



ORIGINAL

22

Tempest
Reporting, Inc.

Post Office Box 3474
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110

(801) 521-5222
(801) 521-5244 fax

**PUBLIC HEARING OF THE DEPARTMENT OF
THE NAVY DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT
FOR THE SELECTION OF A CONTAINER
SYSTEM FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF
NAVAL SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL**

-oOo-

Friday, June 7, 1996; 1:30 p.m.

**Moderator: Lieutenant Timothy M. Sullivan
Speakers: Mr. Elmer Naples, Mr. William Knoll
Reported by: Ariel Mumma, CSR/RPR**

**Olympus Hotel Conference Center
161 West Sixth South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101**

1 asking questions; and if you'd like to make a comment,
2 please wait until the formal comment period to do
3 that.

4 So having said that, does anybody have a
5 question?

6 Okay. It looks like no questions.

7 So at this point we'll take our recess. We
8 don't have to worry about waiting an hour, and we'll
9 come back in about 10 minutes. Let's come back at
10 3:15 and we'll have the formal comment period.

11 Thank you.

12 (There was a short break taken.)

13 LT. SULLIVAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we'd
14 like to reconvene at this time.

15 We've reached the formal comment period.
16 You're welcome at this time to make any statement that
17 you would like to make, and since there aren't too
18 many people here we're going to be pretty liberal with
19 the time requirements. We have one registered
20 speaker, Mr. William D. Peterson representing
21 P&A Engineers.

22 And we welcome Mr. Peterson. If you would,
23 sir, come up to the microphone, please state and spell
24 your name, give us your address, and state the
25 organization you're with.

1 MR. PETERSON: Thank you. William Donald
2 Peterson, and I go by Bill. Address is 2127 Lincoln
3 Lane; it's in Holladay, Utah 04124.

4 I first of all want to applaud you guys
5 getting back on the MPC line. I received copies of
6 this (indicating) a couple of years ago from the
7 Department of Energy when I along -- the things that
8 I've asked when they were telling me that this was
9 going to be how they were going to do it.

10 And to me the MPC makes a lot of sense, and
11 I think it's a good way to go, the reason being is
12 that when you ship it, you are restricted to weight, A
13 but when you store it away you can use the economy of
14 storing it in concrete, which is a lot cheaper than
15 stainless steel fabricated shielding system.

16 So I think economy-wise, weight-wise,
17 logistic-wise, all together this MPC makes much more
18 sense over a canister that is the shield system
19 itself, that starts from the source to go to -- over
20 the railroad or trucking and then goes into the
21 storage. So I want to say I'm glad you're getting
22 back into this thing and I endorse this.

23 Now, I've come here and shown a system that
24 I've been working on to try and convince people that
25 an MRS is a good, safe way of storing nuclear spent

1 fuel, and I haven't -- as we've discussed, my display
2 out in the hall -- and I've given you drawings and
3 write-ups of that, and I'd like to include that as --
4 as part of my comment as for the record.

5 I would like to say that the safety of the
6 system is evident, if it can be shown to the people
7 and the people will see it, if they can see it and
8 understand it, then they will accept it, but until we
9 get past the political part of this thing, just we've
10 got to get beyond the word "nuclear" and get to the --
11 to the nitty-gritty of it and the full understanding
12 of what this thing is, then people will understand and
13 accept it. And I think after it gets going, in a few
14 years it will be -- just become commonplace.

15 I believe that Utah itself has a major
16 responsibility to take these wastes, because Utah has
17 the mines which most of this material -- or much of
18 this material came from. Utah has the mills where
19 this material was processed and refined, and Utah has
20 places where this material is stored now, where wastes
21 from this process is stored.

22 Utah is a generator and Utah must accept
23 its responsibility. Utah is again opening its mines,
24 Utah is again producing uranium; Utah needs this
25 technology for the people who are working in those

1 mines.

2 Those mines in the past have not operated
3 safely. This technology in Utah can complement the
4 technology in those mines used to mine this uranium.
5 There needs to be a real effort put forth by Utah in
6 Utah to -- to work with this technology and -- and
7 improve upon what's going on in Utah.

8 I don't think it's right to force generator
9 status upon Nevada, Idaho, Wyoming, and I don't know
10 about New Mexico or Colorado. I think there may be
11 some mines in those states, but I think the states
12 that have had generator status need to stand up and
13 say we're willing to do something and take care of
14 this problem.

15 My effort is to show how this problem can
16 be taken care of, and my effort as an engineer is to
17 try to make this happen from private enterprise with
18 anyone that is willing to work with me or that I can
19 work with.

20 I appreciate this opportunity to meet you
21 people -- and meet with you and show you my efforts,
22 and I appreciate seeing your efforts. I've worked
23 with state and local people all the way up to the
24 writers of the bill for Nevada, Troy Timmons and Karen
25 Hunsaker; there's a senator, Bennett Johnson's office,

1 and Dan Kane and the Department of Energy.

2 I worked with -- contacted with these
3 people every few days, and I want to make this thing
4 happen.

5 I appreciate this chance to make this
6 comment. Thank you very much.

7 LT. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr. Peterson.

8 I don't have anyone else registered to
9 speak. Is there anyone who would like to make a
10 statement at this time?

11 On behalf of the United States Navy I'd
12 like to thank you all for participating in this
13 hearing this afternoon. We appreciated the
14 opportunity to hear your comments, and we'll work to
15 make sure that they are all addressed in the final
16 EIS.

17 Thank you again.

18 This meeting is adjourned.

19 (The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.)

20 * * *

21

22

23

24

25

Commenter: William Peterson, Utah

Response to Comment:

- A. In Chapter 3, Section 3.8, Comparison of Alternatives, the EIS states that the impacts for most categories are small or nonexistent for all alternatives. Since 1957, the Navy has safely shipped over 660 containers of spent nuclear fuel from the shipyards and prototype sites to Naval Reactors Facility. All of the shipments were made safely by rail and without release of radioactivity. Since any container alternative selected for use must meet the requirements of 10 CFR Part 71, Packaging and Transportation of Radioactive Material, and 10 CFR Part 72, Licensing Requirements for the Independent Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Waste, other containers can also be used safely and reliably.
- B. These materials have been included with the public hearing transcripts in all of the libraries and reading rooms listed in the EIS.
- C. The location of a geologic repository or centralized interim storage facility is beyond the scope of this EIS.