

CONVERSATION RECORD

TIME

DATE

February 2, 1983

TYPE	Distribution:		LPDR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TELEPHONE	ROUTING:			
	<input type="checkbox"/> VISIT	<input type="checkbox"/> CONFERENCE	<input type="checkbox"/> INCOMING	<input type="checkbox"/> OUTGOING		NAME/SYMBOL	INT		
Location of Visit/CHARACTER OF VISIT (e.g., to WM, 623 SS)						JMacDougall			
NAME OF PERSON(S) CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH YOU			ORGANIZATION (Office, dept., bureau, etc.)		TELEPHONE NO.		JSurmeier		
Mr. Brad Erlandson			Wash. State Task Force				JBunting		
SUBJECT Arrangements for Upcoming Visit of Task Force Chairman						HBMiller			
								MBell	
								RBrowning	
								GWKerr, SP	
								CFRussell	
						DLambert			

SUMMARY
On Wednesday, February 2, I called Mr. Brad Erlandson, staff for the Washington State Task Force on High-Level Radioactive Waste Management, to discuss arrangements for the upcoming visit of Task Force Chairman Mr. Nicholas Lewis, who had asked to meet with Mr. Hubert Miller next week. In the course of the conversation, in which I inquired about issues NRC should be prepared to discuss with Mr. Lewis, I learned the following:

1. A number of bills affecting the Task Force have been introduced during the current State legislative session, but Task Force staff apparently believes the problems of the individual sponsors can be addressed to their satisfaction without legislation. Erlandson said about nine of the bills were introduced by Senator Margaret Hurley, who is on the State Senate subcommittee on radioactive waste, and two were introduced by Senator Al Williams, who is on both the subcommittee and the Task Force. He said there has been some impatience among a small minority of legislators that the Task Force has not represented the State aggressively enough, but the Task Force is beginning to move to get a better understanding of the issues,

ACTION REQUIRED

NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION	SIGNATURE	DATE
Robert D. MacDougall	<i>Robert D. MacDougall</i>	2-7-83
ACTION TAKEN		
B3072B0083 B30207		
PDR WASTE		
WM-10	PDR	

SIGNATURE	TITLE	DATE
		00288

and the legislative concerns can be resolved informally.

2. The Task Force last week approved a small contract with Golder and Associates for an initial review of BWIP issues. The contract would probably be effective in about a week, with a final report sometime around the end of March, Erlandson said. Before the beginning of the review, Golder would probably meet with Task Force members to give them a preliminary impression of issues based on past work with NRC and others.

3. Mr. John Gervers, a contractor from Latir energy consultants, reported to the Task Force last week on a long range Task Force work plan, Erlandson said, adding that the Task Force seemed very impressed with his work. Gervers worked for New Mexico State government in the siting process for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), and also served on the State Planning Council for Radioactive Waste Management.

4. Task Force staff, including Mr. Lewis, are still giving serious consideration to negotiating a formal agreement with NRC for State participation in NRC reviews under the auspices of Subpart C, regardless of the arrangement the State concludes with DOE under the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act. Erlandson said enactment of this law giving DOE a primary role in State and tribal cooperation had not noticeably changed the State's plans for working with NRC.

5. The Task Force has not reviewed the issues presented below, but they have been presented to Task Force staff as concerns of the members representing the State Departments of Ecology and Natural Resources, and Erlandson felt sure these concerns would be endorsed by the Task Force. Erlandson reviewed them with me very briefly, but indicated that they might be mentioned when Mr. Lewis visits with Mr. Miller.

a. Differences between hydrologic models of the area underlying the BWIP site -- Erlandson specifically cited Battelle, Rockwell, and NRC models, noted that a State group has been working with USGS to sort out the implications of the differences.

b. Assessment of radionuclide migration -- Erlandson said there is concern about enhanced plutonium solubility in fluoride-rich groundwater. State geologists believe that leaching from borosilicate glass containers in this fluoride-rich environment could contribute appreciably to Pu migration.

c. Vertical communication of groundwater systems -- DOE/Rockwell statements about the lack of mixing of groundwaters in the overlying hydrostratigraphy have not convinced State officials, Erlandson said.

d. Suitability of the Umtanum Flow -- State officials want more information to follow up on questions about the thickness of the flow.

e. Hydraulic convection -- the State DNR has concerns that the temperature gradient from the repository might draw nearby groundwaters to the heat source and return them by convection to or near the surface, Erlandson said. He added that DNR officials have said they've seen such convection systems in nature -- apparently in geothermal systems -- and worry that emplacement of a man-made heat source in the fractured basalts could have the same effect.

f. Borehole sealing -- several old boreholes penetrate to or near the candidate horizons near the limits of the site, Erlandson explained, and State environmental officials want to know more about how DOE proposes to seal them.

g. Instrumentation -- there have been questions about the reliability of the instruments that will be used to measure changes induced in the host rock by heat and radiolysis.

h. Boiling upon saturation -- some questions have also been asked about whether ambient conditions in the repository would permit groundwater saturating emplaced wastes to boil, and if so, what the implications of this possibility are for repository design, operation, and decommissioning.