101.3

2 PDR - WM-10(2)

WARREN A. BISHOP
Chair

STATE OF WASHINGTON
NUCLEAR WASTE BOARD

Mail Stop PV-11 • Olympia, Washington 98504 • (206) 459-6670

FEB 13 A10:41

**NUCLEAR WASTE BOARD**
**NUCLEAR WASTE ADVISORY COUNCIL**

**JOINT INFORMATIONAL MEETING**

**PRESENCE OF NATURAL RESOURCES AT HANFORD**

**February 19, 1987**
**1:30 p.m.**
**EFSEC Hearing Room**
**Rowesix, Building I**
**4224 - 6th Ave. S.E.**
**Lacey, Washington**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1:30 | Introductory Remarks | Warren Bishop |
| 1:45 | Petroleum Potential on and Surrounding Hanford | Bill Lingley, DNR<br>Curtis Canard, CERT |
| 2:45 | Geothermal Resources of the Columbia Basin | Gordon Bloomquist, WSEO |
| 3:30 | Groundwater and Future Agricultural Activity | Bill Brewer, Ecology |
| 4:15 | Adjourn | |

Comment: Federal siting standards and regulations for a nuclear waste repository require consideration of the natural resource potential at a site. The presence of such resources, whether or not they are economic to exploit today, can create a disqualifying condition.

At Hanford the present large volumes and activities of defense waste in storage and dispersed in the environment may profoundly affect the future use of large areas. The Defense Waste DEIS raised some, as yet, unresolved issues.

The affected tribes have special "possessory and usage rights" on the Hanford Reservation, under the 1855 treaties.

These issues will be discussed at the meeting, through staff presentations and open discussion. The public is invited to attend. Contact: Marta Wilder or Bill Brewer (206) 459-6670.

WM Record File 101.3
WM Project 10
Docket No.
PDR ✓
LPDR ✓ (B)

Distribution:
REB MJB D Kunihiro
JOB RDM Linehan
(Return to WM, 623-SS) F Young Sac

2290

8702270238 870213
PDR WASTE
WM-10 PDR

WARREN A. BISHOP
Chair

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

**NUCLEAR WASTE BOARD**

**Regular Meeting**

**February 20, 1987**
**1:30 p.m.**
**EFSEC Hearing Room**
**Rowesix, Building 1**
**4224 - 6th Ave. S.E.**
**Lacey, Washington**

## AGENDA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Introductory Remarks | Warren Bishop |
| 2. | Approval of November 20-21, 1986 Minutes | |
| 3. | Correspondence | Terry Husseman |
| 4. | Testimony of Governor Gardner before the Senate Energy & Natural Resources Committee | Curtis Eschels |
| 5. | Report on the States/Tribes/USDOE Meetings | Warren Bishop |
| 6. | Mission Plan Amendments Review Process | |
| 7. | Report on the February 19 Joint Board and Council Meeting on Resource Potential in the Pasco Basin | Terry Husseman |
| 8. | DSHS Report on "Lost" Waste Sites at Hanford | Nancy Kirner |
| 9. | Committee Reports | Committee Chairs |
| 10. | State Legislation | Linda Steinmann |
| 11. | Litigation Status | Narda Pierce |
| 12. | Federal Legislation | Charlie Roe |
| 13. | Richland USDOE Report | Max Powell |
| 14. | Washington Institute for Public Policy | Max Power |
| 15. | Other Business | |
| 16. | Public Comment | |
| 17. | Adjourn | |

The Nuclear Waste Board welcomes and encourages public participation during the monthly meetings. The Chairman will invite public comment at various points during the meeting. In addition, if there are specific agenda items which you wish to comment upon please sign the sheet on the back table and you will be invited to comment when the Board reaches that agenda item.

STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY
Mail Stop PV-11 • Olympia, Washington 98504-8711 • (206) 459-6000

# NUCLEAR WASTE ADVISORY COUNCIL

**Regular Meeting**

**February 20, 1987**
**9:00 a.m.**
**EFSEC Hearings Room**
**Rowesix, Building I**
**4224 - 6th Ave. S.E.**
**Lacey, Washington**

## AGENDA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Introductory Remarks | Warren Bishop |
| 2. | Approval of January 16, 1987 Minutes | |
| 3. | Significant Recent Developments | Terry Husseman |
| 4. | Mission Plan Review Process | Terry Husseman |
| 5. | Committee Reports | |
| 6. | State Legislation | Linda Steinmann |
| 7. | Discuss Joint Washington State Advisory Council/ Oregon Advisory Committee Meeting, March 19, 1987 | Phyllis Clausen |
| 8. | Public Involvement Report | Marta Wilder/Paul Korsmo |
| 9. | Other Business | |
| 10. | Public Comment | |
| 11. | Adjourn | |

The Nuclear Waste Advisory Council welcomes and encourages public participation during the monthly meetings. The Chairman will invite public comment at various points during the meeting. In addition, if there are specific agenda items which you wish to comment upon please sign the sheet on the back table and you will be invited to comment when the Council reaches that agenda item.

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

CONTACT: Don Provost/Bill Brewer
Office of Nuclear Waste Management
(206) 459-6670

# PRESS NOTICE

**February 10, 1987**

SUBJECTS AND DATES:

Nuclear Waste Board and Advisory Council Joint Informational Meeting
February 19, 1987 - 1:30 p.m.

Nuclear Waste Advisory Council Regular Meeting
February 20, 1987 - 9 a.m.

Nuclear Waste Board Regular Meeting
February 20, 1987 - 1:30 p.m.

PLACE:

EFSEC Hearings Room
Rowesix, Building #1
4224 - 6th Avenue S.E.
Lacey, Washington

The Nuclear Waste Board and Nuclear Waste Advisory Council will conduct a joint informational meeting and their regular meetings during February 19-20, 1987.

At the special joint meeting, 1:30 p.m. on February 19, the Board and Council will hear presentations regarding the potential presence of natural resources on the Hanford site in southeastern Washington. Experts in the areas of petroleum potential, geothermal resources, groundwater and agricultural activity also will make presentations.

During the regular Board meeting, on February 20 at 1:30 p.m., members will receive a report on Governor Gardner's and the U.S. Department of Energy's (USDOE) testimony before the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. The Board also will begin review of USDOE's recently released draft amended Mission Plan. The Mission Plan reaffirmed the May 28th decision and stretched out the schedule for the first repository.

--MORE--

On February 20 at 9 a.m., the Advisory Council will review recent activities and the status of several public information projects. As a supplement to its regular meeting, the Advisory Council will hold an informal meeting at the Westwater Inn, Westwater Club Room, 2300 Evergreen Park Drive, Olympia, at 6:30 p.m. on February 19, 1987.

For more information, contact the Office of Nuclear Waste Management.

# # #

ANDREA BEATTY RINIKER
Director

STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY
*Mail Stop PV-11 • Olympia, Washington 98504-8711 • (206) 459-6000*

# MINUTES OF NUCLEAR WASTE BOARD MEETING

**January 16, 1987**

**1:30 p.m.**
**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
Representative Shirley Hankins
Representative Dick Nelson
Senator Irving Newhouse
Representative Nancy Rust
Senator Lois J. Stratton
Richard Watson, State Energy Office
Senator Al Williams

**Board Designees/Alternate Designees Present:**

Nancy Kirner, DSHS Alternate Designee
Ray Lasmanis, DNR Designee

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

Mr. Bishop welcomed the two new members of the Board: Senator Lois J. Stratton, replacing Senator H. A. "Barney" Goltz; and Senator Irving Newhouse, replacing Senator Sam Guess. Mr. Bishop remarked that he and the Office staff would arrange an appropriate time to brief the Senators to bring them up to date on the program.

## Minutes

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the Joint Nuclear Waste Board and Nuclear Waste Advisory Council Meeting on November 20, 1986, and the minutes of the Nuclear Waste Board on November 21, 1986. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

## Correspondence

Mr. Husseman referred to the first letter in the notebook dated December 10, addressed to John H. Anttonen, Assistant Manager, Commercial Nuclear Waste, Richland Operations Office, USDOE, from Terry Husseman. This was in response to Mr. Anttonen's letter enclosing drafts of the Environmental Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (EMMP) and the Socioeconomic Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (SMMP). The EMMP and SMMP are intended to indicate the actions the U.S. Department of Energy will take to monitor and mitigate socioeconomic and environmental impacts resulting from site characterization. Mr. Husseman said at the time the draft documents were received no drafts or text of the Site Characterization Plan (SCP) had been received. Nor did the Office receive any list of ongoing or planned activities, he said. Therefore, the response was that it was not possible to give an informed comment on the two plans until the SCP was seen. Since that time, Mr. Husseman said an early draft of one chapter of the SCP and part of another chapter had been received. Also received was a first cut at a list of the ongoing or planned activities by USDOE for the next few months, prior to the issuance of the SCP.

The second letter dated January 8, 1987, to Bennett Johnston, Chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, was signed by the Senators from Washington, Nevada, and Texas. It thanked the Chair for scheduling an early hearing on the repository program, which is now scheduled for February 4 and 5, 1987. The governors of the three states and representatives of the three affected tribes have been invited to testify on February 4, with USDOE testifying on February 5.

The next letter, dated December 20, 1986, from Senator Benitz and the letter from him to the Board dated January 9, 1987, referred to the film "Nuclear Legacy". Senator Benitz noted several errors in the content of the film, and asked the Board to consider his views before endorsing its showing at meetings throughout the state.

The following letter of December 29, 1986, from Ben C. Rusche to governor Gardner enclosed the proposed Report to Congress required under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, to indicate the status of the Consultation and Cooperation negotiations. Comments from the governors of the three selected states and the affected tribes are requested prior to submission of the Report to Congress. The state will prepare its comments very soon.

Representative Nelson questioned the statement in the Report to the effect that the state of Washington suspended the C&C negotiations, "pending resolution of several issues...". He asked if the state did suspend negotiations, or was it a mutual suspension. Mr. Provost replied his recollection was that the state had several issues on which progress was not being made and a couple of Governor's 30-day letters were sent to USDOE. No further meetings were called on either side, he said, and there seemed to be no rationale for a meeting. Representative Nelson said he felt this had been a mutual decision because of the issues that

could not be resolved, and he thought USDOE should be corrected on this point.

Senator Williams said he would like to confirm that this was his sense of what happened also. Mr. Bishop said this should be pointed out in the state's response.

The last letter, dated December 30, 1986, to Secretary Herrington is Governor Gardner's response on the issue of C&C, enclosing his proposal for a conflict resolution process.

**Status of Governor Gardner's National Conflict Resolution Proposal**

Curtis Eschels noted that the last two letters mentioned might have crossed in the mail. The Governor did respond to USDOE explaining why the state did not consider this a reasonable time to begin C&C negotiations. The Governor continued saying his proposal could serve the national interest, as well as the interest of the state of Washington. Since then Mr. Eschels said the proposal has been distributed to the Northwest Congressional delegation, as well as the Congressional committees that have jurisdiction. It was also distributed to different environmental groups and some utilities.

Mr. Eschels said a recent news story this week described a meeting between some key Congressional staff and utility representatives. The staff consensus was that the Western state were very upset with the process, and rightly so. The staffers suggested that because of the strong position of the states the utilities should view more closely what is occurring in the relationship between USDOE and the states. Mr. Eschels thought this was one indication the Governor's proposal is "picking up steam". It helps to point out that the exercise of raw power is not going to solve the problem of finding a repository for the nation's high-level nuclear waste.

Mr. Eschels said other feedback received has been overwhelmingly positive. He said he had a call today from Representative Arnie Wight, who is Chairman of the Science and Technology Committee in the New Hampshire Legislature, and involved with the Office of the Governor. He served on the Advisory Panel on Alternative Means of Financing and Managing Radioactive Waste Facilities, set up by former Secretary of Energy, Donald Paul Hodel. Mr. Wight stated that the Governor's proposal was the best proposal he had seen and offered whatever assistance he could give.

Mr. Eschels said the National Governors' Association winter meeting in February will probably discuss the proposal, as he will be describe the proposal more fully to their staff later this month. In addition, he said he understood the National Conference of State Legislatures will also consider the proposal.

Mr. Eschels said he believed the Governor's proposal will be presented to Congress at the Senate Energy Committee hearings in February. He said he was very encouraged by the reaction thus far.

Representative Nelson said there had been press reports that Ben Rusche planned to go to Congress for a "vote of confidence" when he delivered the revised Mission Plan. He wondered what was known of this report. Mr. Eschels said he understood the revised Mission Plan would not be submitted until some time this summer. By that time he thought there would be a more clear impression of what the Department's reaction would be to the Governor's proposal for resolving the conflict.

Mr. Husseman added that his understanding of USDOE's plans at this point was that the first cut budget request sent to Congress at the beginning of this session called for $500 million for the nuclear waste program, for the fiscal year starting in October of 1987. This would be $1 million more than Congress appropriated this year, with a holdback of $79 million contingent upon what happens on C&C negotiations. He said there was an additional paragraph stating USDOE would be coming back to request an additional

$225 million. This would accompany the revised Mission Plan, with an uncertain date some time in the summer. Mr. Husseman said he had been told USDOE would give the states and tribes a copy for comment by late January. The law states that Congress would have thirty days to review the Mission Plan once it is delivered. He said it was uncertain that the Mission Plan is automatically approved if Congress takes no action within the thirty days. He thought the Mission Plan could be tied up in the appropriation process.

Department of Nuclear Safety

Mr. Eschels said for some time there has been a proposal under consideration to consolidate some of the nuclear and radiation functions within state government. Since approximately 1980, Mr. Eschels said, there had been a steady increase in the activities, visibility, and perhaps importance of a number of nuclear and radiation matters. Among the changes, WPPSS Plant #2 has gone from a plant under construction into an operating nuclear plant; the Nuclear Waste Policy Act was passed; Hanford has now been designated of one of the three areas the Department looks at as a finalist; and the Low-Level Waste Act passed in 1980, with significant amendment in 1985, giving the states much more authority and responsibility. Along the way, he said, Chernobyl gave the state the opportunity to test its readiness for problems, and more emergency drills have been conducted at the Supply System Plant. Within the Department of Social and Health Services an Office of Radiation Protection has grown. The Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) has changed from an agency of numerous consultants and staff working on applications to construct energy facilities to the present monitoring of an operating nuclear plant. The Department of Ecology has become responsible for managing the low-level waste site and the Nuclear Waste Board staff are employees of the Department within the Nuclear Waste Management Office.

Mr. Eschels said because of all this growth, the proposal seeks to examine whether or not it would be beneficial to look again at coordinating those functions, plus others, in a way that provides better service. It would also bring to a focal point all of the operations within state government related to nuclear safety. The proposal being circulated has been brought to one House of the Legislature, and to some of the involved agencies. He said a decision should come fairly soon, if the concept is developed and approved, and the proposal would be brought to the Legislature for its input.

Dick Watson inquired how transportation of nuclear waste is dealt with in the proposal. Mr. Eschels said transportation is one area where responsibilities are sprinkled throughout state government. In addition to those areas mentioned, the Utilities and Transportation Commission regulates common carriers, the State Patrol inspects, the Department of Transportation is concerned about overweight vehicles, etc. The thinking is to have the new department responsible for it, as EFSEC is for the WPPSS plant, but not to maintain inspectors, bridge maintenance engineers, etc. The department might have the nuclear expertise, and contract through interagency agreements or other means with the appropriate departments. This would prevent a duplication or build-up of a large staff, and instead use existing staff with proper coordination.

Mr. Eschels added the thought was to disrupt things as little as possible. For this reason he thought it would be a good idea to keep the Siting Council as a body, and similarly the Nuclear Waste Board. This would put the staff to the Board and Advisory Council within the Department of Nuclear Safety, rather than in Ecology. He said he saw no problem with the way things are now, but there was a need to look closely at staying ahead of the progression of events.

Representative Hankins asked how soon the draft would be available for Legislators, and would there be a fiscal note

attached. She commented that she believed suggested changes would be costly, and having served on State Government for a number of years she noted that merging departments does not always solve the size-of-government problems and answer all the questions. Mr. Eschels said he anticipated there would be a draft available next week, or the week after. With regard to the fiscal note, he said he would look at the record. For instance, he said, the Siting Council in monitoring the Supply System Plant #2 does so at a nominal cost to ratepayers by contract with other agencies. Two-thirds of their budget goes to the Department of Social and Health Services, Ecology, Labor and Industry, the Fire Marshal, etc. He said many of the functions of the new department are available within existing state government, and he would ask to what extent consolidations would help to solve the problem. He said he would like to work closely with Representative Hankins.

Senator Benitz asked, in order to clarify thinking, would it be proposed to take fees DSHS collects and use them, along with other appropriations. Mr. Eschels said this is being examined now, and the rule will be to disrupt as little as possible. Senator Benitz said he would be most interested in seeing the draft. Mr. Bishop asked that when a draft is ready, the Office would like a copy to make it available to the Advisory Council and the Board.

Representative Nelson mentioned that the concept of this proposal has been developing in the House Energy and Utilities Committee and, as Mr. Eschels indicated, there are a number of issues that have developed recently that are not well coordinated by the existing structure. Another whole area to be examined, he said, was emergency response by all federal and state facilities within the state. He felt there was also a large area of concern on the part of the citizens which needed to be coordinated as well. He agreed this proposal might make what exists function more effectively. He also agreed there are enormous problems of funding in the state, but without some focus it is not easy to approach Congress to let them know of their responsibility to fund emergency response and monitoring.

Representative Hankins added that since the proposal has such a broad base of interest, she suggested it might be called an "Energy" department, as opposed to "Nuclear". She thought one entity should not be emphasized over several. Mr. Watson said in this regard the question of energy safety applies to a number of different energy sources, and there was a need to examine very carefully how broadly the responsibilities of this particular entity would be spread, and to consider how other aspects of energy safety are dealt with already in state government.

Socioeconomic Committee Report

Mr. Eschels reported that at the Committee meetings on December 15 and 16 they interviewed the candidates for the preparation of the socioeconomic impact report. He said the Selection Subcommittee recommended that negotiations begin with Impact Assessment Inc. of California. They have been asked to revise their proposal somewhat, and the Committee will meet again in Kennewick on January 27 to receive the recommendations of the Subcommittee. Shortly after that there should be a contract signed, with work beginning early in March.

The other large part of the Committee's work is the Payment Equivalent To Taxes (PETT) authorized by the NWPA. The Committee is in the closing stages of recommending a contract with the state Department of Revenue to allow the department to identify the activities and expenditures of USDOE regarding site characterization. Comparable work will be performed by local governments and efforts are continuing to enter into a broader-range, comprehensive agreement to cover their participation--not only in the PETT program, but also to fund them and to define a relationship with the

state in looking at the broader socioeconomic impact report. This is in progress with the Mid-Columbia Consortium of Governments in the Tri-Cities area, and a group in Clark County and one in Cowlitz County have asked for the same kind of assistance for those local governments to review the work of the Committee related to the socioeconomic impact of characterization, and possibly construction and operation of a repository.

**Follow-up on USDOE's Letter Concerning Ongoing and Planned Activities at Hanford**

Mr. Husseman recalled that since May 8, 1986, the state was first told by the USDOE they would provide the state with a list of activities ongoing at the Hanford site, as well as the list of planned activities to be conducted before the Site Characterization Plan is issued. A series of correspondence, leading to a thirty-day letter from the Governor to Secretary Herrington, followed by a thirty-day letter to the President, resulted in a letter dated December 17, 1986, which Mr. Rusche delivered to Governor Gardner when they met in Olympia on that date. The attachments referred to in that letter were received a couple of weeks later.

The attachments included a computer printout of approximately 1,000 work packages related to the repository which have been set up by USDOE at the Hanford site. Approximately 50% of these show as having been stopped under the Stop-work Order issued several months ago. The other 50% are exempt for one reason or another. There are several categories of exemption established when the Stop-Work Order was issued, Mr. Husseman said. The descriptions given are very brief, and the Office has informed the USDOE more detailed information is needed. He said it appeared to him they are ready to provide more detailed information. As dollars are spent to do the work to characterize the site, they will be spent in accordance with the work packages. Therefore, it is important to have the dollars attached to the work packages and have the Department of Revenue do an analysis to determine which taxes will apply to which dollars. That will be a part of the contract agreement entered into with the Department of Revenue.

In addition, Mr. Husseman said it would be necessary to look at the Quality Assurance requirements for each of the work packages. The state is now in the process of going out with an RFP to obtain technical assistance in reviewing not only the list of activities, but leading directly into the review of the Site Characterization Plan, which is just beginning to arrive.

Already received, Mr. Husseman said, is a draft of Chapter IV, one of eight chapters. He said it looks as though a significant portion of staff and contractor effort will go into reviewing the Plan and commenting on it. The Board and Council will be kept informed of issues as they are developed.

Mr. Husseman said Don Provost was in Richland for the last three days to attend the quarterly meeting at the technical level. He asked Mr. Provost to comment on the meeting.

Mr. Provost reported the first day was devoted to the Environmental Monitoring Mitigation Plans (EMMP) and the Socioeconomic Monitoring Mitigation Plans (SMMP). He said it was disappointing to see how the USDOE was approaching these, as they have not followed the state's recommendations and they appear to be trying to make all the site documents the same. Geology, for instance, is unique to the sites, and in environmental monitoring previous activities have to be recognized in a EMMP. Some open and frank discussions were held on some of these issues, he said.

The second and third days were devoted to the quarterly meetings, covering many major subjects. One was the Site Characterization Plan. The document itself will be from six to eight thousand pages long,

with one hundred people working on it now. USDOE estimates they have accumulated 1,865 references to date, compared to 500 references contained in the Environmental Assessment. Mr. Provost said there were bound to be very serious discussions on both technical issues and their relation to others. Yesterday in discussing exploratory shafts USDOE announced in the meeting they planned to do two exploratory shafts - one a six-foot diameter shaft and the other with a twelve-foot, inside diameter. During the time of the draft Mission Plan Comments, this was one of the state's major concerns. The Act states that during site characterization only those facilities will be put in that are needed for site characterization, not those needed for construction. Upon checking the Mission Plan, Mr. Provost said it explicitly states there will be two six-foot diameter shafts.

Mr. Provost continued by saying this is the type of issue that will be seen in the Mission Plan Review, and it will be tied to the Site Characterization Plan. The SCP is now planned for issue in July, which is USDOE's most optimistic schedule. While the quarterly meetings were going on, Mr. Provost said some of the key people from the USDOE were in Washington, D.C. to gain approval on a hydrology strategy. This is the key document in the whole site characterization plan. It seemed to those attending this meeting, Mr. Provost said, that by the time the revised hydrology strategy is approved, they will meet with the states, tribes, and the NRC to insert this into the SCP and may not adhere to their July schedule.

Another announcement at the meetings was that the EIS-scoping process, which was to start this year, has been delayed for two years. This, he said, creates a little problem in data collecting, particularly environmental monitoring. It means that the monitoring done for the EMMP has to be strictly site-characterization-oriented and not EIS-oriented. This narrows the scope of the monitoring and could complicate matters later on. He added that these issues will have to be carefully followed.

Mr. Provost said Russell Jim, Advisory Council Member representing the Yakima Indian Nation, was also in attendance in Richland. Mr. Jim was invited to comment on the meetings.

Mr. Jim considered the meeting very interesting and he thought at least the verbiage at the latter part of the last day was promising in that the USDOE and the affected parties would become more involved with each other in sharing information. It is hoped, he said, this will come about. There was frank discussion revolving around the credibility of the USDOE in relation to the work going on around the N-Reactor. The credibility issue touches the N-Reactor in that all three Program Managers of the affected tribes basically said the same thing in their report. That is, that as nations they are not being treated as an affected party should be, and as is stated in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, on a government-to-government basis. When the issue became heated on credibility, the Yakima National reminded all parties involved, especially the USDOE, that within a short period following the Chernobyl incident the Yakima Indian Nation, as a government, through its proper governmental channels, presented a Resolution to the USDOE requesting the operation mode, the blueprints, and the emergency response plan on the N-Reactor. Mr. Jim said they had received nothing to this effect from the U.S. Department of Energy. He said they understand, as stated at the meeting, the "selling" effect of attempting to justify converting the N-Reactor into a tritium plant, trying to use what appropriations they have to modify the plant and experiment to see if the graphite can be prevented from expanding to the roof by 1990 or 1991. He said they also stressed that when a peer review panel comes through town sponsored by the USDOE in Richland to review something as important as the N-Reactor, that the Yakima Indian Nation be notified in

order to be participants, as they feel is their right under the Act.

Mr. Jim said they had verbally heard from the top echelon representatives at Richland that they would be communicating better. He expressed his hope this would happen, and said he appreciated very much the presence of Mr. Provost at the meeting. His manner and eloquence, he said, showed the USDOE many of their pitfalls, which they thought, perhaps, they could bypass. He said all the discussions were important and the next quarterly meeting is set for the month of April.

Pertaining to the shafts, Mr. Lasmanis asked if USDOE discussed or presented any kind of a fall-back plan in case the drilling is not successful. Mr. Provost said his understanding was that is one of the issues to be covered in the SCP. USDOE plans to proceed with the first, smaller shaft, and if that is successful, go on with the second one. Mr. Lasmanis asked if there would be disruption of the hydrologic regime during the drilling of the shafts, thus negating any kind of modeling based on test results. Mr. Provost said there was an open and frank discussion on this issue. Earlier, he said, the state, together with the NRC, had worked out an agreement with the USDOE that there would be a process leading to the shaft that made sure all the modeling was done, the pumping tests were done, and the results were in before beginning the drilling of the shaft. In their current proposal they plan to drop the shaft down to bedrock before they have completed the pumping tests, and he felt they misunderstand the strong feelings of the states and the tribes about the exploratory shaft.

Mr. Provost said he tried to explain to USDOE that starting that shaft is almost symbolic in the minds of the state and tribes, and going even into the unconfined aquifer was a very serious matter. He said he counselled them that they really should think over this action, and if they still decide to go ahead, although no discussions had been held with the state's attorneys, USDOE would probably see them in Court. He said this was in complete opposition to the agreement worked out previously and the state would find it very distasteful to break off that agreement. Mr. Provost said it seemed to him such actions on the part of USDOE are taken because of schedules, and this another example of moving ahead to meet a time frame. He said he believes, along with Mr. Lasmanis, that the hydrologic regime will be destroyed once that drilling rig goes ahead.

Another point brought out at the meeting, although it was not in writing, was that the state would be invited to all Interagency Coordination Group meetings. There have been problems in the past in the consultation process, he said, including all meetings of a technical nature. There are ten coordinating groups, and this will automatically increase the workload for staff.

Mr. Bishop asked Narda Pierce, Assistant Attorney General, if she had any comments to add from a legal standpoint. Ms. Pierce said she had reviewed briefly with Terry Husseman and Don Provost the response received on site characterization activities. They are reviewing what the next step should be. The first will be to identify what new information is needed and what is of importance to the program. No decisions have been arrived at yet, she said.

For example, staff is following closely the radioactive tracers. Once those are used, the concern is that it will affect the ability to monitor any releases from the site.

Mr. Provost added that there had been long, open discussions on radioactive tracers. They had consultants do a report that indicated from a technical point what could be used. Yet, he said, they have not looked at the issue of what should be used, or what would be appropriate there. They completely ignored the situation that if the site is contaminated with some of these tracers, they would contaminate the lower levels if

used down there, and in the state's terminology would destroy a baseline. Mr. Provost said even after all the letters the state wrote, they were still proceeding down that other line. He found it hard to believe they would do that. This time they were able to meet with the people working on the reports, and it is important for them to understand these other issues.

Mr. Jim added that the Yakima Indian Nation also had a very serious concern about the hydrologic baseline that was supposed to have been developed prior to the EIS. He said they had been asking this question now for three years and USDOE assured them prior to the EA in 1986 the hydrologic baseline would be developed that spring. He said now in 1987 there is still no baseline and they are fearful that just drilling D-23 and D-18 may not give them a sufficient amount of data to develop a hydrologic baseline.

**February 12 States/Tribes/USDOE Meeting in Spokane**

Mr. Husseman stated that in the past the quarterly meetings have been somewhat limited in attendance. The February 12 meeting will be an open meeting, for the first time, with opportunities for public comment. All future meetings will be held in this manner. Major policy issues and technical issues are discussed with USDOE Headquarters staff, Project Offices staff, staff from the states if Mississippi, Utah, and Louisiana. If issues are not resolved, Mr. Husseman said, a list of commitments is developed with assurance from USDOE they will be addressed. At each quarterly meeting the list is reviewed. He suggested Board members may be interested in attending, and the place of the meeting will be announced when USDOE chooses the site. Mr. Bishop indicated any member wishing to attend should advise the Office so arrangements can be made. He also said this would be considered official business of the Board.

**USDOE Proposal for Calculating Nuclear Waste Fund Disposal Fees for Defense Wastes**

Dr. Brewer provided the Board with a draft of comments on the Defense Waste Fee Allocation. The Committee developed the language at their meeting yesterday, and would require Board action in order to meet a February 2 deadline for submitting comments.

Dr. Brewer said that the Nuclear Waste Policy Act states that if commingling is going to take place, there has to be some adjustment of fees. However, no specific method is mentioned.

Dr. Brewer said in the Federal Register Notice of December 2, 1986, USDOE presented three options, with a recommendation for Option I. He explained that Option II would attempt to use the energy production of plutonium reactors as an equivalent to the amount of energy generated by a commercial power reactor. The net effect would be, because of the different residence times of irradiated fuel in the reactors, to understate the amount of money that USDOE owes to the program to cover its waste disposal costs. The amount of actual radioactivity in one commercial canister would be represented by four, five, or six defense waste canisters, yet one canister costs about as much to emplace as the other in a mined repository.

Option III requires estimating the cost of two separate repositories--one commercial, one defense waste, then taking the cost of one combined repository and splitting the savings between the programs. This position, he said, was originally favored by the Edison Electric Institute, a utility trade organization. As of yesterday afternoon, without polling the membership, the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC) indicated this option has some merit. The net effect of this option, he believed, would be to overstate the USDOE contribution to the program. He pointed out that the arithmetic if very interesting because if it only overstated

the USDOE contribution by 5%, that would be 5% of $3.5 billion, if Hanford were involved. Splitting those savings between Hanford and Savannah River might provide $100 million for Hanford for additional cleanup activities. However, if this were split among the ratepayers, a rough calculation would be about five cents annually per household for twenty years. Dr. Brewer said because the defense waste program comes from Congressionally-appropriated funds and has to compete, dollar for dollar, with weapons programs, with military pay raises, boondoggle projects, etc., defense waste cleanup will always be at risk of being the orphan child in the defense program.

Dr. Brewer said the proposed language for Board consideration generally favors Option I, which depends upon a formula that divides the cost into roughly two parts: (1) areal extent, which apportions funds by mining costs; and (2) piece count, which recognizes the fact that it costs about as much to handle one container whether it is civilian or defense waste. He said the complex calculation of cost items seem fair and reasonable, and there are other reasonable assumptions in the Notice of Inquiry. USDOE has taken into account the time value of money.

Dr. Brewer said the draft comments point out four points of exception. One is recognition that events to date are simply an internal administrative action of the Energy Department; noted is support of negotiated rulemaking with public, states, and tribes having input in the final decision to adopt rules and procedures. Also recognized is the fact that the unit cost of disposal could rise at Hanford, if the repository were approximately doubled in size, because of geological limitations. Should that be the case, USDOE should establish a contingency action with outside expert opinions. A third point was that the Notice of Inquiry ignores the single-shell tank waste, while the state of Washington does not. The fourth point is that the Federal Register ignores the fact that there are costs out in local communities, and in the transportation sector, which are based on piece count. The defense waste canisters have to pay their share of those costs also.

Dr. Brewer said the draft comments presented were the final comments recommended by the Defense Waste Committee and he asked for Board action.

In the discussions that followed Dr. Brewer said he did not know how other groups would view these options. As stated, NARUC seemed to be learning toward Option III, which did not mean the state could not support them in other parts of their position. Representative Nelson said he still did not understand where the estimates for Hanford, Nevada, and Texas originated in terms of the potential size of the repository. Dr. Brewer said that was explained in the Federal Register Notice. In USDOE assumptions he said they are looking at two repositories, by pairs, to arrive at a total cost of $2.5 to $3.5 billion. In the case of Hanford, he said, the size could be up to 11,200 acres and it could, according to a Battelle report, occupy the entire RRL at Hanford. It is questionable, he continued, that there is that much good rock available, and the Notice does not allow for any geologic problem.

Ray Lasmanis agreed with Dr. Brewer. He said the further out the estimates are projected, the less reliable they are, and the more chance there is to encounter unexpected geological problems. Dick Watson asked if the Utilities and Transportation Commission intends to make comments, and if so, has staff discussed with them making comments that are consistent with the position of the Board as opposed to the NARUC position. Dr. Brewer said the UTC had a representative at the meeting yesterday. Steven Aos of the UTC said that Commissioner Robert Bratton sits on the NARUC Subcommittee that considers defense waste. The Subcommittee is in the process of drafting some comments. He said no position had been adopted at the Commission, nor has NARUC, other than general support for Edison Electric's

position. Mr. Watson suggested discussing with the commissioners the possibility of forming a uniform position from the state of Washington. Mr. Aos added that there was a need to think in terms of the ratepayer impact in Washington State. There is very little nuclear energy generation here relative to other parts of the country. Some comes through the WPPSS #2 plant, through public power ratepayers. The ratepayers in investor-owned utilities within the state receive virtually none, except for some of their dealings with Bonneville, he said. He thought the one-mill fee would not be so much and if it goes through the Department of Defense, that implies tax increases.

Mr. Bishop said that to the extent possible, it would be desirable to have a uniform position. He pointed out the constraints on time, and offered any staff assistance from the Office.

Senator Williams commented that of the three options, he thought fairness should be the criterion to make sure Defense was paying its share and the ratepayers are not subsidizing defense waste disposal. Because there is so much defense waste, whichever formula levers the most money into dealing with its disposition should be an even higher priority. He asked if Option I did that, and Dr. Brewer replied that was the case and Option I had the capability, if handled right, of being fine-tuned as the program progresses. He pointed out another problem with Option III that bothers the technicians. He said it was necessary to estimate the cost of two hypothetical repositories and there are no precedents to building a repository. Senator Williams commented that his first impression was that perhaps Option I had a very complicated formula, but based on Dr. Brewer's remarks, it could also be the one that has the most certainty in terms of the information available in setting up the calculation. Dr. Brewer said it looked complicated but it could also be the one that has the most certainty in terms of the information available in setting up the calculation. Dr. Brewer said it looked complicated because it has a lot of parts, but they fit together in ways technicians have worked with. Senator Williams inquired if Option I was the one that would lead to the least disagreement in the final result. Dr. Brewer replied that in his opinion, the answer was yes.

Mr. Watson moved the Board adopt the recommended comments of the Defense Waste Committee on defense waste fee allocation. The motion was seconded. Ray Lasmanis asked if there were still time to coordinate with the UTC, and Mr. Bishop said that should be implied in the action as the Board has invited them to coordinate.

The motion was called and carried unanimously.

## Possible Change in the Definition of High-Level Waste

Joe Stohr referred to his memorandum of January 6, 1987, regarding the efforts being made by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to redefine high-level waste, and to a document by Dr. A. G. Croff et al on this subject.

The NRC has been looking at redefining high-level waste and originally had planned to have an Advance Notice of Proposed Rule Making by the first of December. This has slid until around the first of March. At this time there have been three affirmative votes from the five Commissioners, and it appears the current draft will go through with some minor changes. The NRC has essentially come up with two characteristics that high-level waste would have to possess: 1) a high activity content, as shown on the summary chart of the Croff document as "high-power density"; and 2) the need for permanent isolation which is related to the concentration of long-lived nuclides. Should there be one or the other, it would fall into the category of high-activity waste or intermediate level waste, which are currently unlicensed and for which regulations do not exist. Also shown on the chart is low-level waste, which is basically defined now by the 10 CFR 61 limit.

In discussions with the NRC staff, Mr. Stohr said they are looking for many comments on the approach. They feel they can define where the lines fall as they proceed, but they are interested in how people view this approach.

The redefinition could have a major impact on some of the defense wastes. Tank wastes, transuranics, and low-level wastes could all be affected by the ruling and where the lines are drawn. Mr. Stohr said there is also a potential for a legal "mess", as there could be several definitions of high-level waste and there may be an interim period before all agencies adopt one set. The original definitions were established on the basis of licensing authority, and the new definition would attempt to address the physical characteristics of the wastes. Close attention must be paid to the development of this rulemaking to make sure the state's comments are heard on this proposal.

Terry Husseman recalled that when the EPA Standards were being discussed before their adoption, the possibility of a change in the definition of high-level waste was also discussed, and the impact it could have on the single-shell tank wastes. He said there was a likely possibility that much of the single-shell tank waste could be considered low-level as a result of this change in definition.

Don Provost added that the Croff paper was given last year at the Tucson meeting, and he recalled that the authors wanted the audience to understand clearly that Mother Nature does not work in straight lines as shown on the chart, and when they deal with the real wastes there will be problems even if they arrive at a good definition. Mr. Stohr said that the staff of the NRC also said they would have to go through some extensive modeling on an isotope-by-isotope basis to set those lines. However, they are more interested in the reaction to the concept, and should that be approved, they will go back and work on establishing the levels.

Mr. Bishop said this would be followed closely by staff, as the schedule called for issuance of the draft ANPRM the first of March with a 90-day comment period, with the Commission reviewing comments before a final rule is published later in the year.

In response to Mr. Lasmanis, Mr. Stohr said the ANPRM does not address mixed chemical hazardous wastes and radioactive wastes.

Representative Nelson said he was still disturbed with the process. By dropping wastes into categories, he said that carries with it some presumptions about how much risk could be tolerated. He thought the state should consider its position very carefully and perhaps object to this way of defining high-level wastes. He said it could bias the final disposition of certain kinds of wastes and could be a trap for the state. Mr. Stohr said he thought when the limits are set and the modeling is completed, they will have to address risks. However, he said he agreed that the state has specific interests that it will want to incorporate into its comments. If it is felt those specific interests outweigh the general approach, then the state may want to disagree with the process.

Nancy Kirner commented that the only line on the graph that is defined for certain radionuclides is the Class C Limit. The Class C LImit was based upon a risk analysis but using assumptions that for low-level waste, looking at the Richland site, are about a factor of 100 more conservative than the actual situation. It was using existing standards for dose that are generally acceptable for both the EPA and the International Commission on Radiation Protection. Any playing around with numbers will have to take into consideration a lot of assumptions dealing with the ability of the facility, or the package, or the waste form to remain contained. She termed it a big, technical "can of worms", and she echo'd Representative Nelson's concerns that this must be watched very carefully. She said she differed with him somewhat as

risk analysis, risk assessment must be dealt with to make them all comparable.

In response to Mr. Bishop, Mr. Stohr said to date this issue is a staff assignment and could have impacts on several of the Board Committees. Mr. Bishop asked him to consider if this issue should go through one of the Committee structures.

Dr. Brewer commented that in the Defense Waste Committee proceedings so far he had tried to recognize at least two points that the ANPRM does not cover: (1) the total curie count; and (2) the mobility of that radionuclide in that specific geologic setting. He pointed out there will have to be a great deal of work and evaluation done before staff would make any recommendation to the Board.

Representative Nelson continued that he could see why definitions need to be applied to certain activities involving this kind of waste, such as separating it at the source and transporting it with different levels of protection, but in getting down to one repository he thought it made no sense to think about different categories of wastes. He said what did make sense is the physical site, the process that could disperse that waste, and the different radionuclides, with the risks involved. He said he hoped the focus would be placed on that.

Don Provost said he thought at the time of passage of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act a need for definition was recognized and thought that NRC would come back with the definition. He said it would have helped had this been done earlier, as now it will be very complicated. Mr. Stohr commented that the mixed waste issue mentioned by Ray Lasmanis is also included in that mess. Mr. Provost said the current concept is to take the highest regulation and make sure those wastes meet those regulations. However, he said it is complicated because of the chemicals and the chelating agents, so it is not a pure radionuclide. He thought it would be a five-or six-year process to arrive at a final definition.

## Other Committee Reports

### Environmental Monitoring Committee

Nancy Kirner referred to Draft Resolution 87-1, supporting legislation requiring cancer to be a reportable disease and the establishment of a statewide cancer registry, recommending that funding be obtained to support this activity. Ms. Kirner said one recommendation of the Hanford Health Effects Panel that convened in September was establishment of a statewide, region-wide health surveillance data-gathering system. DSHS epidemiologist have looked at the various alternatives to collecting these data, and concluded at this time the best alternative was to establish a cancer registry and to make cancer a reportable disease.

To that end, Ms. Kirner said there have been attempts to obtain legislation which would have cancer as a reportable disease and establish a cancer registry. Representative Rust, member of the Board, is in the process of filing a bill similar in content to the Draft Resolution.

As the situation exists now, Ms. Kirner said two-thirds of the state is covered by a federally-funded cancer registry maintained by the Fred Hutchinson Center; there are various satellite cancer registries maintained by hospitals, but they are not designed for the altruistic purposes of determining epidemiological incidence of disease, but only to determine whether the cure rates at the hospitals is being carried out. She said the Resolution and the proposed House Bill would direct the appropriate members of the House and Senate Committees, the U. S. Department of Energy, the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and any of the involved agencies, as well as the Governor, to recognize the issue is important for the state of Washington.

Ms. Kirner cautioned that radiation-related illnesses will probably not show up in a cancer registry. She considered starting the registry now was too late to

determine if there was an effect of Hanford. Ms. Kirner said it was not too late to determine any other cancer-causing agent, which at this time is unknown, or possibly suspected. She thought it would be valuable for the public health of the state to have a cancer registry.

Mr. Bishop said the Advisory Council considered this Resolution at its morning meeting, and Mr. Reed, Council member, offered some comments. He said the Environmental Monitoring Committee has considered this issue over a period of months. They reached the conclusion that a registry is necessary. He said the major benefit would be an opportunity to identify in the future any incidence of cancer which might be related to exposure to radiation. He said it would never be known if allegations being made that cancers some people have are derived by exposure to past releases from Hanford, because there was no registry in place. Mr. Reed added a registry does not offer a means of treating cancers, nor offer answer to questions as to the cause. It will provide a data base which can be utilized in making epidemiological studies to ascertain the factors which are associated with cancer. He added that the Hutchinson Cancer Registry covers fourteen counties, all on the West side of the mountains. Mr. Reed said the state has an obligation to know what happens in the future as a result of activities taking place at Hanford, and a cancer registry would allow study of part of that.

Mr. Reed said the $300,000 a year, which is requested in the legislation, will provide service similar to the Hutchinson Center under their direction, covering the rest of the state. It will incorporate into the process those registry operations which are being conducted out of some hospitals.

Senator Stratton inquired if the Federal funding amount for the Hutchinson Center were known. Mr. Stohr thought it was approximately $900,000 a year for the Western two-thirds of the states. Mr. Reed said the Federal program including Hutchinson is part of an effort conducted to get a sampling of states around the country. It is statistically designed to provide data from which conclusions about the country as a whole could be drawn. For this reason, he said, the present funding for Hutchinson will not disappear if state legislation is enacted to include the rest of the state.

Senator Benitz asked if the Blue Mountain Registry were still operating in Eastern Washington. Ms. Kirner said the Blue Mountain Registry for the Tri-Cities areas has been in operation since 1978. It was operating for the Walla Walla area prior to that. Mr. Reed said there are several on the East side of the mountains which are hospital oriented. They provide a service, which is not the same in every hospital, the major focus in most of them being an aid to assessing the value of the kind of treatment they provide to cases. In response to Senator Benitz, Mr. Reed said their records are different as they cover some things Hutchinson does not cover and they do not cover some things Hutchinson needs.

In response to Mr. Lasmanis' inquiry as to who would take the lead, Mr. Bishop commented that the Board, through the Environmental Monitoring Committee, had been very anxious to support the concept of the cancer registry, the issue to the Board is to endorse the concept, as the Bill is under consideration by the Legislature. Mr. Lasmanis inquired about the funding request, and asked if that were to be a new request, or if it would come out of the existing level of DSHS. Ms. Kirner said if it could have come out of the existing level of DSHS, the bill would probably have been submitted as a Departmental, Governor-request piece of legislation.

Representative Hankins commented that the idea was a good one, but her concern was that the Resolution could be written in a more direct manner. She thought listing of all the hospitals, the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center, the Hanford Health Effects Panel, etc. was extraneous. She thought a direct approach supporting a state-wide registry with a specific place

for it would be more beneficial on such an important item. Mr. Bishop said the Resolution was worded in that fashion to try to give recognition to those facilities. Representative Hankins said she realized this, but perhaps the word "Hanford" is used far too often.

Senator Stratton referred to Section 3 of the proposed legislation saying she thought the information requested would be information the hospitals would have on file. Considering the counties serviced by Deaconess Hospital in Spokane and the four counties in southeastern Washington presently reporting, she thought the requested amount of money to bring the registry all together was questionable. Ms. Kirner said the $300,000 that is estimated as the annual cost of the cancer registry is far less than what is currently being spent on federally-supported programs. She said most of the information on the federally-supported programs goes far beyond the meager amount of information called for in the legislation, and the need for the additional money was pared down appropriately. Ms. Kirner said it would be enough to establish a registry statewide, but will not provide enough money to do an epidemiological study. Mr. Bishop cautioned the staff to make this clear when it prepares the fiscal note for this legislation.

Mr. Reed commented that some cancers never appear at the hospital. Many of the skin cancers are diagnosed and treated in a doctor's office, as well as other types of cancers. These will be missed entirely, he said, if only the hospitals are included. He repeated that hospitals are primarily concerned with diagnosis and treatment of the malady. A concern of Hutchinson is the residence of that person, and how long, what kinds of exposures were there, and these concerns are not commonly acquired by hospitals which operate individual registries of their own. He said there is also the issue of the quality and accuracy of the diagnoses. He said that degree of comparability and accuracy is necessary if an epidemiological study were to be done, and some of these procedures directly relate to the cost involved.

Mr. Watson moved the Resolution. The Motion was seconded and carried unanimously. (Copy of Resolution 87-1 attached.)

<u>Transportation Committee</u>

Mr. Watson, Chair, reported the Committee met yesterday. It reviewed the legislation being prepared by the Senate Energy and Utilities Committee, two of which deal with transportation of nuclear wastes.

One would establish an interstate committee and is looking at simultaneous legislation being introduced in the states of Oregon and Idaho, with possible expansion to other states west of the Rockies. That legislation would establish model standards or procedures for information reporting by carriers on the type of material, probable routes and time schedule, compliance with Federal and state regulations, compliance with Federal and state liability insurance requirements, issuance of permits, record keeping, and carrier safety. Senator Williams, Chair of the Committee, says he had a large number of sponsors for this bill.

The second bill would establish a permit and fee requirement for all radioactive materials shipped by truck or rail, to be administered by the state radiation control agency.

Mr. Watson said the Committee took no action, nor is it making any recommendations regarding these bills.

Also reviewed at the meeting was a package of material on Federal transportation legislation considered during the 99th Congress. Representative Ron Wyden of Oregon will probably be reintroducing similar legislation during the 100th Congress. Generally, these pieces of legislation would reorganize some of the U. S. Department of Transportation functions, create a bureau of motor carrier safety and hazardous materials

transportation, establish a motor carrier tracking system, require licensing by only one state and provide grants to states for route designation and emergency response training. The Committee will review this legislation and will make recommendation to the Board at a later date.

Another items of discussion concerned the development of emergency response guidelines, a study being undertaken by the Department of Social and Health Services. The contract was signed with the Department in December and they are underway. the ultimate product will be to develop guidelines on spent fuel transportation incidents for inclusion in the state's emergency response plan, and it will serve as a benchmark for evaluating existing response capabilities.

The Committee has been looking at a study on casks for nuclear materials transportation. This study is to be done in conjunction with the state of Oregon, and is awaiting the naming of the staff person in Oregon. Another issue is the question of the transportation risk models which have been reviewed over the past year. The Committee will be working with the Socioeconomic committee to see where it fits in with both Committees' work in an effort to move forward fairly promptly with Washington State University.

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee will be at 1:30 p.m. on Friday, February 13, at St. Placid Priory.

## Richland USDOE Report

Jim Mecca of USDOE, Richland, observed that with the Site Characterization Plan about ready to be released, there would probably have to be a new kind of interface between USDOE and the state. Mr. Mecca stated the majority of Mr. Provost's observations were correct, and more interactions will have to be charted, although there has been no decision as to the look that might take.

In another observation, Mr. Meca said regarding the ESMP and the EMMP, USDOE did its best to relate to the state that these are generic enveloping documents. However, the heart of the program will be the very succinct projects that have to accompany the activities list. There is still much documentation to be put into place and USDOE recognizes that the state does have to have that documentation to review, as well as NRC's, along with USDOE's "study plans". To that end, including the large-scale hydrology tests, there is much documentation the state does not yet have that USDOE would expect to generate and deliver to the state. This would identify still further the additional test specifications and procedures to be used.

Mr. Mecca said he hoped, with the last quarterly meeting, and the opening up of all coordinating groups, there would be a different atmosphere. He advised that as the state receives the information USDOE sends in a preliminary manner, the level of detail be scrutinized and the content, as it may assist in rendering a better judgment as to manpower needs. It will necessitate a change in the grant scopes, he said. The SCP will be from six to ten thousand pages, along with its plans and requisite study plans, and will require a big effort. This document will dwarf the Environmental Assessment.

## Litigation Status

Narda Pierce, Assistant Attorney General, reported there are still a number of motions pending with the 9th Circuit that have not been decided. One reason for the delay is that new parties have petitioned to review USDOE's decisions, and with the deadline having been November 24, a number of those parties have joined in the motions Washington State has filed, or filed their own motions on procedures and discovery. Ms. Pierce said they understood the Department of Justice will be responding very soon to these motions.

Concerning the Tennessee-MRS case, with the 6th Circuit having overturned the Federal District Court, they have stayed their mandate for thirty days. This

means they have stayed the effect of their decision and thereby prevented the MRS Report going to Congress, to allow the state of Tennessee to ask the Supreme Court for review of that opinion. The Attorneys for Tennessee have contacted her, seeking support for some of their legal positions. The one that has implications for Washington State is the degree of deference that was given to the USDOE in their interpretation of the statute. The 6th Circuit gave a great deal of deference to the Agency, and Washington State's argument would be that this is an unusual statute that actually regulates USDOE. It is not a situation where it is an administrative agency regulating someone else, and the state feel this calls for less deference. Tennessee is interested in having this state's support on this position, should they receive a review from the Supreme Court. They are asking for the state's support in obtaining this review and this is being discussed with Attorney General Eikenberry and others. Before proceeding, Ms. Pierce said she would like the opportunity to discuss the issue with the Board.

In response to questions by Nancy Kirner, Ms. Pierce said the state of Tennessee has thirty days to seek review by the Supreme Court. She thought they intend to file their position in early February Ms. Pierce said the state had some interest in the way certain legal questions are resolved, because they may have implications for Washington State's case. The 6th Circuit Court of Appeals' opinion does not control in the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. Should the Supreme Court take up an issue of importance to the state, the state would want to address that and look at participation.

Mr. Provost added that one element developing, in addition to the MRS, is on-site dry storage. The research on that is moving well along, he said, and a lot of utilities are doing it, although it would not apply to all utilities.

## Federal Legislation

Terry Husseman reported for Charles Roe on the status of Federal legislation. He said the Swift-Morrison Bill introduced last year is being examined for probable re-introduction in the 100th Congress. A meeting was held yesterday with Mike Gillett, Legislative Assistant for Energy on Congressman Swift's staff. He advised they are working on this legislation and some version of this bill could be introduced later in the session.

The Price-Anderson legislation will also be a major issue this session because of the need, especially by USDOE contractors, for a re-authorization before the Act expires this summer. If the Act is not renewed, USDOE would not be able to indemnify its contractors.

Mr. Husseman said there is some transportation legislation under consideration, and there probably will be some bills introduced by the second-round states to eliminate the second round. More legislation in the nuclear waste area will undoubtedly appear as the session progresses, he said.

Mr. Bishop commented there may be some need for state legislation in this regard. Representative Nelson said Mike Gillett had mentioned the liability question to him and there might be a need to review the issue at the state level.

## Washington Institute for Public Policy

Max Power of the Institute announced the January issue of their Newsletter is in the mail. He introduced Dan Silver, who joined the staff of the Institute early in December. He will be a direct contact with Legislators during the Session to help channel the Institute's information and support to them. Mr. Power said he and Dan are arranging meetings with all four caucuses to brief them on nuclear waste issues.

Mr. Power said the Institute recognizes the volume of environmental and technical documents that are beginning to issue

from USDOE. He said their intent is not to duplicate the technical work of the Board, but it will identify within the state the University people on whom they can draw on a continuing basis as consultants to the Institute and to Legislators on the issues contained in those documents. He said he and Ellen Caywood plan to make the rounds of the state's Universities to talk with people identified. He asked the Board to advise the Institute if the members know of any persons in these institutions who should be included.

Mr. Power said he had attended the meeting in Richland on the EMMP, and congratulated Jim Mecca for recognizing the need for the whole operation at Hanford to become more sensitive to the cultural heritage of the Native peoples in the area, and is pushing hard to see that that happens. He said Mr. Mecca is moving out with a plan that is very impressive in conception, which is both timely and needed.

Mr. Power concluded by recounting a comment had been made by a tribal representative at the table that native peoples, in fact, were denied access to the Reservation to pursue hunting, fishing, and gathering and some of the activities that were granted to them under the treaties of 1855. A USDOE person (not Mr. Mecca) responded very summarily. Mr. Power said he wanted the Board to recognize that Jim Mecca is working very hard with the affected tribes, and getting some support from Richland to be much more sensitive on that issue.

Mr. Provost added there will soon be a Cultural Resources Report issued, and it will call for involving another state agency and another coordination effort with the tribes to work on the response.

## Public Comment

None.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

WASHINGTON STATE NUCLEAR WASTE BOARD

RESOLUTION 87-1

January 16, 1987

WHEREAS, cancer is not, at present, a reportable disease, nor is there a statewide cancer registry; and

WHEREAS, a cancer registry already exists in the thirteen northwestern counties covering two-thirds of the state's population, which is federally funded, and is operated by the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center; and

WHEREAS, the Deaconess, Holy Family, and Sacred Heart hospitals of Spokane, maintain cancer registries for individuals receiving diagnosis and care through their respective institutions, and the Blue Mountain Cancer Registry covers four counties in Southeastern Washington; and

WHEREAS, the Hanford Health Effects Panel, a group of nationally recognized scientists and physicians, following an evaluation of releases of radioactivity from Hanford, recommended a statewide health surveillance system; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Social and Health Services has reviewed various collection mechanisms available, and recommends that a cancer registry is at this time the appropriate data collection system; and

WHEREAS, the need for a cancer registry goes beyond health effects from radiation as many potential sources of cancer causation exist statewide;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Washington State Nuclear Waste Board supports legislation requiring cancer to be a reportable disease and the establishment of a statewide cancer registry, and recommends that sufficient funding be obtained to support this important public health activity.

The Nuclear Waste Board directs the Chair to transmit this Resolution to Governor Gardner and Chairs and members of the appropriate House and Senate Committees, U.S. Department of Energy, and the National Institutes of Health, and Centers for Disease Control.

Approved at Olympia this 16th day of January, 1987.

Warren A. Bishop

WARREN A. BISHOP, CHAIR
NUCLEAR WASTE BOARD

ANDREA BEATTY RINIKER
Director

STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY
*Mail Stop PV-11 • Olympia, Washington 98504-8711 • (206) 459-6000*

# MINUTES OF NUCLEAR WASTE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

**January 16, 1987**

**9:00 a.m.**
**EFSEC Hearings Room**
**Rowesix - Building #1**
**4224 Sixth Avenue S.E.**
**Lacey, Washington**

**Council Members Present:**

Warren A. Bishop, Chair
Pam Behring
Philip Bercano
Nancy Hovis
Valoria Loveland
Terry Novak
Sam Reed
Betty Shreve
Jim Worthington

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

## Minutes

It was moved, seconded, and carried that the minutes of the November 20, 1986 Informal Council discussion be approved. The minutes of the November 21, 1986 Council meeting were also moved, seconded and carried as published.

## Significant Recent Developments

### Advanced Notice of Proposed Rule Making

Mr. Husseman called upon Joe Stohr to discuss the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) draft Advanced Notice of Proposed Rule Making (ANPRM). This draft proposal changes the definition of high-level waste. Mr. Stohr informed the Council that NRC's proposal to redefine high-level waste, at present, has a three-out-of-five "affirmative" vote from the Commissioners and it appears that the draft ANPRM will be approved with only minor changes. He noted the draft ANPRM is currently before the Commissioners and is tentatively scheduled to be available for public review and comment by March 1, 1987.

In conjunction, Mr. Stohr reported the draft ANPRM is modeled after a study done by Dr. A.G. Croff, Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The study attempts to define high-level waste on the basis that two physical characteristics must be present: (1) activity content (high concentration of short half-life isotopes), and (2) the need for permanent isolation (long lived components, i.e. transuranics). If only one characteristic were present the definition of waste would not be considered high-level. Mr. Stohr also stated that the proposed re-definition would have a significant impact on the disposal future of defense wastes; tank wastes, transuranic and low-level wastes would all be potentially affected by the new ruling.

### C&C Agreement Negotiations

Governor Gardner's response to USDOE's request concerning Consultation & Cooperation (C&C) Agreement negotiations followed as the next topic of discussion. Mr. Husseman reported that Governor Gardner had transmitted a letter to Secretary Herrington, USDOE, announcing the state of Washington would not enter into negotiations at this time. The Governor's refusal to enter into C&C negotiations was due to status of the program and continuing litigation. Also included in the letter was a proposal for a conflict resolution process to restore credibility to the nuclear waste disposal program. At this date, no response from USDOE has come back to the Governor.

In reference to the C&C negotiations, Mr. Husseman stated the Nuclear Waste Policy Act directs USDOE to notify nominated states to commence C&C Agreements. If negotiation agreements are not completed within six months after notification, Section 117(c) directs USDOE to submit to Congress a written report on the status of negotiations and must include reasons why agreements have not been concluded. The Act also provides for the affected states and tribes to have an opportunity for review and comment on the report; these comments are to be included in USDOE's submission to Congress. Mr. Husseman noted that Governor Gardner has received a copy of USDOE's report and the Board, Council, and Office staff will be working with the Governor's Office to prepare a response.

Mr. Husseman reported the first Congressional hearing related to the repository program is scheduled for February 4-5, 1987. The Senate Energy Committee, Chaired by Bennett Johnston of Louisiana, has invited representatives of

the three affected tribes and governors of the three potential host states to attend. Governor Gardner plans to present the state's case and his proposal for a conflict resolution process to the Committee.

Sam Reed stated the Governor's proposed course of action for a national conflict resolution process was reviewed during the Alderbrook retreat held December 17-18, 1986. On December 19, a joint meeting of the Board and Council was also held in which the Board and Council took action to forward their concerns and recommendations of the proposal to Governor Gardner. Council discussion regarding intent of further action followed. It was agreed by the Council that a committee be appointed to interface with the Governor's Office to continue work on the Board and Council comments and recommendations for the proposed conflict resolution process. The committee is to consist of two representatives each from the Board and Advisory Council.

**Dose Reconstruction and Thyroid Morbidity Study**

Next, Mr. Husseman discussed the Hanford Historical Documents Review Committee and the proposed issue of a dose reconstruction and thyroid morbidity study. The HHDRC is focusing mainly on the dose reconstruction study at this point. He stated the study would be a multi-year, multi-million dollar project. At the Hanford Historical Documents Review Committee meeting of December 1986, USDOE indicated that a dose reconstruction study should be done. The remaining issues to be resolved are: (1) who will do the study, (2) where will funding come from, and (3) how are the states and tribes going to be involved. Mr. Husseman noted that these issues will be discussed during the January 23 HHDRC meeting.

Sam Reed voiced his concern regarding a dose reconstruction study. He commented that Hanford does not have the release information available for an accurate study, compared to Nevada; in addition, he felt the probability of useful information for a dose reconstruction and assessment health effects study would be very small. Mr. Reed stated that emphasis should be placed on the present and future; most critical of all is the establishment of proper monitoring and epidemiological studies that would show what happens from this point on. Another concern voiced by Mr. Reed was the need for the final Health Effects Panel Report. He felt the report was necessary in order to assess the priorities, feasibility and cost elements for successful results in the Health Effects Panel recommendations.

**States, Tribes, and USDOE Quarterly Meeting**

Mr. Husseman reported the next quarterly meeting among the states, tribes and USDOE will be held on February 12, 1987 in Spokane, Washington; the states and tribes will meet to discuss various issues the day prior to the quarterly meeting. Officials from USDOE Headquarters, project and staff officials from the three nominated states, staff officials from the three affected tribes, and officials from Mississippi, Utah, and Louisiana will be attending the February 12 meeting. He informed the Council that it will be the first meeting in which the public has been invited to attend and participate.

Jim Worthington suggested local governments be invited to attend the quarterly meetings among the states, tribes and USDOE. He reported that he had recently contacted Max Powell, USDOE, regarding this suggestion and it was very well received.

## Site Characterization Plan

The draft of Chapter 4 of the Site Characterization Plan (SCP) was briefly discussed. Mr. Husseman stated USDOE was not requesting comments of the draft at this point in time; it was for informational purposes only. He added that a technical contractor would assist in reviewing the SCP.

Mr. Husseman stated there has been an ongoing attempt to obtain a detailed list of current and planned activities at Hanford before the Site Characterization Plan is in final form and adopted. He noted that a letter from Secretary Herrington to Governor Gardner, regarding the requested information, was received by the Office during December 1986. Since that time the Office has received a computer printout of approximately 1,000 work packages related to the Hanford project. Approximately 50% of the 1,000 work packages have been stopped under the Stop Work Order; the remaining packages are exempt. Mr. Husseman commented that the printout received was a summary description and additional detailed information has been requested.

## Nuclear Waste Fund Disposal Fees

The U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, recently published their proposed formulas in calculating Nuclear Waste Fund Disposal Fees for USDOE's defense program waste. Mr. Husseman stated the publication can be found in the Federal Register, Vol. 51, No. 231. The public is invited to submit written comments, including suggestions for modifications (comment period ends March 2, 1987).

Next, Bill Brewer presented his report on fee allocation of defense waste costs. He referred to the Presidential decision to commingle defense high-level nuclear waste and civilian waste in a repository. In his report, Mr. Brewer stated that USDOE's announcement in the Federal Register lists three possible options considered by the U.S. Department of Energy for fee allocation of defense and civilian waste. Option 1 consists of a formula that depends partly on the area of the repository that is occupied by defense waste and partly on the piece count. Option 2 is an attempt to equate the amount of energy produced in a plutonium production reactor with the amount of energy produced in a commercial reactor. Option 3 attempts to construct a hypothetical cost model, i.e. calculating the cost for two repositories with the total cost saving being split in half. (See attached Newsletter Article.)

Mr. Brewer continued, reporting that the Defense Waste Committee met December 15 and reviewed USDOE's proposed formulas for calculating defense waste fees; the committee's findings support Option 1. In addition, the Defense Waste Committee drafted the following comments for submittal to the Nuclear Waste Board for consideration: (1) USDOE's published document of proposed formulas does not show the whole range of options considered, (2) USDOE should preserve flexibility of unit cost regarding disposal of canisters, (3) The formula does not deal with single-shell tank waste, and (4) the Notice of inquiry does not allow for transportation and socioeconomic impacts away from the reservation.

## Proposed Resolution 87-1

Mr. Bishop introduced Nancy Kirner, Board member and Chairperson of the Environmental Monitoring Committee (EMC). Ms. Kirner announced the EMC had proposed a resolution for the Board's approval. The resolution endorses the concept of a statewide cancer registry and supports legislation requiring cancer to be a reportable disease in the state of Washington. (See attachment, Draft Resolution 87-1.) She requested the Advisory

Council's comments and endorsement of the proposed resolution.

Ms. Kirner reported there is currently a tumor registry that is operated by the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center and is funded by federal sponsorship. The current registry covers 66% of the state's population but is only in Western Washington counties.

Sam Reed responded by stating a need for the proposed cancer registry and the ability to epidemiologically examine the occurrence and cause of various cancers. He noted that several registries do not deal with all the elements involved in cancer cases and do not provide a base from which epidemiological studies can be done. In addition, Mr. Reed commented, the hospital studies focus only on cancer treatment. The Hutchinson Cancer Research Center studies focus upon what initiated the cancer, i.e., where the cancer occurs and the frequency of occurrence.

Valoria Loveland asked if funding for the proposed statewide cancer registry was to be through the state of Washington. Ms. Kirner reported the bill does request funding through Washington State; if funds were not available, outside sources would be sought. She stated the bill, as written, requires an appropriation and would probably have to pass through the Ways and Means Committee. It was noted that Section 8 appropriates $600 million of state funds to DSHS for the 87-89 biennium. Further Council discussion followed.

Mr. Reed entered a motion that the Nuclear Waste Advisory Council recommend to the Board the adoption of Resolution 87-1. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

## Committee Reports

### Socioeconomic Committee

Phil Bereano reported the main activities of the Socioeconomic Committee have been focused on selecting a contractor for the Socioeconomic Impact Study. He stated the study would take several years and cost approximately $4 million. The RFP process for selecting a contractor resulted in seven proposals being submitted from which four finalists were interviewed. Mr. Bereano informed the Council that negotiations have not been concluded and, as of this date, a finalist has not been selected.

### Environmental Monitoring Committee

Sam Reed reported the Environmental Monitoring Committee did not meet during the month of January. However, he stated the EMC has been appointed by the Board to secure certain monitoring aspects of the Health Effects Panel recommendations. The Quality Assurance Committee, a regional committee of DSHS, has been assigned to help the Environmental Monitoring Committee. Mr. Reed informed the Council the Quality Assurance Committee will meet in Hood River, Oregon on March 3 or 4.

### Defense Waste Committee

It was noted that Bill Brewer reported on the Defense Waste Committee meeting in an earlier discussion regarding the allocation of defense waste costs.

### Transportation Committee

Allen Fiksdal reported the Transportation Committee had reviewed two proposed bills affecting Northwest nuclear waste transportation. Betty Shreve, who attended for Phyllis Clausen, stated there was concern in the possible change in route for the Trojan low-level waste and also the possibility for a third port of

entry for high-level waste. She noted the issue had not been discussed nor resolved at this time.

Ms. Shreve commented that Curtis Eschels had presented testimony to the House Energy Committee and requested a report from Mr. Eschels be presented to the Advisory Council.

Local Government Committee

Valoria Loveland reported the Local Government met January 15 for a final review of the Local Government Survey results. She stated the total number of respondents to the survey was 43 from the cities and 39 from the counties. The committee made recommendations to Office staff for a meeting among the Environmental Monitoring Committee, Transportation Committee, and Health Effects Panel. The purpose of this meeting would be to summarize each committee's activities for distribution to the local governments. In addition, other issues of concern within the survey will be distributed to proper committees for response. Ms. Loveland commented that discussion took place for a meeting among local government representatives from Texas and Nevada. She noted Bill Sebero, Chair of the Local Government Committee, was not present, therefore no further action was taken regarding this matter.

## Public Involvement

Joint Washington Council/ Oregon Committee Meeting

Marta Wilder reported a joint meeting of the Washington Advisory Council and the Oregon Hanford Advisory Committee has been scheduled for March 19, 1987 in Vancouver, Washington. Each group will meet separately from 1-4:30 p.m. at the First Presbyterian Church. A joint dinner has been scheduled from 5-6:30 p.m. at the Red Lion In at the Quay, followed by the joint Washington Council/Oregon Committee from 7-9:30 p.m. at the Clark County PUD Community Room. Ms. Wilder stated that Sandra Chan will be contacting the Council members regarding hotel arrangements and meal selection for the joint dinner. There will not be a March 20 Council meeting in Olympia due to the previous evening meeting in Vancouver. Council discussion of suggested briefing and agenda items for the joint meeting followed.

Public Involvement Update

Paul Korsmo, URS Corporation, reported on the status of current activities. A 30-second PSA, entitled "It Has To Go Somewhere", will be cut and distributed to television stations throughout the state in approximately three weeks. In addition, the audio track of the PSA will be re-cut for radio distribution.

He stated research and content identification of upcoming events are being reviewed in an attempt to focus upon the Issues Documentary. Currently, the issues of site characterization and the Site Characterization Plan seem to be the next major events. A content outline for a focus paper regarding the Site Characterization Plan, issues raised by the state of Washington, and the state's expectations for the Plan is currently being developed.

Mr. Korsmo reported that a school curriculum approach has been developed. This will consist of forming a group of people, with varied interests related to nuclear waste, to identify what information should be taught in the school system.

Triangle Associates has been developing the communications network and a report identifying people contacted regarding this issue will be available in the near future.

A conceptual poster of Hanford will consist of: (1) a map of the Hanford site, (2) a schematic drawing of the finished repository concept, (3) a drawing that shows the exploration concept, (4) supporting text, and (5) photographs. Mr. Korsmo stated the purpose of the poster is to identify ongoing activities at Hanford.

In conclusion, Mr. Korsmo reported that existing materials are being updated to depict the new graphic logo for high-level nuclear waste.

## Public Comment

Bruce Williams, Editor for "OVERSITE", commented that he had recently published an article regarding Governor Gardner's mediation proposal. Mr. Williams stated the article might be of interest to Council and Board members. In conclusion, Mr. Husseman thanked Mr. Williams for the information and noted the Office is currently on the newsletter mailing list.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

## NEWSLETTER ARTICLE:

## ALLOCATING DEFENSE WASTE COSTS IN A REPOSITORY

**Bill Brewer**

Last January the President announced his "commingling" decision - that defense high-level nuclear wastes (DHLW) would be placed in the civilian waste repository being developed under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. While the Act specifically provides for commingling, it does not spell out the formula for sharing the costs between civilian and defense wastes. The nuclear utilities who collect a consumer surcharge are concerned that there be no subsidizing of defense operations by their customers.

A recent USDOE announcement in the Federal Register outlines three possible ways to divide the costs. Public comments will be accepted until February 2, 1987. Two of the options depend on formulas which are hard to document, and will not be discussed here. The favored Option 1 is described as "full cost recovery using sharing formulas", and the formulas are detailed and specific, so that while it is still undecided how many repositories there will be, or where, each side can begin calculating its funding responsibilities.

There are three ways costs are divided among the seventeen major parts of a repository operation. First is "areal dispersion", which is simply the fraction of the total underground area for each waste type. This covers mining costs, for example, and divides the cost of shared or common facilities such as the shafts, surface facilities and utilities. DHLW canisters can be packed a little more closely than spent fuel canisters, but the spacings are comparable. The second formula applies to the Waste Handling Building and consists of the "share of canisters processed". Finally, there is "piece count", the actual number of canisters handled. This is reasonable, since there is virtually no difference in costs to emplace the two or more distinct canister designs; a round trip of the hoist and transporters is a fixed operating expense.

Is the problem solved? Perhaps, in the case of a hypothetical repository, where the geology is uniform and the DHLW requires only scaling up. But at Hanford there may be vertical space limitations, to the point that a significant capacity increase means higher unit costs. Another problem at Hanford is the possible presence of bounding faults, suggested by geophysical data, that could provide pathways for groundwater; if this is the case, a horizontally expanded underground area would encroach into the "accessible environment" as defined in EPA regulations. These geologic questions can only be addressed in underground exploration.

USDOE estimates that HLDW fees could total $2.5 to 3.5 billion, in 1985 dollars, for some 16,000 canisters. With such large amounts at stake, utilities and state utility regulators are highly sensitized to the issues of consumer equity, public participation and Congressional scrutiny. In September the Nuclear Waste Board passed a resolution supporting the position of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners. NARUC had urged USDOE to allow all affected parties to participate in the rulemaking process, to provide for interest on deferred payments and periodic financial reviews, to adhere strictly to the Act in deciding which DHLW goes to the repository and to ensure a strong oversight role for Congress.

DRAFT

WASHINGTON STATE NUCLEAR WASTE BOARD

DRAFT

RESOLUTION 87-1

January 16, 1987

WHEREAS, cancer is not, at present, a reportable disease, nor is there a statewide cancer registry; and

WHEREAS, a cancer registry already exists in the thirteen northwestern counties covering two-thirds of the state's population, which is federally funded, and is operated by the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center; and

WHEREAS, the Deaconess, Holy Family, and Sacred Heart hospitals of Spokane, maintain cancer registries for individuals receiving diagnosis and care through their respective institutions, and the Blue Mountain Cancer Registry covers four counties in Southeastern Washington; and

WHEREAS, the Hanford Health Effects Panel, a group of nationally recognized scientists and physicians, following an evaluation of releases of radioactivity from Hanford, recommended a statewide health surveillance system; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Social and Health Services has reviewed various collection mechanisms available, and recommends that a cancer registry is at this time the appropriate data collection system; and

WHEREAS, the need for a cancer registry goes beyond health effects from radiation as many potential sources of cancer causation exist statewide;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Washington State Nuclear Waste Board supports legislation requiring cancer to be a reportable disease and the establishment of a statewide cancer registry, and recommends that sufficient funding be obtained to support this important public health activity.

The Nuclear Waste Board directs the Chair to transmit this Resolution to Governor Gardner and Chairs and members of the appropriate House and Senate Committees, U.S. Department of Energy, and the National Institutes of Health, and Centers for Disease Control.

Approved at Olympia this _____ day of _____, 1987.

_____

WARREN A. BISHOP, CHAIR
NUCLEAR WASTE BOARD

ANDREA BEATTY RINIKER
Director

STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY
*Mail Stop PV-11 • Olympia, Washington 98504-8711 • (206) 459-6000*

# MINUTES OF NUCLEAR WASTE ADVISORY COUNCIL INFORMAL MEETING

**January 15, 1987**

**7:00 p.m.**
**Westwater Inn**
**2300 Evergreen Park Drive**
**Olympia, Washington**

**Council Members Present**

Warren A. Bishop, Chair
Pam Behring
Nancy Hovis
Valoria Loveland
Terry Novak
Sam Reed
Betty Shreve

## Public Service Announcements

Paul Korsmo of the URS Corporation described the draft public service announcement (PSA) which was shown to Council members. Council members then discussed the following: (1) narrative; (2) language, in terms of accuracy and connotative meaning; and (3) size of the lettering of the Office's address displayed at the conclusion of the PSA. Mr. Korsmo reiterated that the purpose of the public service announcement was to raise the level of public's awareness regarding nuclear waste management, not only the disposal of nuclear waste.

## Toll-Free Telephone Number

Mr. Korsmo stated that the toll-free telephone number may be used in the PSA if the arrangements for the number coincide with the release of the public service announcement. He also stated that someone suggested that the telephone number spell out "nuclear". However, after checking with the Federal Communications Commission, it was found that particular prefix is not available in Washington State.

After further discussion on the draft public service announcement, it was decided that the word "storage" would be changed to "disposal". Mr. Korsmo suggested the audio from the television PSA also be broadcast on radio. He then played the public service announcement audio several times to receive comments from Council members on his suggestion. Council members agreed that the same text could also be effectively aired on the radio.

## Public Involvement

Marta Wilder said that Alice Shorett of Triangle Associates and Mr. Korsmo had two other agenda items to discuss, and Betty Shreve also had a few topics for discussion. She announced that a VHS tape depicting the history of Hanford obtained by Office staff would be shown following the Council's meeting if members were interested in viewing it.

Sam Reed inquired about the URS Corporation, Triangle Associates and North Pacific Film and Tape's timeline for completion of task requests. Ms. Shreve followed up by asking about the Public Involvement Plan. Mr. Korsmo replied by saying that many projects are currently underway. He listed the on-going projects as follows: Office brochure, focus paper, fact sheets, site characterization, overview and defense waste slide shows, issues documentary, Hanford map, education plan, and establishment of a network system of contacts.

Mr. Reed stated his concern that the Public Involvement Plan was falling behind schedule. Terry Husseman responded, saying that the first contract included task requests for a graphic identity, revisions of the three slide shows and publication of a newsletter. He continued, stating that the second contract stipulated completion of approximately 14 projects.

Mr. Reed referred to the Institute for Public Policy's newsletter articles. He felt that the information was good and that it should be utilized by a larger audience, perhaps in the Office's newsletter. Mr. Husseman liked Mr. Reed's idea and stated that a course of action would be taken to find out if it would be possible.

## Education Plans

Mr. Korsmo reported that research has been conducted on national education plans on modules of nuclear waste. He