

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH  
RESEARCH INSTITUTE



391 CHIPETA WAY  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84108  
TELEPHONE 801-581-5226

March 5, 1979

CONFIDENTIAL

TO: Gerry Brophy/Clay Nichols/Roy Mink  
FROM: Mike Wright/Duncan Foley/Debbie Struhsacker  
SUBJECT: Coordination of State Coupled Program

During our State Coupled Program meeting last week several aspects of the program became more apparent:

- 1. We are going to have to take measures to ensure that Phase I data collection and map and report publication are given top billing by certain states. There is a definite tendency on the part of some of the state teams towards the perhaps more professionally satisfying aspect of Phase II specific site investigation even though Phase I is not yet in a satisfactory stage.
- 2. Much of the site specific work leading up to drilling, and much of the drilling itself, has suffered from lack of good exploration techniques. Many of the state teams know little about exploration. ESL input would benefit this portion of the programs considerably.
- 3. Some of our state teams are less competent than others, and the less competent ones will need stronger programmatic guidance.

Table I summarizes a number of considerations along these lines.

- 4. Site selection for Phase II studies was originally designed to be done jointly by the State Teams and representatives of DOE, ESL and the local USGS-WRD. In practice, the state teams are doing their own site selection. This may not result in investigation of the best sites. We should change this system of site selection to include input from various fields of expertise and interest which the broader group including DOE, ESL and USGS people could provide.
- 5. It was apparent to some of the state teams who are funded at the \$100K level (e.g. Nevada) that their results are more impressive than those of states who have been funded at the \$200K level (e.g. Colorado and Arizona). A certain amount of discontent has been generated by this.

We believe several things need to happen in the near future. Some of these will require action on our part, which we are initiating, and others will need initiation by DOE.

1. A detailed program review for certain states at some time before the summer field season is probably in order. States for which this review should occur are Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico and Utah. The review should probably be held either at IDO or in the state. The state teams should be asked to supply data, maps, plans, etc. to support and illustrate what they plan to do, and what they have already accomplished, especially for site studies.


We believe, frankly, we should set a bit more of an attitude that they must sell us on their program, including site studies, and that funding will not just be automatic.


2. We all need to impress the state teams with the need for proper program planning, which should lead to yearly program proposals and/or documented plans. These proposals/plans should be reviewed thoroughly both by DOE and by ESL to ensure that the proposed program will accomplish the DOE objectives. Because most of the state teams are somewhat reluctant to yield too much control to ESL, copies of proposals should come to us through DOE for comment. It would be DOE's responsibility to negotiate program changes with the state teams based on the joint DOE/ESL review.


This process will be necessary especially if multi-year contracts are given to the state teams. This item and the program reviews recommended above will force the states to give more thought to what they are doing.

3. ESL needs to compose an updated management document to replace the one issued informally about a year ago. The new document should be blessed by the USGS and issued by DOE.
4. The ESL role needs to be more clearly defined for the states of
  - a) New Mexico and Arizona (what is LASL's role here now?),
  - b) California and Hawaii (which we understand will be coordinated through SAN),
  - c) Oregon, Washington and Alaska (where we understand we have the coordination role) and a) other new states (Nebraska, Texas, etc.).Definition of our role will become especially important if control on the state programs is tightened as we are recommending.

We believe that the overall program is going very well. Although the tone of much of the above is somewhat critical, it is meant to improve what is already a good program. Much has been accomplished, but much remains to be done.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mike Wright

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Duncan Foley

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Debbie Struhsacker

PMW/smk

encl.

cc: S. H. Ward

Table I State Coupled Program States

State	Level of Competence of State Team (0-100)		Current Activities (Totals 100%)		Acceptance of Guidance (0-100)	Status of Phase I (% complete)	Help needed (Severity of Problem, %)
	Phase I	Phase II	Phase I	Phase II			
Alaska	80	50	70	30	70	60	general guidance (30)
Arizona	80	60	40	60	70	60	site studies (50)
California	60	50	80	20	90	40	general guidance (70)
Colorado	50	40	20	80	50	50	site studies, drilling and general guidance (90)
Hawaii	80	60	70	30	70	40	geophysical consulting (60)
Idaho	60	50	50	50	70	70	site studies, drilling (70)
Montana	70	60	40	60	70	50	geophysical consulting (60)
Nevada	90	90	70	30	90	70	site studies (20)
New Mexico	80	80	50	50	70	70	general guidance (20)
North Dakota	70?	30?	90	10	80	--	general guidance (70)*
Oregon	90	90	50	50	80	80	general guidance (20)
Utah	60	60	20	80	60	60	site studies, general (70)
Washington	70?	70?	90	10	80	--	general guidance (70)*
Wyoming	80	70	80	20	90	10	general guidance (40)

\*to ensure getting the program  
off on the right foot