

101.3

LPDR  
WM-10 (R)

ANDREA BEATTY RINIKER  
Director

WM DOCKET CONTROL  
CENTER



STATE OF WASHINGTON

'87 MAR 23 11:01 AM  
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY

Mail Stop PV-11 • Olympia, Washington 98504-8711 • (206) 459-6000

**MINUTES OF NUCLEAR WASTE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING**

**February 20, 1987**

**9:00 a.m.**

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

**Council Members Present:**

- Warren A. Bishop, Chair
- Philip Bereano
- Phyllis Clausen
- Nancy Hovis
- Valoria Loveland
- Sam Reed
- Robert Rose
- Jim Worthington

B706030050 B70220  
PDR WASTE  
WM-10 PDR

WM Record File  
101.3

WM Project 10  
Docket No. \_\_\_\_\_  
PDR   
XPDR  (B)

Distribution:

REB	MEB	Fana	Still
JOB	RDM	Jwinnhan	
(Return to WM, 623-SS)		Jyoung	Sac

87050034 H

2488

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

### Minutes

It was moved, seconded and carried that the minutes of the January 15, 1987 Informal Council meeting be approved. The minutes of the January 16, 1987 regular Council meeting also were moved, seconded and carried as published.

### Significant Recent Developments

#### Senate Energy Committee Hearings

Terry Husseman reported on the first day of the U.S. Senate Energy Committee Hearings. Secretary of Energy, John Herrington presented the status of the repository program and responded to questions. Also, at that time he delivered the draft amended Mission Plan which was the primary focus of the hearing. The impression received by committee members, the audience and reporters was that Secretary Herrington presented the amended Mission Plan with the intention of indefinitely postponing the second round site selection process until the mid-1990's. He stated that unless the U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) is told otherwise by Congress, this plan will take effect. Mr. Husseman observed, based on the comments and questions by committee members, that it was unanimous that they disagreed with the Secretary. Committee members clearly stated that the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA) does not give discretion to USDOE to stop the second round process. Instead, NWPA requires the second round process to be on-going and the law cannot be amended with an amendment to the Mission Plan. On February 4th there was an opportunity for the affected states and tribes to present testimony to the committee. The committee requested affected states and tribes to focus on any problems in the first round selection process. Mr. Husseman referred to the Governor's tes-

timony, given by Curt Eschels, in the Council's notebook. Former Governor Sawyer of Nevada, Steve Frishman of the Texas Nuclear Waste Project Office and representatives of the Yakima, Umatilla and Nez Perce tribes also presented testimony.

Mr. Husseman continued, reporting that prior to the affected states' and tribes' testimony, Senator McClure had stated it was expected of the first round states to raise many issues, which the Senator considered part of the process. Following testimony by the first round states and tribes, Senator McClure released a written statement indicating his concern and reservations about USDOE's first and second round site selection processes. Another interesting development at the hearings, Mr. Husseman reported, was that Senator Johnston, Chairman of the Committee, summarized "Nuclear Imperatives and Public Trust: Dealing with Radioactive Waste" a proposal on the repository issue by Luther Carter.

In this proposal, Mr. Carter analyzed past events and described problems in the selection process. A course of action was also suggested to characterize the one, best site and if it is found not to be the suitable, then to characterize another. Mr. Carter recommended the Yucca Mountain site in Nevada be characterized first. Mr. Husseman said that Senator Johnston reviewed the entire article at the hearing and asked Grant Sawyer, former Governor of Nevada, if the state would consider such a proposal in exchange for the economic benefits associated with the repository. Mr. Sawyer indicated that Nevada would not be interested.

On the third day of hearings, Ben Rusche, director of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, briefed to the Committee members on nuclear waste for approximately one hour. After the briefing, Senator Dan

Evans questioned Mr. Rusche about Governor Gardner's conflict resolution proposal. Mr. Rusche indicated he did not believe USDOE could allow a decision regarding the program process to be made by a third party. Senator Evans then stated that the intervening third party would not be responsible for making decisions; all would be involved in a non-binding conflict resolution process. Mr. Rusche replied that it would be unrealistic for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Environmental Protection Agency to participate. He stated that USDOE will reject the Governor's offer.

#### Amended Mission Plan

Mr. Husseman stated that in the week following the Senate hearings, Secretary Herrington testified to Congressman Morris Udall's House committee. Regarding the second round site selection process, the Secretary once again presented the amended Mission Plan, although USDOE's position had changed since the Senate hearings. Currently USDOE's stance is that an amended Mission Plan has been developed and the department believes it is best to indefinitely postpone the second round. However, unless Congress "affirmatively acts" the Energy department will resume the second round process, possibly as early as summer 1987.

Mr. Husseman speculated that from USDOE's perspective, an affirmative act by Congress could mean an amendment of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, or language in the appropriation that USDOE will be receiving at the conclusion of the Congressional session. In effect, USDOE is now acknowledging the fact that since the May 28th decision to postpone siting of the second round, they have been in violation of NWPA. With the amendment to the Mission Plan, they are trying to get Congress to change the Act.

#### National Association of Quality Assurance Professionals

The second annual meeting of the National Association of Quality Assurance Professionals was held in Las Vegas, Nevada. Primary on the energy committee's agenda was the repository program, Mr. Husseman reported. The attendees consisted of quality assurance people from the nuclear industry and from various utilities. Representatives from the affected first round states and tribes were invited to participate in a panel discussion and make presentations. Mr. Husseman stated it was a good opportunity to inform representatives from the nuclear industry of problems which have occurred in the repository siting process, and the state and tribal delegates were well received. Cassette tapes of the meetings will be available upon request.

Commissioner James Asselstine of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission stated his concerns regarding the repository process: 1) USDOE may not submit a quality application; 2) there may be a failure to resolve differences among federal agencies with overlapping responsibility regarding preliminary determination of suitability; 3) possible divisions among the scientific community; and 4) emergence of strong opposition of host states, tribes and the public. Mr. Husseman supported the Commissioner's opinion that the process is in disarray and the chance for ultimate success is in serious jeopardy. Commissioner Asselstine recommended that the site selection process begin anew, siting guidelines be reopened, ranking methodology be reviewed; and that both the siting guidelines and the methodology be adopted in a rule making process concurred in by NRC and reviewed by Congress. Other recommendations included: eliminate of the second round, lift the seventy thousand ton cap on waste to be stored in the first repository, suspend all work on the first round and

conduct a nationwide search, identify sites nationwide to be characterized, develop a specific financial incentive package for the final site, reexamine the schedule and consider a new agency to implement the program and remove USDOE from the process. Mr. Husseman stated that the reaction of the audience after listening to the Commissioner's recommendations was surprise and realization of problems in the siting process from someone other than first round states.

#### American Association for the Advancement of Science

Phil Bereano referred to three documents, distributed to Council members, regarding the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) meeting in Chicago. He stated that Stephen Kale acted as representative of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Management. Council member, Russell Jim and Board member, Representative Shirley Hankins, both on the AAAS agenda, unfortunately were unable to attend. Mr. Bereano gave very brief summaries of the presentations at the meeting and stated that copies will be given to the Office's public reference center. He also said he would try to obtain a audiotape of the session.

He stated the question of funding for five non-state participants arose at the session. Apparently, it was found that the U.S. Committee for Energy Awareness, represented by Marie Harris of Bacon & Hunt, had lobbied against funding for the non-state participants, according to Mr. Bereano. He said that it was unknown to him at the time that the group had taken such action. Ms. Harris replied, saying that her group made an inquiry to Mr. Bishop and Mr. Husseman if the Nuclear Waste Board and/or Nuclear Waste Advisory Council had given approval to fund the AAAS session. The answer was negative. At that point Ms. Harris reported it appeared as if Mr.

Bereano was independently pursuing other options, which was acceptable to the study group. However, she stated, if money was granted from the general Washington State Nuclear Waste Fund grant, her group holds the position that funds of this sort should be spent on public involvement in Washington. She stated that the reason the U.S. Committee for Energy Awareness is involved in the program is to oversee Board and Council activities.

#### States/Tribes/USDOE Quarterly Meeting

Mr. Husseman reported that the state/tribe/USDOE quarterly meeting held in Spokane was the first opened to the public. The states and tribes had requested USDOE to make the meetings public, and since the meetings are sponsored by USDOE it was their responsibility to publicize the meeting. Office staff contacted the public relations personnel at USDOE and had been assured they would handle the publicity. However, after talking with a few reporters, it was found that no contact had been made on USDOE's part to inform the media of the meeting. Mr. Husseman stated no citizens attended the meeting, only reporters whom were contacted by the Office staff. This concern, the lack of publicity by USDOE, was raised at the meeting. It was stated by the states and tribes that it was a USDOE meeting and they were responsible for the publicity. USDOE did make a commitment to inform the media and the public about the next quarterly meeting, to be held in Las Vegas, Nevada.

At the quarterly meeting, one of the issues which took precedence was the amended Mission Plan. The meeting took place the day following Secretary Herrington's presentation before the Senate committee. States and tribes attempted to receive a clear indication of where USDOE stood regarding the plan. However, the USDOE representatives

stated only that Congress needs to take some "affirmative action." Mr. Husseman said that it is not known at this time what type of affirmative action will take place.

Mr. Husseman stated the second significant issue was the states' and tribes' grant requests. For the last few months, all the states and tribes, with the exception of Oregon, have been funded by month-to-month grant extensions. USDOE Headquarters states that they have not been able to review the grant requests. He indicated that this situation is no reflection on the Office's relationship with USDOE's Richland Operations Office and their personnel.

Mr. Husseman then referred to USDOE's fact sheet, "Management Changes in the Geologic Repository Program." He explained that, according to the fact sheet, USDOE is in the process of developing a Request For Proposal (RFP) in search of a central contractor who will be responsible for technical work on site characterization in the three states. The USDOE advertised on February 13, 1987 in the Commerce Business Daily their intention of releasing this RFP. He said the USDOE estimates one year to review the proposals and select the contractor, and an additional year to actually hire the contractor. Mr. Husseman said that the state had not, as yet, formally commented on this action although the state has said this would be a good time to get the repository program in order, and when the contract is signed, USDOE will be able to move forward. This will be a significant change in the program. He stated another possibility would be to move the Headquarters office from Washington D.C. to a central location.

Jim Worthington, in reference to the states/tribes/USDOE quarterly meeting, requested that Council members be sent notices and agendas prior to the meeting.

## Correspondence

Mr. Husseman referred to Congressman Morris Udall's statement, which was distributed to Council members. Congressman Udall is one of the key figures in the establishment of the repository siting program and has been making incremental steps towards totally supporting a restart of the first round. Mr. Husseman inferred that with the release of this statement, Congressman Udall is beginning to agree changes are needed in the program.

Another letter referred to was addressed to Secretary Herrington from Congressman Philip Sharp. In his letter, Congressman Sharp directed specific questions to the Secretary regarding the draft amendment to the Mission Plan. Mr. Husseman noted the Congressman's importance to the program as a new key figure, since he is now the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power. He stated the Office will be working closely with the Subcommittee and its staff.

## Final Draft of Hanford Health Effects Panel Recommendation Report

Sam Reed stated the final draft of the Hanford Health Effects Panel Recommendation Report was brought before the Environmental Monitoring Committee in late January. The committee is in the midst of reviewing it for possible submission of comments. He said the deadline for comments is February 28, 1987.

## Mission Plan Review

Mr. Husseman stated that copies of the draft amended Mission Plan had been sent to all Council members. April 2, 1987 is the deadline for submitting comments to USDOE regarding the plan. USDOE will review the comments received and prepare a final amended Mission Plan for Congress in July. He

said that Office staff presented many questions on various items in the plan to USDOE. He then stated the key elements of the plan as follows: 1) reiteration of position on indefinite postponing of the second round; 2) reiteration of position on Monitored Retrievable Storage; 3) extension of the schedule to begin operations of the first repository; and 4) increasing the size of the exploratory shaft.

Mr. Husseman said that a process should be arranged for the review of the plan by the Council. Mr. Bishop noted that a review committee for the original Mission Plan had been established, and he stated his desire to reactivate the committee to act as the focal point for developing comments by staff and recommendations to the Council and Board. The members of the Mission Plan Committee are as follows: Chairman Dick Watson, Senator Max Benitz, Representative Dick Nelson, Representative Louise Miller, Senator Al Williams, Curt Eschels and Robert Rose. Mr. Bishop reactivated the Mission Plan Committee with no objection from the Council. He then noted there was only one member of the Advisory Council on the committee and suggested an additional person be appointed. Jim Worthington endorsed Mr. Bishop's suggestion. Mr. Bishop took the occasion to appoint Mr. Worthington to the review committee. It was decided to devote the major portion of the regular Advisory Council meeting on March 19 to review of the draft amended Mission Plan. Mr. Bereano recommended that a letter, along with the other substantive materials, be sent to the absent members of the Council to alert them to review the plan prior to the meeting. Mr. Bishop accepted Mr. Bereano's recommendation and stated that staff would follow through with it. During the interim period, the Mission Plan Committee will review staff recommendations in anticipation of the March's Board and Council meetings.

## Committee Reports

### Socioeconomic Committee

Mr. Bishop called upon Mr. Bereano as the Council's appointee to report on the Board's Socioeconomic Committee.

Mr. Bereano suggested that an opportunity be given the Council to discuss the contract on social and economic impacts at Hanford, which is a four year study, and the selection process for choosing the contractor. Mr. Bishop agreed that it would be beneficial to Council as well as Board members, and could be a subject for a special joint Board/Council meeting in the near future. Mr. Bereano mentioned that the contractor is currently involved in negotiations with Office staff. A series of meetings is scheduled for next week. If the contract is approved by the state and USDOE, the work can begin in March. As yet, the contract has not been finalized.

### Transportation Committee

Phyllis Clausen reported that the Environmental Protection Agency requires that a state agency response organization be appointed by April 17, 1987. Also, by 1987 the nuclear waste transportation system is to be operative. A third item of interest, Ms. Clausen said, was that the Department of Transportation's policy on written pre-notification by USDOE on shipping spent fuel is expected to be issued in the near future. She continued, reporting that the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission recently published a report on 1985 heavy truck hazardous materials accidents, of which the committee received copies. The report will be available at the Office's public reference center. Finally, a federal bill entitled "Commercial Motor Vehicles Safety Act of 1986" provides for driver training and emergency response grants. This bill also calls for licensing of drivers in only one state, and sets registration and route records requirements.

### Environmental Monitoring Committee

Sam Reed reported that the Office of Radiation Protection within the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) has prepared and distributed a generic letter to all interested parties regarding the status of the Hanford Health Effects Panel studies. The letter was accompanied by a copy of the final draft of the preliminary recommendations. He stated that the letter will be supplemented as more information is available. Mr. Reed continued, reporting that the committee decided to prepare a summary of the health effects final report in laymen's terms. Also, the committee will develop a fact sheet specifically for the media.

Mr. Reed announced that the 1986 Annual Monitoring Report on the Basalt Waste Isolation Project (BWIP) is available. The annual report is authored by DSHS, pursuant to state statute, with funding from the U.S. Department of Energy. The report represents a comprehensive effort to review monitoring and establish baselines. Mr. Reed stated that conclusions in the report reveal that expansion of monitoring has been accomplished, and the results obtained through this effort and independently by BWIP are comparable. He said the independent monitoring contract has been extended through 1988.

Also, the committee committed to sending a copy of each report it receives to the Office's public reference center, to make it available for others to review. Therefore, periodically a list will be developed of new environmental monitoring publications in the reference center and distributed to Board and Council members. Committee members also committed to sponsor a meeting of all people who have an involvement or interest in monitoring, and to attempt to review the comprehensiveness of current monitoring procedures.

Next, Mr. Reed referred to the "Lost Waste Sites at Hanford (200 and 600 Areas)" paper prepared by staff at DSHS' Office of Radiation Protection. This study arose through an inquiry by Board member, Representative Dick Nelson. Mr. Reed reported that the term "lost" in this particular context should be defined as "the inability to locate certain low-level waste disposal sites by physical inspection of the area, such that monitoring and sample collection on the site surface are impaired, or that inadvertent excavation into waste is possible." He stated that it is known generally where the sites are, but specific boundaries are not accurately known. Mr. Reed referred to particular sections of DSHS' report to cite examples of his inferred definition of "lost" sites.

### Hanford Historical Documents Review Committee

Dr. Royston Filby, chair of the committee, discussed several significant issues: dose reconstruction at the Hanford site, prospective epidemiological studies on thyroid morbidity and a cancer mortality study. He stated that these studies are being proposed as pilot projects to USDOE for funding. Currently, the request for funding is being reviewed by USDOE.

Dose reconstruction is the aspect which the committee members believe to be the most important of any future activities. Many of the recommendations or actions on recommendations of the Health Effects Panel would hinge on the results of the dose reconstruction study. USDOE indicated, within the last six weeks, that they wish to proceed with the dose reconstruction study on their own. Committee members participated in a lengthy discussion on whether two studies were appropriate. Conclusions drawn from the discussion were: 1) dose reconstruction efforts would be time consuming, approximately two years, possibly three or four;

and 2) it would be a multi-million dollar project, based on knowledge of the Nevada Test Site's similar study. Therefore, two independent studies, one each by the state and USDOE, would most likely be unrealistic. For these reasons, Dr. Filby stated, committee members decided they would investigate with USDOE the possibility of a joint dose reconstruction study. The objectives are to satisfy the needs of USDOE in any current or future lawsuits involving the need for dose reconstruction data and, at the same time, to satisfy the states and tribes that the study is conducted in a credible scientific manner. It must also be credible to the scientific community and the public.

A subcommittee was formed consisting of Terry Husseman, Mary Lou Blazek and Jack Wittman of the Yakima Indian Nation. The subcommittee's responsibility is to negotiate with USDOE a suitable framework for scientific study that would preserve the credibility of the final product. Subcommittee members have met once with USDOE and Battelle Northwest Laboratories (PNL) representatives. A meeting is scheduled for February 23 for further discussion. Dr. Filby stated that discussions are progressing towards some type of joint dose reconstruction study. The full committee will meet in Portland, Oregon on February 27 to review the discussions between the subcommittee, USDOE and PNL, and take action at that time.

Dr. Filby said that there had been some concern expressed regarding the credibility of a joint state/tribe/USDOE study, rather than an independent state study, by the media and public interest groups such as the Hanford Education Action League. However, Dr. Filby reported, in general most of the concern has been restrained.

#### Defense Waste Committee

Mr. Bishop noted that the Defense Waste Committee did not convene in February.

#### Local Government Committee

Valoria Loveland, vice-chair of the Local Government Committee, reported that the committee did not meet in February. She stated the reason for this was that the major issue discussed at the January meeting was still in progress. The issue she referred to was responding to the local government survey. Ms. Loveland also relayed to the Council members that the two local government representatives on the Socioeconomic Committee will be travelling to Nevada to meet with their counterparts. She said, according to a letter from the Socioeconomic Committee, Richland City Manager Neil Shulman and Commissioner Ron Jones will meet with their counterparts during March 11-13. The assessors from Benton County have been invited to attend as well.

Ms. Loveland stated that after a discussion with chairman of the Local Government Committee, Bill Sebero, they felt the meeting should have been scheduled when a representative of the committee could attend. She relayed that Mr. Sebero felt that there needs to be a coalition between the Council, local government, Mid-Columbia Consortium of Governments and others with socioeconomic concerns. Initially it was Mr. Sebero's idea to meet with other states' local governments, she said, and he was disturbed about the situation. Ms. Loveland stated that the point is that he believes the communication between the Socioeconomic Committee and Advisory Council local government representatives should be open as to what events and actions take place between the two groups. Mr. Bishop suggested that it be discussed with the chair of the Socioeconomic Committee, Curt Eschels, and Office staff, Jerry Parker to develop an alternative.



## State Legislation

Linda Steinmann referred to her memorandum addressed to the Board and Council regarding the status and summary of high-level nuclear waste related legislation. She stated of the bills directly related to the Board and Council, there are four areas of focus: transportation, health effects, taxing of repository related activities, and litigation funding.

Senate Bill 5164 is a bill which would establish an interstate agreement among Pacific Northwest states to coordinate regulation of radioactive waste transportation. This bill has passed through the Senate. She stated an amendment on consultation with the affected tribes was included in SB 5164 on the floor of the Senate.

She reported that Senate Bill 5165 is a companion bill to SB 5164. SB 5165 would establish permits and fees for the transport of certain radioactive materials. This bill has passed the Senate Energy Committee. The final transportation related bill is actually two bills which are identical, SB 5222 and House Bill 385. It would require legislative approval before establishing new ports of entry for transporting radioactive wastes. SB 5222 has passed the Senate Energy Committee and HB 385 is currently in the House Energy Committee.

Health effects bills include House Bill 265, which directs DSHS to contract with a recognized entity to establish a statewide cancer registry, and provides \$600,000 for the biennium ending June 30, 1989.

The bill is currently in the House Health Care Committee. HB 265 in its present form is not ready for legislation. The House Health Care staff is in the process of revising the bill to fund a \$50,000 study. The study would address the issues of how the registry would be man-

aged, who would manage it, who would provide funding, and the question of confidentiality. The outcome will be recommendations to the legislators in 1988. Ms. Steinmann reported that it is not clear who would pay for the \$50,000 study, but in principle it is easier to bear than \$600,000.

Ms. Steinmann stated that repository-related activity taxation bill HB 357 would extend the 30 percent Business and Occupation Tax on low-level radioactive waste to low and high-level waste, and on to transportation, site characterization and other related repository activities. The bill is still in the House Energy Committee.

Senate Bill 5351, relating to litigation funding, is a supplemental appropriation for Fiscal Year 1987. This bill includes \$149,000 for litigation, in addition to funding for other state agencies.

She reported on three bills not included in the memorandum. These bills, HB988, 990 and 991, deal with compliance with environmental laws. The three bills were recently introduced by Representative Mike Todd and direct the Department of Ecology to use all possible means consistent with federal law to enforce state and federal environmental laws and standards where the N-reactor, site characterization and federal nuclear facilities are concerned. The bills are identical, except that each applies to one of the stated activities.

Several state reorganization bills are on the floor, which would impact the structure of the Board and Council, said Ms. Steinmann. First introduced in the Senate and House are HB409 and SB 5377, which would create a new Department of Public Health and Environment. It would be created by transferring public health functions from DSHS to the Department of Ecology. Ecology's name

would then be changed to the Department of Public Health and Environment. She added both bills have momentum and are supported by public health officials.

Another reorganization bill is HB 639 to create a Department of Nuclear Safety. The bill is scheduled for executive session on February 23 in the House Energy Committee. The Department of Nuclear Safety would consolidate DSHS' Office of Radiation Protection with Ecology's Office of Nuclear Waste Management along, with the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council, into one agency. Two options are being discussed. Option One would be for the Nuclear Waste Board to conduct a study of the state's emergency response to a nuclear disaster and file a report, within one year, to the Legislature. Option Two would be to formally designate an officer within the Governor's office to coordinate emergency response for this type of activity, but the staff would remain in their current respective agencies. House Bill 688 would divide DSHS into approximately six or seven sections.

Ms. Steinmann announced that copies of the bills are available through her, the Legislative Hotline or the Bill Room. She entertained several questions by the Council members regarding the Senate and House bills.

#### Washington/Oregon Joint Meeting

Mr. Bishop requested Mary Lou Blazek of the Oregon Department of Energy to come forward to discuss the draft agenda for the Washington/Oregon joint meeting in March at Vancouver. Phyllis Clausen referred to the memorandum from Sandra Chan to the Council members regarding the draft agenda for the joint meeting.

The Council members and Ms. Blazek conducted a thorough review of possible discussion items, provided many sugges-

tion, and stated particular issues of interest to individual members. Ms. Blazek stated she followed up on a request by Mr. Sebero to meet informally with local government people from the Oregon Hanford Advisory Committee during the joint dinner. She stated the Mayor of Astoria, Edith Henningsgard, and Executive Director of the League of Oregon Cities, Jane Cummins, have agreed to meet with the Local Government Committee members. Ms. Loveland stated with regret that Mr. Sebero and herself would not be able to attend the meetings in Vancouver due to other commitments. However, Nancy Hovis agreed to meet with the Oregon representatives on the committee's behalf.

Ms. Blazek requested that the joint meeting in Vancouver be co-chaired by Mr. Bishop and Arno Denecke, chair of the Oregon advisory committee.

#### Draft Resolution 87-2

Mr. Bishop referred to draft Resolution 87-2 which was distributed to Council members on February 19. He stated he wanted the Council members to inquire, comment or take action on the draft resolution if they so chose. Mr. Bishop informed the Council the draft resolution was a collaborative effort between the Department of Natural Resources and the Office of Nuclear Waste Management staffs. Land Commissioner, Brian Boyle is scheduled to discuss the resolution with the Board members.

The Council conducted a lengthy, comprehensive discussion regarding the language, meaning of recommendation and purpose of the Resolution. Mr. Reed, in the form of a motion, moved the Council endorse the concept of the Resolution and recommended to the Board adoption of Resolution 87-2. Mr. Reed's motion was seconded by Ms. Hovis and passed by a vote 4 to 2.

### Public Involvement

Paul Korsmo of URS Corporation reported that the 1987 Public Involvement Plan had been revised, based on Council members' comments.

A number for the toll-free telephone has been identified and the Office will proceed with the installation procedures. The draft proposal of the network system of contacts throughout Washington state is being reviewed by Office staff. Mr. Korsmo said that approximately 200 telephone calls were made to possible participants around the state, with about 80 affirmative responses by individuals who are willing to act as a network contacts. Phase Two of this project will be to facilitate interaction through the distribution of information and workshops.

An interim report on the school curriculum project has been submitted to Office staff. Office staff and URS are anticipating implementation within a few weeks of Phase Two: the development of a group of participants to assist in identifying content of the curriculum project.

Mr. Korsmo continued, reporting that the public service announcement (PSA) is completed, except for the final edit and holding for the toll-free telephone number. The PSA will also be cut for radio spots. The issues documentary pre-production word is progressing; a draft script is the next stage of production. The Site Characterization slide show is complete, and available at the Office.

URS Corporation representatives are expecting to meet with Office staff during the week of February 23 for a final review and approval. Two information brochures and the overview fact sheet have been revised and will be available shortly. A new fact sheet is being composed on the chronology of the ranking of the sites. Also, a new focus paper is being developed which deals with the Site Characterization Plan and key concerns of Washington state.

He stated work continues on the Hanford poster, now in the second stage of narration. This will be given to Office staff for review in March. The newsletter will be available at the March Council meeting.

Mr. Bereano voiced his concern that a sufficient amount of time is not allowed to review the public involvement and information activities at the regular Advisory Council meetings. He also said that the informal discussion meetings should not preclude the need to discuss public involvement and information items. Mr. Bishop agreed with Mr. Bereano that the informal meetings should not be a substitute and items should be brought forward during the regular Council meetings, on actions such as the approval of the 1987 Public Involvement Plan.

### Public Comment

None. The meeting was adjourned.