

WARREN A. BISHOP
Chair



101.3

PDR-1
LPDR- Wm-10 (2)

WM DOCKET CONTROL
CENTER

STATE OF WASHINGTON
NUCLEAR WASTE BOARD

'87 JUN 15 AM 11:30 Mail Stop PV-11 • Olympia, Washington 98504 • (206) 459-6670

MINUTES OF JOINT NUCLEAR WASTE BOARD/ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

May 14, 1987

1:30 p.m.
EFSEC Hearings Room
Rowesix, Building #1
4224 Sixth Avenue S.E.
Lacey, Washington 98504

Board Members Present:

Warren A. Bishop, Chair
Curtis Eschels
Representative Dick Nelson
Representative Nancy Rust

Board Designees/Alternate Designees Present:

Ray Lasmanis, DNR Designee

Council Members Present:

Phyllis Clausen
Nancy Hovis
Russell Jim
Valoria Loveland
Betty Shreve
Jim Worthington

8712030265 870514
PDR WASTE PDR
WM-10

WM Record File 101.3
WM Project 10
Docket No. _____
PDR ✓
XLPDR ✓ (B)

Distribution to:
REB MJB Still Tana
JOB RDM Young Linehan
Return to WM, (623-53) Runikro

3758

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

Introductory Remarks

Mr. Bishop indicated that the Joint Information meeting on the preparation of the Socioeconomic Impact Report coincided with a critical meeting day of the Legislature. He stated this as the reason why many of the legislators were not present. Appreciation was expressed to those legislators who were able to attend the Joint Information meeting.

Mr. Bishop called upon Jerry Parker, Policy Analyst with the Office of Nuclear Waste Management to describe the meeting's agenda, to introduce the individuals who would speak on the specific topics, and to identify documents distributed to Board and Council members and to the interested public.

Mr. Bishop stated that many people contributed to the activities of the Socioeconomic Committee. He specifically acknowledged Board members Curtis Eschels, Socioeconomic Committee Chair, and Representative Dick Nelson for their work with the Committee and called upon Mr. Eschels to report activities of the Committee.

Mr. Eschels reported that the Socioeconomic Committee was created originally from Board members. Council members were later added as liaisons. Council members were appointed because of the recognition that if site characterization or construction should occur, there will be major social and economic impacts upon Washington State of concern to the public. He noted that the membership of the Committee had been further expanded to include two state agencies, Agriculture and Trade & Economic Development, and observed

that close coordination has been established between the Committee and the Local Government Committee of the Council.

Mr. Eschels listed the Committee's main objectives: 1) examining the potential social and economic impacts of siting a repository at Hanford through preparation of an impact report; and 2) implementing the provision in the Act for payments equal to taxes (PETT). He then identified basic objectives of the impact report: 1) to assist the Board, Legislature and Governor in deciding whether to exercise the notice of disapproval provided for through the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982; and 2) to identify impacts as a basis for claims by the state and by local governments to mitigate or compensate for potential adverse effects of a repository.

Mr. Eschels listed the membership and staff of the Socioeconomic Committee and noted that the Committee is also assisted by consultants, William Freudenburg and John Gervers.

Mr. Eschels reported that prior to publishing a request for proposal (RFP) for preparation of an impact report, the Committee met between November 1985 and June 1986 to identify the major concerns to be addressed in such a report. Mr. Eschels said that four public hearings were held during the spring, 1986, in Seattle, Vancouver, Tri-Cities, and Spokane to receive comment from the public regarding concerns to be considered in the impact report. Upon review, the Committee assigned these comments to one or more of seven categories:

1. The loss of credibility in the repository program;

2. Potential health impacts;
3. Potential economic impact of routine site characterization, construction, and operation of a permanent repository;
4. The probability and consequence of unanticipated releases from the repository;
5. The impact of uncertainty;
6. The loss of control related to uncertainty; and
7. The potential of the repository program to polarize the population.

Mr. Eschels stated that each of these concerns will be included in the impact study. He said that state-of-the-art work will be one, and called upon Sandi Benbrook of the Department of Community Development and a member of the Committee to discuss the contractor selection process and the current status of the Committee.

Ms. Benbrook reported that soon after the conclusion of the public meetings, the development of the request for proposal (RFP) began. The RFP was distributed to more than 300 potentially interested contractors in late August. A sixty-day period was provided for submission of proposals. As of October 30, seven proposals were received. A subcommittee of the Socioeconomic Committee was appointed by Curt Eschels to screen the proposals and select candidates for oral presentation and interview. Following the screening, the subcommittee recommended to the full Committee that four candidates be interviewed. The interviews were conducted in mid-December and a preferred candidate, Impact Assessment, Inc. (IAI), was identified.

The Committee discussed revisions in the proposal with IAI and on January 22 voted to enter contract negotiations with the firm. An agreement was signed by IAI in mid-March and submitted to the USDOE for funding. A notice of approval was received from USDOE on April 22. On April 28, the Department of Ecology signed the agreement which became effective upon signature.

Mr. Eschels then discussed the role of local government in the siting process, and called on Lane Bray to report on local government involvement. Mr. Eschels explained that in addition to being a member of the Richland City Council, Mr. Bray was a former member of the Nuclear Waste Advisory Council and a current member of the Socioeconomic Committee, representing the Association of Washington Cities. Mr. Bray expressed his appreciation to be present and discussed local government's involvement in the Socioeconomic Committee. He stated that when the Committee was first formed to assist the Nuclear Waste Board, Mr. Bishop and Mr. Eschels had the forethought to involve local governments.

Mr. Bray said that the RFP was modified in many different ways to reflect the concerns of the city and county governments. He then referred to and recited from a section of the RFP which specifically identified the need to work closely with local governments and provided for financial support for involvement by local governments.

Mr. Bray identified three associations of local governments which are currently seeking funding from the Nuclear Waste Board to participate in the preparation and review of the impact report. He discussed the activities of one of these asso-

ciations, the Mid-Columbia Consortium of Governments.

On March 11, 12 and 13, the Consortium members and assessors from Benton and Franklin Counties visited Nevada. The group met with Nye County officials to discuss the local ramifications of siting a high-level nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada. Also, the group met with Nevada state officials, local representatives of the Las Vegas, Clark County, and Nye County. On April 27, the Consortium representatives traveled to Washington, D.C., to meet with their counterparts from Nye County, Nevada, and Deaf Smith County, Texas. The joint meetings in Washington, D.C., focused on common concerns which exist among local governments in the three areas of the country in which repositories are proposed. These include recognition that safety is the primary concern of all three potential sites, insistence that the site selection process center on the technical and scientific facts related to each site, and a fear that political decisions may override scientific and technical data. The local government representatives agreed that Congressional modification to the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act should include a more direct reference to local government involvement and that a common approach to issues such as PETT may be beneficial. Finally, the local government representatives agreed that from their standpoint it is appropriate to form an association of local governments adjunct to potential sites and maintain a representative in Washington, D.C., to maintain contact with each potential host site is appropriate.

Bray reported that during the course of their visit to Washington, D.C., elected officials from the three organizations were invited to testify before the Senate

Energy and Natural Resources Committee. Senator Bennett Johnston of Louisiana, Committee Chair, requested comment by state and local government officials regarding possible amendments to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. Mr. Bray reported that Benton County Commissioner Ron Jones, Chair of the Mid-Columbia Consortium, testified on behalf of the Consortium. The Commissioner's testimony was distributed to the Board and Council members.

Gil Mallery of the Intergovernmental Resource Center in Vancouver, and Steve Harvey of the Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Governmental Conference in Kelso-Longview, briefly described draft agreements between the Board and their respective associations to support participation in the preparation and review of the Board's impact report. Both Mallery and Harvey described public concern regarding potential contamination of the Columbia River in explaining the need for such participation. They also cited potential transport of spent nuclear fuel from the Trojan plant to Hanford as a source of concern among local governments.

Following the discussion of local government involvement, Mr. Eschels returned to Sandi Benbrook to describe the major divisions of the RFP and the process used to select a contractor. Ms. Benbrook stated that the Committee views the RFP as the outline of concerns to be addressed in the impact report. The RFP describes 5 major areas of analysis: economic and demographic conditions and impacts; social and cultural conditions and impacts; risk analysis; transportation and mitigation; and compensation. Impacts are divided into 2 categories: standard and special. The former described impacts associated with any major construction process while the

latter describes those impacts attributable to the nuclear nature of the repository.

Ms. Benbrook stated that the study is divided in four sections and should take a minimum of four years to complete. The phases of the impact study follow:

1. Initial investigation and data collection;
2. Examination of actual impact occurring during site characterization;
3. Analysis of impacts of construction, operation and decommissioning; and
4. Identification of post closure impacts.

Ms. Benbrook explained that the Contractor, Impact Assessment, Inc., is currently preparing a detailed research design for the initial phase. She stated that as research design development occurs, the Board and Council will be given status reports.

The difference between the special and standard impacts was then discussed in greater detail by Mr. Eschels. Both positive and negative special impacts will be reviewed in the study. A prominent special impact identified in the RFP is the potential stigma that could be associated with a "nuclear waste dump." The potential stigma could result in market discrimination against agricultural products from the region and in a difficulty in both recruitment and retention on non-nuclear industry to the region. On the positive side, a repository could augment the already strong research capability of the region.

Mr. Eschels introduced John Petterson, President of Impact Assessment, Inc., and

called upon him to discuss the study objectives and procedures. Mr. Bishop extended his personal appreciation and on behalf of the Board and Council to Mr. Petterson for his patience in waiting for funding to be approved by USDOE for the impact study. Mr. Petterson stated that each person on his staff is committed to the project and enthusiastic about involvement in it. He said the first meeting of the key participants was scheduled for May 22.

Mr. Petterson referred to the packet of information from Impact Assessment, Inc. which was distributed to the Board and Council members. The packet contained a description of organization of the study team, personnel, plans of work, schedule, and deliverables.

In his discussion on the plan of work, Mr. Petterson stated that IAI agreed to open an office in the Tri-Cities area to act as a resource base. He said that the meeting of team leaders on May 22, 23 and 24 would focus on the research design, preliminary identification of impacts, and identification of key criteria for an adequate monitoring and mitigation plan. Mr. Petterson said that this workshop would also be an opportunity for the team members to become acquainted with each other.

Mr. Petterson introduced Charlie Wolf, Technical Advisor to IAI. Mr. Wolf gave a brief summary of his background and expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to work on the project.

Jerry Parker, Office staff and contract officer for the study, stated that the study will extend, at a minimum, for four years. He said that the contract with IAI for the first year is approximately one million dollars. Phase one is divided into thirteen tasks. IAI is autho-

rized to begin five of those tasks at a total cost of \$438,000. Each subsequent task in the first phase requires a task order from the state which describes the work to be completed.

At the completion of phase one, the work will be evaluated for adequacy and an application will be made to USDOE for phase two. Each subsequent application to USDOE will be contingent upon completion of the previous phase. The key role of the Socioeconomic Committee is to review the quality of work. A peer review panel will be established to assist the Committee in this function. It will serve to assure the quality of work and lend creditability in case of litigation.

Mr. Parker continued, reporting that the next step in the peer review panel selection process is to entertain suggestions from Committee members, and Board and Council members. He stated that the Committee is interested in forming a panel of nine to eleven members whom will meet semi-annually. The first meeting of the panel will take place shortly after July 13, when the research design is received. He added that Nevada has a similar peer review panel which costs approximately \$20,000 to \$25,000 per meeting. Mr. Parker then introduced Max Power of the Institute for Public Policy to discuss the involvement of faculty at state universities in review of work on the impact report.

Mr. Power reported that the functions of the university review panel will be to (1) review interim products; (2) extend the ability of the Committee to review specific materials; (3) develop a cadre of informed and involved people within Washington State institutions; and (4) identify the major issues for the national peer review panel. Mr. Power stated that most of the communication between the

university peer review panel will be conducted through computer telecommunications. The Institute will identify the members and fund the panel through its grant.

Russell Jim of the Yakima Indian Nation expressed his interest in the day's discussion of the socioeconomic impact study. He said that the interest of the state to learn what may come from the entire study will be beneficial to all parties.

Mr. Bishop recommended that periodic joint information meetings regarding the socioeconomic impact study be conducted whenever significant activities occur.

Mr. Eschels expressed special appreciation to Mr. Parker for his dedication to the project and complimented Council member Phil Bereano for his contribution to the project. He also thanked Board member Ray Lasmanis of the Department of Natural Resources for his contributions to the project while serving as a member of Socioeconomic Committee. Mr. Bishop stated, on behalf of the Nuclear Waste Board and Council, his gratitude for the work completed by Mr. Eschels and members of the Socioeconomic Committee.

Public Comment

None.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.