

WINDOCKET CONTROL NUCLEAR WASTE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING
CENTER July 19, 1985

'85 AUG 15 P2:47 9:30 a.m.
EFSEC Hearings Room
Rowesix - Building #1
4224 Sixth Avenue S.E.
Lacey, Washington

WM Record File
101-3

WM Project 10
Docket No. _____
PDR
LPDR

Council Members Present:

Warren A. Bishop, Chair
Councilman Lane A. Bray
Ms. Anita Monoian
Commissioner W.H. Sebero
Jim Worthington

Distribution:
REB MJB JTB HJM KSR
DM DM CR Linehan
(Return to WM, 623-SS) DQuahua, Reg. V of
To: HJM

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

Mr. Bishop commented on the excellent presentation by the USDOE on its monitoring activities at Hanford which was presented to the Environmental Monitoring Committee the day before. He said there would be a brief version of the report at the Board meeting in the afternoon and invited Council members to attend. Lane Bray, member of the Monitoring Committee, agreed the presentation was very beneficial, and felt the staff of the USDOE received a good insight for additions to their Annual Report for next year.

It was moved and seconded the minutes of the meeting of June 21 be approved as published. Motion carried.

Public Involvement

Anita Monoian, Chair of the Public Involvement Committee, asked Marta Wilder to lead the report.

Ms. Wilder said the Association of Washington Counties annual meeting was held in Spokane July 25-28. Warren Bishop moderated a panel on nuclear waste composed of Senator Benitz, Senator Williams, and Curt Eschels. The staff set up a table at the meeting to disperse Newsletters, Fact Sheets, and other information on the repository program. Mr. Bishop remarked that one of the outstanding aspects of participation in this meeting was exposing elected County officials to the kinds of information and material available from the Office of High-Level Nuclear Waste Management. Mike Lawrence, Manager of the Richland Operations, introduced the presentation. Commissioner Sebero agreed the presentation by Mike Lawrence was excellent, and the Senators addressed the issue very candidly. As a result of that, and the information that was available, he said he is making arrangements for tours of Hanford for seventeen counties. He said

8509100338 850719
PDR WASTE
WM-10 PDR

they determined there were previous comments made which caused some doubt, but Mr. Lawrence's appearance generated an interest for people to go out and take a look at the site. Overall, he said, it was an excellent presentation.

Mr. Bishop added he hoped the Counties' and Cities' presentations in Spokane were forerunners of the Council's efforts to reach out to include local governments more actively in the whole process.

Newsletter: Ms. Wilder stated the July Newsletter had been released and copies were available for the public at the meeting. She said the mailing list now contains about 6,000 names. The August/September Newsletter is in the draft stage. Ann Croman of EnviroSphere reported the next Newsletter will focus on spent fuel, today and in the future, including an interview with a representative of Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) to explain the current storage at the Trojan plant. Another segment will include basic, typical questions the Program Office received with answers to those questions. It will contain a brief description of Waste Board members, with a map showing the areas they represent. There will be an article outlining the state's position on full liability. The Newsletter will also contain an announcement on the issuance of the revised Mission Plan, with a basic explanation of the document. Another article will briefly explain site characterization.

Mr. Worthington liked the idea of having a timeline and suggested it be periodically reinserted in the Newsletter. He mentioned the resolution opposing Hanford as a site until more studies are done, which he received from the Clark County PUD last week. He thought it was important to stress the length of time characterization would take.

Mr. Bishop inquired how socioeconomic activities would be handled, although this area is in the early stages. He said inquiries were already being received and he thought there should be anticipation in some of these areas and not just reactions. Mr. Provost thought a better understanding of the socioeconomic issues should be had by staff and the Board before discussion in a newsletter, and this should evolve from the proposed committee activities.

Mr. Bishop commented he saw continual improvement in the Newsletter. Ms. Monoian reported most of the comments she received were very supportive and positive, and also noted a continual improvement. She said there was a request for it to be meatier, and perhaps a little more technical than it is. Louise Dressen said one of the concerns considered on each article was that there was agreement the audience was becoming more and more informed on the issue, but on the other hand, the mailing list keeps increasing so there are those new people coming onto the learning curve. Ms. Wilder added references for further reading are now being included to assist people to learn more on the technical issues.

Mr. Worthington asked if the Advisory Council could receive extra copies of the newsletters as they are published. He had requests for them, he said, and would like to be able to hand them out to interested persons.

Slide Show: Ms. Wilder said a meeting had been scheduled for next week to begin work on a new slide show which will be more technical. Dr. Brewer will assist in this effort, and said he had a number of geologic slides he has taken which could be used. He said he had also sent a list of about 50 topics to Richland, requesting slides from their stock of more technical material. He said Tom Tinsley has almost completed that list, and the slides have already been checked for security. These will be useful in addressing specific interest groups as the basic slide show can be filled in with appropriate technical slides. There should be about 150 slides ready within a couple of weeks.

Ms. Wilder said presentations during the past month had not been so numerous, with three presentations to over 100 people. However, she said, many have been scheduled in the future, including the Yakima Health Board in July, the Washington Building & Construction Trades Council in August, the Washington State Labor Council in September, the Washington Counties meeting in October, and a Waste Transportation Seminar with the Physicians for Social Responsibility in October. Gonzaga University has indicated an interest in doing a seminar on nuclear waste in November, she said. Over the past three months about 40 presentations have been given to about 1500 people.

Fact Sheets: Final drafts of the Fact Sheets are now being reviewed, and the subjects include: Understanding Radiation, What is Commingling?, Defining Nuclear Waste Terms, Monitored Retrievable Storage, High-Level Nuclear Defense Waste at Hanford, and Repository Impacts on Environmental Issues. It is anticipated these will be in final form and released by the end of August, she said. These Fact Sheets, the Newsletter, and other information available will be listed in the flyer being developed. Ms. Wilder circulated two versions of the flyer cover, and the Council chose to use the one with the bold diagonal lines. References for more material will be included in the future Fact Sheets.

Work Request: Planned for the next three months are two newsletters, continual update of the mailing list, the new slide show, the flyer, and some proposed focus papers. The papers would be more in-depth discussions on particular subjects, such as geology, hydrology, or defense waste. A networking plan is being considered to contact groups around the state. Editorial Board meetings will be scheduled with additional media contact. A cover design, and possibly a logo, will be developed. Ms. Wilder asked for any suggestions on this idea from the Council. The purpose, she said, would be to establish an identity on reports emanating from the Board and Council. Presentations will continue.

Mr. Provost said that after the agenda had been completed, he received a call from Don Beck of Washington State University's Social Research Center. In the conversation Mr. Beck asked if they were to submit a proposal to the Council for a telephone survey, would it be seriously considered. Following the phone call, Mr. Provost said he received the letter contained in the packets describing the area of their expertise and a general plan for the survey. Mr. Provost said the Council had considered updating the telephone survey and it might be an appropriate time to do this. Mr. Provost said he agreed only to present the suggestion to the Council for their decision.

Discussion followed concerning the time frame for such a survey.

Should a survey be done it should be done before the release of the Final Environmental Assessment, which is expected about the end of December. Another question raised was whether there was a requirement to seek other proposals throughout the state. Mr. Provost thought this would be handled through an interagency agreement, but would have to make certain.

Lane Bray wondered if the Research Center had the background to compose the questions and analyze the data once it was received. Mr. Provost responded they had done many surveys, and the Department has used one of their earlier surveys, but this would have to be spelled out in their proposal. Mr. Bray wondered what the objective would be to have a telephone survey at this time. Mr. Provost said his recommendation would be to see what level of knowledge the public has and make a comparison against the earlier survey that was done. He said Mr. Beck had read the first survey in detail. Mr. Bishop said since this was an unsolicited proposal the Center should not be discouraged from submitting such a proposal. A survey, he thought, could be helpful in the public involvement program and it might also be helpful to see how this organization connected with the University might do it. Mr. Provost repeated all they were asking at this time was consideration of a proposal.

Mr. Bray said his concern was whether this group was current with the events in the program and whether their questions would be properly posed. Mr. Bishop thought advice and direction should come from the consultant, as well as Council, Board, and staff, to questions drafted, regardless of what public survey group would be used.

The Council agreed it would consider a proposal submitted, with the understanding there was no commitment beyond review on the part of the Council and the Board. Mr. Bishop said this would not preclude going out for a proposal which would have to be approved by USDOE.

Mr. Worthington inquired about the current status of the budget. Mr. Provost replied there is a draft of the fiscal '86 budget proposal, which is being handled by Gary Rothwell in the Office. He

will go over to Richland to meet with USDOE to consult with USDOE in order to complete the request. Mr. Provost said there was a substantial amount in the budget for public involvement. Mr. Worthington suggested any proposal from WSU should be considered by the Public Involvement Committee and staff for review first.

Mr. Bishop said, since there was no objection, Mr. Provost would be asked to communicate a positive response to the Social Research Center indicating the Council would be willing to consider their proposal.

Mission Plan

Mr. Provost reported the final Mission Plan, which took one year to develop, has been received. He said one of the reasons for the delay was USDOE's decision to concentrate on issuing the Environmental Assessment. The final reports consist of three documents: Volume I, Final Mission Plan, which is the policy statement; Volume II, Record of Responses on Draft Mission Plan; and a Listing of Comments. Mr. Provost says the Act states Congress must review the Mission Plan within 30 days after they receive it, but since Congress will be on vacation the month of August, hearings are now set for the first week in September.

Among the major policy issues important to the state of Washington are defense waste, a legal issue dealing with the adequacy of a site, monitored retrievable storage, transportation, and natural resources. Mr. Provost said the plan of action to be presented to the Board is to request the contractor to identify and evaluate priority issues to assist in developing testimony for those September hearings. The Mission Plan Review Committee would meet in late August to review the findings, with a further review from the contractor later in September. A full report from the Committee to the Board would be presented at the September meeting, with recommendations for proceeding with any of the identified issues.

Dr. Brewer commented the Mission Plan contained 1600 pages of very "meaty" material, which will call for a major effort on the part of the staff and the contractors to have comments ready by September. Mr. Provost added there are only a few copies, and an effort would be made to obtain additional copies of the Mission Plan should anyone desire one. Sections could be duplicated if there were a special interest in a certain area, he said.

Status of Oregon Proposal

Mr. Provost reported that at the June meeting of the Board, Oregon agreed to forward a revised proposal for a contract for Oregon to do work on the repository program. The revised proposal has been reviewed by the staff and the U.S. Department of Energy. They have decided there has to be a grant and has to be identifiable outputs

before they could approve the proposal, and have asked for additional improvements. Staff is looking at these areas and a meeting is scheduled today to work out details with staff and Mr. Dixon of Oregon in order to present the proposal to USDOE.

Other Business

Semi-Annual Report

Marta Wilder noted the Semi-Annual Report in the members' packets had just been received from the printer. It covers the period from July through December, 1984. She said work is currently being done on the next six-month report, which should be in final form by the end of August. Extra copies of the report were made available for the public.

Mr. Provost added the new report will be more streamlined and will contain a report on the progress of USDOE work at Hanford, as required under the new legislation. Mr. Bray suggested including a timeline of future activities to assist the reader track the progress of the program. He thought it could be viewed as a report card on the Office activity, as well as that of USDOE.

Mr. Provost said the Monthly Report from the Office is distributed to the Council, and the Semi-Annual Report is built upon those reports.

Anita Monoian said it would be useful to her to have a list of coming events, such as meetings outside of Olympia. She said she would like to be aware of any event in her area as she liked to attend these meetings to hear what information the citizens are receiving and their comments to it. Mr. Provost referred to the weekly in-house schedule used in the Office and said that was a possible item for inclusion periodically. Another option, he said, was to include a section in the Monthly Report listing upcoming events. Mr. Bray suggested when there is an event planned in a member's area the Public Information Officer notify that member ahead of time.

Reference Center

Jeanne Rensel, Librarian in the High-Level Nuclear Waste Office, referred to the list of "Selected New Additions" she prepares for the Council and Board each month. She said her experience has been that a few people do use them, and she often receives requests for the material listed. She said she receives even more requests from the Newsletter now that some reports are being listed. She said an effort was made to select materials that would be of interest to

people. Some of the visitors to the Center included heads of various organizations interested in taking information back to their groups, and some of the Legislators and/or their staff. Volume of material is increasing, she said, and she would appreciate any comments or suggestions on the listings she prepares.

Mr. Bishop asked if this information were provided to other libraries. Mrs. Rensel said she had a computerized mailing list of about thirty-five recipients, with more than half of them being librarians, and the list includes persons from other states. She said she had not arranged to send the lists out from a geographical point of view, and the list was compiled in response to requests. Mr. Bishop said his interest was related to expanding the base of information and thought libraries would be a helpful source for people. Mrs. Rensel said a copy is sent to the State Library and she would check to see if they were interested in circulating the lists to other libraries.

Dr. Brewer introduced Dick Holton of the U.S. Department of Energy, who will be working on the defense waste Environmental Impact Statement, with the current schedule indicating issue in late spring. Dr. Brewer also introduced Susan Wade, a CEIP intern, who will prepare for the Board and Council an evaluation of what the Monitored Retrievable Storage means to the state of Washington. The report will be presented at the end of her six-week review.

Dr. Brewer referred to the 1984 Site Monitoring Report from Hanford. He pointed out that document is written by technical people for a technical audience and is full of unfamiliar terms. He cautioned that reading this document without the technical ability to interpret the figures could be misleading. He suggested anyone who wants to use any of the figures relating to geochemistry contact Dr. Brewer. If they are using figures relating to health effects, he suggested contacting Terry Strong, DSHS, who serves on the Environmental Monitoring Committee. Dr. Brewer added the report itself was considered excellent and a fine briefing was given the Committee on the 18th by USDOE and Battelle. He said all of the releases reported are a very small fraction of the permissible state and federal standards.

Litigation Status

Charlie Roe, Assistant Attorney General, reported in the case of the State of Washington Nuclear Waste Board v. United States Department of Energy regarding the Siting Guidelines, the brief in reply to the motion to dismiss the case was filed on July 10, 1985. The USDOE moved to dismiss the Board's case on the basis that the case was not "ripe" for review. A copy of the brief is available for perusal in the High-Level Nuclear Waste Management Office, and copies could be made if desired. Mr. Roe said the Justice Department should reply by the end of the month and, if there is oral argument, it would probably take place in August, but no later than September.

Concerning Nevada's case involving Funding Litigation, Mr. Roe said the case has been set for oral argument in the 9th Circuit in San Francisco on August 12, 1985.

The Texas case against the U.S. Department of Energy dealing with the selection of potentially acceptable sites was subject to a motion to dismiss also. The 5th Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans did grant that motion to dismiss on the grounds it was not appropriate for review. He said this did not have a direct impact necessarily on the Washington State motion, but there is some indirect impact which will have to be distinguished.

In connection with Governor Gardner's letter regarding compliance with Washington State Water Rights laws, he said he and the staff had met with the Justice Department Attorneys to discuss a means of resolution. Mr. Roe said he had a call yesterday indicating USDOE will be responding within a short time, realizing they had extended their response beyond the thirty-day period.

Other areas of examination are the Mission Plan, which was just received, and continuation of work on the defense waste issue.

Mr. Provost pointed out a series of articles from the Tri-City Herald on the potential repository at Hanford, which was contained in the members' packets. Copies were available for the public at the meeting. In response to Mr. Bray's question, Mr. Provost said the Oregonian series, distributed at the last meeting, were still available in the Reference Center. Mr. Provost said no position is taken on these articles, and they are distributed for information on what is being reported.

Mr. Bishop commented that representatives of four major newspapers were present at the Environmental Monitoring Committee meeting yesterday to hear the presentation by USDOE and Battelle.

Mr. Worthington asked what the status was of the government's choices from the five to the three sites for characterization. Mr. Provost said USDOE is working on the final Environmental Assessment, then they will get to the three process. Officially, the EA is due out in late fall, which Mr. Provost said is believed to be late December. This will be the final recommendation by the U.S. Department of Energy which will go to the President.

Mr. Bray asked the timeline for starting to drill again at Hanford. Mr. Provost said it would come after the final EA and the Presidential recommendation of the three sites. A Site Characterization Plan will then be issued some time next year. After the final EA is released a public hearing will be held in the vicinity of the exploratory shaft. The current position of USDOE is that soon after this hearing is held drilling will commence. An issue that arises, he said, is that the site characterization plans are plans of how all the characterization will be conducted. From their viewpoint,

they will be starting that shaft before a review of all the comments of the SCP is made. USDOE now plans, he said, review those that might be affected by the exploratory shaft. The process will be the same at each of the three sites, he said.

Public Comment

Marie Harris of Bacon & Hunt, Portland, Oregon, said the Oregonian is reissuing their series on Hanford. She asked the status of the USDOE information program proposed at the last meeting. Mr. Provost replied there will be a meeting in Denver in early August and one of the agenda items will be the information program proposal for discussion with the USDOE and the states. Ms. Harris also mentioned that the Washington Waste Site Study Group, which she is helping to staff, is now publishing a newsletter. She said they are trying not to be redundant with the Nuclear Waste Board Newsletter, and asked for permission to distribute the copies she had available.

Sam Reed of the Washington State Public Health Association commented he was not too familiar with the prior effort on the public opinion survey. He said he was concerned with the approach to the WSU proposal to conduct a survey. He felt they should be responding to what the Council needed to know, rather than the Council responding to the Research Center's interpretation of what needed to be known. He thought the Center needed guidance. Mr. Bishop said he had the impression they wished to make a proposal as to their facilities, their ability to carry out such a survey, and not necessarily tell the Council what they think it should know or the content of the questions. Mr. Reed asked if this is pursued further would there be an opportunity for the public to make some sort of input or comment. Mr. Provost said the Committee would review the proposal with recommendation to the Council for input before submitting to the Board. Ms. Monohan added the last survey was not a "public opinion" poll. It was a poll to find out the knowledge level of the average citizen to give guidance to the Council for future endeavors in the public information field. Mr. Reed agreed level of knowledge, source of knowledge were more useful than opinions.

Mr. Bray said that was his thought when he questioned the objective of a survey. He believes the Public Involvement Committee needed to write an objective statement before they ask for the unsolicited proposal.

Mr. Reed commented he had not heard the same level of concern expressed over socioeconomic impact as he had over environmental monitoring. He said knowing the kinds of socioeconomic impact such a venture as this would have on that area is extremely important. Mr. Bishop said this would be one of the major undertakings coming up and asked Mr. Provost to expand on the issue. Mr. Provost said a Socioeconomic Committee is being established. The approach is to use organizations that have had some experience in this area and are knowledgeable in this subject. He said as soon as the site is officially nominated and characterization begins, the state and

local governments are eligible for grants in-lieu-of taxes. Studying this area will be one of the first tasks of the Committee. During site characterization the state where the work would be done is required to make a detailed socioeconomic report. He said that the heavy socioeconomic impact will not come until construction is started. The Committee will be the lead in this area. Should Hanford be chosen for site characterization, the state would then have the reports and the mechanism in place. This stage is five or six years down the road. It is a phased operation, he said, and the emphasis is to start now to set up this mechanism.

Mr. Reed continued there have already been significant socioeconomic impacts resulting from this whole proposal, with no documentation, measuring of them, and no monitoring. He thought even though the authorization and the money comes late to begin a more formal effort, he hoped there would be some focus on going back to pick up what has gone on before. Mr. Provost said they would be using the experience of EFSEC and build that into the Committee.

Mr. Bray agreed it is a late start and based on his experience in presenting the case for the Tri-Cities on the economic impact in the area when Mr. Reed sat on the EFSEC Board, he found once the monies arrived it was a case of playing catch-up. He thought a well thought-out plan should be formulated now, with a baseline for socioeconomic studies. Mr. Reed added he hoped it would be realized the EFSEC is an experience to be learned from and not a model to follow. Mr. Provost replied there are boundaries in the real world and there are certain monetary restrictions, and regarding the socioeconomic study per se, it becomes grant eligible as soon as a site is chosen for characterization. He agreed it is an important issue and a lot of help would be needed in this area.

Mike Spranger of Washington State University, Columbia River Specialist, stated the Social Research Center at WSU is at the forefront for developing survey instruments. He said Dr. Don Gilman wrote the bible for the instruments for mail and phone surveys. He said he knew they had the expertise, but he agreed unless they have firm objectives of the type of questions to be asked and what the Council wants, the information gained may or may not be worthwhile.

Mr. Spranger said the Oregonian series was available for \$1.50 by writing The Oregonian in Portland. If picked up in person, he said the charge is \$1.00.

Mr. Spranger thought if the Fact Sheets are for the public, he believed they could be in a little better form as there is a great deal of information being crowded into single-space type. He thought a little more white space would be appropriate, perhaps with the text broken into smaller paragraphs, with possibly some diagrams. He also thought analogies rather than a scientific explanation would be appropriate for the general public, as his experience showed people are really frightened by numbers.

Don Paine of Rockwell said the socioeconomic aspects have always been an important consideration from the site standpoint. He said there are several different reports that are available which were prepared by Battelle in Seattle. He said they are very extensive and did address the problems encountered with WPPSS, so he felt those types of mistakes would not happen during the repository process. All of this work, he said, was done seven to nine years ago and is available.

Mr. Bray added there was also a base study that was done by Thirty-Five Mile Radius jurisdictions in the Tri-Cities area on the impacts that would be available for study.

Mr. Bishop suggested the Council reevaluate the discussion held earlier on the unsolicited proposal by the Social Research Center at WSU. He said in view of the comments that had been made and the reservation that some have had, it would be better for the Public Involvement Committee to help to shape an outline or format in which an unsolicited proposal could be made. It might be, he said, the Council was being led in the direction of an RFP, which does set forth the capability and competence of the group, as well as the format concerning the kinds of information and goals of the effort. Mr. Bray said it was also important to look at the timeline as to events coming up in the future in order to have the survey done at an appropriate time to fit in with a future event.

Mr. Bishop advised that before a response is sent to the letter from the Research Center, the Public Involvement Committee should consider the idea. He asked Marta to alert the consultant to devote some time and attention to this also.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.