

WM DOCKET CONTROL
MINUTES OF NUCLEAR WASTE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

'86 JUL 25 AM 11:32

June 20, 1986

WM Record File

WM Project 10

9:30 a.m.

Docket No. _____

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

PDR

Distribution:

REB MSB
JOB AHak
(Return to WM, 623-SS)

Billhorn RDM
Lynch
Hildenbrand
D. Kunihiro, Reg. V

Council Members Present:

- Warren A. Bishop, Chair
- Pam Behring
- Philip Bercano
- Phyllis Clausen
- Nancy Hovis
- Dr. Estella B. Leopold
- Valoria Loveland
- Terry Novak
- Sam Reed
- Robert Rose
- Commissioner W. H. Sebero
- Betty Shreve
- Jim Worthington

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

On behalf of the entire Council, Mr. Bishop extended a hearty welcome to Commissioner Bill Sebero who had returned after an absence because of illness. Mr. Sebero thanked the Council for the warm welcome, and expressed his deep appreciation to all those who sent cards and notes while he was recuperating.

Mr. Bishop reported that last night the third of the series of public meetings sponsored by the state to hear comments on the Defense Waste DEIS was held in Spokane. The other two were held in the Tri-Cities and Yakima, with meetings in Vancouver and Seattle scheduled for next week. He acknowledged the assistance of the League of Women Voters at each of the meetings.

Betty Shreve said the League had sponsored a Forum in Ellensburg at which she and Nancy Hovis had participated. She stated it was the first meeting she was aware of that the U.S. Department of Energy had refused to attend. Ms. Shreve said she understood the Forum was prompted by a grass-roots organization which presented to the Council of Ellensburg a petition to declare Ellensburg a nuclear-free zone and consider sending a petition to shut down the N-Reactor. The Council felt they needed more information and thought the general public should have more information also, so they asked the League to set up the Forum. The USDOE response to the invitation was that it was too adversarial a group for them to appear. An invitation was then extended to Battelle and Rockwell, who checked with USDOE, she said, and were told they could not attend.

JAN 10 1985 MW

Gordon Rogers of Pasco stated as a private citizen and a member of the American Nuclear Society, Richland Section, he had received a call from the ANS Section Chairman on Tuesday afternoon, relayed to him by Tri-Cities Economic Development Committee (TriDec) indicating asking if the ANS could supply a speaker in light of the turn-down by USDOE. He said he tried to locate a speaker, but they also thought the panel composition identified to them included three people who were strongly anti-Hanford. He agreed it was unfortunate the USDOE was not able to participate, but the ANS indicated to the Chair their sincere interest in participating in future forums.

It was suggested a resolution be drafted expressing the concern of the Council about the refusal of USDOE to participate in public forums when they judge them to be adversarial. Mr. Bishop instructed that such a resolution be drawn for action later in the meeting.

Minutes

Mr. Bishop called for consideration of the minutes of the meetings on April 18, April 29, and May 16. Several members reported they had not received copies of these minutes, although Mr. Husseman explained all had been mailed. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. Mr. Bercano offered two minor corrections in the May 16 minutes, and the minutes of all three meetings were approved, as corrected.

Recent Developments

Litigation. Mr. Husseman said that following the federal government's decisions on May 28, the Board at its special meeting on May 30 unanimously voted to recommend that the Attorney General commence litigation. Three lawsuits were filed on June 4. The Governor has proposed certain action and steps have been taken to follow through with the Governor's proposal.

The first lawsuit is a challenge to the time of the preliminary determination of suitability with the state contending the USDOE cannot make a preliminary determination of suitability until site characterization has been completed. The second lawsuit is a challenge to the USDOE's decision to indefinitely postpone the second round of the site selection process, which the state maintains is in direct violation of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. The third lawsuit is a comprehensive lawsuit which includes the two prior suits and in addition, basically challenges the process by which the USDOE made its decision to select Hanford as one of the final three sites for characterization. It will focus heavily on the ranking methodology used by the USDOE, submitted to the National Academy of Sciences for independent review with their conclusion the methodology was good, if properly applied. In applying the methodology, the USDOE found the Hanford site ranked fifth out of the five sites in both pre-closure and post-closure conditions. It was also found to be the most costly site and the least safe site of all the sites under consideration. All three lawsuits will receive very high priority by the state of Washington, he said.

In explanation of Preliminary Determination of Suitability (PDS), Mr. Husseman said there appeared to be disagreement in Congress as to the intent of Congress in passing the Act. Key House members who had been instrumental in passing the bill had written to President Reagan stating the intent of Congress was that preliminary determination be made after site characterization. Key Senators also active in developing the Act had written stating that the intent of Congress was that the decision could be made at the start of site characterization. The state of Washington has consistently maintained that the House position is correct. Nevada and Washington have raised this issue in their litigation, but

he understood Texas had not. Mr. Bishop pointed out that should sites be eliminated during the process, and a site could be selected by default if PDS is made at the beginning. He also said part of the theory of having a second-round site-selection process was that in the event the first round failed, the second round would be a backup.

Nancy Hovis asked if funding for litigation had been included in the lawsuit. Mr. Husseman replied that a grant request had been made for the funding of litigation now filed, and should that be made available, there would be no need to file a lawsuit. If the grant were refused, a lawsuit should be filed.

Governor's Proposal. The Governor suggested an effort be made to try to resolve the problem, prior to the outcome of the litigation. His proposal included bringing the site selection process to an immediate halt, temporarily, and restructured so that the scientific community be brought directly into the decision-making process on key decisions. This would include the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Geological Survey, and other such respected, credible, independent scientific groups that would have the expertise in the areas where the decisions were being made. Another suggestion was to combine the first and second rounds into a nationwide search for a single, safe repository. A third point was to eliminate the specific statutory deadlines and restart the process with an independent study made to determine whether or not a second repository is needed. A final proposal was to ask Congress to authorize an MRS and encourage and push for early completion in order to give the utilities a place for temporary storage.

Defense Waste. Mr. Husseman said in deleting the second-repository process, the USDOE has assumed that the single-shell tank waste at Hanford will be stabilized in place and will not be sent to a repository. The Defense Waste DEIS now being presented to the public indicates that is one option under consideration, but no decision has been made. The decision will not be made until the process is complete. The state's concern is that apparently USDOE Headquarters has made a decision that the single-shell tanks will not go to the repository, and the state feels that violated the process. He added it was felt Jerry White, who heads up this program for USDOE at Richland, is very sincere in his statement that Headquarters have not made this decision. His group will make a recommendation to Headquarters at the end of the process, but is concerned that Headquarters may not follow a recommendation, based on prior decisions made there.

Betty Shreve suggested all material discussed by Mr. Husseman, including the chronological paper referred to and any related comments and acronyms, be included in the next Newsletter.

Valoria Loveland asked how the state could tell there has been a predetermination on the single-shell tanks. Mr. Bishop said in his opinion that rests on the fact that the capacity of the first repository is stated at 70,000 cubic feet.

In further discussion Mr. Husseman said there were three alternatives offered in the Defense Waste DEIS:

1. Remove all waste from tanks and place in repository;
2. Stabilize the single-shell tanks and place an engineered barrier;
3. Use a combination of the first two.

Estella Leopold noted that the Governor had referred to one MRS, and since the Act permits multiple MRS facilities, she wondered if the question of an MRS had been considered for perhaps reactor sites. Philip Bercano agreed with Estella Leopold and thought this was a proposal that should be studied and proposed that the Council discuss in more depth the whole issue of issues related to defense waste and the commercial wastes. He said in some conversations he had recently with individuals in Washington, D.C. he thought there might be a major game plan for the whole process, whereas the states had been considering each issue as an isolated issue. Pam Behring said she had similar feeling and thought perhaps the state should work up its own game plan and be in a position to resolve the concerns about defense waste on the Reservation as they exist.

Phyllis Clausen asked how the numbers were arrived at that caused the USDOE to state a second repository would not be needed. Mr. Husseman said this was not known, although Ben Busche had said in a speech to Congressman Markey's Subcommittee prior to the May 28 announcement that although there were declining forecasts of spent fuel, there was still a clear and definite need for a second repository. He has not disclosed what happened within that month to change his mind, Mr. Husseman said, and there are no specifics in the announcement. Ms. Clausen said USDOE should be pressed for some figures, which Mr. Bishop said the state was planning to do. Mr. Husseman reminded the Council the MRS project is also in litigation and the state of Tennessee has successfully enjoined the USDOE from delivering their MRS proposal to Congress. Oral argument is set for some time in July, he understood. Ms. Clausen thought the public should be made aware of all the event and conditions that have made the NWP nonfunctioning, including the lack of funding for the Subcabed research.

Governor Gardner's Testimony before Senate Subcommittee on Research and Development. Mr. Husseman reported Governor Gardner had testified before Senator Domenici's Subcommittee on June 16. A copy of the testimony was distributed to the Council, as well as a strong statement made by Senator Evans, member of that Subcommittee. Mr. Husseman quoted one sentence: "...it appears that DOE has made a unilateral decision to abrogate its responsibility under the law, choosing to discontinue site specific research which will ultimately result in the failure to nominate sites for a second repository as required under Section 112 of the Act." His final comment was: "...the DOE has brutally mangled the Act it is obliged to follow. Unless the Department can quickly redevelop confidence in its management of the program, and accurately follow the law, then new leaders ought to be chosen."

A letter signed by Senator McClure, Chair of the Senate Energy Committee, Congressman Udall, Chair of the House Interior Committee, and Senators Evans, Gorton, Domenici, and other key Senators and Congressman was sent directly to Secretary Herrington requesting him to come forward if he has any legal authority for his decision to halt the second round. Mr. Husseman said at the hearing the Attorney for the Secretary of Energy was asked to give specific authority for that decision, and did not have any at that point, and even acknowledged there was none.

Betty Shreve suggested that in a Newsletter the public could be advised of actions they might take in the decision-making process and spelling out appropriate Congressional Committees, Subcommittees, and key Congressmen. She said she had a feeling of frustration from people not knowing what they could do as individuals.

Mr. Husseman pointed out the "Draft" Document distributed which contains the state's preliminary comments being distributed around the state at the public meetings on the Defense Waste DEIS.

Philip Bercano suggested the state of Washington could be more vigorous in resolving some of the issues at Hanford by using its authority under the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA), similar to actions taken by the state of South Carolina. Mr. Husseman replied there are about three of the twelve issues that are directly related. Also, the Washington State Department of Ecology has been pushing the issue with the USDOE, concerning compliance with RCRA, for at least a couple of years. About two or three months ago the Department fined USDOE \$49,000 for violation of RCRA. One of the problems, he said, is that USDOE is attempting to define its waste streams out of RCRA by definition of "By-products". It becomes non-RCRA waste if defined as a by-product of defense activities and cannot be regulated by the state. He understood USDOE is now coming out with a new version of their regulations, which has not been seen, so the battle is ongoing. It is a major issue in the review of the DEIS, he said, but it will not be resolved immediately. He added part of the reason South Carolina was a higher priority was they were a "wet" site and Washington was a "dry" site. There was a more immediate threat to the environment at South Carolina.

Mr. Reed inquired how the Council would have an opportunity to make comments and modifications to the "Draft" document being circulated at the public meetings. Mr. Bishop said it was anticipated a special meeting would be called for the Council to consider the draft document, including comments received from the public. Following discussion, the decision was made to hold a special session of the Council on Thursday afternoon, July 17, following the joint meeting with the Oregon Advisory Committee in the morning in Vancouver. Estella Leopold concurred with Mr. Reed's consideration of the importance of the Council's input.

Jim Worthington suggested the Committees of the Council might meet to discuss some of the items mentioned. Some of the recommendations, he thought, should come from the Committees. Mr. Bishop suggested the Committees might make an effort to meet Wednesday afternoon in Vancouver.

Public Comment

Dick Overstreet, from Centralia, introduced himself as liaison with the Council, representing the Democrat party in District 20. Mr. Bishop explained that at the suggestion of the Board the Office had contracted every County Central Committee of both parties, asking they designate a liaison who could work with the Council at the local level. Approximately forty to fifty people have responded, and when all responses are received the individual Council members will be advised of those persons in their districts. It should be organized shortly, Mr. Bishop said, and information would be sent to those persons named.

Mr. Bishop asked Sandra Chan to outline the schedule for the Vancouver meetings, as follows:

Wednesday, July 16

1:15 p.m. Committee Meetings

6:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. Informal Meeting of Council

Thursday, July 17

9:30 a.m. Joint Council Meeting With Oregon
Advisory Committee

2:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. Review of State Comments on Defense
Waste DEIS

All information will be sent members before the meeting, with details of room reservations at the Red Lion Inn at the Quay. All members planning to be in Vancouver were asked to contact Sandra after the meeting.

Philip Bereano raised the issue of the Council's role in the whole process and especially the events that had transpired the past few weeks. Mr. Bishop explained the Council had been invited to the emergency Board meeting on the 30th, and although notice was necessarily short, some of the Council members were present. Estella Leopold, who had been at the meeting, said she agreed that the Council should comment formally on the Board's action in terms of their own decision and go on record as Amicus Curiae, or something similar.

Betty Shreve inquired about the augmentation of staff now that Hanford had been named for site characterization. Mr. Husseman said there is adequate funding to hire additional people now, and during the last three days have been interviewing people. Susan Hall and Associates are now under contract and doing an excellent job in arrangements for the defense waste meetings, and will be helping with additional meetings. An RFP had gone out to a broader public involvement assistance with graphic and video capacity, publications. The new grant year starts at the end of September, he said, and a substantial request will be inserted for funding the operation of Council and their activities.

Mr. Reed expressed his concern that the Council was not more closely involved in certain events. In his opinion it was necessary that the Council discuss and decide how it is going to related to the Board. At the present time, he said, the Board in fulfilling its role of establishing policy acts relatively independent from the Council. He urged the Council's role with respect to operating and providing input to the Board be considered seriously by the members. Nancy Hovis echoed Mr. Reed's comments and thought this should be a first item for discussion. If the role is not defined, she said, any action from that is irrelevant. She suggested it might be appropriate to draft some By-Laws for the Council, which would be an expansion of the "Role of the Council" established in the statute.

Richland Health Effects Meeting

Mr. Husseman referred to the request at the last meeting by the Environmental Monitoring Committee of the Board, asking the Council to coordinate a process by which citizen concerns related to health effects from the Hanford Reservation could be gathered in an organized, responsible manner. The Board approved the request at the afternoon meeting. On May 19 an outline for procedure was sent to implement the request, and meetings have been held with Nancy Kirner, Chair of the Environmental Monitoring Committee, and Sam Reed, Council Designee to the Committee. Suggested additions to the approach included placing a survey-type advertisement in the local papers, requesting people to provide information in advance of the hearings should they have concerns related to themselves or their families. Ms. Kirner discussed the general idea with Dr. Ruttenber of the Centers for Disease Control, who agreed the idea was good.

Nancy Kirner distributed a draft of the newspaper ad and explained the three goals of the information-gathering project she termed: Sincerity, Science, and Splash. Ms. Kirner said a planning meeting among representatives of the Advisory Council, DSHS staff, and some epidemiological expert to factor in their scientific concerns. She said to avoid misconception and confusion the survey will now be called "Health Concerns Inventory". She proposed a meeting be set with the Advisory Council, the Public Information Contract, WDOE staff, and DSHS staff to formulate plans.

Ms. Kirner said epidemiological concerns and data gathering are a natural outgrowth of this project, and DSHS staff will be investigating other ways of gathering factual, useful information. One way suggested was a tumor registry, another would be to add patient-unique identifiers onto existing information hospitals report to DSHS, and others.

The Council discussed the draft presented by Ms. Kirner with suggested changes to improve the copy. It was suggested she meet with interested Council members and Susan Hall, the Contractor, to do some initial planning during the lunch hour. The Council agreed to take the inventory as proposed by Ms. Kirner, and follow that with meetings, or whatever steps seemed necessary. In response to a question concerning the use of the information posed by Phyllis Clausen, Ms. Kirner said the results of the inventory, as a minimum would provide a basis for presentation to the CDC Panel regarding the public's concerns.

Environmental Monitoring Committee

Nancy Kirner, Chair of the Committee, briefly reported other activities, including the state of Idaho's indicated interest in participating in the CDC Study, as well as the Hanford Historical Documents Review Committee. She said CDC has compiled the release data and chosen the EPA air dose computer model for their dose assessment work. Baseline monitoring continues, she said, but the baseline was interrupted over the last two months by the Chernobyl incident. A report on Chernobyl will be made to the Board at the afternoon meeting.

Public Involvement Projects

Marta Wilder reported the Program Coordinator letter has been written for members to send to local interest groups. A letter to political committees throughout the state was sent, asking for a liaison to receive information from the Advisory Council. Approximately fifty responses have been received. Since the liaison role is not fully defined, the Council will need to discuss involving these people in the process.

Ms. Wilder and Sandra Chan attended the Association of Counties meeting in Ocean Shores. They took a televised slide show and a display prepared for such meetings. She said there was a lot of interest and many names were added to the mailing list. On June 26 the new display will be taken to the Association of Cities meeting in Tacoma.

Responses are being received to the letters sent to the list provided by the Science and Technology Committee. About 1300 names have been added to the mailing list from the list provided. A clerk was hired to input names and delete duplications and the work is proceeding.

Early this week, Ms. Wilder said an RFP for a contractor to provide overall assistance on public involvement was sent out. There will be a meeting held on June 27, with proposals to be submitted by July 14.

Defense Waste DEIS meetings held to date have been successful, with the League of Women Voters providing assistance at these meetings. Attendance in Yakima was about 350 people, the Tri-Cities meeting drew about 90 people, with about 50 people attending in Spokane. She commended Hall and Associates and the League for their work on these meetings. Mr. Bishop requested that the new display be taken to Vancouver for the meetings.

Ms. Wilder said a letter was sent to 78 libraries, including the regional libraries, offering them a kit of basic information on nuclear waste using information materials available from the Office. Jeanne Rensel explained that if all responded, we would need at least 425 kits to supply each library and its branches with one kit. Mr. Bishop asked that the same letter be sent to the colleges and universities. Betty Shreve asked that a copy of the letter be given to each of the Council members. (She said "Board".)

In connection with the overall contractor support, Mr. Husseman stated that at this point it was only possible to enter into a contract to run until the end of September. It will be written to give the state the option to renew it for the new contract year, if performance is satisfactory. He pointed out this is all contingent upon receiving funding from the USDOE. A Selection Review Committee has been formed to review the proposals and consists of Betty Shreve, Sam Reed, Fred Olson of the Washington State Department of Ecology, with Office staff. There should be someone onboard within the month, he said.

Referring to the Political Liaison process, Mr. Bishop said he believed that should be handled through the Public Involvement Committee. They will review the scope of action and bring their recommendations to the Council.

Public Participation Symposium

Mr. Husseman referred to his memorandum of May 19 to the Council, suggesting the Council consider the idea presented to increase public participation in the process.

Philip Bercano said in discussing this proposal with a number of groups, he received oral response, particularly from WashPIRG, Greenpeace, and Physicians for Social Responsibility, indicating they did not feel a conference such as this was what they needed. They did feel they needed money for research, technical support to evaluate technical documents, and for outreach.

Estella Leopold reported the Hanford Oversight Committee (HOC) has in draft a statement in response to the proposed symposium, and they will make a proposal at the same time for educational purposes. She said she had drafted a proposal for a seminar series to be held next fall at the University of Washington on the question of economic and ecosystem impact of past and potential radionuclide releases in the Columbia Basin. This would emanate in a publication, according to the proposal. It would be held every week during the fall by the School of Forestry and the Institute for Environmental Studies, conducted by all inside faculty, except two. She said this is a request for funding in the draft stage. She distributed copies, and asked for input from the Council.

Referring to the proposal for a symposium, Pam Behring considered it a good idea to utilize a symposium for public education where all groups of interest are able to come together. She suggested particular topics could be assigned to cover the program subject by subject, with particular experts representing those different viewpoints.

Phyllis Clausen expressed her concern that because of the actions of the USDOE on May 28, she finds people in her area are very distrustful of the USDOE and any statements being made by the Department. She questioned the usefulness of having USDOE representatives participate.

Valoria Loveland stated that she was in favor of the concept outlined in Mr. Husseman's memorandum. She thought this proposal appeared to be more in line with her understanding of the Council's responsibility, whether trust or distrust was there. She said all people should be brought together in order to receive answers to concerns and exchange opinions.

Mr. Bishop suggested discussion of this topic be continued and ask the contractor to begin developing various proposals to implement the goals of involving more public participation. Mr. Bishop said the plan would be studied further in an effort to perfect it.

Public Comment

Marie Harris of Bacon and Hunt called attention to the efforts of the Washington Waste Site Study Group to have Gonzaga University sponsor a similar type of proposal. This was an effort to bring together Eastern Washington residents and the forum will be held tomorrow to discuss their concerns and identify ways of satisfying those concerns. She applauded the Council's consideration of the proposal, and hoped the forum at Gonzaga tomorrow would be a microscopic case study of how the process works. Pam Behring said she thought a state-sponsored symposium might result in more unbiased responses than one sponsored by an industries-citizens forum. She thought perhaps they should work together.

Funding for Interveners

Mr. Bishop suggested this be discussed at the Wednesday evening meeting in Vancouver.

Philip Bereano asked if Charlie Roe, Senior Assistant Attorney General, has a memorandum on the subject. Mr. Roe said he had prepared a memo on the powers and restraints on the Board, and wondered if the subject should be taken up at a time when it could be discussed in greater detail.

Mr. Bereano said until the legal limitations are known, he did not know what there would be to discuss. He said those interested in preparing proposals would not do so until there was clear word from the state that this sort of proposal would be in the realm of things that could be funded.

Mr. Roe said his own personal conclusion, which was solidly based, was that the Board does not have the power to fund interveners in the understanding some have had. The Board can undertake certain contractual arrangements related to the implementation of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, and when precise proposals are received, a response can be made. He said in the case of an intervener for the Energy Facility and Site Evaluation Council and the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, both interveners turn out to be state officials, members of the Attorney General's Office. One is expressly provided by statute and the other is provided by general authority.

Philip Bereano pointed out he misspoke when he used the term "intervener", and asked that that term not be used again in reference to proposals from interested groups.

Mr. Reed felt the discussion concerned the utilization of resources of groups which have, or appear to have, a bias on the issue, to perform certain services for the Council. If that is correct, he said, the next step should be to consider a policy which the Council would propose to the Board to describe and regulate how to deal with the contract proposals from groups such as this. Estella Leopold agreed there should be a policy. She said the purpose of interested groups was to do research which is essential and should be objective, and she would agree with Mr. Reed but modify the word "bias".

Mr. Worthington also agreed with Mr. Reed, and recalled he had inquired what the criteria would be for this type of funding. He said he had some real concerns as WashPIRG, Greenpeace, HOC, were the only organizations mentioned last month. He pointed out there were many groups in this state which would meet that same criteria. He said the Texas document in reference for funding used the IRS designation for a non-profit organization. He pointed out that every labor organization, every local union in this state meets that requirement. They do represent citizens and taxpayers, he said, and he wondered if the Council would be willing to accept their request for similar funding as they do a considerable amount of research. He said a major concern of his was where the line would be drawn.

Following further discussion of criteria it was agreed there was a need for extended discussion on the issue with goals and objectives spelled out by the Council. Mr. Reed said the need of the Council was the first objective, looking first to the present resources, then looking further if necessary.

Joint Meeting With Oregon

Agenda for the Wednesday evening meeting was discussed and the decision was made to discuss further the question of implementation of interested groups. Another priority item was setting of direction and policy for the Council.

The Thursday morning joint meeting would include:

Defense Waste Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Status of significant issues, with reports from both Washington and Oregon representatives to include litigation development, Environmental Assessment development

Public involvement to include critique of the Defense Waste DEIS workshops, summary of socioeconomic workshops, and the future of public involvement

Mr. Reed was concerned that a joint meeting would not provide opportunity for the Council to consider any action items. Mr. Bishop said since the Council would be meeting separately Thursday afternoon to consider the Defense Waste issue, it could take time to take actions it deemed necessary. It was suggested that should there not be time at the Thursday afternoon meeting to consider action items, the Council could convene Friday morning in Olympia if necessary.

Discussion followed on the publicity to be given to the joint meeting, and Mr. Husseman said Hall and Associates would work on that to get the best possible coverage.

Recommendation of the Council

Betty Shreve read the following recommendation concerning the participation of the U.S. Department of Energy in public forums:

"The Nuclear Waste Advisory Council of the state of Washington, because of its responsibility for public information and involvement, is concerned that the USDOE has failed to accept invitations by organizers of public forums on nuclear waste issues when the USDOE subjectively judges these meetings to be "adversarial". The Council feels strongly that as a tax-supported, public entity, it is the USDOE's responsibility and duty to participate in these public meetings, to be accountable to the citizens it should be serving, and to use these meetings as opportunities to inform the public about the Department's policies and programs."

Ms. Shreve moved that the recommendation be accepted and directed to be sent to all those in authority in the USDOE, regionally and nationally.

The motion was seconded. Valoria Loveland inquired if there were any representative of USDOE present who could address this action. Mr. Jim Mecca of USDOE Richland said this action took him by surprise, as within the confines of BWIP everything possible had been done to honor all requests for participation in forums, tours, independent discussion, etc. He said they had dealt with groups, regardless of a bias or not. He said he was interested in the foundation for the statement, and if there is a problem he would find out where it is. He said if any other issues of this nature should arise, he would like to know about them. Mr. Reed cited another instance he had experienced with a Washington State Environmental Health Association meeting last year when USDOE and Rockwell refused to be on the program on the same day as the Office staff representative. They did accept a commitment for another day, but Mr. Reed felt the issue could have been more comprehensively covered had both parties been present at the same session.

Bill Sebero suggested this information be taken to the Board for their consideration and action.

The motion was called and carried, with one objection.

Public Comment

David Tarnas, consultant with the Habitronic Centre, a non-profit research group in Seattle, read a three-page statement concerning the recent past events and the political situation at Hanford. He suggested an independent scientific review for all studies and activities at Hanford should be done, funded by USDOE through the state of Washington. Also suggested was that USDOE and state-sponsored research needed during the site characterization phase should be conducted by more academic scientists and their graduate student researchers. He supported USDOE grants to groups such as GreenPeace, WashPIRG, HEAL, and the Hanford Oversight Committee to fund unsolicited research proposals.

Mr. Tarnas referred to the discussion of these issues at a symposium on Hanford, held at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Pacific and Arctic Divisions in Vancouver, British Columbia, which was organized by Estella Leopold and him. Also discussed was the geology of the Hanford area, the policy and decision-making process of the repository program, and the role of the National Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Geologic Survey.

Mr. Tarnas suggested in spite of filing lawsuits against the USDOE, the state could lose control of the decision-making process. He suggested an independently-funded mediator to be used to review what long-range goals are shared by Washington state, and other affected states and tribes, and the USDOE, with the goal of working out the differences. He said there needed to be closer liaison in the Advisory Council with the public interest groups to include their views. Since this is a time-consuming process, Mr. Tarnas felt the state should demand reconsideration of the 1998 deadline for accepting the wastes. (Copy of full text available upon request from the Office of Nuclear Waste Management.)

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.