

300

WM DOCKET CONTROL
MINUTES OF NUCLEAR WASTE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING
March 21, 1986

'86 APR 14 P12:09

9:30 a.m.
EFSEC Hearings Room
Rowesix - Building #1
4224 Sixth Avenue S.E.
Lacey, Washington

Council Members Present:

Warren A. Bishop Chair
Harry A. Batson
Philip Bereano
Pam Behring
Phyllis Clausen
Nancy Hovis
Dr. Estella B. Leopold
Valoria Loveland
Terry Novak
Sam Reed
Commissioner W. H. Sebero
Betty Shreve
Jim Worthington

WM Record File

101.3

WM Project 10

Docket No.

PDR ☒

LPDR ☒

Distribution:

REB MTB JTB

RDM DEM CER

(Return to WM, 623-SS)

To: Linehan, NRC

Linehan

BLKerr

DKWahid, Reg V SF

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

Mr. Bishop commented on the presentation by USDOE yesterday giving an overview of the 19,000 pages on 40 years of radioactive releases at Hanford. The presentation was made by Ronald E. Gerton, Director of Environmental Safety, Health and Quality Assurance Division of the Richland Operations, USDOE. At the direction of the Governor, a committee has been formed to review this material and is composed of representatives of Oregon, Washington, and the three affected Indian tribes. (A list of the members of that joint review committee is attached.)

Hanford Historical Documents Review Committee

The Committee held its first meeting following the USDOE presentation and elected Dr. Royston Filby, member of the Board, as the Chair. Dr. Andrew Klein of Oregon was chosen Vice-Chair. Mr. Bishop asked Dr. Filby to comment briefly about the actions taken at the meeting held yesterday.

Dr. Filby reported the goals of the Committee are to evaluate the health and environmental impacts of the releases of radionuclides from Hanford operations during the past 40 years. One of the first objectives of the Committee during the next two months will be evaluation of just how that study will be carried out. Because of

B605140004 860321
PDR WASTE
WM-10

PDR

1797

overlaps with other activities, the work of the Committee will relate to several of the committees of the Nuclear Waste Board, the announced Congressional investigation, and the Centers for Disease Control studies, which is being started.

The future activities were divided into two phases, one primarily an organizational phase. During this phase the Committee expects to hire a contractor whose first task will be to evaluate the large volume of information to see what is there and what is not there, and what needs to be added to the data in order to make an evaluation of it. This will form the data base for the real meat of the study, he said, which will be Phase II. This phase will determine the environmental health impacts of the releases.

Yesterday the Committee approved preparation of a single amendment to the Nuclear Waste Board grant, rather than seek individual grant amendments through the different entities, particularly the grants to the Indian tribes. It was also determined an RFP needed to be prepared for a contractor to carry out Phase I. The Committee decided to set up a Peer Review Group of five to ten nationally-recognized scientific experts in a number of delineated fields, which would cover the origin of radionuclides in the Hanford processes, their distribution, their environmental releases and fates, and their effects. This review group will review the performance of the actual study and determine the health and environmental impacts which will be carried out during Phase II.

Dr. Filby continued that the Committee felt that it was absolutely essential that this Peer Review Group be of the highest quality and caliber so that the final conclusions and recommendations for action will have the utmost credibility. He requested that members of the Advisory Committee nominate experts, either in the region or outside the region, to serve on this group. Nominations, including short biographical information, can be sent directly to him, he said, or to the Office.

The Committee also set up two subcommittees for Phase I. One would carry out the screening process of the proposals received in response to the RFP. The second subcommittee would perform a screening of the nominations for the Peer Review Group for submission of a list of recommendations to the full Committee for action.

Dr. Filby said it was expected the contractor selection through the RFP process, and the formation of a Peer Review Group would take approximately two months, with six weeks needed for the rest of Phase I to be completed.

Introductions

Mr. Bishop acknowledged the presence of Anita Monoian of Yakima, former member of the Advisory Council and Chair of the Public Involvement Committee of the Council.

USDOE - Washington, D.C.

Mr. Bishop introduced Carol Peabody, Desk Officer, Siting Division, Office of Geologic Repositories in Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, USDOE, Washington, D.C. Ms. Peabody said her duties included tracking a couple of states in the first repository program, and she is now picking up some states in the second repository program. Specifically, she said, she is following Washington State and the state of Mississippi, and the state of Wisconsin has been added in the second repository program. She said the first hearing on release of the Draft Area Recommendation Report on the second repository crystalline site selection process was on Thursday in northern Wisconsin. About 250 people attended and she found the people were very interested in activities in the first repository as well, as they felt it would affect the siting process for the second.

Ms. Peabody said she had been in attendance at the Tucson meeting, and she would be pleased to discuss that following Marta Wilder's presentation later. She offered her assistance to the Council should it be needed in Washington, although she complimented Max Powell, Jim Mecca, and Judy Tokarz in the Richland Office for the assistance to the state from the BWIP Office.

On the informational side, Ms. Peabody said there is finally a new pamphlet published on transportation. It is an overview, or primer, on transporting spent fuel, she said, and will be available from the Richland Office. Mr. Bishop said enough copies will be obtained to furnish one to each Council member, as well as the Board and affected Indian tribes.

Minutes

It was moved and seconded that the minutes of the February 21, 1986 be approved as published. The motion was carried.

Proposed Procedural Operation

Mr. Bishop said in order to expedite the business of the Council and devote proper time to public involvement, the following was proposed for adoption by the Council:

1. Any Resolution on an action to be proposed by a member, whether on the Agenda or not, should be presented to staff for proper copying, background information, etc. two weeks before the Council meeting.
2. A suggested Agenda item from members should be furnished to the Office two weeks before the meeting because of logistics problems of processing, collection of data, and mailing ten days ahead of the meeting.

Mr. Bishop added that if items of interest or importance come to the Office later than the two-week time line, copies will be made available but will not be considered for action at that particular meeting. They will be added to the Agenda for the following meeting.

Estella Leopold commented that although she appreciated the difficulty of advance preparations, she felt a two-week lag would make the Council's response out-of-date and would hamper the Council's response to the issues at the meeting. She thought in general it was a good idea, but it would be an undue requirement.

Mr. Bishop pointed out the Council by unanimous vote could consider an action on any item presented. Terry Husseman pointed out that by state law the Office is required to send out the Agenda ten days prior to the meeting in order that all interested parties will know what is happening at that meeting. This gives those who might wish to speak to the issues plenty of notice.

Betty Shreve commented that her minutes, which came by United Parcel Service, were received last Monday. Terry Novak said he had received his Agenda two days after the meeting last month. Mr. Husseman stated that they were all mailed on the same day, which is always ten days before the meeting.

Estella Leopold asked if the proposed procedure would close the door on Resolutions that might be of a more immediate character relating to events within the prior two weeks. Mr. Bishop said in explanation of the proposed system, that he thought it unfair to the members of the Council and to the staff to have to act on Resolutions that arise, even from the public or through a member from the public, such as occurred at the last meeting. He felt it did not allow the Council itself to be prepared to consider and take action without having as much information and background on a subject as the members could, or should, have. Mr. Bishop said every effort would be made to avoid emergent situations, such as Estella Leopold had mentioned. Mr. Bishop said he was trying to propose a procedure to avoid some rather severe criticism that had been received about the way the Council operates, and he desired to correct that if possible.

Sam Reed expressed his concern for the proposed procedure, particularly having it raised at this particular time without forewarning, and he requested that there not be a definitive action on the proposal at this meeting. He also asked if this were being proposed as a Chairman's ruling, or as a decision by the Council at the suggestion of the Chair. He went on to say he was concerned about a rule as stated that lacks sufficient flexibility to let the Council do its job. He said he recognizes the concern of the Chair and others and thought there should be discussions today with action by the Council later. Mr. Bishop said his proposal was suggested as one for adoption by the Council, and perhaps there should be a mechanism to handle situations such as mentioned by Estella Leopold. He thought the Council should suggest what that might be. Mr. Bishop asked him what kind of support from the Council should be required

for emergent issues to be acted upon at the time they are presented. Mr. Reed said his opinion favored majority rule.

Bill Sebero said if his Local Government Committee brought an action item to the Council meeting they would need immediate action and would not want to be constricted to an Agenda item. He said he agreed with Estella Leopold that the Council would be dealing with items at least two weeks old. He thought such a proposal would put an undue burden on committee members.

Jim Worthington asked if he were correct in understanding that the proposal did not prohibit motions from the Council on any action items under discussion and passed by majority vote. He asked if Mr. Bishop, in referring to "Resolution", meant that as the only item. Mr. Bishop said it was not the intention to incorporate those actions into the proposal. Mr. Bishop said he referred to subject items that would be proposed for action and were totally new to the members. He referred again to the situation that occurred at the last meeting wherein the Council only received a briefing on the subject accidentally when Mr. Fitch happened to pass through the room. He thought there should be some kind of a procedural way to deal with that kind of situation. He said if the Council really did not care about that, he would abide by the sentiments of the Council.

Mr. Bishop then asked if any members had concerns over actions proposed about which they did not have enough information. Pam Behring said she thought if that should occur, it could be expressed and a delay in action could be requested. If not delayed, majority rule would apply.

Phyllis Clausen said she would prefer delaying action on the proposal until the next meeting. She suggested a less formal way to avoid problems by asking members to submit Agenda items two weeks in advance, and make it clear that if they were not, there was the possibility no action could be taken on the items.

Mr. Reed said he continued to be bothered by the two-week restriction. He pointed out many of the action items derive from committee considerations, and most are scheduled immediately prior to the Council meeting to minimize travel time. With a two-week limitation, he foresaw having to bring people from around the state to a central point twice in one month. Concerning the situation at the last meeting, he said he had concern at the time, as he felt the Resolution was inappropriate because of the fact that the Governor had a process underway to deal with the situation. He said he also felt that the Resolution, if it were to be heard, would be more appropriately heard by the Board, as it was a basic policy issue. He added that those kinds of situations might very well be spoken to by the Chairman and his decision should carry some weight.

Mr. Bishop commented the Council spectrum of authority is rather broad too, as their advice to the Board presumably covers any subject. Mr. Reed said he recognized there was an element of public

information involved in that Resolution, but he still felt it was incongruous to have the Council voting on it while the Board had not considered it at all.

Nancy Hovis asked if the Council had the option to table an action for a future meeting to obtain more information, rather than locking it into a two-week limit. Mr. Bishop said they did have that opportunity. Ms. Hovis said she did feel uncomfortable last meeting, and some of the comments that are being expressed now are because people thought of things later. She said she agreed totally with the spirit of the Resolution and voted for it, but was not sure exactly why she was voting for it. She said they may vote as a majority, but if the majority is uninformed, what is the meaning of the majority. She thought Resolutions outside the Council, that do not come from subcommittees, should have that two-week limit. Mr. Bishop wondered if those kinds of Resolutions should flow through the Committee.

Estella Leopold stated that the information circulated to the Council on October 17, 1985, dealt with the Taiwan issue, so she felt the Council had the reading material.

Mr. Reed said he liked the suggestion for a two-week lead time for actions arising from outside the Council, and he would support that proposal. He again pleaded for the exception to the rule.

Mr. Bishop said consideration would be given to any additional proposals that might be suggested and discussion on this issue would continue at the next meeting. He said his only concern was to make the process as careful and precise as possible to ensure that people feel comfortable with the actions taken. He said he wanted to be sure the conduct of the meeting was open and efficient.

Recent Development

Liability. Mr. Husseman said the effort had continued to have federal legislation drawn in Congress that would accomplish goals set forth by the Governor, the Board, the National Governors Association, the National Association of Attorneys General, and a significant committee of the National Conference of State Legislatures on the liability for transportation, storage, or disposal of high-level nuclear waste. Last week, Congressmen Swift and Morrison introduced H 4394, which would accomplish these goals if passed in the form it was introduced. Work by the state will continue through the Washington delegation to get support for this bill from other delegations.

In the Senate there is a bill introduced by Senators Simpson and McClure. This bill in its current form does not accomplish all the objectives of the state. Mr. Husseman said the Office has been working closely with Senator Evans and his staff on some amendments, which if passed by the Committee would meet all of the states' concerns. Charlie Roe and he went back to Washington, D.C. for the mark-up of this bill scheduled last week. Unfortunately, he said,

Senator McClure became ill on the morning of the hearing and the meeting was canceled. When the bill does leave this Committee it will be referred to the Senate Environment Committee, which will have 120 days for review before sending the bill to the floor.

Historical Data on Hanford Operations. This subject was thoroughly covered by Dr. Filby's earlier report.

Health Impacts of Radionuclide Releases (CDC Study). As noted in the memo, Mr. Husseman said, the study is underway and the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) has met with the Environmental Monitoring Committee. Mr. Provost, who is working closely on this issue, said the staff of the Department of Social and Health Services and the Office have developed a preliminary budget and are presently working on language for a grant amendment to cover the expenses. They hope to hold a panel meeting in Richland in September and would like to have reviewing data in early April. The current plan is to have representatives of CDC to come to the state in April to review the historic material and put it in a form for use by epidemiologists.

Defense Waste DEIS. USDOE still plans to make the late-March release of the Defense Waste DEIS, Mr. Husseman said. The Office has completed the RFP process for a contractor to assist the Board to develop comments on the DEIS. A selection has been made and will be announced next Monday.

Environmental Assessment - Ranking Methodology. USDOE is still holding to a release date of late April for the final Environmental Assessment. This date could change, he said, depending upon the results of the National Academy of Sciences review, which will be given the U.S. Department of Energy next week. At the moment, USDOE is briefing the first-round states and affected tribes in Washington, D.C. on what they will be providing the NAS next week. Charlie Roe and Max Power will be calling in results of the meeting when it is over.

Monitored Retrievable Storage (MRS). There has been no change in the MRS status since February 7, when an injunction was placed against submission by USDOE of any portion of the MRS proposal relating to site selection to Congress.

Estella Leopold asked how long the injunction would hold. Mr. Husseman said he heard in Tucson that all briefs from all parties have been submitted, and it is now up to the Judge to make a determination.

Estella Leopold inquired about the paper prepared by Susan Wade for the state on the MRS situation. She said she had a copy and would like a copy of this report sent to each Council member.

Foreign Fuel Shipments. Since the last Council meeting a coalition of several groups filed a lawsuit seeking an injunction to prevent USDOE from bringing any shipments of foreign fuel into the

Port of Seattle, or into the waters of the state of Washington until an Environmental Impact Statement is prepared. Mr. Husseman reported the Near-Term group formed at the request of the Governor to study this issue will be funded for their work by the U.S. Department of Energy.

Estella Leopold expressed again her concern about the concept of having a "Principle of Understanding" drafted that might commit the state on this issue. She wondered how often the Council would be briefed on the Near-Term group's activities. She asked if that group were completely independent from the Board and Council, or would there be opportunity for either Board or Council to have input in the process. Mr. Bishop suggested Mr. Fitch be invited to give a brief report at the next Council meeting, but Estella Leopold said she would like a report that day.

Sam Reed asked if the Governor had received any assurances from USDOE regarding the events in the interim period before the work of the Near-Term group was completed. Mr. Husseman replied this could best be answered by Curt Eschels, Chair of the group.

Mr. Eschels was contacted in his office and agreed to brief the Council on activities of the Near-Term group. Mr. Eschels said the name of the group is the "Near-Term High-Level Nuclear Waste Transportation Group". He reviewed the reason the Governor requested formation of the group--to have an identifiable group within the state to examine and to help state government respond to the proposal by the U.S. Department of Energy to bring foreign research reactor fuel into the United States for shipment to the Savannah River Plant in South Carolina for reprocessing. The group is made up of representatives of the affected state government agencies, as well as local governments directly involved, such as the Ports of Seattle and Tacoma, and their city governments.

Mr. Eschels said the group has been meeting regularly, developing two products. The first will be a set of principles which will define how the state and the U.S. Department of Energy relate to each other when there are foreign shipments coming into the state. Another product would be a report to the Governor and the people of the state, explaining that particular series of shipments--if they occur--and other domestic shipments that come into Hanford for research purposes. Currently there are a number of different procedures being used by the federal departments, as well as the state departments involved. One of the goals of the group is to bring about some uniformity, so that, for instance, should it be a shipment of fuel being brought to Hanford from Maryland under the repository program to test the effect of radiation on basalt, the same set of procedures for transporting it would apply as if it were coming to Seattle for a stop, and then on to another destination.

Mr. Eschels said the deadline for this group's report is next July. He said the group's work relates to the work of the Advisory Council and the Nuclear Waste Board in a temporal way. Although what they are doing now is in response to some shipments in the near-term, he

said, they are aware of the precedent that could be set--not only if Washington were chosen as a repository state, but also for shipments that could originate in the state if the repository were located elsewhere. There is also the defense waste at Hanford, which under present plans is supposed to be moved.

The "Principles of Understanding" would be just guidelines, he said, and the intent of developing those is to assure safety while these shipments are ongoing. The group has been working with the U.S. Department of Energy toward their financing the efforts of the group, so the work has not been so extensive as it will be once the funding is set.

Sam Reed asked what kind of an understanding the state had with USDOE regarding actions during the interim period before an agreement is reached. Mr. Eschels said by a gentlemen's understanding, the state is notified ahead of time when there is what USDOE calls a "campaign", which could be a series of shipments, meaning two, three, or four shipments over an entire year. The state is told of the contents, type of casks, and approximate time of transport. A phone call is made at the time of the actual shipment and that information allows the state to alert the State Patrol at the border, alert emergency response personnel, etc. When the campaign is concluded a summary is given to the state as a verification of what has been shipped. Mr. Reed wanted to know if the state had an understanding permitting it to affect the manner of shipping, time, or any other particulars regarding the process. Mr. Eschels said the state has made suggestions, and all of them have been taken.

In response to Estella Leopold's question about USDOE sitting in on the group's meetings, Mr. Eschels said the group met with USDOE every other meeting. She asked why the state did not lay down some rules and not try to accommodate the interests of USDOE. Mr. Eschels said they had transmitted a list of conditions to USDOE, but legally the state is not in a position to make demands and set rigid rules. Mr. Eschels continued there are Court cases that say the state could not do this if the U.S. Department of Energy says the state is being "unreasonable". He offered to share the list of conditions with the Advisory Council members.

(Mr. Eschels was thanked by the Chair for making an impromptu report.)

Public Involvement Report

Mr. Reed said he would discuss two items, the first of which he considered of paramount importance to the Public Involvement Committee, and considered equally important to Mr. Sebero, Chair of the Local Government Committee. The issue, he said, related to resources. The present Council has been in existence for six months and there is no substantial accomplishment or product affecting public information and involvement to show for it. He stated he did not mean to say the staff is not competent or is not working hard, but the fact is there is not enough manpower to get the job done. As an example,

at the last Council meeting there were proposed for the Council's approval a series of conceptual ideas regarding work to be done, with the understanding that if these were approved the staff would then have the assignment of developing them in greater detail, determining the costs, and coming back to the Council with a proposal. He said nothing had been done on those--not because of unwillingness, but because of lack of time. He questioned how productive it was for the committees to meet, the Council to meet, and go over the same thing again and again.

Mr. Reed said he recognized the Council was in an interim period between the employment of a contractor, which was available to the Council in the past, and a decision regarding characterization which will determine how staff will be supplemented either with additional staff or contract assistance. Mr. Reed continued that since this interim period is dragging on and there is no certain time when the Council will be on a different track, it means that there must be a way found to supplement resources. He said it was not realistic to expect much additional activity, if any, with the current staff. He cited the in-house publication of the Newsletter, responses to requests for presentations, news releases, plus the organizational bureaucratic demands that take up all the available time. He considered the situation had reached a crisis point as far as morale and productivity of Council committees are concerned, maintenance of the momentum created by the former Council and the lessening of the public image of the Council. He said the need for action by the Council is greater than ever when public information and public involvement actions engaged in by other people are observed, as well as the media coverage.

Mr. Reed said as a Committee Chairman he felt strongly something has to happen as a first order of business.

Bill Sebero stated that the Council is not only eager, but is extremely aggressive. He said it was very interesting that two committees, independent of one another, would come to the same conclusion. He recalled that at the last meeting the Local Government Committee added 3,000 names to the Newsletter mailing list. The staff is still attempting to get those names inserted in the list. The Local Government Committee, he said, is prepared to give the staff another 20,000 names, and they cannot handle it. In addition, separation of key people also has to be done. The Committee felt it was quite obvious that the Nuclear Waste Board and Council has to hire someone, single, who owns a suitcase, has a car, and is willing to travel.

Mr. Sebero said Marta Wilder has a list of people who want a slide presentation; there is a minimum of three local government conventions this year, and contacting another 20,000 people soliciting presentations will be impossible, so there is no point in sending it out. He said he agreed with Mr. Reed that there was no way the existing staff could deal with just the two committees, in addition to all their other duties with the Council and Board. Mr. Sebero

said he thought it was critical that the Council deal with that staffing problem.

Mr. Husseman said he appreciated the comments and agreed that not only Marta and Sandra are inundated and overworked, but all those involved in the program are in the same position, including the folks at Richland and Headquarters. Right now, he said, staffing of the public involvement program is a serious problem. There are allocations and plans to hire four additional people for the public involvement program, with additional plans to contract out work that cannot be done in-house. Until Hanford is actually declared to be in the final three sites for nomination, there is no way to inform potential applicants there would be work for them longer than one month. Should Hanford be designated number four, the funding for the program would be ended shortly after that. This puts the Office in a difficult situation, as it would not be possible to recruit desired personnel.

Mr. Husseman said they were trying to avoid going out with another blanket contract without specifics. He said it could be possible to take priority items, such as the mailing list, and go out with a Request for Proposal, but staff additions would probably have to wait for the final Environmental Assessment. Should the release date be delayed further, the situation would have to be reassessed. He said his recommendation would be to prioritize specific projects, such as updating the mailing list, and draft some specific grant requests and Requests for Proposals to take care of them, rather than to try to recruit people into an uncertain situation. Both of these actions could be started at the same time, as was done with the Defense Waste DEIS.

In response to Betty Shreve's question, Mr. Husseman said the funds that were going to Envirosphere were part of the grant at the time Envirosphere was the contractor. When the relationship with Envirosphere was terminated they were no longer part of the grant. The grant does not include an open-ended amount of money. It covers only specific project. He said he could provide the breakdown of the grant, if desired.

Mr. Bishop suggested identified areas of public involvement should be addressed with proper scoping and request a grant proposal. Mr. Reed agreed that the probable feasible method would be to contract for needed services. He said with the array of ongoing activities and those which the Council approved at the last meeting, the workload would warrant the two persons on staff spending their time managing contracts and coordinating contractors working on the projects. He recommended contracting out the units identified and leave the time of present staff for management and coordination and development of new concepts.

In light of the earlier procedural discussion, Betty Shreve asked if the Chair would consider a Resolution she had prepared on March 16. The proposed Resolution followed along the same lines as Mr. Reed's remarks, and she said she shared the concerns he expressed. She

said adequate funding was essential to accomplish the goals of the Council and she too was anxious to see more accomplishment. The Resolution read:

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Nuclear Waste Advisory Council that:

the necessary steps, procedures, etc. be taken to engage a professional, public relations-public information firm to work with the Council to implement both short-term and long-term goals of the Council and that the Council function in its designated "advisory" capacity to direct and monitor this contract firm."

Mr. Sebero commented he agreed with Ms. Shreve, but after hearing Mr. Husseman's remarks and realizing there is a problem, he thought the prime thrust of the Local Government Committee then should sit until it is determined what is going to happen. The Local Government Committee needs support, he said, and he thought the Council should react with the premise that Hanford has been selected. Either that, he said, or the Council should back up until the selection is made and then react accordingly.

Phyllis Clausen said although all were agreed funding was needed, she was concerned that contracting specific tasks, such as adding 20,000 names to the mailing list, will only add to the staff workload. She said the Council should think beyond getting a specific job done.

Estella Leopold said, speaking for the Science and Technology Committee, the comments by Mr. Reed and Mr. Sebero follow very much along the line of Mr. Bereano's thinking in the past meetings. She also thought the idea of contracting for specific tasks was very good, but perhaps we should also go ahead and hire supplementary staff if even on a short-term basis. She also agreed with the content of the Resolution.

Mr. Worthington said when the committees come back to the Council with specific recommendations and the body approves them, perhaps they should be passed on to USDOE as major concerns of the states as carrying out part of their duties. The state should receive funding from them, perhaps an ongoing grant to cover the public involvement programs, as they evolve.

Max Powell of the USDOE-Richland commented they appreciated the concerns and comments of the Council. He said they are faced with similar concerns both in Richland and Headquarters. He noted the whole process started with BWIP, but other issues are becoming more involved, such as the CDC Study, defense waste, and the 40-year historical data. He suggested that perhaps the Governor, the Council, or the Board bring up this issue and that maybe funding should be coming from other sources than the Nuclear Waste Fund. These are all issues the public wants to know about, he said, that BWIP cannot fund, but perhaps USDOE could find other sources for the public information.

Mr. Bishop remarked this item was on top of the agenda for the meeting planned in Richland on Tuesday with Mike Lawrence. Mr. Powell added it is very difficult, if not impossible, to spend the Nuclear Waste Fund for non-BWIP-related repository activity. This is stated by law. He said there were many issues that the public information people in the Nuclear Waste Office are doing that are non-repository related that could and should be funded by other funds.

Mr. Husseman said he would have to disagree that any activities conducted by the Office public information program are not repository related up to now. Mr. Powell said he agreed, but he thought the outreach activity goes beyond repository now in transportation, defense wastes, etc., even though they should be funded. Mr. Bishop said all of these issues will be discussed with Mr. Lawrence and his staff on Tuesday to try to get a definite clarification.

Mr. Reed said he wanted to make it clear when he spoke of adequate funding, he was speaking only of the issues and tasks that were presented to the Council at its last meeting. Mr. Powell agreed they were all within the BWIP concept.

Mr. Powell added that whether Hanford is selected as a site or not, he believed the public involvement and information process will have to go on concerning Hanford. He agreed now was the time to find out the source of funding needed to continue the process.

Following further discussion of the proposed Resolution, the Council agreed to change the wording to cover individual pieces of work and to permit flexibility and more effective utilization of staff.

The following Resolution was pass unanimously:

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Nuclear Waste Advisory Council that:

the necessary steps, procedures, etc. be taken to engage appropriate professional firms to work with the Council to implement both short-term and long-term goals of the Council and that the Council function in its designated "advisory" capacity to direct and monitor these contract firms."

In explanation, Mr. Husseman said preparation of grant amendments for approval by USDOE and appropriate RFPs could begin as soon as the priority tasks were identified. He said the Board may want to review the plan, but legally it did not have to approve the RFPs. Mr. Husseman said there would be no delay in getting the process started.

Public Involvement (continued)

Mr. Reed said the second item in this report concerns an individual who would like to work with the Council through a contract arrangement. Dr. Pamela Elkind from Eastern Washington University at

Cheney, with the Department of Ecology, has an interest and expertise in a limited area relating to the Council's responsibility. Her proposal is for a project which would continue over an extended period of time which would define the opinion leaders in the community capable of influencing the attitudes of other individuals. She would propose to define the groups they relate to, and the relationships between those groups, in order to show the contacts potentially most productive in reaching the greatest numbers of people. She states she has techniques and experience which would define the levels and kinds of information regarding subject material which existed in each of those groups. She has a third area of expertise aimed at gauging the opinions held by people and the modification of those opinions over time.

Mr. Reed said a letter from her delineated her interest and expertise, and the Committee met with her yesterday to explore the issues at a greater extent. She indicated that whether or not she is funded, she intended to conduct a more restricted study, but she is interested in obtaining funding from the Council under a sole source contract. She is not interested in a competitive bid contract, he said.

Mr. Reed asked the Council to consider if these products were ones the Council was interested in buying, whether they could most appropriately be obtained from this source, whether they are items that can be met through other means or partly met by actions already taken. The only commitment made to her, he said, was to report back the actions of the Council.

Mr. Reed said the Committee as a whole felt it had little or no interest in utilizing her skills, opinions held and modification; the Council already had some part of the knowledge of opinion leaders; the Council had relatively little information in the area of relationships of these groups; the Council did not have the knowledge of the informational level and changes. The Committee made no recommendation.

Pam Behring said there was some merit in the proposal, but the Science and Technology Committee faces the same problem with unsolicited proposals. She wondered what the procedure was for these proposals. She asked who does review the unsolicited proposals. Mr. Husseman said the one Ms. Behring had mentioned related to monitoring-type issues, so it was referred to the Board's Environmental Monitoring Committee.

Mr. Reed reminded the Council that at the last meeting it decided to eliminate from the new survey the questions regarding opinions, as they were not of primary interest.

Mr. Novak said one of the reasons he was not in support of this proposal was that it was an unsolicited proposal. He said without going out for an RFP there was no way to judge if this were the best available. He said he was opposed to taking action at this time.

Mr. Husseman agreed with this theory. He said the Council has certain goals it wishes to accomplish and should this person be interested in one of the subjects in the RFP, she could certainly submit a proposal. The RFP process ensures a better product, he said.

Mr. Reed said the RFP process was explained to Pamela Elkind. It was agreed Mr. Reed would inform her there was no apparent interest on the part of the Council at this time in pursuing what she has to offer.

Local Government (continued)

Mr. Sebero prefaced his report by saying any remarks he made were not meant as criticism, but simply informational items.

He said there was a reason that the Governor appointed a common Chair for the Council and the Board, in order to avoid conflicting items or committees. The Committee thinks there is not necessarily a conflict, but it does have a concern. Both the Board and Council have committees, but at this particular time there is no dialogue between those committees. Mr. Reed's suggestion for the Council committee chairs to meet before Council meetings to discuss items of common interest was an excellent one, he said. It avoided unnecessary duplication of reports.

Most people think local governments are just Councils and Commissions, he said, but that is only a small fraction of the whole. All junior taxing districts, health districts, fire districts, library districts, etc. are a part of local government. Many of these have absolutely no idea what is occurring at the state level in regard to the nuclear waste issue.

At the Board level there is a socioeconomic group working and they have plans now to conduct workshops, giving information that grants will be available and methods to be pursued for funding if the local entity feels it will be socioeconomically impacted. The Council's Local Government Committee feels there is a direct conflict and as a result of his Committee meeting and his meeting with Mr. Reed this morning, Mr. Sebero said he had spoken with Curt Eschels, Chair of the Socioeconomic Committee of the Board. Mr. Sebero requested that any meetings of the Socioeconomic Committee be stopped at this time. Fifty percent of the local governments will be impacted, and the Council's committee is not sure all of them have been notified there will be meeting around the state. He said he had asked Mr. Eschels for assurance that if meetings are being held with local governments, the Socioeconomic Committee is talking with the same people the Council committee is dealing with.

Mr. Sebero said that both he and Sam Reed had requested that Jerry Parker, staff of the Socioeconomic Committee, and Curt Eschels meet with them on April 18 and discuss some of these items. He also felt that perhaps the workshops planned by the Socioeconomic Committee should be a joint effort with the Council's Local Government Committee.

Mr. Sebero concluded by saying there should be dialogue between the Chairs of the Board committees and the Chairs of the Council committees to avoid gaps and duplication. A cohesive effort is needed in order not to confuse the public, he said. In response to Phyllis Clausen's question, Mr. Sebero said no commitment had been made by Mr. Eschels.

Mr. Bishop said appropriate follow-up action would be taken on this issue. He hoped the meeting on the 18th would clarify all questions.

Valoria Loveland added that as chief fiscal officer for one of the impacted counties, she had not received any information on the Grants Equivalent to Taxes. She wondered where this information was directed. This was a point of discussion in the meeting yesterday, she said, and it is important for the state, USDOE, and others to know who the people are who will be dealing with the issue. She said it would be important to notify directly the chief fiscal officer in each of the five counties that would be impacted in order to have the right people at the meetings.

Science & Technology

Estella Leopold reported for Phillip Bereano, Chair. She asked Pam Behring to enlarge upon a need for certain aspects of an epidemiological study, and an unsolicited proposal.

Ms. Behring said in light of the information she received today about the Centers for Disease Control and their work, they are proceeding in a manner the Committee encouraged. She said a recommendation for a qualified scientist to serve on the panel will be sent.

Estella Leopold continued that the Committee is still very concerned about funding and resources for outside studies, such as unsolicited proposals. She referred to the hydrologic study by Search on the problem of groundwater radioactivity at Hanford.

Oregon Report

Mary Lou Blazek, Hanford Program Coordinator for the Oregon Department of Energy, reported the Oregon Hanford Advisory Committee met within the last two weeks. The major subject of discussion at the last two meetings has been a joint meeting to be held with the Washington Advisory Council to form a more cohesive regional effort. Oregon would like to pursue a joint meeting and suggested a joint meeting be held in Vancouver or Portland in July to coincide with Oregon's regular monthly meeting. Mr. Bishop asked the Council members to give this suggestion consideration and said staff work would be started. He asked if any member had objection to pursuing the possibility of a joint meeting.

Mr. Reed said he would like to see as early as possible a suggested agenda from the Oregon Advisory Committee. Ms. Blazek said she would arrange this for presentation to the Council.

Estella Leopold inquired about the disposition of the suggestion of a joint letter from Governor Atieyeh and Governor Gardner to Secretary Herrington. Mr. Husseman said the draft letter had been sent to the Office of the Governor and has been under discussion. A redraft is being considered to include some of Governor Gardner's comment and another attempt to obtain a joint signature would be made.

Washington Institute for Public Policy

Fran Barkan reported for Max Power who was still in Washington, D.C. at the meeting on ranking methodology. She sketched the schedule for the Working Group on High-Level Radioactive Waste of the National Conference of State Legislatures to be held in Richland in April.

The meeting dates for the group will be April 25-28. Following their meetings at the Hanford House in Richland on Saturday and Sunday, they will tour the Hanford Reservation on Monday, April 28. She explained the Working Group is made up of two designated representatives of each state legislature, usually one from each House, who are involved in the repository process. Washington State's two representatives on this group are Senator Al Williams of Seattle and Representative Dick Nelson of Seattle, both serving as members of the Nuclear Waste Board. The group meetings are held about every six months, and are funded by USDOE. Other interested legislators attend these meetings, plus contractors, and other group who attend as observers.

Ms. Barkan invited any interested Council members to attend the meetings as observers. She outlined the general program agenda and will furnish details when they are final.

There will be two tours on Monday, Ms. Barkan said. One will be a general tour, with a more technical tour scheduled for those who have seen the general overview. Both tours start at 8:30 a.m. and finish at 4:30 p.m. The entire Washington State Legislature has been invited to take a tour. Ms. Barkan invited the members to join the tours, as well as observe the meetings, if they so desired. She said the NCSL did have a registration fee of \$50.00 for attendance at the meetings.

Mr. Bishop said a meeting of the Council could be planned for Friday if the Council wished to attend the entire meetings of the NCSL. Or, if not interested in being there for the entire weekend, they could participate in a tour on Monday and hold a Council meeting on Tuesday.

The Chair suggested a meeting be scheduled for 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday. Those who planned to take a tour could arrive earlier. A special notice of the meeting on Tuesday, April 29, will be sent.

Mr. Reed said the Public Involvement Committee had been aware of the possibility of a Council meeting in Richland, and they felt it might

be advisable to have the regular meeting of the Council on April 18, concentrating on doing business on ongoing items, and the 29th meeting primarily of an informational nature, with opportunity for more public comment.

The Council agreed this was a good suggestion, and the regular meeting will be scheduled for April 18.

Following further discussion including holding an evening meeting, the Council decided the Richland meeting would be held on Tuesday, April 29, at 10:00 a.m.

Ms. Barkan offered to send a copy of the letter the Institute is sending to the Legislators to each member of the Council. It contains a registration form, and necessary information needed for anyone wishing to tour in order to have the proper badges prepared.

Other Business

Marta Wilder commented she had developed a draft form for listing liaison organizations for members to contact, and she will be sending the form soon. She asked that it be returned by April 11-12. She referred to the list of comments on the Newsletter that had been received in the Office, which was contained in the folders. She reported she had attended the Public Information meeting sponsored by USDOE in Tucson. She said it was held to get input from the states, affected Indian tribes, and educators on public information to assist USDOE's public involvement program on a national level. Three committees were formed: education, public participation, and public information. Members of the committees will be developing suggestions for submission to USDOE, she said.

Pam Behring referred to the tumor registry suggested at the last meeting. She recalled it would take some legislative changes, and asked for information on what would be required to establish a tumor registry. Mr. Bishop asked Fran Barkan to send Ms. Behring a copy of the measure discussed in the Legislature this session. Phyllis Clausen also requested a copy.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

HANFORD HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS REVIEW COMMITTEE

Washington Representatives

Dr. Royston H. Filby, Chair
Nuclear Radiation Center
Washington State University
Pullman, WA 99164-1300
(509) 335-8917

Dr. John Beare
Division of Health
Dept. of Social & Health Services
1206 Quince
Mail Stop ET-21
Olympia, WA 98504
(206) 753-5871

Andrea Beatty Riniker, Director
Department of Ecology
Mail Stop PV-11
Olympia, WA 98504
(206) 459-6168

Oregon Representatives

Mary Lou Blazek
Oregon Department of Energy
102 Labor & Industries Bldg.
Salem, OR 97303
(503) 378-5544

Dr. Andrew Klein
Department of Nuclear Engineering
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331
(503) 754-2341

Ray Paris
Oregon State Health Division
Radiation Control
1400 S.W. 5th, Room 1012
Portland, OR 97207
(503) 229-5797

Indian Tribe Representatives

Bill Burke, Program Director
Nuclear Waste Program
Confederated Tribes of the
Umatilla Indian Reservation
P.O. Box 638
Pendleton, OR 97601
(503) 276-3018

Russell Jim, Manager
Nuclear Waste Program
Yakima Indian Nation
P.O. Box 151
Toppenish, WA 98948
(509) 865-5121

Ron Halfmoon
Nez Perce Tribe
Box 305
Lapwai, ID 83540
(208) 843-2253

STATE OF WASHINGTON
NUCLEAR WASTE ADVISORY COUNCIL

RESOLUTION
March 21, 1986

WHEREAS, the Nuclear Waste Advisory Council is charged with creating and managing a major public information and involvement program; and

WHEREAS, the Nuclear Waste Advisory Council is made up of volunteer, unpaid, citizens with varying professional backgrounds and living in diverse areas of the state; and

WHEREAS, the Nuclear Waste Advisory Council meets only once a month; and

WHEREAS, staff assigned to the task of public involvement and the charge of the Nuclear Waste Advisory Council is limited; and

WHEREAS, the USDOE is quoted as having a 1.5 million dollar budget in addition to staff and contractors who purpose is public information; and

WHEREAS, the former Council did a commendable job of producing a work plan on which to develop a public information program; and

WHEREAS, our goal is to have the citizens of Washington State look to the Nuclear Waste Board and Advisory Council as the source of information regarding the siting of a high-level nuclear waste repository, as well as to register their concerns and comments;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Nuclear Waste Advisory Council that:

the necessary steps, procedures, etc. be taken to engage appropriate professional firms to work with the Council to implement both short-term and long-term goals of the Council and that the Council function in its designated "advisory" capacity to direct and monitor these contract firms.

Submitted by Nuclear Waste Advisory Council Member:

Betty G. Shreve
1710-9th Street
Wenatchee, WA 98801
(509) 663-3238