their public involvement program and she thought it would be of interest to the Council. She planned to show it over the lunch hour. Mr. Bishop suggested it be shown immediately after adjournment since it was about twenty minutes long.

Larry Caldwell of the Hanford Oversight Committee said with regard to the comments on the Mission Plan, they noted there was a consensus that USDOE was not involving the public in the planning and deployment of a repository, nor incorporating concerns into USDOE's plans. He quoted Chapter 43 of the RCW regarding the Council's responsibilities involving the public in the program. He said HOC wanted specific wording to be in the WAC explaining how the public comment could be incorporated into the Council's deliberations. He said one of their thoughts was to have the public allowed to offer motions, etc. to be considered in the meeting.

Mr. Stevens said he thought that consideration of public opinion was one of the objectives in developing the legislation and that was why the citizens' Advisory Council was created. He referred to the "Role of the Council" which was adopted by the Board, explaining the Council's functions and responsibilities - specifically referring to public involvement. Mr. Stevens quoted a portion: "The Council will seek to identify areas of public concern regarding the health, safety, and welfare impact of the facility. It shall solicit and collect the views of local units of government, Indian Tribal Council, the general public and

citizens' interest groups to develop recommendations to the Board. The Council may identify opportunities for public participation and evaluate the adequacy of the procedures for involving the public in State and Federal decisions."

Mr. Caldwell said although they felt the Chair had done a good job in incorporating their concerns, HOC would feel more comfortable if this were in the WAC since the Chair person could change.

Mr. Greenen pointed out the Council is composed of individual citizens from the various parts of the State. He thought HOC now had two ways to have their comments heard, one to present them at the Council meeting, and the other to converse directly with the person representing his area.

Mr. Bishop said this question would be reviewed to see best how to answer their concerns.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.