

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

October 16, 1987

1:30 p.m.

**EFSEC Hearings Room
Lacey, Washington**

AGENDA

- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 1. Introductory Remarks | Warren Bishop |
| 2. Approval of September 18, 1987 Minutes | |
| 3. Correspondence/Recent Developments | Terry Husseman |
| 4. Report on National Conference of State Legislators (NCSL)
Working Group: European Waste Management Tour | Legislative Members |
| 5. GAO Report--Information on Growth in
Site Characterization Cost Estimates | Max Power
John Ridgway |
| 6. Discussion of Proposed Amendments to
Hazardous Materials Transportation Act | Pat Tangora |
| 7. Upcoming State Legislative Events | Legislative Members |
| 8. Legislative Status | |
| 9. Litigation Status | Narda Pierce |
| 10. Richland USDOE Report | Max Powell |
| 11. Committee Reports | Committee Chairs |
| 12. Washington Institute for Public Policy | Dan Silver |
| 13. Other Business | |
| 14. Public Comment | |
| 15. 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.

8712030394 871016
PDR WASTE PDR
WM-10

PDR-1
LPDR WM-10(2)

WM DOCKET CONTROL
CENTER

'87 OCT 13 P1:44

WM Record File
101.3

WM Project 10

Docket No. _____

PDR

x LPDR: (B)

Distribution:

ESB MJB McConnell
TJB Tana Wattler
(Return to WM, 623-SS) Kumihira

To: McConnell Kumihira



STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY

Mail Stop PV-11 • Olympia, Washington 98540-7111 • (206) 459-6670

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

PRESS NOTICE

August 12, 1987

SUBJECTS Nuclear Waste Board and Nuclear Waste Advisory Council Joint
Informational Meeting
AND August 20, 1987 - 1:30 p.m.

DATES: Nuclear Waste Advisory Council Regular Meeting
August 21, 1987 - 9 a.m.

Nuclear Waste Board and Nuclear Waste Advisory Council Joint Meeting
August 21, 1987 - 1:30 p.m.

Nuclear Waste Board Regular Meeting
August 21, 1987 - 3 p.m.

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

Key congressional staff members will brief the state's Nuclear Waste Board and Nuclear Waste Advisory Council on the progress of bills that would change the process by which Hanford was selected as one of three candidate sites for the nation's first high level nuclear waste repository. Congressional action on the matter is expected after Congress returns from its August recess. The staff members work for Senators, Representatives and Committees that will play a significant role.

The congressional staff presentation will begin at 1:30 p.m. on Friday, August 21.

The previous day, August 20, U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) representatives will present plans for hydrology testing at the Hanford repository site. These tests for groundwater movement must be completed before a shaft several feet in diameter is drilled 3200 feet into the basalt rock where the repository may be located. Drilling such a

large shaft will disrupt the groundwater system and make it impossible to predict long-term patterns.

The USDOE spokespeople will also discuss the status of the 10,000-page site characterization plan for Hanford, scheduled for release late this year. This meeting will begin at 1:30 p.m., Thursday, August 20, in the EFSEC Hearings Room, Rowsix, Lacey.

The Nuclear Waste Advisory Council will meet at 9 a.m. on August 21 to discuss the series of town meetings and the status of other public involvement projects.

Contact the Office of Nuclear Waste Management for more information.

#

ANDREA BEATTY RINKER
Director



STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY

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

**MINUTES OF JOINT NUCLEAR WASTE BOARD/ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING
July 17, 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
Dr. William Funk, Water Research Center
Representative Shirley Hankins
Representative Dick Nelson
Senator Irving Newhouse
Senator Lois J. Stratton
Richard Watson, State Energy Office
Senator Al Williams**

Board Designees/Alternate Designees Present:

**Ray Lasmanis, DNR Designee
Roger Stanley, Department of Ecology Designee
Terry Strong, DSHS Alternate Designee**

Council Members Present:

**Pam Behring
Phyllis Clausen
Nancy Hovis
Russell Jim
Sam Reed
Jim Worthington**

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

Introductory Remarks

Mr. Bishop announced the July 17 meeting would be a joint session between the Nuclear Waste Board/Advisory Council to discuss recent developments and view a presentation given to the National Academy of Sciences. The regular, monthly Board meeting would follow.

Approval of Minutes

A motion for the approval of the June 19, 1987 Nuclear Waste Board minutes was entertained. The motion was moved, seconded, and carried. The minutes were approved as written.

Correspondence/Recent Developments

Previous action taken by the Board on June 19 had resulted in the adoption of Resolutions 87-5 and 87-6. Copies of the final drafts and their respective cover letters were contained in the notebooks as correspondence. A Minority Report signed by four legislative members of the Nuclear Waste Board had also been included with Resolution 87-6. It was reiterated that Resolution 87-5 called for USDOE to extend the public review and comment period on its draft Site Characterization Plan (SCP) from the proposed 90 day plan to at least six months. Resolution 87-6 had urged Congress to establish a forum and a process to review the high-level nuclear waste repository program in an effort to find a solution to the nation's nuclear waste disposal problem.

In regard to the USDOE Mission Plan Amendment, a memo from Max Power, dated July 6, 1987, to the Nuclear Waste Board stated that USDOE had transmitted its final version of the draft

amendment to Congress on June 9. Although the submittal contained a few modifications in detail, the major points remained. The final version included comments received from Washington, other states, tribes, and interested parties. The memo concluded that the U.S. Department of Energy was most responsive in its amendment process to state comments that dealt with consultation and cooperation with the states and affected tribes; the Department was less responsive to the issues that dealt with scheduling, site selection and technical approach.

Senate Bill 405 was the next item of correspondence. The bill, enacted by the state of Oregon, dealt with the federal selection process for a high-level nuclear waste repository. It had been legislatively referred to the voters of Oregon and had passed through both houses of the Legislative Assembly without a dissenting vote on May 19, 1987. Its purpose directed Oregon state officials and agencies to continue activities to challenge the site selection process for high-level nuclear waste repositories and seek status that would allow the state of Oregon a greater role in the site selection process of a high-level radioactive waste repository.

The annual Western Governor's Association meeting was held on July 7, 1987. During the meeting, Governor Gardner proposed a course of action that would best lead to a solution of the nuclear waste disposal problem. The Governor's proposal was adopted by the western governors in the form of a resolution that was supportive of the Nuclear Waste Policy Commission Act, H.R. 2888. (See attached Western Governors' Association Resolution 87-013) In a letter to Congressmen Swift and Udall, dated July 17, 1987, Governor Gardner expressed his appreciation to the Congressmen for their continued

support and leadership on the issue of nuclear waste disposal and enclosed a copy of the recently adopted resolution.

National Academy of Sciences Presentation

The National Academy of Sciences recently invited the three nominated states and affected tribes to make presentations to the Board on Radioactive Waste Management. The presentations were to be in observance of each respective state/tribe's specific technical concerns on site characterization. It was noted that the states of Texas and Nevada were unable to attend the July 14 presentation. The state of Washington's presentation focused on three issues determined to be the most critical elements of the site characterization program at Hanford. They were (1) natural resource potential; (2) geotechnology; and (3) site contamination.

The Board and Council members proceeded to view the slide presentations that had been given before the National Academy of Sciences. The first presentation dealt with geotechnology. It contained the six local geotechnical issues at Hanford. These issues were directly related to disqualifiers and identified as:

- Groundwater travel time
- Methane - resources
- Mining conditions - cost
- Mine safety - environment
- Waste package definition
10CFR60
- Retrievability

A slide presentation on site contamination followed. It contained information from a recent report issued by the U.S. Department of Energy. The report identified the environmental problems and areas of environmental risk of the controlled area study zone. The 200 East Area contains 101 waste sites that were investigated by the USDOE as superfund sites; continuing studies are being performed on 26 sites. The 200 West Area contains 87 liquid waste sites that are under consideration as superfund sites; 27 of those sites are continuing to be studied.

There are currently 28 liquid discharges within the 200 Area and a summary of the findings is as follows:

- Of the 95 cribs in the 200 Area, 16 were active in 1985;
- Of the 16 ponds in the 200 Area, only 2 remained active at the end of 1985;
- Of the 18 ditches in the separation area, 7 were active in 1985;
- Of 37 French drains and reverse wells (pipes or rock-filled encasements inserted into the ground) in the separation areas, 6 french drains were active in 1985; and
- 7 Solid waste disposal sites were active in 1985.

In closure of its presentation to the National Academy of Sciences the state of Washington concluded:

- On May 28, 1986, USDOE ignored the results of its ranking methodology and selected Hanford for characterization even though it had been determined to be the least

safe and most expensive of all the sites under consideration;

- Information obtained and analysis performed since the May 28th decision had further confirmed the technical concerns at Hanford;
- The cumulative effect of the serious technical concerns should have eliminated the Hanford site from further consideration;
- USDOE's flawed implementation had destroyed the credibility of the site selection process;
- If the site selection process is to be successful, it must be halted, restructured and restarted, with involvement by nationally respected scientific groups such as the National Association of Sciences; and
- The state of Washington urged the NAS to support a site characterization process which would require early identification and investigation of potential fatal flaws.

Board and Council discussion ensued the slide presentation. Representative Shirley Hankins inquired if the 87 liquid waste sites contained in the 200 West Area were calculated to be high-level radioactive waste sites. Don Provost replied they were considered as superfund sites that contained both radionuclide and chemical contamination.

Representative Dick Nelson commented that an early part of the site characterization process should focus on the expenditures necessary for clean up around the Hanford area. He asked if specific costs had been estimated for the most critical soil column discharge

remedies. Roger Stanley responded that monies had already been appropriated for the two or three concentrated cribs located at the N-Reactor, however he was not certain of the amount. The current focus was on remedial activities that would take place at the historic disposal sites; this would be followed by assessments, prioritization and actual implementation of alternative technologies for the operating facilities.

Ray Lasmanis asked if injection wells had been used to dispose of water wastes. Mr. Provost said that to the best of his knowledge most were in the unconfined aquifers.

Terry Strong inquired to the question of Iodine-129 having been found in the confined aquifer. Based on titles of reports received, (and those that had not yet been received), Mr. Provost said there were indications that Iodine-129 had reached the confined aquifers on and off the Hanford reservation. He noted that an earlier presentation on Iodine-129 had been given during the April 1987 Board meeting. During that presentation, a request had been made for copies of all documents used in the compilation and study of the Iodine-129 issue. To date, approximately 150 known documents have not been received. Based on information obtained thus far, it was considered appropriate and accurate to maintain that Iodine-129 had indeed reached the confined aquifers.

The Yakima Indian Nation, in its presentation to the National Academy of Sciences, also alluded to the technological studies that had been performed. However, the Yakimas went one step further by addressing the cultural issues in relation to the natural resources. On behalf of the Yakima Indian Nation, Russell Jim stated appreciation to the state of Washington for its specific

remarks to the NAS regarding the many treaty issues not brought up in numerous studies already performed. He reiterated the treaty of 1855 and the rights of the Yakima Indian Nation in the Hanford area.

In conclusion of the joint Board and Council meeting, a request for a future presentation with respect to the technical concerns by the states of Texas, Nevada, and Tennessee on site characterization was made. There being no further business, the joint meeting was adjourned and a recess of the Board was called.

BREAK

The Board resumed and the meeting was called to order.

Mr. Bishop introduced Roger Stanley as a new designee to the Nuclear Waste Board. Mr. Stanley was to represent Andrea Beatty Riniker, Department of Ecology.

Payments Equal to Taxes (PETT)

The U.S. Department of Energy recently released its draft language for a guideline in administration of the PETT provision of the NWPA. As a result, a major hindrance stems from the language contained in the NWPA: *"The Secretary shall grant to each state and unit of general local government in which a site for a repository is approved under Section 112(c) the recommendation of three sites an amount each fiscal year equal to the amount such state and unit of general local government respectively would receive were they authorized to tax site characterization activities at such site as such state and unit of general local government tax the other real property and industrial activities occurring within such state and unit of general local government."*

The language "at such site" had been embodied in the House version of the bill as it went through Congress in 1982; neither the Interior Committee nor the Energy Committee called attention to the particular phrase. At the same time, however, they had commented on certain other items contained in the paragraph as being restrictive in a certain way. A reasonable interpretation of the phrase was believed to be that the state and local jurisdictions would tax activities related to characterization of that particular site, as opposed to generic activities.

USDOE's draft language defines the repository as the area encompassed by a zone that extends 5 kilometers from the outer boundary of the underground facility. In addition USDOE's language states: the only industrial activities subject to payments equal to taxes are those that happen within the boundaries of that site, i.e., the 5 kilometer radius; the short term monitoring outside the controlled area, i.e., wells drilled for either hydrologic or geologic testing purposes or activities directly related to repository testing are not subject to payments equal to taxes; and the liability to the tax begins only when the actual activity starts within the site. The U.S. Department of Energy's proposed guideline rule will apply both to the potential host states and also the state of Tennessee should the MRS facility be authorized. It is anticipated that USDOE's draft language for its proposed guideline will be subject to considerable discussion and debate in the near future.

Commissioner Ray Isaacson, Benton County, commented that there were problems with the current state laws. One such problem was the legislation passed by Congress which referred to equivalent property taxes of industrial companies. He stressed the need for

changes in the legislation and state laws in support of the PETT issue regarding property and real tax categories.

Developments in Congress

On July 16, 1987, a hearing on nuclear waste bills had been before the United States Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The bills before the Committee embodied a wide range of ideas that would change the direction of the nuclear waste program laid out in the 1982 Act. They were as follows:

- Senator Hatfield's bill: S. 1007 (would allow for as many as 9 additional states to participate in the siting of a nuclear waste repository)
- Senator Hecht's bills: S. 1141, S. 1211 and S. 1428 (S. 1141 would restructure the nuclear waste program to rely on long-term storage of spent fuel for 50 years or more, prior to disposal in a geologic repository; S. 1211 and S. 1428 would direct the Department of Energy to do further study of the benefits of reprocessing spent fuel prior to disposal and further study of the concept of subseabed disposal)
- Senator Evan's bill: S. 1266 (would establish a system of regional monitored retrievable storage facilities and defer the search for a permanent geologic repository)

Furthermore, the Committee received testimony presented by the Department of Energy, affected states/tribes, and public witnesses with respect to the pending legislation to amend the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act. Testimonies were presented by Terry Husseman, on behalf of Governor Gardner and Representative Dick Nelson, on behalf

of the Washington State Legislature; statements were presented on behalf of Ben Rusche, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (OCRWM) and Governor Ned McWherter, state of Tennessee.

In summarization of Governor Gardner's testimony, support had been conveyed in regard to the four bills being considered by the Committee. However, it was the state's opinion that a piecemeal approach to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA) would not be productive. Given a proper forum, sufficient time, and good faith participation among representatives of the various interests, a consensus could be reached and also restore confidence that the goals of the NWPA could be achieved.

The Governor's testimony also contained comments on several of the proposals contained in the four bills:

- Restructuring the Repository Site Selection Process: The proposed restructuring process, as contained in S. 1266, calls for a restart of the site selection process, a nationwide search for a suitable site, eliminates unachievable statutory deadlines, and a study of the need for a second repository. The state of Washington supported this general approach.
- Study of the Feasibility of Reprocessing Spent Nuclear Fuel: Washington State considered this issue to be a national issue and had not taken a position on this question. However, it would not oppose a feasibility study on this issue which could be done contemporaneously with the review of the site selection process.

- **Research on Alternatives to Deep Geologic Burial:** The state supported the national policy of investigating the technical feasibility of deep geologic burial. It also supported the restoration of funding for research into the feasibility of subseabed disposal as a potential backup to deep geologic burial.
- **Participation By Adjoining States:** The state of Washington supported full participation by the state of Oregon in the site selection process, so long as the Hanford site is under consideration. Additionally, the issue of participation by adjoining states should be considered as part of the nuclear waste program consensus-building process.
- **Economic Incentives for Potential Host State and Local Government:** The state of Washington supported the concept that economic incentives should be provided to state and local governments in which potential sites have been selected for site characterization. Once the search has been narrowed pursuant to a credible, scientifically-based process, fair and adequate economic incentives should begin.
- **Solution to Nuclear Utilities' Short-Term Spent Fuel Storage Problem:** The state of Washington recommended that if Congress elected to adopt the moratorium approach, the Commission should be instructed to compare and evaluate the relative merits and shortcomings of the several proposed spent fuel storage options. The Commission should also recommend to Congress the methodology that will best solve the nuclear utilities' short-term spent

fuel storage problem. It is crucial that Congress reach a consensus of the preferred course of action and establish the preferred course as national policy.

Testimony presented on behalf of the Washington State Legislature dealt primarily with the issue of monitored retrievable storage (MRS). It reflected that Washington State was willing to do its part in the storage and disposal of high-level wastes, as long as decisions were based on the best scientific and technical analysis available. It also supported the state Nuclear Waste Board's position that a moratorium approach was the correct approach to take regarding the repository program. The legislature believed it necessary that Congress, together with the states, affected Indian tribes, and the federal executive branch use the next eighteen months to reexamine the pros and cons of deep geologic disposal, regional monitored retrievable storage, and at-reactor storage to gain public trust for the nation's nuclear waste policy. In addition, there was the need to free the program of its political overtones and create a program administration that would be responsive to state and tribal concerns.

In terms of a regional MRS, the legislature had previously written to the Washington State congressional delegation urging them to support a study of a regional system -- including a possible MRS on the Hanford Reservation. It was noted that an advantage of having a regional MRS system would be that it could promote an expeditious cleanup of the defense wastes already at the Hanford Reservation. (A precondition of the state's participation in a national MRS program would be cleanup of these wastes.)

Next, Senator Max Benitz stated his view of the recent Committee hearing. The main issue of the hearing was whether the 1982 NWPA would be reopened. Senator Bennett Johnston's testimony stated that his preferred course of action would be to stick with the process laid out in the original Act and there was no technical reason to halt the program at this point in time. Senator Johnston felt that it would be a mistake for the Act to be repealed as it would send the program back to where it was in the mid-1970's, thus wasting the work, time and financial support that had already gone into the program. Senator Benitz stated that he felt it would be appropriate for the Nuclear Waste Board to consider returning to C&C Agreements in the near future.

Major Proposals in Congress

There are approximately 30 bills before Congress that deal with the nuclear waste program. Mr. Husseman briefly described each major bill that had recently been introduced. It was noted that Charles Roe, Legal Staff, was working on a memo that would summarize each approach taken. A synopsis of the proposals would be made available upon completion.

Historical Documents/Health Effects Study

An agreement between the HHDRRC and USDOE to perform a joint dose reconstruction study and additional health effect studies has been met. The agreement encompassed three points:

- The Hanford Historical Documents Review Committee and the U.S. Department of Energy will enter into a joint dose reconstruction project;

- Concurrent with the dose reconstruction study, the Hanford Historical Documents Review Committee will initiate a feasibility review of health studies; and
- Studies recommended as a result of the feasibility review and which both the Hanford Historical Documents Review Committee and U.S. Department of Energy believe are reasonable will be funded.

Workplans have been developed for the feasibility review of health studies and the dose reconstruction effort. In reference to the dose reconstruction study, the formation of a Technical Steering Panel (TSP) will be the first priority. The (TSP) will consist of an independent group of outside experts to oversee the entire dose reconstruction study. (The USDOE and HHDRRC will have input into the study through the Technical Steering Panel and their staff.) In regard to the feasibility review of health studies, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and our state/tribal resources will proceed to develop a sequence that would allow for the best use of monies. A monthly progress report concerning these issues will be presented to the Board.

Litigation Status

USDOE recently filed a brief in response to the state of Washington's opening brief on the second repository suspension. Washington's reply brief was due July 16 and filed on behalf of all twelve parties in the case. The Secretary of Energy, the twenty intervening utilities, and the eastern states made no attempt to argue for the legality of the Secretary of Interior's second-round suspension decision. The Secretary responded with a declaration that he would begin site activities again on September 30. The state of

Washington responded by saying the Secretary had admitted to the illegality of his actions, however, he had asked the Court to tolerate this in order to satisfy his own agenda. The state of Washington has asked the Court to enter an immediate declaration that the Secretary's action is illegal, without oral argument, and proceed to decision of the case.

Committee Reports

Transportation Committee: The committee met on June 23 with the U.S. Department of Energy, Oregon Department of Energy and Indian tribes. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss transuranic waste shipments (TRU) from Hanford to New Mexico. USDOE representatives presented a slide show which examined the composition of TRU waste, the Joint Integration Office (JIO) and the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP); a videotape on testing of the initial transportation container design, TRUPACT-1 was also shown. The starting date has been estimated for October 1988, with shipments of contact-handled wastes to be approximately 146 per year. Up to 105 remote-handled TRU waste shipments will leave Hanford per year beginning in 1999.

The issues of importance discussed at the meeting included:

- Specific state/local emergency and inspection proposals;
- Procedures for notifying Washington of shipments (since Hanford is a point of origin, satellite tracking may not be appropriate);
- Route/risk analysis; and

- State-input on USDOE's specifications for carriers.

The states will develop specific proposals on the above mentioned items and present them at future meetings.

The next scheduled meeting of the Transportation Committee will be July 31 in Olympia, WA.

Environmental Monitoring Committee: The committee met on July 10. A briefing was held on the review of the USDOE Richland's environmental monitoring program associated with the Department of Social and Health Services.

The EMC had previously been requested to review the Hanford Health Effects Panel recommendations #20 and #24 (coordination and monitoring of environmental monitoring programs). The EMC turned the assignment over to a task force already formed by DSHS, the Quality Assurance Task Force. The task force has concluded that all environmental monitoring programs should be evaluated. A simple matrix will be developed to reflect criteria of the evaluations in the environmental monitoring programs.

Funds from the surveillance fee revenue have been generated to support 1 additional position for the activities of the Office of Radiation Protection. The priority for the additional position will be for a full-time, on-site inspector. It was noted that the Advisory Council had formerly prepared a recommendation on the loss of statewide radiological monitoring that had been adopted by the Board. The recommendation directed the Chair to inform the Governor and the Secretary of the Department of Social and Health Services of the immediate need for the resolution of the funding issue. To

date, a response had not been received. The legislative members were requested to inform the four legislative caucuses of the low-level radioactive waste surveillance and environmental monitoring issue. It was suggested that the Institute for Public Policy convene a meeting of the legislative members to further explore possible solutions to this problem.

Defense Waste Committee: The committee did not meet during the month of June or July.

Hanford Historical Documents Review Committee: Curtis Eschels was introduced as the newly appointed member and Chairman of the HHDR. The committee's latest meeting had resulted in a compromise on the final language for a dose reconstruction study and related health studies between the HHDR and USDOE. A letter of agreement had been transmitted to Michael Lawrence, U.S. Department of Energy, for signature.

Socioeconomic Committee: A meeting of the committee has been scheduled for July 21 in Seattle. During that meeting, a summary of the working draft research design will be presented by John Petterson of Impact Assessment, Inc.. Don Taylor will also lead a discussion of potential state and local responses to the PETT guidelines issued by USDOE.

A request for funding of the Mid-Columbia Consortium had been signed recently. USDOE, however, has not approved a request for funding of the Mid-Columbia Consortium to give direct assistance to the county assessors in determining the applicability of taxes. There have been delays in USDOE's approval of contracts for the peer review panel and document review panel for the Socioeconomic Impact

Study: To prevent any major disruptions in the study efforts, the Office will issue a conditional task order for several remaining tasks in Phase I due to anticipation of funding approval.

Other Business

Nancy Hovis, Chair of the newly appointed Advisory Council Proposal Review Committee reported the primary function of the committee was to review unsolicited proposals made by non-profit groups or individuals. All proposals or ideas will be submitted to the Office of Nuclear Waste Management; the designated Office staff person will review the proposals in order to ensure they meet the guidelines created by the committee. After the initial Office screening process the proposals will be distributed to the Proposal Review Committee and the committee would complete its review of proposals within one month after receiving them (under most circumstances). The committee will then determine which proposals merit further consideration and recommend these proposals in its report to the full Advisory Council for review. The final step of the process will be the Advisory Council's recommendation of the proposals to the Board for its consideration.

Public Comment

None.

Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Western Governors' Association
Resolution 87-013

Adopted: July 7, 1987
Snowbird, Utah

SPONSOR: Governor Gardner
SUBJECT: High-Level Nuclear Waste Repository

A. BACKGROUND

1. The repository site selection process as intended by Congress in enacting the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 is on the verge of collapse (reference WGA Resolutions 85-003 & 86-014).
2. There is widespread agreement that a solution must be found to the nation's high-level nuclear defense waste and commercial reactor spent fuel disposal problem.
3. There is widespread agreement that serious consideration must be given to implementing a mid-course correction to the repository program.
4. Several proposed courses of action have been offered in good faith to answer the question of "where do we go from here", but there is no consensus as to the preferred course of action.

B. GOVERNORS' POLICY STATEMENT

1. The western governors urge Congress to establish a forum and process designed to make a fresh search for the course of action which will now best lead to a solution of the nation's nuclear waste disposal problem.
2. The governors propose the following guidelines for consideration by Congress in establishing the national forum and process:
 - The problem-solving forum and the process should allow for meaningful participation by all of the major interests, including: federal agencies, Indian tribes, states, local governments, environmental groups, nuclear utilities, utility regulators, and public interest groups;
 - The forum and process should be directed by a panel or commission composed of nationally known and respected policy-makers;
 - The panel or commission should be required to submit a report to Congress by January 1989, with

a recommendation as to the preferred course of action that will 1) lead to a timely solution of the nuclear utilities' short-term spent fuel storage problem, 2) define the elements of an equitable site selection process that will provide confidence that the search will be for the best, scientifically appropriate high-level nuclear waste repository site, and 3) ensure that selection decisions will be based on credible scientific evidence;

- In seeking the preferred course of action to solve the nuclear utilities' short-term problem, the panel or commission should compare and evaluate the relative merits and shortcomings of 1) U.S. DOE's monitored retrievable storage proposal, 2) a nationwide system of regional monitored retrievable storage facilities, 3) at-reactor dry cask storage, and 4) transportation to the preferred sites.
- The panel or commission should recommend methods to provide ample funding to ensure the timely cleanup and permanent, safe disposal of defense wastes which have accumulated during the past forty years at DOE sites throughout the West.

3. The governors urge Congress to bring repository site-specific activities to a halt while preserving information now being gathered until a consensus is reached in answer to the question "where do we go from here".

C. GOVERNORS' MANAGEMENT DIRECTIVE

1. The staff of the Western Governors' Association is directed to transmit this resolution to the President of the United States, the United States Secretary of Energy, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, and the western congressional delegation.

ANDREA BEATTY RINKER
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
JULY 17, 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
PHILIP BEREANO
PAM BEHRING
PHYLLIS CLAUSEN
NANCY HOVIS
RUSSELL JIM
DR. ESTELLA B. LEOPOLD
SAM REED
ROBERT ROSE
JIM WORTHINGTON

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

A motion for the adoption of the June 19, 1987 Advisory Council minutes was entertained. The motion was moved and seconded. Phyllis Clausen noted that page 4, paragraph 4 of the Council minutes should have read: "Taking Nuclear Issues to the Village Square." The motion for adoption was carried and the minutes were approved as corrected.

TOWN MEETING REPORT

Marta Wilder reported on the recent town meetings held on June 30 and July 1 in Aberdeen and Longview, respectively. Sam Reed hosted the meeting in Aberdeen and Phyllis Clausen hosted the Longview meeting. The comment forms and articles from the meetings were distributed to the Council members.

Sandra Chan reported that 16 people attended the Aberdeen meeting, which Sam Reed moderated. A presentation was made to the Kiwanis Club, which included 20 people. Representatives from a local paper and two local radio stations covered the meeting. Phyllis Clausen moderated the Longview meeting, where 32 people attended. There was representation by the local newspaper and a local cable television station taped the meeting. A copy of the videotape has been requested for the Public Reference Library.

Sam Reed felt that people needed encouragement to pick up the materials. It was suggested that all materials be put in folders and distributed as people enter the facility. Different points about the slide show and its effectiveness were brought forward. Although there were favorable reports, it was felt that it is a continual process to improve the slide shows.

Additional meetings are scheduled for Bellingham on August 5 and Port Angeles on August 6. Brian Martin of Hall & Associates noted that there will be news interviews prior to the meeting in Bellingham on August 5. Sam Reed will be moderating the Bellingham meeting. Warren Bishop will be moderating the meeting in Port Angeles on August 6. In addition to the town meeting, a noon presentation will be made to the Lions Club in Port Angeles.

Additional Town Meetings

Ms. Wilder proposed that two additional town meetings be held during September and October. She suggested that no meetings be scheduled November through February. After several suggestions, Walla Walla and Toppenish were chosen for the meetings in September, and Pullman was scheduled for October.

Office of Radiation Protection Budget

Terry Strong, Chief of the Office of Radiation Protection, reviewed DSHS' funding situation. He said it appears that DSHS may be able to provide funding for an on site inspector for the low level site. If more resources become available, funding for radon and general environmental monitoring will be restored. At this point there is no new source of funding on the horizon.

Dr. Estella Leopold asked Council members if something could be done to assist with this matter. The following suggestions were brought forward:

1. The Council acknowledges that no action has been taken to resolve the matter and that the Chair should again bring this situation to the Board's attention, urging that a solution be found and advising that

the same persons contacted previously be contacted again.

2. Keep the issue in the forefront, with the public, media, and those who are in positions to resolve it.
3. Address a statement to the Secretary of the Department of Social and Health Services, and the legislative leaders, stating that the Council has noted that no significant action has taken place to resolve the issue and request again that a resolution to the problem be found.

It was moved and seconded that because of lack of any positive action on DSHS' environmental monitoring program budget that the Chair review the current situation and take steps to bring the situation to the attention of the Board. The motion was approved.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Environmental Monitoring Committee:

Mr. Reed reported that the DSHS Quality Assurance Task Force has been asked to assist the committee with implementing one of the two recommendations of the Hanford Health Effects Panel. The recommendation, Number 24, calls for an independent assessment of Radiological Monitoring Programs in Washington and Oregon. The Quality Assurance Task Force has developed guidelines for assessment. The Quality Assurance Task Force is also developing options to define the scope of this assessment.

Proposal Review Committee: Nancy Hovis reported that the proposed guidelines for unsolicited proposals has been finalized. Council members discussed the need for periodic review of the contractors' projects. The committee discussed and reviewed proposals received by the Board's Socioeconomic Committee. The

symposium with the League of Women Voters has been postponed, and no new proposals were received. Ms. Hovis said that the Committee would meet as necessary when new proposals are received.

Historical Documents Review Committee:

Joe Stohr stated that a new chair, Curt Eschels, was elected at the last meeting. Mr. Stohr said that dose reconstruction effort and thyroid morbidity review are the two top committee priorities. After negotiating with the U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) these three points were agreed upon:

1. A joint dose reconstruction study would be controlled by an independent technical steering panel comprised of members nominated by the public, the committee, and USDOE.
2. An analysis will be conducted on the feasibility of various types of health studies.
3. Based on the analysis, a study type will be chosen and the details negotiated with USDOE.

Mr. Reed suggested that the Council bring before the Board a proposal to communicate to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) that their commitment would be welcomed to design prospective studies to track possible health effects associated with Hanford operations.

A joint consensus was reached by the Council that a recommendation be made to the Hanford Historical Documents Review Committee (HHDRC) to investigate current epidemiology studies.

Transportation Committee: Phyllis Clausen reported that transuranic waste shipments from Hanford to New Mexico were the topic for the committee meeting between

the states, tribes, and USDOE. A two way satellite tracking system for trucks to be in operation by 1988 was also discussed. Carrier specifications will be out for bid this fall and states were encouraged to provide some recommendations. USDOE has agreed to have the Nuclear Regulatory Commission independently certify casks for shipping spent fuel and high level waste. Under existing law the USDOE can certify its own casks.

A scoping session was requested by the representative from Oregon regarding the process and decision making methods of transportation route selection.

Socioeconomic Committee: Jim Worthington reported that the committee will be meeting Tuesday, July 21.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Approximately 30 calls were received on the toll-free line since the last Council meeting. The calls have been divided almost equally between Eastern and Western Washington. About one-third of the calls were from the Tri-Cities area. People have asked for general information, the newsletter, and the Site Characterization Focus Paper.

Several television and radio stations have been contacted regarding the broadcast of the public service announcement. In addition, a press release along with the new Hanford poster have been distributed to the media.

Status of Public Involvement Projects

Paul Korsmo of the URS Corporation reported on the status of the various public involvement projects. He said two revised fact sheets and the focus paper on site characterization are in camera ready form. Two other fact sheets are being reviewed by staff and should be ready soon.

The network participant notebook has been completed and is being given to the network participants. Some orientations have been held and the remainder will be completed by next month. In addition, the network notebook will go to the political liaisons. Participation statewide totals around 80-85 people. Several groups have been contacted and three of those groups have agreed to participate in the network.

Mr. Reed asked what measures there are to ascertain the degree of activity of the network members. Mr. Korsmo stated that the principal feed-back mechanism is a monthly report form in the notebook which the participants are asked to outline their activities. Philip Bereano suggested that a list be provided to Council members of the participants for further discussion.

Terry Husseman stated the importance of communicating with the participants to keep them in the system. Mr. Korsmo reported that there will be a quarterly letter, regular newsletter, and other correspondence sent out regularly. Network members will also be able to request multiple copies of information to distribute in their communities. It was also suggested that the Network members be asked to attend the Council meetings.

Mr. Korsmo reported on the school curriculum project. Over the next few weeks a wide variety of potential participants for a workshop will be contacted. At the end of the workshop an outline will be made of what the scope of the curriculum should be. The next phase will be to work on a methodology and actual teaching materials with actual teachers.

Tom Putnam of North Pacific Film and Tape reported on the status of the second public service announcement (PSA). He said the PSA should be completed in mid-August. He also reported on the issues

documentary. It will involve technical issues of site characterization, with the idea that it will anticipate the publishing of the site characterization plan. The first composite print of this documentary will be available December 1. In early 1988 it should be available to the public.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Marie Harris of Bacon & Hunt noted that because of the change in agenda format it was nice to be able to receive a status report on public involvement projects. Ms. Harris stated that she hopes the state makes it clear that the problem regarding the lack of funding is not with the low-level waste site fees but with the state general fund. The fees generated by the low-level waste site are sufficient to cover an adequate monitoring of the Hanford site and its radiation activities.

Ms. Harris also suggested contacting the Washington Waste Site Study Group, Heal Hanford Education Action League, and the American Nuclear Society for the network participant system.

There being no further comment, the meeting recessed to reconvene with the Board at 1:30 p.m.