

WM Rec. File
101.3

WM Project 10
Docket No. _____

PDR
LPDR

MINUTES OF NUCLEAR WASTE DISTRIBUTION MEETING

86 JUN 12 P12:13

May 16, 1986

1:30 p.m.

Distribution
REB MJB
JOB RDM
(Return to WM, 623-SS)
To: Linehan
DEM CER
Linehan
Hildebrand
EW Kerr
D. Kunitz leg. II

EFSEC Hearings Room
Rowesix, Building #1
4224 Sixth Avenue S.E.
Lacey, Washington 98504

Board Members Present:

- Warren A. Bishop, Chair
- Senator Max Benitz
- Curtis Eschels
- Dr. Royston H. Filby, Water Research Center Designee
- Senator H.A. "Barney" Goltz
- Senator Sam Guess
- Representative Shirley Hankins
- Ray Lasmanis, DNR Designee
- Representative Dick Nelson
- Philip Johnson, Ecology Designee
- Nancy Kirner, DSHS Designee
- Richard Watson

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

In his opening remarks, Mr. Bishop referred to a presentation on May 15 by the U.S. Department of Energy on the Defense Waste Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), with a question and answer period following.

Hanford Historical Documents Review Committee Meeting

Also held yesterday, Mr. Bishop said, was the second meeting of the Hanford Historical Documents Review Committee. Prior to the meeting a press conference had been called to familiarize the press with the role of the Committee, as well as the Environmental Monitoring Committee of the Board. An important issue that arose during the press conference was the fact that there may be some question regarding the funding of both the CDC Study of the Environmental Monitoring Committee, and the Historical Documents Review. Mr. Bishop said every effort would be made to re-establish the understanding he thought existed with USDOE that the two studies would be funded by USDOE. The amount involved is approximately \$100,000, with \$40,000 for the Historical Documents Review and \$60,000 for the CDC Study. No official notification has been received, he said.

In response to Representative Nelson's question as to the nature of the disagreement, Mr. Bishop said he thought there was some feeling on the part of USDOE that the view had been conveyed to the Governor's Office that USDOE would "share" in the cost of the historic review. The Governor's Office did not have that understanding, and

8607110348 860516
PDR WASTE
WM-10 PDR

1879

because it was not clear, a meeting was held with Michael Lawrence in Richland, attended by Terry Husseman, Charlie Roe, and Warren Bishop. It was then they thought the matter was resolved. The state felt that if these studies were to be done, they would have to be funded by USDOE, and their question would be the funding source, whether the funds would come from BWIP, as the review of the documents and the CDC are very much involved with the siting of a repository.

Senator Guess said the problem was a result of the defense program for the last 40 years, and thought the funding should be borne by the Defense Department. Mr. Bishop agreed, but the state still felt there could be a strong case made for it to be funded by BWIP, as the defense wastes are to be commingled in a repository. Mr. Bishop said the state would not dictate the funding source, but would challenge if no funding is found.

Senator Goltz asked what would be the nature of such a challenge, and what would be the consequences if USDOE refused to fully fund the studies. Mr. Husseman stated funding was requested under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, and the state's position has been throughout the process that defense waste on the site and the environmental impacts from that waste are related to the repository. The study that needs to be done during site characterization will have to examine cumulative effects of stored wastes, in addition to releases that could invade the environment should there be a failure of the repository. To the extent that defense waste studies are repository related, the state has an absolute right under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act to do reasonable studies to assure the citizens of the state that those matters are adequately studied. Should funding be denied for these studies, one option would be to follow through and contend that USDOE improperly denied a reasonable request for a reasonable study. Assuming this could not be resolved by mutual agreement, he said, the next course of action would be litigation, such as Nevada did when they were denied money for funding.

Senator Goltz said in the event of being denied funding, the state would be in a position of (1) trying to find alternative sources, or (2) not completing the studies. He thought the image of fund denial would be another loss of credibility of the USDOE.

Ray Lasmanis asked if USDOE had been approached from the viewpoint that this work is absolutely necessary to establish a health baseline prior to a repository. Mr. Bishop replied this was one of the state's first contentions.

Dr. Filby was asked to give a report on the activities of the Historical Documents Review Committee. He repeated that although the press conference was dominated by the funding issue, it had been called to publicize the similarities and differences between the CDC Study and the Historical Documents Review. The Committee meeting itself was dominated by the funding issue. The status of the Committee's activities at this point are that the grant request was forwarded to USDOE as part of the package with the CDC Study and an

RFP has been written and distributed for a contractor to carry out Phase I of the project. This would be primarily establishment of a data base on radionuclide releases on which Phase II would work to determine environmental and health impacts, as best possible.

Dr. Filby said the Committee is now in a holding pattern. He said his personal opinion was that this review is a vitally important project and although the composition of the Committee is regional, he thought the study had national significance. It takes a non-accident scenario in which large amounts of radioactivity were released to the environment, and the determination of what happened to those releases, the pathways taken, and the ultimate health impacts is of national importance in the sense that it is probably the only study of its kind.

Dr. Filby also agreed it was the responsibility of the U.S. Department of Energy to fund that study as it does relate very definitely to the repository program, as well as the defense program. He emphasized that only was it important to have funding for Phase I of the program, but assurance that Phase II will be funded as that will be the real meat of the study. There could be no estimate of the funding that would be needed Phase II, he said, as the magnitude is not yet known.

A Summary of Preliminary Review of the Hanford Historical Documents-1943 to 1967, prepared by A.W. Conklin, Office of Radiation Protection, Department of Social and Health Services, was included in the member's notebooks. It is available upon request from the Office of Nuclear Waste Management.

Representative Nelson suggested a look might be taken at some of the other events that have occurred and see if there were a precedent for funding. He thought the responsibility starts with the U.S. Department of Energy, which passed the project on to the two states and the Indian tribes. If not willing to fund the project, he felt the Department should then conduct the review of the releases. Mr. Bishop said this point was made in the conversations at Richland.

Senator Benitz said he believed the U.S. Department of Energy is a little concerned with the two studies, and that they will eventually fund it. However, he thinks they want to know it will not be an ongoing project, and will come to a conclusion. He said he believed by sitting down with USDOE in good faith, with a schedule for termination of the review, the two sides will get together. Dr. Filby agreed, and said it certainly was not his intention to have this an open-ended program, even though the results of the studies might lead to a lot of unanswered questions and recommendations that may have to be addressed in a different manner and not within the responsibility of the Committees.

Mr. Bishop introduced Lesley Russell, Professional Staff for the House Committee on Energy and Commerce in Washington, D.C., who had come out to meet with the Hanford Historical Documents Review Committee, the Council, and the Board. Ms. Russell said the Energy and

Commerce Committee is chaired by Congressman John Dingell of Michigan, who also chairs the Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee. The Energy and Commerce Committee has a continuing interest in events at Hanford, and in fact has had this interest before the release of the 19,000 pages of documents and before the Chernobyl disaster brought the issue into focus. Some of the work is done through Congressman Ed Markey's Energy, Conservation and Power Committee, but he is looking particularly at the issue of who should regulate mixed waste, that waste both chemically and radioactively hazardous, and more recently looking at the issue of safety of the N-Reactor and its similarities to the Chernobyl reactor.

The Oversight Investigation Subcommittee has been looking at the lack of compliance of federal facilities, including Hanford, with those regulation, she said, in particular the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Regulations (RCRA) that are used to regulate chemically hazardous waste, groundwater monitoring compliance, how to define a RCRA facility that is a very real issue at Hanford, and who should do the RCRA inspections that are mandated in the statute--the Department of Energy, the EPA, the Regional Office of the EPA, or the state?

Ms. Russell said when the U.S. Department of Energy made the decision to release those 19,000 pages of documents, Congressman Dingell and Congressman Ron Wyden, the ranking majority member on the Committee, wrote to USDOE and asked for that documentation. They also asked for some classified documents, which they now have. The Committee is currently assessing these documents, she said, looking particularly at effects on health and the environment. They have been able to get a number of people with the clearances and the ability to "crunch" some numbers, to examine the data to make it tell a story in terms more readily understood and more easily compared to the standards in terms of exposure level to the people who live in the vicinity of Hanford.

The study will look at the appropriateness of people living in the vicinity of a USDOE facility being subject to standard for contamination that are very different and much higher than the standards set by EPA with which commercial facilities are obligated to comply. They are also looking at the question of whether or not it is appropriate for USDOE to be responsible to be its own watchdog. Also being studied is whether or not USDOE has complied and is continuing to comply, with the various statutes and guidelines to which it has subjected itself. This is particularly relevant, she said, given that Hanford is in consideration for a high-level nuclear waste repository, and the Committee is not only interested in past releases, but in the continuing releases and whether or not they need to be as high as the Committee believes they might be.

In response to Representative Nelson's question of whether their study would cover airborne releases as well as ground and water, Ms. Russell said they asked for documentation that related to releases into the environment, and they are mostly interested in airborne

releases, releases into the river, and releases into the groundwater. Representative Nelson asked if there would be any attempt to go beyond regulation and deal with the budget requirements that might be suggested from a study that suggests certain releases could be reduced. Ms. Russell said yes, and no, as one cannot disassociate one from the other and there is an overlap in many of the studies the Committee is doing. She said, for example, the issue of what constitutes a confined facility over a contained facility is one of filters, and the questions becomes those filters that have limited capacity for absorption and must be changed regularly and in the correct manner. If that is not done, releases into the atmosphere can occur, and that is a safety hazard.

She said they first became interested in Hanford because rumors had been heard there were health problems at Hanford, and looking at the USDOE FY '87 budget for clean-up, the USDOE was going to give 1.5% of the \$785 million budget to Hanford, and 25% was going to go to Savannah River. She said the proposed budget contained some interesting reading in terms of what they are asking for and why they need \$12.1 million to replace the graphite control rods that are so worn they interfere with the effectiveness of the operations. She said it would be possible there would be budget recommendations coming out of the study. She said she was sure the Pacific Northwest Congressional delegation are already very concerned about the possibility that a CDC Study might not be done.

Minutes

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes of the April 18, 1986, meeting be approved. Motion carried.

Correspondence

Terry Husseman referred to the one letter in the notebooks to Secretary Herrington, signed by fifteen U.S. Senators concerning the funding of the Subseabed Disposal Research. The letter urged continued funding of the international research project.

Other correspondence received following mailing of the notebooks included:

1. A copy of a letter to Michael J. Lawrence, Manager of the Richland Operations Office of USDOE, signed by Mel Sampson, Chairman of the Tribal Council of the Yakima Indian Nation. It enclosed a copy of their recently-passed Resolution regarding the Chernobyl Nuclear Reactor incident and requested the USDOE to provide certain information. Mr. Husseman advised Mr. Sampson the Board would be interested in the information and would share the information on the state's activities in this area.
2. A copy of a letter of May 9 to President Reagan, signed by Governor Gardner, concerning the disaster at Chernobyl. Mr. Eschels says the letter lists both the direct and indirect

impacts from the Russian facility here, those being the fallout on Washington State and the indirect effect of the concern over the safety of the N-Reactor at Hanford. The letter notes the similarities and difference of the two facilities and points out that the difference between the two reactors, in his mind, makes it premature to call for an immediate shutdown of the N-Reactor. The letter goes on to suggest that a panel of experts fully-independent of USDOE be established with a participant from the state of Washington on that body.

Mr. Eschels said that request has been granted and Secretary Herrington has invited both the National Academy of Engineering and the National Academy of Sciences to undertake a review of the safety of the N-Reactor, as well as some of the other major federal nuclear plants.

Senator Guess suggested an effort be made to have Dr. Filby appointed as a member of that panel, and Mr. Eschels said the Governor was open to suggestion.

3. He continued there were two items of correspondence he was unable to get to the Board, as they were being signed today. One is from the Governor to Robert White, President of the National Academy of Engineering, and the other to Dr. Frank Press, President of the National Academy of Sciences. Both repeated the suggestion to have a state representative on the panel.

Mr. Watson inquired if there would be a concern about the adequacy of funding for this effort by the Academy. Mr. Eschels said he had nothing to indicate there would be a problem.

4. Another letter, dated May 9, to Secretary Herrington and co-signed by Governor Gardner, Senator Williams and Representative Nelson expressed concern about the failure of the USDOE to bring independent experts into the ranking methodology process. It is supportive of the Board's Resolution 86-1, passed April 18, 1986.
5. A letter dated April 25, 1986, to Secretary Herrington, signed by Governor Gardner of Washington and Governor Atiyeh of Oregon, suggested holding NRC/USDOE meetings which are BWIP specific in the Pacific Northwest, to the extent possible. This would allow the states to have appropriate technical experts present at the meetings. Mr. Husseman said no response had been received to date.
6. A series of letters related to the general stop-work order issued by USDOE-Richland to Rockwell, their prime contractor, was discussed. The reason for the order was inadequate quality assurance which had been raised between USDOE and NRC over a period of time. Max Powell of USDOE-Richland stated that as the letter to Rockwell states, no work on BWIP on the listed items were stopped. It only redirected work that would ensure that

appropriate management and technical prerequisites are and would be in place to conduct project activities. No jobs were terminated, he said.

In the discussion of the Rockwell stop-work letter, Nancy Kirner asked what this implied to all the data that had been collected under the scheme of inadequate quality assurance. Mr. Powell said that data was not thrown into question, as they are beefing up the quality assurance procedures to produce better documentation. He said the work was not stopped because of the work done, but the lack of documentation.

Dr. Brewer was asked to comment on the pertinence of the documents to the stop-work order. Dr. Brewer said there had been a good deal of discussion between USDOE and NRC, and between the states and tribes and NRC, over quality control/quality assurance. Meetings were held on April 29 and 30 and the principal point raised by NRC was that it is futile to continue testing activities that were not going to pass present, established, or future quality control/quality assurance plans, including training. NRC had been critical of the training, or lack of training, in several areas he said. In the area of hydrologic testing, he said, a recent letter from NRC to BWIP pointed out it would not be acceptable practice to attempt now to document anything that has happened in the past. He said, as Max Powell had stated, this is not the end of the BWIP program, but it marks the point of departure which relates to a lot of other actions that NRC is taking in regard to licensing.

Mr. Bishop called on Bob Cook of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, On-Site Licensing at Richland, to comment. Mr. Cook said the NRC position on QA was that USDOE needs to have a system to assure quality, as well as providing credibility. Credibility involves getting the documents and the planning together, and using this in the best, rational decision-making. NRC is only insisting that there is good, sound planning with the record to show that it is adequate and credible, he said. NRC will then sample that planning and conclude that either the system is good or not. Mr. Cook said NRC was also somewhat concerned about personnel qualifications.

Dr. Filby said he understood that NRC is suggesting to USDOE that if they are going to meet the licensing requirements of NRC, this is advice as what they should do. Mr. Cook said it is a requirement. Design controls the requirement, he said, found in Part 50, Appendix B, as a part of the quality assurance system.

Dr. Filby inquired if NRC had this same relationship with its reactor licensees. Mr. Cook said yes, insofar as they are doing design work. The design work for reactors has frequently been done before there is ever any applications for license, and research and development activities have not been regulated to any degree in the reactor business, except when a reactor utility would state they wanted to use information generated by others with validated designs. There are accepted codes and standards to evaluate the system, he said, but there is no accepted standard for evaluating a

repository. Therefore, it is important to control the design for a repository. The NRC rule addresses the site characterization phase of the activity, and insofar as site characterization is a part of R&D, it is controlled under design control. He said NRC has no contractual arrangement with USDOE at this stage, although there are some Memoranda of Understanding for his position.

Ray Lasmanis inquired about baseline studies on previous emission releases mentioned in the 70,000 pages of the documents. He asked if NRC feels that work is essential to establish health baselines based on those previous releases. Mr. Cook replied the NRC position, for example on the iodine release, is that they were more interested in the long-term iodine, Iodine-129, and how it got in the groundwater and what it indicates about groundwater travel times. He said in his reports he has made the point that the EPA Standard also addresses groundwater levels which are acceptable levels. Should the level go above a certain standard, there is a 10% increment above the starting level as a limit on what is allowed to be added to the water as a result of a repository. Therefore, it is necessary to know what the background levels are to establish a base when a repository is started to understand whether or not the EPA standard is met. That background information will be needed, although much will depend upon where the accessible environment is going to be defined, he said. In his opinion, he said, there is some deep contamination, although minute and not a threat, but it does give an idea of groundwater interchange in a vertical sense. That is one of the most important issues that has worried the NRC, he said.

Mr. Eschels commented the Commission's insistence on a high-level of quality assurance would be good, not only for the performance of a repository should one be there, but also from an economic standpoint to avoid redoing work. Mr. Cook agreed. He said credibility is a very important factor. He mentioned the importance of the effort by NRC to consolidate all information pertinent to a licensing decision into a central computerized system which would be available to all the states, affected Indian tribes and interested parties. He said this was especially important if the licensing process should be shortened to 27 months, instead of the usual 36 months.

Mr. Eschels said he also wished to compliment the Department for moving on the stop-work order for the same reasons mentioned. He said in the letter of May 1 there was a request for Rockwell to submit the Plan of Action by May 23, and he asked Mr. Powell where the Department and Rockwell were in the process and if he had a prognosis for a date for the stop-work to be lifted. Mr. Powell said he had not seen the response due by May 12, but as soon as it was received it would be for public distribution and he would secure a copy for the Board.

Low-Level Waste Report

Elaine Carlin, Department of Ecology, reported the Department's low-level waste program is continuing with its activities to implement the federal amendment to the Low-Level Waste Policy Act. Following distribution in March of the set of requirements to generators and brokers, many comments were received, which were incorporated into a second, more streamlined set of requirements set out on April 15. The requirements call for surcharge payments to be made for waste outside the Northwest Compact, and payment is due prior to disposal of the waste. The brokers are also required to attach to their shipping papers a list of generators from which they have collected waste. This information is used to track the waste back to its point of origin. The new system appears to be working very well, and the program has no knowledge of any major problems at the site.

Ms. Carlin said waste volumes continue to be less than usual. For the first quarter of 1986 they were approximately half of the volume for the first quarter of 1985. In April, they were also much less than usual. The surcharge requirement went into effect March 1, and to date \$674,000 has been collected and deposited into the General Fund. Twenty-five percent of that amount will be transferred to the Secretary of Energy, as required by the federal statute.

Ms. Carlin said last week she, Terry Husseman, and Nancy Kirner attended a meeting of waste brokers, including waste processors. They expressed an interest in working closely with Washington State in the development of rules and regulations. This group also expressed its interest in the three sited states establishing uniform procedures. One issue raised at the meeting that was resolved was agreement on how waste from recycling and laundrying processes should be designated as to its origin. An additional issue of concern was whether or not Compacts intend to regulate the transport of waste in and out of a region when it is not destined for disposal, such as waste transported between processing facilities.

Also, last week she, Terry Husseman and Nancy Kirner met with states and regions which presently do not have disposal sites, with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and with the U.S. Department of Energy to discuss continuing implementation of the federal law.

On April 22 the Northwest Interstate Compact was held in Helena, Montana. At that meeting policies were adopted by the Committee to implement the federal Act. These cover priorities for in-region waste disposal; the various volume allocation caps, including the individual caps for reactors; surcharges, penalty surcharges, and the denial of disposal access; and the information requirements for disposal-site operations, generators, and brokers. These policies will be carried out by the Washington State Department of Ecology. The next meeting of the Compact will be on July 22 in Sitka, Alaska.

Mr. Bishop introduced Joe Stohr of the Department of Social and Health Services. He reported on the waste volumes the state has been receiving lately and how they affect the funding of the regulatory programs. He showed on overheads receipts of approximately 1.4 million cubic feet of waste from the beginning of 1985. Activity and volume increased toward the end of that year as waste generators anticipated the new Low-Level Waste Policy Act amendment coming on line. The November-December receipts amounted to almost the volume of receipts for the rest of that year.

Receipts dropped off dramatically at the first of 1986 to about half the average of early 1985.

Looking at the surveillance fee of \$.75 per cubic foot and the distribution of the money, the majority, or about \$.23 goes to the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Program in the Department of Social and Health Services; the Environmental Monitoring Program receives about \$.20; section support for the Office of Radiation Control receives about \$.15; the State Patrol get \$.07; Ecology \$.04; Public Health Laboratory in Seattle about \$.04; and the Public Health Fund receives about \$.03. With the declining waste volumes at about 50% of last year's receipts, assuming first quarter volumes, receipts amount to about half of the \$1.4 in 1985.

Representative Rust commented that the purpose of the legislation was to force other states to proceed with siting. She asked if any progress had been made, or are the states just hoarding their wastes?

Mr. Stohr pointed out that only the surveillance fee was affected by the reduced volumes, but the surcharge fee and the B&O tax of 33% on the volumes were affected. Ms. Kirner said Representative Rust had a very good point, and Ms. Kirner had not seen a lot of action by other states to establish new disposal sites. She said she saw them grappling for excuses not to establish disposal sites. One good one was the mixed waste issue and the fact that EPA has not set their hazardous waste siting guidelines, due in 1988. This conflicts drastically, she said, with a milestone of the Amendments Act.

Representative Hankins inquired if anyone were policing to see if the states are storing these wastes someplace else. Ms. Kirner said the only people who would be policing the actual facilities where the materials are being stored are the NRC and the agreement-state licensing agencies. She said DSHS had run a quick comparison in April and learned for the first time the Northwest was producing 35% of the volume received. It looked as though power plants were under-represented over earlier receipts. The only conclusion was that the power plants are storing the wastes. It is known, she said, they have established five-year storage capacity.

Senator Goltz said he considered this the best news that had been received in months. At one time, he said, there was the fear that there would be such a volume of low-level nuclear waste that the Hanford site would be filled to overflowing. After all the urging

of compacting and other alternative means of handling low-level waste, it now looks as if the state was succeeding. Although revenue projections are not up to what they were supposed to be, he thought it should be hoped this success continues.

In response to Ray Lasmanis' question as to whether the projections were normalized, or was only the low first quarter extended, Mr. Stohr said the 50% estimate was taking the first quarter times four.

Mr. Husseman commented that this scenario would mean that the site would only take in about 700,000 cubic feet, with which Mr. Stohr agreed. He said about a month ago industry estimated 1.2 million cubic feet, but although this revenue is down the actual revenue to the state is up because of the \$10 per cubic foot surcharge. The intent of the federal Act was to reduce volume to the only three states in the nation that have low-level radioactive waste sites. Unless the utilities are betting that the whole system is going to fall apart, they can only lose out because they have to dispose of that waste some time and the surcharge increases to \$20 in 1988 and goes up to \$40 in 1990.

Senator Guess commented the longer the low-level waste is held, the less radioactive and it becomes inlandfill.

Mr. Eschels added that it all goes back to the federal Act. The goal of the Act was to reduce the volumes coming into Washington, South Carolina, and Nevada. For whatever the reasons are, he said, that is working and although it causes a minor problem, he thought it could be dealt with. Representative Nelson asked if these decreases continue, did Mr. Stohr think there would be a need to increase the surveillance fee. This depend on the regulatory capabilities that exist.

Terry Strong of the Radiation Control Unit of DSHS stated that the state had been successful in reducing the volume of waste coming into the state. At the same time, however, DSHS was given the responsibility to operate an environmental monitoring program and the state General Fund dollars were removed from the radiation control budget. They replaced those dollars with revenue from low-level radioactive waste, and those revenues are falling. The radiation public health activities, the environmental monitoring program, the section support, and the technical support activities that were funded and viewed as important and appropriate functions in radiation protection will have less funding, and there will be a problem. Increasing the fee would be a potential, he said, but if it were intended to reduce the public health activities, that would require a close look. He said they have had two inspectors at the site, and one would be removed on Monday.

Mr. Watson inquired if these revenues broadly supported the radiation control activities, such as the extraordinary duties they assumed last week as a result of Chernobyl. Mr. Strong said the public health activity that DSHS did conduct with the state General

Fund dollars is now supported by these activities. The Chernobyl effort currently underway is directly related to these revenues.

Dr. Filby said he understood that present wastes being shipped into the state are paying for all of the monitoring activities of the waste which is already there. Mr. Strong said yes, but it is a complicated situation. The revenue received as a result of waste deposited in April, May, and June of 1985, and previous biennium, arrives on approximately August 15. That revenue was \$.27 a cubic foot--not \$.75 a cubic foot, so the biennium begins in the hole. April, May, and June of 1987 revenue will be in the next biennium. The two months of 1985 shown on the chart were the big high months, and that is what keeps the overall average for the biennium to date at approximately what the budget was predicted to be. However, he said he thought it would never go back to 180,000 cubic feet a month. Therefore, they will end up with less money than DCHS was permitted to spend by the legislature for the 1985-86 biennium. Cuts will have to be made.

Mr. Eschels commented the kinds of actions taken to ensure safety because of the Chernobyl accident could be considered emergency actions, and looking to the emergency fund is one of the options being considered. He also thought although sensitivity was felt about the revenue difference, he felt there should be no commitment to any hasty course of action as there was only three months' experience under a new law.

Nancy Kirner said the reason these figures were brought before the Board was to call attention to the Board of the potential \$8-\$10 million shortfall that the General Fund won't see. She thought the Legislators should know about it as soon as it was starting to show.

New Jersey Dirt. Mr. Eschels referred to his discussion at a previous Board meeting about the application the Dawn Mining Company had before the Department of Social and Health Services to dispose of some radium-contaminated dirt they had in New Jersey. After reviewing application for some time the decision has been made to deny the application for two reasons. The first is that the purpose of the state tailing pond is to dispose of uranium mill tailings, and the state is not interested in expanding the purpose of the site to take in contaminated dirt from all over the country. The second reason, he said, is the NRC presently regulates the uranium mills and their tailing and has delegated that authority to the state. It does not regulate what is called naturally-occurring radioactive materials that are not mill tailings. If the state were to import non-mill tailing, naturally-occurring radioactive materials, there was a great deal of concern the state would never be able to turn back regulation of that site to the NRC. That would leave the taxpayers of Washington State exposed to potential liability by becoming custodian of that site for all time.

Public Involvement

Mr. Bishop referred to the schedule of events regarding the Defense Waste Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), provided by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (see attached). The schedule includes USDOE events, as well as those planned by the state for the next six weeks.

Marta Wilder explained the major effort in June will be to conduct five public meetings on the DEIS. A contractor has been selected to assist in conducting these meetings, and Marta introduced Susan Hall of Hall & Associates. This firm also helped as a subcontractor to Envirosphere and assisted with the workshops on the Draft Environment Assessment. Ms. Wilder read the schedule for the proposed workshops, and a sign-up sheet was circulated to Board member to attend one or more of the events. The format will consist of a short presentation by staff of the state's concern, an executive summary, and a technical document. Most of the time will be devoted to public comment. A news media conference is planned preceding each meeting. In addition, Editorial Board meetings will be scheduled. All comments will be summarized with a draft for review by the Board in June.

Mr. Bishop said it is planned to have a staff person at each of the U.S. Department of Energy workshops, and if possible a member of the Board. Either the staff person or Board member will present a short statement indicating the plans of the state, giving the dates, places, and pertinent information about the state workshops. The statement will be printed and available for the public.

The special Board meetings planned in June were discussed. The first would be the 13th, with the regular meeting on the 20th. Mr. Bishop asked for reconsideration of holding another special meeting on June 27th. It was originally scheduled to review the statement that would be submitted at the USDOE hearings in July. The Board agreed sending a draft of the statement to the members, with request for comments and suggestions would be acceptable, in lieu of a special meeting. Mr. Bishop added that if any indication from USDOE of the release of the Environmental Assessment is received it may be necessary to call an emergency meeting to hear the press conference and announcement. It was agreed to cancel the proposed special meeting on June 27th.

Mr. Husseman added that in contacting USDOE this morning there is still no definite date for release of the EA. They continue to say it will be mid-May. However, he said USDOE had assured the Office they would give two weeks notice when they met in Albuquerque, but now they are saying they will give as much notice as they can.

Mr. Bishop said USDOE has established a 28-member Citizens Forum to be the citizens' sounding board on the Defense Waste DEIS for the USDOE. They are conducting separate meetings throughout the state, with one already held in Spokane. The second is planned for Portland on May 27 at 9:00 a.m., and the third June 12 in Seattle at the

same hour. No notice of the meeting in Spokane was provided the Office and it was not possible to have a representative there to describe the state's role. A memorandum has now been sent by the Chair to all members of the Forum, describing the state's plans and asking for an opportunity to meet with the Forum. He said he, Terry Husseman and some of the staff will attend the meeting in Seattle on June 12. A list of names of Forum members was distributed to the Board.

Sam Reed said the Advisory Council met in Richland on April 29. He said most of the time was spent in talking among themselves and with the audience regarding their inability to get their job done in the time available. He said the Council had decided to meet informally on Thursday evening before the regular meeting.

Marta Wilder commented she had attended the National Conference of State Legislatures meeting in Richland and presented the slide show on site characterization. She thought the show was well received and gave an opportunity to share information about Washington State's program with Legislators around the country.

Special Order of Business

Mr. Bishop said at the Advisory Council meeting this morning action was taken at the suggestion of Russell Jim of the Yakima Indian Nation. The recommendation passed reads as follows:

WHEREAS, the political processes behind siting a nuclear waste repository are driving a wedge between the first round states and tribes and second round states and tribes;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Nuclear Waste Advisory Council:

Recommends to the Nuclear Waste Board that it adopt a policy to avert such a division and that the appropriate officials and lawmakers make written communications reflecting the policy.

Nancy Movis, member of the Council, said Russell Jim's concern and the concern of the Yakima Indian Nation is that the second round will be dropped. This points to the Hanford site, which allegedly has a large space with which to work, unlike the tuff site in Nevada and the political opposition in Texas. She said Mr. Jim felt this is creating a rift between the first-round states and tribes and the second-round states and tribes.

Senator Benitz inquired if there were more evidence that the second-round states will be dropped. Ms. Movis said a lot of it is rumor and speculation, but there seems to be a move afoot. The second-round states are back East where the power is. She said the political action is an action USDOE is comfortable with, and it is an option they might be looking into also.

Representative Nelson said the issue did arise at the NCSL meeting in Richland, and it seemed clear that it is a strategy the second-round states are pursuing to point out that the projected waste volumes may not materialize if the numbers of reactors don't increase substantially in the country and their operating levels are reduced. He thought the message from the Council was that the Board look at this issue to see if those are true facts and what they would portend. Does it mean that a second repository would not be cost effective and the statutory limit might be increased for the first repository? He suggested staff collect data that might shed some light on this issue.

Senator Benitz remarked that if that were to happen the Nuclear Waste Policy Act would have to be opened up, and he said the message continually being sent from Washington, D.C. was that this was one of the most difficult Acts to pass Congress and be signed, and it was very unlikely it would be opened up.

Representative Nelson observed that the driving force these days is money, and the lack of money. Should it come to expanding one repository or building a second one, it might be less expensive to expand.

Mr. Eschels remarked that if the volume is not there to support two repositories and since the best site for a repository is desired, perhaps the division between first- and second-round should be erased and put all of them in the selection process. Representative Nelson said the Washington State Legislature had taken that position through a Memorial to Congress. Mr. Eschels added that he thought this is something the states should band together on and considered this a very positive recommendation.

Mr. Lasmanis considered it wise to try to mend fences between East and West, but realistically, since most of the waste is generated in the East and many of the states feel that the West is a good place to take these materials, he wondered what could be done in the way of a resolution to resolve that difference when those differences are very basic, politically and otherwise.

Representative Nelson suggested this be taken under advisement, to determine how the Board could structure a response. This was agreed to by the Board. The recommendation will be mailed to the Board in the next distribution of materials for consideration at the regular June meeting.

Committee Reports

Defense Waste Committee. Phil Johnson reported there had been no meeting of this Committee this month.

Dr. Brewer was asked to report on the status of the contract for work on the Defense Waste DEIS. Dr. Brewer said review of the DEIS on Hanford Defense Waste is under contract with URS and is going on now. He said Resolution 86-2, which established the criteria of the

Board, has been taken and woven into the format of the final report. A work session is scheduled for June 4 to provide highlights of work done so far to present at the special meeting on June 13. That material will be taken to the public in the workshops. A draft report will be delivered on July 7 after work sessions to get staff comments, mostly of a technical nature, and the Board members will have the opportunity to review the draft in mid-July. August 4 would be the date for the final version, as this is Monday of the week in which the comments must be submitted.

The second item, Dr. Brewer said, is the review of the 19,000 pages of the 40-years' releases. A bidders' conference will be held on Monday, and selection will be made as soon as possible. He said the time-urgent thing is to have a "Users' Guide" to that material. This will allow anyone in the future to get the document numbers, which will be cross-indexed to particular items of interest. Dr. Ruttenger was pleased to know his CDC Panel will have this guide some time before the September conference.

Mr. Husseman added a transcript of the USDOE DEIS presentation yesterday was being prepared. All issues raised will be pulled together and organized for submission to the contractor to be incorporated into the Board comments.

Senator Penitz said that before Representative Hankins had to leave, she asked the date for the next Defense Waste Committee. Mr. Johnson replied it was not yet scheduled.

Representative Nelson announced that the House Energy & Utilities Committee has formed a subcommittee to look at defense waste. They plan to meet in Richland on May 22, 1986, at the Auditorium of the Tri-Cities University Center, at 12:30 p.m. They will combine the defense waste question with a tour of the N-Reactor. The subcommittee plans to look at the various streams of defense wastes that are associated with the plutonium production processes there, including the Purex Plant, as well as other facilities. They will focus on actions that might be taken to reduce those waste streams, the federal budget for Hanford and the other facilities around the country, and the potential impact of the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction program on those budgets. They will also look at the role of USDOE and local and state agencies in emergency response associated with the N-Reactor. Finally, he said, they will look at the need for energy that plant produces. He invited anyone interested to attend the meeting.

Environmental Monitoring Committee. Nancy Kirner said the Committee had held two meetings this past month. Dr. Ruttenger of the Centers for Disease Control attended the special meeting in Richland on April 29. The meeting was called primarily to give the public and Committee members an early progress report on the CDC Study. Dr. Ruttenger reviewed the scope and the purpose of the study, which will focus on both occupational studies and general population, looking at what epidemiological work has been done, reviewing the

methodology, and making recommendations for the future. He also hopes to come with an Order of Magnitude kind of risk, which might be several Orders of Magnitude for various known health effects.

Al Conklin reported on the Historical Documents releases and explained at that meeting the details of his summary. Ms. Kirner said this summary was a cursory, but very well done, generalized look at what went on and what information is contained in those 19,000 pages. The Centers for Disease Control is identifying major areas where additional data is needed, based on Mr. Conklin's review. USDOE has promised they will furnish those pages of additional information, if they can find it.

The public comments at that meeting basically wanted the CDC to look at the health anomalies that were occurring around the Hanford area. CDC states their approach was much more related to a statistical approach, a review of the releases, and the kind of health effects probability that could be expected from those releases.

Ms. Kirner said the regular meeting of the Committee was held on May 9 with a special report on the monitoring resulting from the Chernobyl accident. A discussion followed of the CDC Study, and although the money appears to be questionable at this point, nominations are still being received, and CDC will decide by June 1 the composition of that select panel. Also, CDC is deciding on what computer model to use for calculating the doses resulting from Hanford operations.

As a follow-up to the public comment portion of the previous meeting, because of the public concern over the health effects, and because the Advisory Council is charged with soliciting public concerns for the Board, the Committee directed a request to the Advisory Council to conduct public meetings focused on hearing the public's concerns about health effects. The Committee thought the meetings could be best conducted by using the assistance of an impartial group as a facilitator, such as League of Women Voters, the American Cancer Society, and the American Lung Association. Data would be tabulated and made available to the CDC when it convenes in September, possibly the week of September 22, with a presentation for the Board at the October Board meeting.

Presented for Board consideration was a meeting of the Board and the Advisory Council in Richland in October to focus on the CDC Study results.

The Quality Assurance Task Force would be willing to report to the Board at a Thursday session in August. Bob Mooney will confirm with Don Provost. The Task Force briefly reviewed the groundwater monitoring program that is about to be initiated in conjunction with USDOE.

It was noted in the special meeting that there was a need for better publicity for the CDC-related actions. Although there was public present, she said, she was told they were the same public who always showed up. She requested better assistance from staff for this needed publicity, especially the September meetings.

At this point Ms. Kirner asked if the Board wished to hold its regular meetings in the Tri-Cities in October, with a special focus on the CDC Study.

Mr. Bishop replied that unless there was some objection, he would plan to work with Ms. Kirner to plan such a meeting.

Ms. Kirner then asked if the Board concurred with the Environmental Monitoring Committee's recommendation for public meetings to be conducted by the Advisory Council on the public health concerns.

Mr. Bishop said he saw no objection from the Board to the Council's planning to hold those meetings.

Socioeconomic Committee. Mr. Eschels commented the meetings that the Advisory Council holds should be helpful if they can be coordinated and the information pulled into the work of the Socio-economic Committee.

The Committee spent its time since the last meeting principally holding workshops throughout the state in Seattle, Vancouver, Kennewick, and Spokane. He thanked Committee members who filled in for him when urgent work in Olympia prevented his attending the last two workshops. The Committee's findings will be systematically documented, he said, but he related some of his impressions. The emphasis that people gave to various social and economic concerns varied by the location. One common concern, strongly held and most frequently cited, was the lack of confidence the public had in the U.S. Department of Energy and its calculations and studies. A related one was the perception that the state was too closely associated with USDOE. He thought that credibility problem with USDOE may wear off on the state.

Other concerns were marketability of agricultural products, mentioned at all four meetings. The ability to attract new investments, economic effects on existing industries and the liability question were all of widespread concern. The results of these workshops will be used to define the issues the Committee wants the consultant to address and they will be reflected in the Request for Proposals planned to be sent out later this year.

The Committee will meet next on May 22, which will be the first meeting where the results of the workshops will be reviewed formally. The Committee will look in a more detailed way at the social impacts and the aspects of risk that many of the Board members have expressed.

Mr. Eschels said while at that series of meetings, the Committee met with several local government representatives in the Tri-Cities area to discuss the work of the Committee. A great deal of attention was paid to the Grants Equivalent to Tax Program (GETT), and those local governments will be presented with the Committee position papers to assist the Committee to determine those concerns.

Mr. Bishop expressed the appreciation of all to the Leagues of Women Voters who facilitated those workshops. In response to Mr. Bishop's inquiry, Mr. Eschels said a draft scope of work for the RFP will be prepared and circulated ten days before the June meeting of the Socioeconomic Committee.

Transportation. Richard Watson referred to the Monthly Report of the Transportation Committee furnished to the Board.

Washington State University has proposed a detailed, six-month study to revise USDOE's risk model into an analytic tool for local-level hazard assessment and emergency response for scenario planning purposes. He said it was a little out of sync with the longer-term goals, which are to be able to make recommendations to the USDOE on how its risk model could be improved as a screening tool for national level routing and transportation mode decision. On May 1 Max Power and Pat Tangora met with Alan Marcus and Jack Kartez to review the proposal. Follow-up meetings will be arranged with WSU to see how their proposal might be modified to meet those needs.

The Department of Social and Health Services is developing a draft Scope of Work for incident response guidelines for nuclear materials transportation accidents. It is scheduled to be completed by June 1.

The State Patrol has indicated that they would like to pass the baton on the local emergency response question to the Department of Community Development-Emergency Management Division. Further meetings will be held later this month to clarify the point.

No regular Committee meeting will be held in June, as subcommittees of the Committee will be meeting to refine the scopes of work.

Mr. Watson said the Western Interstate Energy Board (WIEB) has been preparing a route-specific analysis report. The WIEB states at this point have been unable to reach a consensus on that, and Pat Tangora will be meeting with the WIEB task force on June 11-13 to work on it. Any interested Committee members will be contacting Pat Tangora with their comments on the draft.

As pointed out before, Mr. Watson said there is some overlap between the Transportation Committee and the Socioeconomic Committee, and the report lists a number of areas of common interest. He said Transportation will be working with the Socioeconomic Committee to make sure all issues are accounted for.

The Transportation Committee has also reviewed the Near-Term Transportation Working Group's Draft "Principles of Understanding" between the state and the U.S. Department of Energy. This refers to the reactor wastes which could be passing through the state from outside the United States on its way to Hanford or Savannah River. Mr. Watson said there are a number of points of concern as the Committee did not wish the Near-Term agreement to constrain the state on a long-term basis. First, it was felt the Principles should not imply any tacit approval of USDCE's policies on funding of emergency response or on liability, and perhaps it would be better to be silent on these issues. The Committee believes these issues should be reviewed by the Attorney General for the Nuclear Waste Board. The Principles should identify issues remaining to be resolved and concentrate on inspection provisions and notification procedures. They also believe the USDCE should fund state inspections of near-term shipments.

Representative Hankins suggested that perhaps the Committee should meet with representatives of the Umatilla Tribe because both the rail and truck route pass through the Reservation. This will be considered by the Committee.

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee will be on July 18 at 10:00 a.m. at St. Placid's Priory in Lacey.

Federal Legislation

Charlie Roe said the two most important pieces of legislation, other than Price-Anderson, in the liability area were S. 2354 and S. 2383.

S. 2354, introduced by Senator Mitchell of Maine and others from the second-round states reads: "The Secretary may not nominate or recommend any crystalline rock site for site characterization under this section for the repository to be developed under the Act."

S. 2383, introduced by Senator Tribble of Virginia and others, including some of the sponsors of S. 2354, removes the requirement of a second repository for disposal of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel.

Price-Anderson. S. 1225, sponsored by Senators McClure, Simpson, and Dole, was reported out of the Senate Energy Committee on April 24. It went to the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee where one hearing was held on May 13. That Committee has 120 days in which to take action. In July and August the Committee does intend to hold mark-ups, which will closely follow. But in light of the Senate schedule, Mr. Roe felt it was highly unlikely any bill would be reported this year.

Over in the House, H.R. 2353, sponsored by Congressman Udall, was held at a full mark-up hearing on April 23. An amendment by Congressman Sharp was added by a vote of 21-20. It raised the level of compensation from approximately \$2 billion per incident to slightly above \$8 billion, to come out of the Nuclear Waste Fund.

A second bill, H.R. 3653, allowing full compensation for accidents was to be heard on May 14. That hearing was cancelled and is now set for May 21. If this bill passes out of Committee, it should go to the House Energy Committee chaired by Congressman Dingell. At that time H.R. 4394, the Swift-Morrison bill, may become a point of focus.

Litigation

In the case of Maine v. Herrington, relating to the procedure followed by USDOE pertaining to the selection of potentially acceptable sites for NWPA's second-round repository siting program, the First Circuit Court of Appeals in Boston has dismissed the case on the ground that the case was not "ripe" for review.

Concerning the State of Washington, Nuclear Waste Board v. United States and Department of Energy, Mr. Roe said a two-sentence Order was issued by the 9th Circuit within the last 30 days. This procedural Order transferred the Motion to Dismiss, filed by the United States, to the Merits Panel. This means, he said, that the same panel that will hear the merits of the case will also decide whether they have jurisdiction to decide the merits. Mr. Roe said a letter has been sent to the Court requesting a Status Conference.

There are other states that have filed suits against the United States, and all of those cases were transferred to the 9th Circuit Court. He said his office would be requesting that all of these cases be processed at the same time as the State of Washington case.

Potential Litigation. Mr. Roe referred to his memorandum of May 13 to the Chair and the Board, in which he outlined five Nuclear Waste Policy Act decision-making actions that need to be addressed in terms of potential litigation:

1. Nomination
2. Recommendation
3. Environmental Assessments
4. Presidential Approval or Disapproval of Secretary's Recommendation
5. Preliminary Determination of Suitability

Mr. Roe noted that either directly or indirectly all of the above decisions are required to be made in relation to Siting Guidelines promulgated by the USDOE. The Guidelines were adopted in November, 1984. Early in 1985, the Nuclear Waste Board challenged the validity of the Guidelines in the federal court system, as discussed earlier. Mr. Roe pointed out that should the court rule in favor of the state of Washington and the Guidelines be declared faulty, all five of USDOE's actions would be invalid. Closely associated with this point is that it is highly questionable whether further implementation of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act repository program should proceed to the site characterization stage until the cloud over the Siting Guidelines brought about by the the state's litigation is resolved.

Mr. Roe said serious doubts exist as to the sufficiency of the Environmental Assessments, based on the study of the Draft EAs, when measured against the statutory criteria of the NWPA and the Siting Guidelines adopted pursuant to the NWPA.

The validity of the Preliminary Determination of Suitability (PDS) is a legal one involving an attempt to divine Congressional intent as to the meaning of Section 114(f) of the NWPA.

Mr. Roe assured the Board his Office is following very closely activities of USDOE and NWPA's implementation process. With regard to any related litigation, Mr. Roe said he will meet with the Board after USDOE makes its decisions. At that time recommendations will be given on the subject of initiation of litigation, including the remedy aspects, such as the subject of stays and injunctive relief.

Oregon Report

Mary Lou Blazek, Hanford Program Coordinator for the Oregon Department of Energy, reported both the Advisory Committee and the Review Committee met in May in preparation for beginning Oregon's review of the Defense Waste DEIS. Their workshops are also being organized in a slightly different style from those planned by Washington State. Ms. Blazek expressed appreciation for Phyllis Clausen's participation with their group. Ms. Clausen is a member of the Washington Advisory Council and will continue to serve in the capacity of liaison between the two states. Because she was there at that particular meeting, Ms. Blazek said they were able to coordinate some advertising efforts in the Vancouver area for Southwestern Washingtonians to be involved in Oregon's workshops.

Ms. Blazek said Oregon's contract with Washington State includes a hydrogeologist's specific duties. She said they had been unable to fill that position, the major problem being salary constraints. Oregon has elected to increase the starting salary for that position in order to draw an individual. There are now two individuals interested in the position, and it is hoped the position could be filled by the end of this month. During the interim, she said some support had come from Oregon Water Resources, but because that position has not been filled full time there will be some contractual commitments made that Oregon will not be able to fulfill by the end of the contract term.

Ms. Blazek said she had contacted Congressman Wyden's staff in regard to the Board's request for her to provide an update from the Oregon Congressional delegation. She wondered if that request were still in effect following Lesley Russell's very complete review of the Dingell-Wyden Committee's activities. Should the Board desire further information, Ms. Blazek said someone from Congressman Wyden's staff could be available for the June meeting.

Ms. Blazek provided the Board with copies of the Oregonian's article on the 40 years of radioactive releases from Hanford. It does specifically mention that David Stewart-Smith and Ms. Blazek were

responsible for assisting the science staff in the calculation. She said David and she had no intention of attempting to make any dose estimates from the 17,000 pages, as scientifically that would be extremely difficult to do. The science staff contacted them with some conclusions they had made after reviewing the material for 30 days, and it was suggested they spend time with Ms. Blazek and Mr. Stewart-Smith to make sure their conclusions were at least scientifically pointed in the right direction. After spending two and a half days with them, no effort was made to redirect their approach to the article. She said the staff simply gave them data and information, and "can we assume this, and can we work the calculation in this manner, and if we do this what assumptions do we have to make". That's how they arrived at their figures, she said.

Representative Nelson asked if Congressman Wyden had received official response from anyone concerning the federal funding of Hanford as compared with other federal installations. Ms. Blazek said she did not know, but would try to obtain this information for him.

Representative Nelson asked, in relation to the calculations that were made in the Oregonian article, if she felt that there is enough information about the events that took place in the 1940's and the population in the surrounding area to do a reasonable job of estimating the dose levels. He wondered if the numbers could be improved if those efforts were undertaken, either by independent persons or by the U.S. Department of Energy. Ms. Blazek said they could, without question. The figures shown are "guesstimates", she said. There are many assumptions, as noted, and that makes it scientifically inaccurate. Representative Nelson asked if there were data on record for weather conditions, wind velocity and direction, population, food chain for that population. that would allow some reasonably accurate estimates. Ms. Blazek said that was her understanding in most of those areas and that is why it is so imperative the CDC Study and the Historical Documents Review Committee work go forward.

Nancy Kirner said the information on meteorology is available and will be used to the extent that the CDC Study has the time. The population information will be harder to get, she said, and the life-style habits will be even harder.

USDOE-Richland Report

Max Powell of the U.S. Department of Energy, Richland, advised he had phoned Hanford following the discussion of the Stop-Work Order with reference to the Plan of Action that was to be at USDOE on the 12th of May. He said they had received it on May 14th. It will be reviewed and when that is completed he will furnish a copy to the Board.

Mr. Powell said a rumor was circulating to the effect that the Environmental Assessment was in Richland. He said in his telephone efforts, those he spoke with did not have any knowledge of it.

Washington State Institute for Public Policy

Max Power of the Institute reported that the NCSL High-Level Waste Working Group meeting was held April 25-27, with a tour of the Hanford facilities and a briefing by Mike Lawrence on April 18. He said twenty-nine members of the Washington State Legislature participated in some or all of these events. There were legislators from another thirteen states, with representatives from several other states as well. An issues paper was prepared for those who had not taken the Hanford tour or had not particularly followed the issue of nuclear waste. Should anyone wish a copy, he said, they should advise the Institute and they would be sent out.

Mr. Power said Institute activities would now focus on two areas, pending release of Final EA's and characterization. One will be to initiate the work reviewing methods to determine potential economic loss from a perceived failure of a repository in the long term. Two teams of scholars have been selected from Washington State University to do independent studies. They will not collaborate, he said, as it is desired to have a range of methodology. Funding appears certain, he said, and the work should soon get underway. He said it would provide relevant information in scoping the Board's socioeconomic impact study report and would be relevant to dealing with Congressional proceedings on liability.

Mr. Power said they understood the USDOE is going to respond to all the unanswered letters from the Board and others on the issue of economic risk, and they want to initiate some discussion.

Mr. Power said the Institute is thinking ahead about the work they propose to do in the coming year in preparation for the next grant period. They will circulate ideas to the Legislative members of the Board, the Energy and Utilities Committee members and staffs, and to Terry Husseman and his staff for any suggestions and comments.

Public Comment

Marie Harris of Bacon & Hunt invited the Board members to a Conference the Washington Waste Site Study Group and Gonzaga University are sponsoring Saturday, June 21, at the University in Spokane. This will cover conflict management on nuclear waste policies, she said. Curt Eschels and Dr. Ruth Weiner will both be participants, along with other prominent speakers. She said it was hoped some policy papers for Eastern Washington elected officials would be produced from the conference.

Dr. Ruth Weiner of the Huxley College of Environmental Studies at Western Washington University said she had a student who is doing a project on decision analysis on the Defense Waste DEIS, using the same method the National Academy of Sciences by which the repository EA's were redone. The student, Roger Quiggle, prepared a document, which basically outlines the questions that have to be asked in coming to a decision about the defense wastes.

The document reaches no conclusions, she said, but contains a paragraph in the beginning indicating what decisions are not part of the defense waste decision, and there is a list of questions subdivided into several areas.

Dr. Weiner said Robert Quiggle had been unable to be there to present the document, but she had brought copies with her. They were distributed to the Board members, and should others wish a copy, they were available through the Office of Nuclear Waste Management, upon request.

In response to Mr. Roe's report of the Senate bills introduced in the past month that would take crystalline rock sites out of the second-round states, she hoped that the Board and the State Legislature would work together and send a Memorial to Congress. She said she personally thought this was an appalling action. She said she could not imagine how those who voted for a piece of legislation that theoretically was going to make a scientific decision now could say very bluntly they do not want a repository simply because their state happened to contain a certain kind of rock. She considered it a "Not in My Back Yard Bill of 1986".

Mr. Bishop reminded everyone a special emergency meeting of the Board would be scheduled the day word is received when the Environmental Assessment would be released, "R" day. Notice may be short, he said, but all members and interested parties will be advised as soon as possible.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

WASHINGTON STATE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

The Evergreen State College

Olympia, Washington 98505

Telephone (206) 844-6000, ext. 6380

May 13, 1986

Public Meetings

Defense Waste Environmental Impact Statement

Listed below is a series of meetings to be held by U. S. Department of Energy and the Nuclear Waste Board concerning the Defense Waste Draft Environmental Impact Statement. If you have any questions, please contact the Washington State Institute for Public Policy, Science and Technology Project.

<u>USDOE Workshops</u>	6:30 to 10:00 p.m.	
May 20	Richland	Richland High School Cafeteria
May 21	Yakima	Davis High School, Kiva Auditorium
May 27	Portland (Wilsonville)	Wilsonville Holiday Inn Convention Center
May 28	Pendleton	Blue Mountain Community College Theater
June 3	Spokane	Gonzaga University, Hughes Auditorium
June 10	Olympia	St. Placid's Priory
June 11	Seattle	Seattle University, Pigott Auditorium

<u>Nuclear Waste Board Public Meetings</u>	7:00 to 10:00 p.m.	
June 17	Yakima	<i>Eisenhower</i> Davis High School
June 18	Kennewick	Kamiakin High School
June 19	Spokane	City Hall
June 24	Vancouver	Foster Auditorium, Clark College
June 25	Seattle	Northwest Room, Seattle Center

<u>USDOE Public Hearings</u>	2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.	
July 8	Richland	Federal Building Auditorium
July 10	Portland	Bonneville Power Administration Auditorium
July 15	Seattle	Federal Building North Auditorium
July 17	Spokane	City Council Chambers