

Corrected
9-18-83

High Level Nuclear Waste
Policy and Review Board Meeting

WM DOCKET CONTROL
CENTER

August 12, 1983
1:30 p.m.
Hearings Room, Bldg. 4
Rowesix

'83 OCT 24 A11:34

Sue Gould opened the meeting and Ecology Director Don Moos announced the establishment of a special assistant position for nuclear waste. Don Moos has asked the Governor to appoint David Stevens to the position. David has been working in the program through the Governor's Office, has a good deal of experience, and is well known nationally and locally. Moos thanked Don Provost for the assistance he has provided in the interim and asked that he continue to assist him on the technical issues involved.

David Stevens covered Bill Bennett's presentation on USDOE program status. Bob Morgan is continuing as interim director of the program while a permanent head is being sought. The siting guidelines have been revised again. Schedules have been pushed back. It will be sometime next year before USDOE will be prepared to issue the EA's and nominate the five sites - three of which will be characterized. Bob Morgan has indicated again his support of strong state participation.

Cooperation and Consultation (C&C) Activities - David Stevens

The development of a formal C&C agreement between the state and the USDOE was initiated on July 1, 1983. The first meeting with USDOE was held on July 20. The meeting was devoted to "how we are going to proceed" and covered various aspects of procedures to be used in the negotiation process. Our negotiating team consists of

1. Fred Adair/Ted Hunter, House
2. Sue Gould, Chair, Bd & Advisory Council
3. Chuck Lean, Ecology
4. Nick Lewis, EFSEC
5. Don Provost, Ecology
6. Elaine Rose, Senate
7. David Stevens, Office of the Governor

The next meeting will be all day Tuesday, August 16, in Richland. The federal statute calls for completion of the agreement within six months of initiation of the process if all issues are resolved.

Senator Williams asked about agendas being made available before the negotiating sessions. Sue Gould replied that clear agendas will be made available. Presently, the negotiating members are deciding which items need to be discussed.

David Stevens told the committee that next Friday in Dallas, states would be meeting with USDOE, USEPA, and NRC on various aspects of the repository program.

WM Record File	WM Project
<u>101.3</u>	<u>10</u>
Docket No.	
	PDR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	LPDR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distribution: <u>REB</u>	<u>RM</u> <u>CR</u>
<u>MJB</u>	<u>DM</u>
<u>JDB</u>	<u>HM</u>
(Return to WM, 623-SS)	<u>Wkerr</u> <u>02</u>

8311080420 830916
PDR WASTE
WM-10
PDR

00573

Contract Review - Don Provost

1. Technical assistance contract with Golder & Associates.
2. Telephone survey contract with Communications Design for the public participation program.

No new contracts will be started until the new special assistant takes over the program.

Advisory Council Meeting Overview - Sue Gould

The September public participation program was discussed. Stu Elway of Communications Design will conduct a telephone survey of the state to find out what people know about the nuclear waste disposal program, what their perceptions are, and what they need to know so the council can plan the public participation program. USDOE agreed to hold off on their public information meetings until the council gets the information from the survey. The council has established a subcommittee to work with Stu Elway to develop a preliminary plan for the telephone survey. The survey will be a computerized random sampling from different parts of the state. First phase of the project should be finished by the end of September with the final analysis following.

Grant Application - Don Provost

Application is being made to USDOE in early September for a grant covering the next fiscal year. David Stevens, Dick Watson, and Don Provost met to outline what they thought would be necessary to handle the job. Attached is the draft organization chart.

It may be necessary to pay higher salaries to attract qualified candidates. The on-site coordination, technical coordination, governmental liaison staff would probably be hired in the near future. During the next six months, the hydrologist, radiation health physicist, physicist, and engineering geologist would probably be hired.

Al Williams asked if the positions had to be under the state personnel system. They could be "agency unique" classifications under the Personnel Board with higher salaries possible.

David Stevens interjected that we do not know if this will be a one-year program or a ten-year program, depending on the federal government's decisions on sites. We will be competing with USDOE and NRC for persons with the necessary qualifications to fill these projected positions. John Gervers pointed out NRC says the same thing. USDOE funds will be going to the states and states may pay more and take staff away from NRC.

Don Moos thought the positions should be appropriately compensated because of the fact that it is not known what is going to happen to the program. The positions may be temporary, and if not, the pay should be high enough to keep the staff if the program is ongoing.

Don Provost continued that staff needs for the rest of the year include administrative assistant - possibly a contract administrator, on-site coordinator, technical coordinator, continuing help from the other state agencies on geology radiation, environmental impact, hydrology, health, safety; contractual assistance for technical work, the public participation program, policy and management tasks, C&C negotiating team activities, and the high level nuclear waste reference room; legislative assistance on the C&C negotiating team and a science advisory committee.

The time frame for the budget request is 1) meet with USDOE mid August, 2) final submission after Labor Day, and 3) obtain grant by October 1.

The next discussion item concerned separate funding for the Legislature. Senator Williams discussed the issue of submitting a separate grant for legislative support staff to provide the Joint Legislative Committee on Science and Technology with technical data and program information. The Legislature will need more time to get a grant proposal drafted for submission.

Chairperson, Sue Gould, said the budget proposals could be submitted with a cover letter explaining the legislative grant application would be coming later. She stated her concerns that separate application for funding could appear that Washington State is divided on the issue. She also thought it was possible USDOE might use the division as a wedge in later negotiations.

Representative Rusf questioned if it were necessary for the Legislature to have a separate grant for staff and technical support with eight legislators already on the Board with access to the data and information collected by WDOE.

Don Moos pointed out that if the Legislature went for a separate budget and staff, there could be a great deal of unnecessary duplication in information collection. He stated the State of Washington has a mission and role in the determination, for centuries to come, of the permanent nuclear waste repository site. It is the state's responsibility to fulfill this mission in the most effective way possible.

Sue Gould thought it best to get a recommendation from the Dick Watson Committee to see what would ultimately be the best way to go on the budget issue.

John Gervers of Latir Energy Consultants, who works with the State Working Group, brought the Board up to date on the national situation. The siting guidelines should be finalized at the Dallas meetings next week. One of the major concerns of the State of Washington on the guidelines is the method of ranking the sites. David Stevens commented on this concern. A system should be devised in the guidelines whereby the environmental assessment can appropriately be used and would include the ranking process.

Fred Adair, who was representing Representative Dick Nelson, reported that Representative Nelson would be making recommendations in writing to the USDOE, Geologic Repository Division, that the guidelines explicitly

delineate the site selection process which would compare and select the sites going from the nine sites to five sites and then from the five sites to three sites. The Board is welcome to join him in this recommendation if it is the Board's position also.

A tour of BWIP is planned for August 17. Any member who has not already toured the site can make arrangements with Marta Wilder.

Dr. Estella Leopold made a presentation relating to the geology of the proposed site at Hanford. (The report is attached).

The report is a synthesis of criticism of the geology and hydrology of the Columbia River basin regarding use of the Hanford site as a nuclear waste repository.

Brian Baird of the UW Institute of Environmental Studies and Estella Leopold's report quotes from documents from USGS, NRC, and Golder. The report criticizes data and interpretation of data found in the USDOE/Rockwell SCR and draft EA. There is a discrepancy in findings regarding the water flow in the basin.

The USGS task force criticizes Rockwell's drilling of holes as not being conducted according to a professional hydrology study plan. USGS; NRC and Golder say the work resulting in the view of how the ground water moves was not performed in a professional hydrological way. There are major difference in interpretation of data concerning travel time of radioactive material.

The USGS task force is currently studying the problems and should have a report completed by mid September. A USGS representative will be invited to participate in the next council meeting.

Brian Baird - Institute of Environmental Studies, U of W.

Scientific authorities have raised serious questions about the SCR. There is a large conceptual difference - strong evidence to suggest that USDOE estimated travel time may not be an accurate interpretation of the data. USDOE and Rockwell believe the ground water is in a steady state. USGS disputes that, after work in the Columbia basin for decades. All the hydrological data may have to be replaced if the USDOE/Rockwell's conception is incorrect.