

STGWG
Meeting Summary
March 17-19, 1998
Hotel Santa Fe
Santa Fe, NM

For additional information, please contact:
STGWG Coordinator
National Conference of State Legislatures
1560 Broadway, Suite 700
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 830-2200
Fax: (303) 863-8003

The State and Tribal Government Working Group (STGWG) convened a three-day session on March 17-19, 1998, at the Hotel Santa Fe in Santa Fe, New Mexico. The purpose of the meeting was to continue STGWG's review of activities and plans at U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) nuclear weapons facilities that are of mutual interest to states and tribes affected by the sites. On March 17 and 19, meeting presentations and discussions addressed STGWG organizational issues, STGWG's 1998 draft workplan, [*Accelerating Cleanup: Paths to Closure*](#) and disposition maps, and DOE transportation issues. Activities on March 18 included a brief tour of Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) and the San Ildefonso Pueblo, followed by afternoon presentations and discussions about tribal cultural resources. Before the meeting, on March 16, 1998, several STGWG members participated in an associated tour of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in Carlsbad, New Mexico.

ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES

STGWG discussed the group's internal structure. The group decided to continue working under the guidance of two co-conveners, one of whom will be a tribal member and the other a state representative. Tom Winston will continue to serve as the state co-convener through the end of the year, and Armand Minthorn will serve as the interim tribal co-convener until the tribes formally select someone to act in this capacity. A tribal co-convener should be appointed by the Fall 1998 STGWG meeting.

STGWG co-conveners—with support from the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL)—will track budget events relating to DOE cleanup and also will serve as leaders on a STGWG Executive Committee. Other members of this committee will include the chairpersons of STGWG subcommittees, two at-large members and an NCSL representative. For 1998, STGWG has identified four issue-based subcommittees: Tribal Cultural Resources, Transportation Planning, Stewardship, and Nuclear Waste and Materials Disposition. The group decided not to go forward with a proposed *Paths to Closure* and Budget Events subcommittee. Each of the remaining subcommittees will

address *Paths to Closure* as it relates to that subcommittee's focus. Subcommittee membership is as follows:

Tribal Cultural Resources

Janice Archuleta (NM)
Jeff Breckel (WA)
Harvey Martinez (San Ildefonso)
Linda Murakami-Sikkema (NCSL)
Donna Powaukee (Nez Perce)
Lana Redeye (Seneca)
J.R. Wilkinson - acting chair (CTUIR)
Alternate chair - TBD
DOE point of contact: Lois Thompson

Stewardship

Peter Chestnut (San Ildefonso)
Ann Dold (ID)
Robert Geller (MO)
Russell Jim (Yakama)
Earl Leming - chair (TN)
Dan Miller (NAAG)
Armand Minthorn (CTUIR)
Linda Murakami-Sikkema (NCSL)
Cheryl Runyon (NCSL)
Steve Tarlton - alt. chair (CO)
Tuss Taylor (KY)
John Walker (NV)
Tom Winston (OH)
DOE point of contact: Jim Werner

STGWG Executive Committee

Transportation Planning

Rich Allen (IL)
Levon Benally (Navajo)
Mary Lou Blazek - alt.
chair (OR)
Peter Chestnut (San
Ildefonso)
Robert Geller (MO)
Mike Grainey, with
Ken Niles - chair (OR)
James Hall (CTUIR
contact)
Donna Powaukee/Rico
Cruz (Nez Perce)
Cheryl Runyon (NCSL)
James Setser (GA)
DOE point of contact:
Judith Holm

Nuclear Waste and Materials Disposition

Gordon Appel (IL)
Janice Archuleta (NM)
Jeff Breckel - chair
(WA)
Peter Chestnut (San
Ildefonso)
Ann Dold - alt. chair
(ID)
Mike Grainey/Mary
Lou Blazek (OR)
Robert King/Ann
Ragan (SC)
Earl Leming (TN)
Roger Mulder (TX)
James Setser (GA)
Tuss Taylor (KY)
John Walker (NV)
DOE point of contact:
Martha Crosland,
interim

Jeff Breckel (Waste and Materials Disposition chairperson)
Ann Dold (at-large member)
Michael Grainey (Transportation chairperson)
Earl Leming (Stewardship chairperson)
Armand Minthorn (acting co-convener)
Ann Ragan (at-large member)
Cheryl Runyon (NCSL)
J.R. Wilkinson (acting Tribal Cultural Resources chairperson, possible at-large member if he does not continue as chair of a subcommittee)
Tom Winston (co-convener)
DOE point of contact: Catherine Volk

Another organizational issue that STGWWG discussed involved the group's draft charter. Members decided not to pursue formalizing the document.

STGWWG also discussed a process for setting future meeting dates and sites. Generally, the group plans to hold spring and fall meetings each year, but this is subject to change if important DOE decisions arise at other times. Subcommittees may meet in the interim. The Executive Committee will determine specific meeting dates and sites, with input from other interested STGWWG members and DOE.

STGWWG has a new web site, which will be maintained by DOE with support from NCSL. The address is www.em.doe.gov/stgwg/.

STGWWG 1998 DRAFT WORKPLAN

There were discussions regarding STGWWG's 1998 draft workplan during both executive and open sessions. DOE affirmed that the four issues STGWWG plans to address match up well with DOE's needs for input. The subcommittees for these issues will hold conference calls to develop subcommittee workplans, which will be integrated into a workplan for the entire group.

Everyone agreed that STGWWG's perspective on these issues is valuable. STGWWG members expressed their desire to partner with other groups-like the NGA, the WGA, EMAB, and the Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC)—who are working on similar issues. To identify such groups, STGWWG and DOE plan to create a matrix showing which groups address which issues.

STGWWG members decided that a few wording changes should be made in the "purpose" section of the 1998 draft workplan. DOE officials also requested some changes in the workplan's language. Martha Crosland agreed to identify and inform the group about areas in which DOE would like to see changes. The group discussed solving this problem by cutting the workplan down to a "bare bones" document that only would provide

information about STGWG's plans to move forward on its four chosen issues. However, some members remarked that the draft workplan provided important information about the group, and they would like to retain such information in a finalized workplan. No final decision was made, but STGWG co-conveners and NCSL will work with DOE's suggestions to revise the document.

NATIONAL DIALOGUE MEETINGS

Martha Crosland informed STGWG about DOE's upcoming National Dialogue meetings and asked for STGWG's support and input. Due to DOE's schedule and budget constraints, there will be only two regional workshops, one in the west and one in the east. Both will occur in June.

PATHS TO CLOSURE AND DISPOSITION MAPS

Roger Liddle from DOE's Oakland Operations Office gave a presentation regarding the disposition maps that accompany [*Paths to Closure*](#). He emphasized that *Paths to Closure* is a strategy rather than a plan and that it is based on a budget assumption. To create the national strategy, each DOE site was directed to plan projects, develop disposition maps, identify programmatic risks, identify waste disposition options and risks, and identify "TBDs"—decisions that must still be made. Site plans are the basis for the disposition maps. There is now an approximate 75% rate of qualitative connectivity between suppliers and receivers on these maps, and DOE is trying to up this rate to the 90% range by June 1998.

Mr. Liddle asked for STGWG's input regarding the regulatory framework that exists for execution of the disposition maps. He also requested STGWG's help in resolving the maps' "TBDs," with special emphasis on equity, environmental justice and PEISs.

Mr. Liddle indicated that comments from STGWG and other groups would be incorporated into the next draft of *Paths to Closure*. Some comments that came out of discussion were

- The disposition maps may not suggest the optimal or most efficient options.
- Concern regarding the justification for disposition decisions
- Concern regarding the involvement of stakeholders in making disposition decisions
- Disposition maps provide an initial framework for input and discussion.

STGWG members also provided comments to DOE regarding *Paths to Closure*. Members stressed that the comments were based on a cursory analysis of the document.

Comments and questions included the following:

- *Paths to Closure* is a vast improvement over earlier documents.
- Concern regarding the expected shortfall in funding.

- Concern regarding the potential to renegotiate agreements with state and tribal regulatory agencies.
- Request that DOE ask for enough funding to meet legally binding obligations as well as agreements.
- Concern regarding the effective involvement of tribes in cleanup.
- Concern that the plan does not adequately address end states for desired end uses.
- Concern that stewardship is not adequately addressed.
 - STGWG encouraged DOE to move at a more rapid pace in addressing this issue.
- Acknowledged "holes" in the strategy should be filled in.
- Concern that overall risk/risk reduction/risk reduction schedule is not adequately addressed.
 - In response to this comment, Mr. Liddle emphasized that risk considerations were primary drivers behind site plans.
- Concern regarding privatization and performance enhancement assumptions.
 - In response to this comment, Mr. Liddle remarked that sites only accepted productivity enhancements that they were confident could be met.
- Are institutional controls and natural attenuation being substituted for cleanup?
 - DOE responded that the strategy assumes each site will be cleaned up to current regulatory requirements. This is a preliminary end state, and DOE will not necessarily stop at that point.
- Is there a commitment to continue with radioactive sources recovery?
 - DOE responded that this is included in the strategy.
- Are environmental justice and equity addressed?
 - DOE responded that these issues are addressed in the strategy's components, but there have been no definitive judgments. *Paths to Closure* sets the stage for dialogue.

Finally, STGWG asked if DOE could identify the appropriate person at each site for addressing further questions. Martha Crosland and Roger Liddle volunteered to put contact names up on STGWG's web site.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

Judith Holm gave a presentation on the [National Transportation Program \(NTP\)](#). She handed out information on the radioactive material incident report database and the NTP web site, as well as the ES&H Performance Indicator Report. She also handed out a summary of NTP activities, stakeholder recommendations and program implementation.

Ms. Holm discussed some integration activities in which the NTP currently participates. She also summarized feedback DOE had received from the Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC). Ms. Holm indicated that she was developing a list of stakeholder groups that address transportation issues. She offered to share this list, as well as a TEC membership list, with STGWG. Ms. Holm also informed STGWG about DOE's Senior Executive Transportation Forum, a group that addresses cross-cutting transportation issues such as communications, funding and technical assistance.

Some issues that came up in discussion were rail inspection and concern about notifying tribal governments about shipments. A question was also raised regarding the volume and types of waste moving across the reservations associated with Hanford. Ms. Holm indicated that there is some reporting of material coming onto the site and that the NTP web page contains an annual summary of DOE shipments. (Copies of Ms. Holm's handouts and notes from her presentation are available from NCSL.)

TOUR OF LOS ALAMOS NATIONAL LAB AND THE SAN ILDEFONSO PUEBLO

On the morning of March 18, meeting attendees toured parts of the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) and the San Ildefonso Pueblo. The tour's purposes were to show the lab's proximity to San Ildefonso lands and to show some of the impacts that LANL has on the Pueblo, such as the lab's effects on archaeological sites and religious sites and practices. Gil Suazo from LANL directed the tour, along with other LANL and San Ildefonso representatives. The tour included a stop near LANL's low-level radioactive waste disposal facility and two stops at tribal archaeological sites. It also included presentations from a LANL archaeologist, a National Parks Service official and other LANL and San Ildefonso representatives. After the tour, the San Ildefonso Pueblo hosted a luncheon for meeting attendees.

PANEL DISCUSSIONS

The afternoon session of the meeting was devoted to presentations and discussions about tribal cultural resources. Three panels presented information, and group discussion followed.

The first panel, entitled "Overview of Federal Laws, Statutes and Guidelines," included presentations from Tom King, Consultant and former employee of the National Parks Service and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; Vicki Thornton, DOE Departmental Liaison for Indian Issues; and Eugene Pino, Tribal Council member from the San Ildefonso Pueblo.

Dr. King gave an overview of relevant federal laws, including the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA), the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). He emphasized how these laws apply to cultural resources and also presented a "definition" of cultural resources as not only historic properties and artifacts, but also physical environment and non-physical resources such as values, beliefs and traditions. Dr. King closed by comparing some inefficient strategies and some useful strategies for cultural resources management. Inefficient strategies included emphasizing nominations to the National Register and context-based planning. Useful strategies included understanding the management context, determining resource types of concern, setting priorities, assuming eligibility for the National Register and emphasizing

consultation and cooperation. (A handout summarizing Dr. King's presentation is available from NCSL.)

Ms. Thornton presented information on Executive Order 13007 regarding the protection of sacred sites, President Clinton's 1994 executive memorandum regarding U.S. government agencies' relationships with tribes, and Secretary Pena's reaffirmation of that memorandum. She said that these have led to improved government-to-government relations between tribes and U.S. government agencies, but acknowledged that progress needs to continue. Ms. Thornton also gave a brief introduction to DOE's American Indian Policy and presented a brief history of U.S. government/Native American relations. (Copies of DOE's American Indian Policy are available from Ms. Thornton.)

Mr. Pino talked about the impacts of LANL on the San Ildefonso Pueblo. He pointed out examples of LANL's intrusion onto tribal sites and explained how LANL's presence jeopardizes the tribe's spiritual and physical existence. He explained that all tribal cultural sites are sacred and that excavating and moving such sites is not an option from the Pueblo's point of view. Mr. Pino also expressed concerns about shipments of radioactive material through Pueblo lands. He requested advance notice of shipments, upgraded communication between tribal leaders and emergency personnel, provision of paramedics and tribal participation in training. Mr. Pino identified other concerns, such as the relationship between DOE and the San Ildefonso Pueblo. He emphasized that DOE and San Ildefonso should work together as equal partners. The problems he identified were not specific to San Ildefonso, but applied to other tribes and communities that have been impacted by DOE activities as well.

There was no time for discussion after the first panel.

A second panel, entitled "Law Implementation and Cultural Resources Management," included presentations by Lois Thompson, DOE Federal Preservation Officer; Darby Stapp, Hanford Cultural Resources Lab, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory; and Tom Bailor, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR).

Ms. Thompson talked about DOE's cultural resources management program at the national level. She explained that DOE's cultural resources program provides guidance and technical assistance to sites and focuses on site managers' responsibilities. Ms. Thompson also expounded on DOE's "definition" of cultural resources as archaeological materials and sites, standing structures, places of importance for Native Americans, and American folklife traditions and arts. Ms. Thompson gave a brief overview of relevant statutes and DOE guidance documents. She identified some of the goals of DOE's cultural resources management plan, including ensuring that the agency's stewardship responsibilities are met, educating DOE managers and ensuring that cultural resources management is included in management plans. Ms. Thompson emphasized that the guidelines are flexible and that all sites are at different points in cultural resources management planning. (Copies of Ms. Thompson's presentation notes are available from NCSL.)

Dr. Stapp's presentation focussed on the implementation of DOE's cultural resources program at the Hanford site. He spoke about archaeological versus built environment budgets in Hanford's cultural resources management plan. Dr. Stapp also presented a summary of funding history and projections and indicated that the future budget for cultural resources management at Hanford is somewhat uncertain. Included in Hanford's cultural resources management plan are plans for tribal and public involvement, site protection and monitoring, traditional cultural properties, NAGPRA compliance and more. Dr. Stapp spoke about tribal involvement in creating the plan and indicated that the plan was in "review mode" from 1987-1994 but that its creation and implementation have been "participatory" from 1994 to the present. He identified some of the challenges now facing Hanford, including river erosion, previous ARPA violations, site survey completions, the need to increase tribal involvement, and others. He concluded by recognizing that the futures of Hanford area tribes are being affected by site cleanup and that DOE must provide funding and support to ensure the tribes' survival.

Mr. Bailor presented a tribal perspective on cultural resources management at Hanford. He emphasized that everyone involved, including tribes and DOE, should work together to seek common ground in establishing a process to manage cultural resources. Part of successful cleanup is to create a partnership between tribes and DOE. CTUIR sees a need for tribal values to be incorporated into the cultural resources management process through education and new approaches. Also, emphasis should be on on-the-ground management of cultural resources. Mr. Bailor raised other concerns, including a concern that existing structures are distracting DOE from the cleanup mission and that it seems more action is currently being taken to protect these buildings than to protect tribal cultural resources. He also expressed concern that historically, DOE has focused on compliance with NHPA's Section 106, and Section 110 compliance has been lacking. Mr. Bailor pointed out that few people understand the issues involved in post-Cold War cleanup and stewardship. He believes that cultural resources management can be an educational tool and a method of public involvement.

In discussion after the second panel, a few issues were raised:

- Natural foods and medicines should be treated as cultural resources.
- There is a difference between respect for treaties and compliance with treaties. Treaty compliance is an issue of major concern.
- Statutes need to be applied in on-the-ground management.
- Many tribes are dealing with similar issues, statutes and entities.
- DOE may need to be more innovative in order to get funds for Section 110 implementation.
- State governments can become involved through communicating with state historical preservation officers.

The third panel, entitled "Specific Tribal Issues in Cultural Resources Management: Individual Tribal Experiences and Perspectives," included presentations by Bill Wyatt, Pueblo of San Ildefonso; Rico Cruz, Nez Perce Tribe; Armand Minthorn, CTUIR; and Russell Jim, Yakama Indian Nation.

Mr. Wyatt spoke about the efforts to develop and implement a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) at the San Ildefonso Pueblo. The MOA would address tribal concerns such as the establishment of a government-to-government relationship and the effective and early consultation with the Pueblo about how to best identify and protect sites. Mr. Wyatt emphasized the need for tribal consultation before DOE decisions are made. He also pointed out that DOE projects can have an impact on cultural sites even if they don't displace or alter the site itself. For example, building a road five feet from a site has an impact on that site. Mr. Wyatt suggested that there needs to be a better means for sharing information between DOE and San Ildefonso; site information needs to be recorded and shared more readily with the Pueblo. Mr. Wyatt also identified the need for Pueblo members' access to sites for monitoring purposes.

In discussion following Mr. Wyatt's presentation, the issue of "avoidance" came up. There is no set definition for avoidance of impact to cultural sites. The term should apply not only to avoiding artifacts but also to avoiding adverse impacts on religion, culture and the natural landscape. Similarly, the term "mitigation" can hold various meanings. To some, excavating and moving a cultural site may be "mitigation," but for tribes, such measures are not acceptable.

Next, Dr. Cruz spoke about inter-tribal restoration activities at the Hanford site and the Nez Perce risk assessment model. He discussed the April 1994 incident in which DOE uncovered human remains while excavating land for a Hanford structure. Tribes were then faced with the process of re-interring the remains, as well as re-contouring and re-vegetating the site. Dr. Cruz talked about how tribes near the Hanford site worked together to restore a natural habitat through native plant revegetation. He also presented the Nez Perce risk assessment model, a tribe-specific decision-making tool for measuring the nature and magnitude of risk. The model may be helpful in providing solutions for adherence to environmental justice, trust resource stewardship, co-management, and co-regulation. (Handouts from Dr. Cruz's presentation are available from NCSL.)

Following Dr. Cruz, Mr. Minthorn spoke about contaminated remains. He stressed the urgency of taking action to address this issue. The inadvertent discovery of contaminated remains is an issue not only for the short-term, but for the future as well. Mr. Minthorn maintained that DOE must work with tribes to identify a process to handle this issue. DOE must also be educated about this concern as a sacred and religious issue for tribes.

Mr. Jim gave the final presentation. He talked about respect for treaties versus compliance with them. When making end state determinations, treaty rights cannot be overruled. Mr. Jim raised other issues regarding end states, including the need to consider more than legal requirements, the question of how well sites will be cleaned up and maintained, the long-term timeline and the suggestion for timely analysis and definitions of end states. Mr. Jim also expressed his concern about meaningful public participation in DOE's cleanup process. He urged reform to encourage participation in developing decisions before they are made. Mr. Jim noted that the Yakama Indian Nation as a resource for technical assistance is being overlooked. In addition, he pointed out that he was still awaiting answers to some questions he had previously asked DOE regarding the

cleanup process and DOE/tribal relations at Hanford. (Notes from Mr. Jim's presentation are available from NCSL.)

Issues and questions that came out of discussion following the third panel included:

- Accountability for cultural resources management is not consistent among DOE sites.
- What assurances can tribes have that they will be allowed unrestricted access to sites?
- Methods of protection for sacred sites (security) are of concern.
- A holistic approach to cultural resources management is important.
- There is a need for emphasis on long-term activities (stewardship, cultural resources).
- Tribes should be involved in mitigation of sites on DOE land.
- Success stories and useable tools should be identified, disseminated and applied elsewhere.
- Should states be involved in DOE/tribal resolution of tribal cultural issues?
- Current communication between DOE and tribes can be seen as the beginning of progress in continuing to work together.
- How should East Coast sites be addressing cultural resources issues? Perhaps by contacting organizations like the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) to identify tribes that may be affected by cleanup there.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

- Develop and distribute/post on web page matrix of stakeholder groups that address similar issues to those addressed by STGWG [**Steve Tarlton, Martha Crosland, NCSL**]
- Develop and distribute/post on web page comprehensive list of groups that work with the NTP on transportation issues [**Judith Holm, NCSL**]
- Identify points of contact at DOE sites for *Paths to Closure* and disposition maps. [**Martha Crosland, Roger Liddle**] Post this information on STGWG web site. [**NCSL, Catherine Volk**]
- Identify/confirm DOE points of contact for STGWG subcommittees [**Martha Crosland**]
- Revise STGWG 1998 draft workplan. [**Martha Crosland, Tom Winston, Armand Minthorn, NCSL**]
- Develop detailed subcommittee workplans for compilation in the STGWG workplan [**subcommittee chairpersons and members**]
- Send out letters from the Secretary of Energy to tribal leaders and state governors informing them of STGWG's status and asking for (re)appointment of a representative. Send current representative copies [**Catherine Volk**]
- After tribal representatives are identified, formally select a tribal co-convenor before the Fall 1998 STGWG meeting [**tribal STGWG members**]

- Follow up on new tribal interest in STGWWG membership (Pueblo of Jemez, Santa Clara Pueblo, Pueblo de Cochiti) [**Catherine Volk, Tom Winston, Armand Minthorn**]
- Update STGWWG on National Dialogue progress [**Martha Crosland**]
- Invite STGWWG members not currently serving on a subcommittee to sign up for one or more [**NCSL**]

SUBCOMMITTEE ACTIONS

Tribal Cultural Resources

Notes:

- Adopt and address the issues identified at Fall 1997 STGWWG meeting
- Get state organizations (State Historic Preservation Officers?) to participate on committee
- Address issues raised in March 18, 1998 panel discussions
- Should (has) DOE establish its own mirror working group on tribal cultural resources?

Action plan:

- 1) Help to get recruitment letters out to tribal governments and to identify tribal representatives to STGWWG
- 2) Hold subcommittee conference call to sort out issues
- 3) Communicate issues back to Executive Committee
- 4) Summarize progress/status to STGWWG members by fax and Email
- 5) Develop subcommittee workplan and goals to be met for Fall 1998 STGWWG meeting
- 6) Communicate workplan and goals to STGWWG members by June 30, 1998

Transportation Subcommittee

Notes:

- Chairpersons for Tribal Cultural Resources and Transportation will coordinate to ensure effective tribal participation on Transportation Subcommittee
- Judith Holm will provide DOE input on issues
- It is important for the subcommittee to assimilate information/knowledge that is already in place and identify/establish contact with groups that have already evaluated transportation issues.

Action plan:

- 1) Identify previously raised transportation issues
- 2) Bring subcommittee up to speed on issues/background
- 3) Establish links to DOE transportation workgroups
- 4) Hold conference call to sort out issues and agree on path forward for subcommittee
- 5) Summarize progress/status to STGWG members by fax and Email
- 6) Develop subcommittee workplan and goals to be met for Fall 1998 STGWG meeting
- 7) Communicate workplan and goals to STGWG members by June 30, 1998

Stewardship Subcommittee

Notes:

- J.R. Wilkinson will discuss tribal membership on the Stewardship Subcommittee during the tribal conference call.

Action plan:

- 1) Coordinate and/or partner with EMAB Stewardship subcommittee
- 2) Coordinate with Site-Specific Advisory Boards
- 3) Get feedback from "Resources for the Future" workshop in April 1998
- 4) Develop comments on DOE stewardship report (potential)
- 5) Examine site-by-site end states and institutional controls
- 6) Hold conference call after EMAB meeting to sort out issues and agree on path forward for the subcommittee
- 7) Summarize progress/status to STGWG members by fax and Email
- 8) Develop subcommittee workplan and goals to be met for Fall 1998 STGWG meeting
- 9) Communicate workplan and goals to STGWG members by June 30, 1998

Nuclear Waste and Materials Disposition Subcommittee

Notes:

- Plutonium disposition Environmental Impact Statement is an important issue for this subcommittee to address.

Action plan:

- 1) Coordinate and/or partner with EMAB and/or NGA
- 2) Evaluate disposition maps and identify issues
- 3) Evaluate *Paths to Closure* document and identify issues
- 4) Hold conference call after EMAB meeting to sort out issues and agree on path forward for the subcommittee
- 5) Summarize progress/status to STGWG members by fax and Email
- 6) Develop subcommittee workplan and goals to be met for Fall 1998 STGWG meeting
- 7) Communicate workplan and goals to STGWG members by June 30, 1998