

24

WM DOCKET CONTROL CENTER

MINUTES OF NUCLEAR WASTE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

'85 JUN 17 May 17, 1985
AIO:50
9:30 a.m.

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

Council Members Present:

- Warren A. Bishop, Chair
- Councilman Lane A. Bray
- Dr. Jerome Finnigan
- Mayor Joe Jackson
- Mr. Gordon Kunz
- Dr. Estella B. Leopold
- Ms. Anita Monoian
- Commissioner W. H. Sebero
- Jim Worthington

WM Record File
101.3

WM Project 10
Docket No. _____
PDR
LPDR

Distribution: D. Kunihira Reg. II
REB MTB JAB HJM GWKRR
PDM DPM CFP Linchan
(Return to WM, 623-SS) 24
TO: HJM

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

Mr. Bishop noted the change in personnel in the Office of High-Level Nuclear Waste, with Don Provost now Acting Program Director. Mr. Bishop thanked Mr. Stevens for his contribution to the whole program since it was statutorily created in 1983. He ordered his best wishes and those of the Council to Mr. Stevens in his new endeavors. Dr. Finnigan commented he hoped Mr. Stevens' talents would continue to be available to the state.

It was moved and seconded the minutes of the meeting of April 19 be approved. Motion carried.

Review of Public Involvement

Anita Monoian reported the group met yesterday with Fred Jarrett in attendance. He was unable to be at the Council meeting because of city commitments. She asked Marta Wilder to review the major items of discussion.

Ms. Wilder said the new Fact Sheets being developed were: MRS, defense waste, commingling, socio-economic and environmental issues, basic radiation facts, and a glossary of radiation terms. Drafts of these should be ready by next week, she said, and copies will be sent members for comment.

8507080389 850517
PDR WASTE
WM-10 PDR

1414

Ms. Wilder reported good response has been experienced from the last issue of the Newsletter, with many citizen comments being received. The June/July Newsletter will contain a box, which can be easily checked, for each Fact Sheet. It will also include a detailed timeline, either as an insert, or placed in the center fold. Other items in preparation are a major article on defense waste and commingling, an article on MRS, and a questionnaire response compiled from the February/March Newsletter questionnaire. She said there might also be an article on how waste is stored in canisters. Coming events and information available will be included, with special emphasis on the Reference Center.

Future articles for August were discussed, she said, and a follow-up article on MRS would probably be one article. Oregon's involvement with Washington State could be another. Other states' involvement in the program, and detailed article on liability would be other possible articles.

Ms. Monoian reported a memorandum had been received from the USDOE suggesting that funding be considered for joint USDOE/state nuclear waste education programs to be organized and implemented by the universities. Mr. Provost said he thought the U.S. Department of Energy was finding a problem with disseminating information that the public perceived to be biased. Also, they were finding a duplication of material is being issued, therefore, their proposal is to go out to an RFP to ask a consortium of universities to issue this information for both the states and the federal department. This was disclosed at the meeting in Baltimore, he said, and he emphasized Washington State legislation has given this role to the Advisory Council. He said the department promised to send a letter requesting the state's comments on this type of proposal, and he hoped for a discussion to enable a preparation of a response when the letter is received. Marta Wilder added that a report on this proposal was coming from USDOE in Richland, which should explain the intent and purpose more clearly.

Mr. Bishop said when the specific proposal is received he would like the Public Involvement Group to meet to discuss it, with a full discussion by the Council. He felt a careful review was necessary before a final conclusion is drawn. Mr. Provost said USDOE did agree to listen to the states before they proceeded, but no time frame was set.

In response to Dr. Finnigan's request for a summary of the comments received, Marta Wilder said some good ideas for future Newsletter articles were received. She had the comments with her, and offered to share them with the members.

Ms. Monoian referred to the Questionnaire in the February/March Newsletter and reported 88 responses were received. A summary was included in the members' packets (see attached). She said it was interesting to compare these results with those of the original citizens' survey done in 1983. She noted there were some interesting swings. Marta Wilder said in her unscientific observations,

she noted a change from general concerns to more specific and technical concerns. Ms. Wilder said the Questionnaire Summary was also included in the submission of final comments on the draft Environmental Assessment.

Ms. Monoian mentioned a Flyer is being prepared to use as a handout at meetings or presentations. It lists information available, the availability of the slides for group presentations, the Reference Center with its technical documents, Fact Sheets for distribution, and mention of the Newsletter. The draft was circulated to the Council members.

Dr. Leopold inquired about the progress of the re-organization of the Council. Mr. Bishop said this had been discussed several times and until a new Council membership is named by the Governor, no further structure could be accomplished. Dr. Leopold said she thought the idea of special task groups representing broad elements in the community would help to distribute information and create a liaison to the communication system in the community. Mr. Bishop emphasized that should the restructuring of the Council along the lines previously suggested begin, it would require selecting persons with the time and dedication necessary to do the tasks.

Ms. Monoian continued by noting the slide show has had some changes, and should time permit it would be shown again at the end of the meeting. Mr. Bishop added that this slide presentation is a superb vehicle for public information on the nuclear waste program. He thanked all of those involved in the organization of the slide show and the presentations that had been given. Because of limited staff, he said it would be appreciated if Advisory Council members would take the show and present it to local groups in their areas. Ms. Wilder added that since mid-March, 16 presentations had been given to approximately 700 people. Currently, the Office has three sets and two more are being requested, Mr. Provost said.

Mr. Kunz inquired if the Association of County Officials had requested any participation in their state Convention in Spokane. Mr. Provost said this was discussed yesterday, and it was agreed this would be a high priority. He said it was a little late to be on the program, but efforts are being made to participate. Mr. Worthington said a letter was being sent by the Washington State Building and Construction Trades Council asking for a presentation at their state Convention this year. Also, a similar request would come from the Washington State Labor Council, he said.

In response to a question about the restructuring of the Council, Mr. Bishop said the policy coordinating group within the Governor's office has been in discussion with him for two or three weeks. He said they are well aware of the plans and objectives of the Council, and he felt progress is being made. He said present terms would continue until a successor has been appointed.

Mr. Bishop commended Mr. Provost for his long technical service to the nuclear waste program. He said Mr. Provost has worked in the

program as long as anyone in the staff group, having been involved with the Task Force before the Board was created. He asked Mr. Provost, as Acting Program Director, to report on the status of USDOE activities.

Mission Plan. Mr. Provost referred to the summary paper in the packets on the Mission Plan, and said it appears now that the Mission Plan will be issued about June 1, which is 14 months late. The major change is that they will include material on an integrated MRS, which had formerly been considered backup only. Other change will include a comprehensive section on defense waste, which was one of the state's major comments. Another important section, he said, would be a determination by the U.S. Department of Energy that a preliminary determination on suitability of a site will be made shortly after three sites are recommended. The state, he said, has felt that determination should be made after three sites are characterization. That may become a legal issue that will be raised. Because the Act so states, Congress will see the Mission Plan first, he said, and will have a 30-day review period. The states should receive it shortly thereafter.

Commingling Report. Mr. Provost said the President has made the decision that defense wastes and commercial wastes will be commingled. No official work, however, has been received. A draft policy has been released stating that states can receive grants on defense wastes to study only those defense wastes which impact the performance of a site. That would allow a lot of latitude at Hanford, he said, but with other sites under consideration for characterization, the funds would be minimal compared to Hanford. The second tier states would receive no funds.

Environmental Assessments. According to the U.S. Department of Energy schedule, the final EAs will be issued later in the fall, which could go into December, Mr. Provost said. The final document will contain sections on integrated MRS and defense wastes.

MRS Status. The U.S. Department of Energy recently announced three sites in Tennessee as possible locations for their integrated MRS: the Clinch River Breeder Reactor near Oak Ridge, the Oak Ridge Reservation, and a TVA Reactor site at Hartzville, Tennessee. That facility would handle, package, and temporarily store high-level nuclear waste. Mr. Provost added there were no discussions with the state of Tennessee before this was announced, and he understood no assistance money would be granted until after Congress approves a site. A letter report describing the process will be sent to Congress by USDOE in June. About six months later a detailed report covering design, etc. will be sent. Congress will then make a decision and the state of Tennessee will become involved.

Should an MRS become a reality, Mr. Provost said, the waste rods received would be consolidated into a transportable canister, which would be stored until a repository was ready. Mr. Provost said

this would mean dedicated shipments would come to a repository, perhaps a dedicated train of at least five cars, with a mix of 90% rail and 10% truck.

AM/FM Report. This report has been transmitted to Congress by the U.S. Department of Energy. Comment letters do not recommend a FedCorp or any of the changes recommended by the AM/FM Panel at this time.

Schedule Hearings. Hearings in Congress could be scheduled in June on the Mission Plan and Price-Anderson.

Litigation Report

Charlie Roe, Assistant Attorney General, referred to the Litigation Report in the members' packets and briefly reviewed the status. (A copy of the report is attached to the Nuclear Waste Board minutes.)

Siting Guidelines Litigation. Nuclear Waste Board v. Department of Energy - Ninth Circuit No. 85-7128. A Pre-Briefing Conference was held on April 23, 1985, at which time the attorney for USDOE announced he was filing a motion to dismiss on the ground the court had no jurisdiction. A court decision on the jurisdictional aspect is expected to be given in August, 1985. The court has granted other party intervenor status to Colorado, Nebraska, the Environmental Defense Fund, and seven private utilities. Mr. Roe was advised that Minnesota will soon initiate litigation similar to the Nuclear Waste Board in the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals, and three other states may do the same.

Mr. Roe also noted that a potential dispute over the content of the record in this case has arisen. He filed a second petition for review, together with a motion to consolidate that case with the Nuclear Waste Board case. Mr. Roe explained that the state is claiming the draft Mission Plan, the draft Environmental Protection Agency Standards, and the draft EAs that have been developed by the various federal agencies are a part of the record and within the scope of the issues raised in the litigation. The second suit was filed, he said, to make it clear that those sequencing issues are clearly before the Court.

Another area being looked at, Mr. Roe said, was the use of federal funds by the state of Washington to finance litigation actions in those situations where it is thought the Nuclear Waste Policy Act is not being properly implemented. Several other states with the same concerns are also looking at this issue, he said.

Other areas being explored are defense wastes, water rights, and Mission Plan, and this will be pursued during the next monthly period.

Mr. Bishop added that when the funding for litigation was denied, an effort to obtain funding from the State General Fund through the Legislature was begun. This still is unresolved, he said, as a budget has not yet been approved.

Mr. Roe added that the Nevada funding case, which does not deal directly with the issue of litigation funding, has been requested in responding Brief by the United States to Nevada's opening Brief that the Court hold the federal funds are not available for these litigation purposes. He said that issue was not raised directly, but apparently the Justice Department and the Department of Energy decided to have that issue raised.

Mr. Provost said the suit over the EPA Standards apparently will be settled soon. He said there was a consent decree and as a part of that the EPA Standards should be issued in early August, although nothing in writing has been received.

Oregon Report. Mr. Bishop said the state of Washington is attempting to develop a way to enter into a contract agreement with the state of Oregon, with the concurrence of the U.S. Department of Energy. Oregon is not classified as an affected state, but has a vital interest in any development of a repository at Hanford.

Mr. Bishop introduced Bill Dixon, Administrator, Siting and Regulation Division of the Oregon Department of Energy. He has recently been appointed by Governor Atiyeh to lead all activities associated with an Oregon review of Hanford issues, in addition to his responsibilities with the Oregon Department of Energy. These include ensuring a safe and reliable operation of the Trojan Nuclear Power Plant, ensuring the safe disposal of low-level radioactive waste within the state of Oregon, and ensuring the safe transportation of radioactive material in the state. His department also has the lead responsibility for emergency preparedness and response to radiation accidents.

Mr. Dixon described the Governor's Hanford Review Committee, which he Chairs, consisting of nine state agencies. The Oregon State Department of Energy provides staff for the Committee. He reviewed the mission and the goals of the Committee. Their major concerns are environmental impacts and transportation of high-level waste. They are also looking at the defense waste activities at Hanford, he said, to see what impacts they might have on Oregon. They are also studying the proposal to ship decommissioned reactor plants up the Columbia River to Hanford, which is scheduled to begin within the next couple of years. These would be submarines and the first commercial power reactors, he said. He described the makeup of the Review Committee to address the two major concerns of water and transportation.

In addition to the Technical Review Committee, he said the state of Oregon established a Hanford Public Advisory Committee, composed of thirty-four members from business and industry, existing citizen

committees, elected officials, and public interest groups. The mission of the Advisory Committee, he said, is to make sure the Review Committee is addressing the citizen concerns on the issues. This Advisory Committee has also appointed two Task Forces to address the major issues of water and transportation. From those Task Forces four members have been elected to sit on an overall steering committee to provide guidance to the Review Committee.

Mr. Dixon said the conclusion reached today in Oregon was that not enough information exists to determine what impact a potential repository would have on Oregon, and much additional work needs to be done. Oregon, he said, has concerns about whether the uncertainties that exist today can ever be reduced to a level that is acceptable. Regarding defense wastes at Hanford, Oregon agrees that additional actions will be necessary to ensure long-term stability of those wastes. Oregon also believes there needs to be a coordinated program to address transportation issues. Local jurisdictions, states, affected Indian tribes, and the federal government should work together to reach a unified decision about transportation to address the risks and to reduce those risks.

Regarding the joint review, Mr. Dixon said Oregon believed the two primary issues they have are issues Washington shares. He said he had recommended to Governor Atiyeh that Oregon join the state of Washington in a joint review process. He enumerated many advantages of a joint review to Washington and Oregon, especially avoiding the need to duplicate a great deal of the work being done. He said it would enable the federal government to address the unique concerns the non-host state of Oregon has about the Columbia River, without the necessity of amending the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. In addition to aiding the U.S. Department of Energy to increase its credibility, he said, it would provide them with a national model for cooperation. He concluded it would also be an advantage to the people, as they are the ones who ultimately fund the program and a coordinated review would reduce the overall costs.

Mr. Bray inquired if the Nuclear Waste Board had a policy limiting border states entry, or would allowing Oregon to come in would open all the borders of the corridor states. Mr. Bishop replied there was no specific policy and pointed out USDOE would have to respond to any kind of other states' involvement. He cautioned any proposal between Oregon and Washington should be carefully worded to apply to the unique situation of sharing the Columbia River.

Discussion following concerning the need for the Board to set up a policy on border states, and Mr. Bishop said this would be brought to the Board.

Mr. Worthington inquired if the state of Oregon planned to set up a public involvement program similar to Washington State's. Mr. Dixon said at this point the emphasis would be placed on the technical aspects. It would be desirable for future action, he said, but resources would have to be found. Mr. Bishop mentioned the USDOE proposal to involve a consortium of universities to put

together a public education program might be of interest to Oregon. Mr. Worthington said coordination with Oregon on public involvement could prevent some conflict of information. Mr. Dixon said his department provides as much information to the media as possible, and added, having access to the Advisory Council slide show would be useful.

Final State Comments on Draft Environmental Assessment

Mr. Provost introduced Louise Dressen of Envirosphere who reviewed the summary on the final comments. Ms. Dressen said the key additional comments were included in the packets. The initial report was modified to reflect minor word changes, but the extract represents either new comments or major additions, she said. Specifically addressed in the new comments was the need for economic risk assessment, implications on transportation of the MRS concept and other aspects of transportation concerns, emergency response, tectonics, seismicity, and other concerns in the geotechnical area. A new section dealing with geohydrology was also added, she said.

A whole new section was added to support the uncertainty of the groundwater travel time, as it was felt the draft EA overplayed the optimism about the lengths of groundwater travel time. Among other additions, a new comment was added raising a concern about the potential for climatic change which could significantly affect patterns of groundwater recharge and discharge in the area with a recommendation that the EA should evaluate the effects of warming and cooling trends on groundwater flow.

Following Ms. Dressens' review of the final comment package, Dr. Brewer stated the draft cover letter to Ben Rusche, if approved by the Board, will be sent on May 20. Also contained in the package to USDOE will be the complete document with marginal notes indicating new material, plus the rewritten overview statement and Appendices. The final document submitted to USDOE will be printed and copies sent to the members. Mr. Bishop asked any interested party to indicate on the sign-up sheet if they would like a copy, as they will not be unlimited.

Technical Report

Mr. Brewer highlighted two items: (1) Effect of MRS: No decision will come from Congress for perhaps a year, he said, but should it be implemented virtually all the waste that would come to Hanford would come by rail. (2) A policy decision by the department has been received in writing allowing the state to address existing wastes at Hanford as part of the physical environment. This means the state is not prohibited under the grant from looking at the implications of the defense wastes at Hanford, which is very significant for the technical program.

Legislative Report

Gary Rothwell reported the Legislature passed only one bill that directly affects the Nuclear Waste Board. Substitute Senate Bill 3468 is essentially a study bill, he said, requiring the Board to study certain areas including economic, social, public health and safety, and environmental impacts; risks to citizens of transporting high-level radioactive wastes, alternative routes, and improvement in state, local, and federal agency accident response capabilities; and the financial and technical resource impacts of a repository on affected state and local government agencies. This bill is yet unsigned by the Governor, he said, but he knew of no reason he would not sign. Mr. Rothwell invited any comments on the suggested plan for implementation he gave the Council.

Mr. Provost mentioned this was the first step of the planning process and when feedback from the Council and the Board is received, it will be worked into the grant application for the next fiscal year.

Report on Meetings and Presentations

Don Provost reported he had recently attended the first-tier Program Director's meeting in Baltimore, a National Association of Attorneys General meeting, and a quarterly USDOE information meeting in Kansas City. Mr. Provost said a procedure for reporting these meetings with brief summaries of the information is being established.

Mr. Bishop mentioned that a Survey Mission from Japan will be visiting Washington State on June 3 in Richland, and on June 4 they will be in Olympia to visit the Office. He said they are principally interested in low-level waste, and to a degree high-level waste.

Mr. Bishop called attention to the Selected New Additions composed by Jeanne Rensel, Librarian of the Office, and suggested they be circulated to any interested persons in the members' districts.

Location of June Meeting

Mr. Bishop said the plan to move the Council meeting out of Olympia is still sliding forward until the restructuring of the Council is completed.

Public Comment

David Tarnas of the University of Washington commented on the USDOE proposal for a consortium of universities doing an information program and the necessity for credible information being developed. He thought this may require a stronger working relationship between the universities and the USDOE by working with existing groups and current programs at both universities in Washington State.

He mentioned there was a proposal from the National Academy of Sciences to review the three sites during the characterization phase which is still under discussion in the Office of the Governor. He said in discussions, Mr. Eschels thought the most appropriate way to proceed on this proposal would be to wait until the new Council had been established with a scientific and technical task group.

Mr. Tarnas reported he had been advised some people who had requested to be on the mailing list for the Newsletter had not yet received any. It was suggested he check with Marta Wilder, the Public Information Officer on staff.

Mr. Tarnas said, as a representative of the academic community and the public, he would welcome Oregon participation in the review process. He agreed with Mr. Bray there was a need for the Board to develop a policy in having other states participate in a coordinated effort with the state of Washington. He suggested the Council make a motion to serve as a strong statement of advice from the Council to the Board to this effect.

Mr. Tarnas said he noted no reference in the final EA comments to the recent EPA change in 10 CFR 191 on the controlled area. Ms. Dressen said that issue was not specifically cited, but that issue was raised under the section about uncertainties on groundwater travel time. She said this could be taken under consideration, but the reason it was not brought up was because it was still a part of a working draft. Dr. Brewer said 40 CFR 191, the Mission Plan, and now the documentation on MRS are milestone documents in the sequence which should come before the final EA.

Mr. Tarnas asked Dr. Brewer what the progress was on any state MRS study. Dr. Brewer replied the state would want to comment on MRS as a milestone document once the document is seen. Mr. Provost said that USDOE, as a policy, is saying they will not fund that sort of study until an MRS is authorized by Congress. He was certain there would be a great deal of information that will be forthcoming on which the state would be able to comment.

Mr. Tarnas commented that with the establishment of a scientific and technical task group in the Council it could be instrumental in socio-economic impact studies, but would also be of assistance on environmental impacts and more technical issues. He stressed his feeling about the need for the new Council to develop a mission statement and the strategy for implementing it. He added he would not be at the June meeting because he would be in Japan at that time.

As the lead state in the repository issue, he said the new Council would be a major part of the new administration in dealing with the Hanford issue.

Mike Spranger of Washington State University commented on citizen involvement and the role of the University. He said he provides

education programs on broad public issues on the Columbia River. He said a loose-knit consortium of universities has been set up, including the University of Washington, Washington State University, Oregon State University, and the University of Idaho, connecting with land-grant and sea-grant universities to put together these programs. He suggested continuation of this type of program as a way of disseminating information. He said he had used the slide show in some education programs in some of the smaller communities of the Columbia River and will be doing one next week in Stevenson and the following week in Hood River, Oregon.

Mr. Spranger said he thought the land-grant institutions have a role to play as their mission is similar to the role of the Council in providing accurate, unbiased information. He said he would like to see more of a formal network developed with the Council to avoid the duplication of programs.

Mr. Provost added this was discussed briefly in the Public Information Group meeting, and a further look would be taken at this role in the public information program. Mr. Spranger pointed out they have offices in every County in the state which could be utilized.

Dr. Leopold suggested the Council follow Mr. Tarnas' comments on recommending the Board develop a policy in having other states' participation in the repository review.

Dr. Leopold moved that the Council recommend to the Nuclear Waste Board that it is highly appropriate for the state of Washington to enter into a cooperative working agreement with nearby states, especially Oregon, for the purpose of (1) sharing technical information, and (2) sharing expertise. The Council recommends that the Board formulate a policy regarding guidelines for other state participation. The motion was seconded and carried.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

FEBRUARY/MARCH NEWSLETTER QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Results of the Washington State Nuclear Waste Board and Nuclear Waste Advisory Council's public issues questionnaire from their February/March newsletter showed hydrology issues to be most important.

The public was asked to rank and comment on eight different issues related to the Draft Environmental Assessment and the U.S. Department of Energy's (USDOE) repository siting activity at Hanford. Over 5,000 newsletters were distributed, of which 88 questionnaires were returned. Fifty-five of these contained additional written comments.

The comment categories included hydrology, geology, geochemistry, underground engineering, environmental impacts, socioeconomics, transportation and radiology. Written comments were reviewed and assigned to one of these eight categories or to the categories of policy, site selection, health and safety, trust and community relations.

The survey results will be incorporated in the Nuclear Waste Board's supplemental comments on the USDOE's Draft Environmental Assessment of the proposed high-level nuclear waste repository at Hanford. Initial comments were submitted on March 20, 1985, and these supplementary comments will be sent to the USDOE before the May 20 deadline. All comments are to be considered by USDOE in developing the Final Environmental Assessment.

In Table 1, a ranking of the most important issues for a high-level nuclear waste repository at Hanford is illustrated. Hydrological issues were most important, including groundwater travel time, future groundwater use, and the effects of groundwater heating and construction activities on the area hydrology. Secondary importance was given to geological issues like basalt tectonics, seismicity and natural resources. Transportation issues (e.g., waste shipment routing, potential hazards, and accident emergency response plans) were ranked third. This was closely followed by radiological issues (e.g., human exposure to radiation and background radiation levels) and finally by environmental impacts. Geochemistry (i.e., rock chemistry) and underground engineering (e.g., safety and ease of construction) received a moderate importance ranking. Questionnaire respondents considered socioeconomic issues least important.

The questionnaire results closely correspond to the results of the public EA workshop, conducted by the Nuclear Waste Board and Advisory Council in February. Transportation, hydrology, and geology were of great concern at the workshops. Health and safety were of even greater concern, similar to the radiological issue ranked in the newsletter questionnaire.

Table 2 shows the frequency with which issues were mentioned in written comments solicited at the end of the questionnaire. The same categorization procedure that was used for workshop results summarization was used to tabulate the comment results. Policy issues were mentioned most frequently--including the need for nuclear power, government policies and procedures, payment of storage costs, and monitoring. Health and safety issues were discussed with the second greatest frequency, but were only mentioned half as often as policy issues. Citizens also were concerned about current and future health effects from radioactive leaks. Once again, environmental and hydrological concerns were expressed often. The community relations category included questions, concerns, and suggestions about public information, education, publicity, and media coverage. This category ranked fifth (see attached tables).

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF NEWSLETTER QUESTIONNAIRE ISSUE RANKING

Issue	<u>Level of Importance</u>			
	High	Medfum	Low	No Answer
1. Hydrology	71	4	1	13
2. Geology	61	10	3	15
3. Geochemistry	46	17	4	22
4. Underground Engineering	30	22	19	18
5. Environmental Impacts	52	17	7	13
6. Socioeconomics	15	20	35	19
7. Transportation	53	18	5	13
8. Radiology	53	16	6	14
Totals	381	124	80	127

Total Number of Questionnaires = 88

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF NEWSLETTER WRITTEN COMMENTS

Issue	Frequency of Mention	Rank
1. Policy	28	#1
2. Transportation	4	
3. Environment	11	#3
4. Groundwater	9	#4
5. Site Selection	2	
6. Community Relations	6	#5
7. Geology	3	
8. Socioeconomics	3	
9. Health and Safety	14	#2
10. Trust	1	
11. Other	5	

Total Comments

86

Total Number of Questionnaires With Additional Comments = 53