

WM Record File
101.3WM Project WM-10
Docket No. _____
PDR ☒
LPDR ☒

371/83

n. Stiel

101.3

Distribution: CONVERSATION RECORD		TIME 2:30	DATE February 28, 1983
TYPE (Return to WM, 623-SS)	<input type="checkbox"/> CONFERENCE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TELEPHONE	ROUTING NAME/SYMBOL INT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> INCOMING <input type="checkbox"/> OUTGOING			
Location of Visit/Conference:			
NAME OF PERSON(S) CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH YOU Brad Erlandson	ORGANIZATION (Office, dept., bureau, etc.) EF SEC - Washington State	TELEPHONE NO. (206) 459-6490	
SUBJECT Status of NRC SCR Review, Revision of 10 CFR 60, Written Agreement w/NRC for State Participation			

SUMMARY

Mr. Erlandson called to check the status of NRC's activities concerning the Hanford site. He said his boss, Nicolas Lewis, Chairman of the Washington State Task Force on High-Level Radioactive Waste Management, was currently in Washington, DC meeting with DOE Secretary Hodel. He said Mr. Lewis wanted him to request a briefing by Waste Management personnel in Washington State on the NRC SCR review, changes to 10 CFR Part 60 resulting from passage of the NWPA, and current activities at NRC regarding the Hanford site. I told him I would check with the appropriate staff members and call him back. In the course of the conversation, I told him we had received a resolution from the Yakima Indian Nation to ensure their participation in the NRC proceedings regarding Hanford as specified under 10 CFR Part 60. Brad said the Governor's Office had received a similar resolution stating that the Yakimas were neither for or against nuclear power, but they were opposed to any further nuclear-related development at Hanford. Brad expressed interest in knowing the nature of our response to the Yakima resolution.

When he asked about the current NRC role under the NWPA in State/Tribal participation in the siting/licensing proceedings for a high-level waste repository. I told him there appeared to be some differences of opinion within NRC as to the nature of our role. I told him we would be asking our legal office for an opinion and, once that was completed, determine some type of official NRC position. Brad reiterated that Washington State feels very strongly about the need to work closely with NRC on the Hanford site. He said they would like to have a written agreement with NRC, pursuant to 10 CFR 60 regarding their participation in NRC proceedings. (Similar to that currently mandated for DOE/States under the NWPA.) Brad also indicated Washington State would be sending us a letter in the near future asking for specific information about the role of NRC with the State and stating Washington state's position on this matter.

ACTION REQUIRED

NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION Catherine F. Russell	SIGNATURE <i>Catherine F. Russell</i>	DATE 3/7/83
ACTION TAKEN		

SIGNATURE <i>ORIGINAL NOT RECEIVED</i>	TITLE	DATE 00402
---	-------	---------------

8307280228 830307
PDR WASTE
WM-10