September 11, 1995

Ms. Merilyn B. Reeves, Chair
Hanford Advisory Board
800 N.W. Sixth Avenue
Suite 342
Portland, OR 97209-3715

Dear Ms. Reeves:

Thank you for your letter transmitting Hanford Advisory Board Advice #29. The U.S. Department of Energy is in the process of developing several Environmental Impact Statements that may impact the Hanford site. It is not always clear to us how these relate to one another, as in the case of the Notice of Intent for the Programmatic EIS on Stockpile Stewardship and Management and the supplemental notice concerning the Pantex Site Wide EIS. We are increasingly concerned about the lack of a focus on the potential cumulative impacts of these and other decision documents on the future of Hanford cleanup.

Given this concern, Governor Lowry took the occasion of the Board's advice letter to write Secretary O'Leary and to urge the following two steps be taken:

1) That USDOE, in cooperation with the state and Hanford stakeholders, develop a public forum or process to consider the potential impacts of all these activities on Hanford and the region; and

2) That USDOE, in cooperation with governors of affected states, develop a national dialogue to discuss openly the equity issues in cleaning up from fifty years of nuclear weapons production.

A copy of Governor Lowry's letter is enclosed.

We are optimistic that the Secretary of Energy will recognize that using existing environmental processes in a piecemeal, fragmented way is not adequate to support good public involvement in key decisions. We want to work with you and the Hanford Advisory Board to pioneer a more integrated, less draining and confusing approach.

Sincerely,

Mary Riveland
Director

Enclosure
August 31, 1995

The Honorable Hazel R. O'Leary, Secretary
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue S.W.
Suite 7A 257
Washington, D.C. 20585

Dear Secretary O'Leary:

I am enclosing a copy of a letter I received recently from the Hanford Advisory Board which stresses the need for an integrated and coordinated approach dealing with information on waste management and other key issues relevant to the Hanford Site. The Board members have experienced some frustration in what they see as a piecemeal and fragmented approach, making it very difficult for stakeholders to understand the full impact of any particular decision.

I believe the Board has identified a very real problem. My staff came to the same conclusion recently in reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on Foreign Research Reactor Spent Nuclear Fuel. This DEIS dealt primarily with the ports of entry for foreign research reactor spent fuel, but was separate from a different Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that dealt with where such material would end up. Instead of getting a cradle-to-grave and holistic picture about how this material would be dealt with, we found that process somewhat arbitrarily segmented and, as a result, it was difficult to fully understand the implications for Washington State.

Our staff have also had a problem helping the public, including the Hanford Advisory Board, in sorting out the relationships between Hanford, the Pantex Sitewide EIS, and programmatic EISs on Fissile Materials Storage and Stockpile Stewardship.

The enclosed list is our attempt to capture the current U.S. Department of Energy EISs that appear to have relevance to Washington State. As you can see, the list is daunting.

You have made major strides in bringing openness to the U.S. Department of Energy. Now we need greater coordination and integration of this information to promote active and intelligent public debate.
Washington officials and staff stand ready to work with your staff to take further steps toward integration. We propose two things: First, we are ready to work with you to develop a forum that puts all of these separate actions in the context of their potential impact on the Northwest.

Second, we would like to join with you and with other governors and state officials affected by your Department's nuclear waste and materials decision to develop a public dialogue to put these segmented issues in a national context.

We recognize that you face legal constraints and time requirements. But it is time to help citizens and public officials see how these decisions relate to one another, and to begin a good-faith discussion about equity. My strong concern is that continuing the piecemeal approach to the public will prolong distrust and stymie the nation's ability to deal forthrightly with the nuclear legacy of the Cold War.

I hope you will accept our suggestions and our offer to help.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
MIKE LOWRY
Governor

Enclosures (2)

cc: John Wagoner, USDOE
Merilyn Reeves, HAB