

PUBLIC HEARING

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
 FOR THE CONTAINER SYSTEM FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF
 NAVAL SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL
 AT FORT HALL, IDAHO
 JUNE 3, 1996
 AFTERNOON SESSION

MODERATOR: Lieutenant Timothy Sullivan, USN

SPEAKERS: Mr. Elmer Naples
Mr. William Knoll

REPORTED BY:
 LISA K. ERSTAD, C.S.R. No. 279
 Notary Public
 (and)
 KATHY McCOY, C.S.R. No. T163
 Notary Public

M Court
& M Reporting
Service, Inc.
 Since 1970
 Registered Professional Reporters

SOUTHERN
1-800-234-9611

■ BOISE, ID
208-345-9611

■ TWIN FALLS, ID
208-734-1700

■ POCATELLO, ID
208-232-5581

■ ONTARIO, OR
503-881-1700

NORTHERN
1-800-879-1700

■ COEUR D'ALENE, ID
208-765-1700

■ SPOKANE, WA
509-455-4515

1 the people there, and I have read of the Three
2 Mile Island accident.

3 I have read in the newspaper, the Post
4 Register of Idaho Falls, about storage containers
5 at the INEL site that have eroded. If I remember
6 correctly, these storage containers apply to
7 waste that has been stored at the site for
8 years. Nevertheless, the possibility can occur
9 again because of mismanagement and carelessness.

10 And one last thing, when I referred to
11 the Hanford site in Washington, there have been
12 other tribes, including Yakima and Umatilla, who
13 have spoken at Native American conferences about
14 the nuclear waste and the contamination of the
15 fish in the Columbia River system and the human
16 effects of the waste haven't been determined.

17 Even at Chernobyl the effects of the
18 nuclear accident upon the human population
19 haven't been determined. Thank you.

20 LIEUTENANT SULLIVAN: Thank you,
21 Ms. Edmo.

22 Mr. George Wood.

23 MR. WOOD: My name is George Wood and I
24 want to make a couple of remarks because I was a
25 former naval aviator serving aboard aircraft

1 carriers during World War II and during the
2 Korean War.

3 I know how dangerous it is to refuel an
4 aircraft carrier at sea during wartime. I have
5 seen the spilled oil and the big hoses and the
6 ships sailing together and the extreme danger
7 that was imposed upon us at that time.

8 I have also seen the oil spilled at
9 times, accidents, and I know, I know full well
10 that the saving of that type of injury from the
11 ship's oil alone is a great step in advance by
12 using nuclear power on our ships.

13 I believe the United States Navy should A
14 have every ship that is large enough to do it
15 powered by nuclear. It would be far safer, far
16 more environmentally benign to do that.

17 I also believe that nuclear power,
18 electricity, is by far the cleanest, the safest,
19 most environmentally benign way of producing any
20 meaningful amount of electricity.

21 There is no question in my mind that
22 radiation has saved far more lives through
23 medicine and incidentally, possibly through the
24 production of energy, than it ever took at
25 Hiroshima and Nagasaki combined. We are not even

1 talking about the relatively minor loss at
2 Chernobyl and no loss at all at Three Mile
3 Island.

4 My former questions, by the way, were
5 intended to bring out the factors of exposure,
6 time and distance as a protection against
7 radiation. As a protection against almost any
8 other peril. If you are getting shot at, if
9 somebody is throwing rocks at you, you get away
10 from them, that is the distance. You do it as
11 soon as you can, that is the timing. And you get
12 behind a rock or something if they are shooting
13 at you and that is the shielding.

14 But we use the same shielding in
15 radiation that you talked about. But I want to
16 explain, too, that the time and the distance are
17 also factors and that the people this far away
18 from the works of INEL are, indeed, quite safe
19 because of the distance alone.

20 And if you should have an accident on a
21 railroad here, back away from it as you would a
22 poisonous gas, a bunch of explosives or anything
23 else. It is not a mysterious thing that cannot
24 be overcome. Thank you very much.

25 LIEUTENANT SULLIVAN: Thank you,

1 Mr. Wood.

2 Ladies and gentlemen, I have no further
3 registrations. Has anyone registered to speak to
4 whom I have not given the opportunity?

5 I want to thank you all on behalf of
6 the United States Navy for taking the time to
7 participate in this hearing this afternoon. We
8 appreciated the opportunity to hear your comments
9 and we will work to make sure they are addressed
10 in the Final EIS. Thank you.

11 This meeting is adjourned.

12 (Whereupon, the hearing was
13 concluded at 3:50 p.m.)

Commenter: George Wood, Idaho

Response to Comment:

- A. The Navy appreciates support expressed for its efforts. The Navy needs to ensure that naval spent nuclear fuel, after examination, is managed in a fashion which facilitates ultimate safe shipment to a permanent geologic repository or centralized interim storage site outside of the state of Idaho; is protective of the Idaho environment while being temporarily stored at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory; and complies with the court ordered agreement among the State of Idaho, Department of Energy, and the Navy (U.S. District Court, 1995). As the commenter noted, this EIS includes proposed actions by the Navy that would commence placing naval spent nuclear fuel into dry storage on a schedule consistent with that required of the Department of Energy in the Idaho Agreement.