this evening and would remind all the folks in the audience that, if you would like to comment, you can do so by March 20, 2000, by submitting written comments, fax comments, Internet comments, or by attending one of the other public meetings being held throughout the region.

We did have one commentor who I called earlier this evening who wasn't in the room when I called him. We'll see if he's departed or if he's here.

Joe Marantette.

I will note for the record that Mr. Marantette is not here, and ask if there's anyone else in the audience who has not yet had an opportunity to do so but would like to comment this evening on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

I will note for the record that no one has so indicated.

With that, we will close this evening's hearing, and we'll resume tomorrow in Pocatello at the Quality Inn --

MS. CAROL COLE: No. At Idaho State University.

THE FACILITATOR: -- at Idaho State

HLW & FD EIS PROJECT (AR)/PF
Control # DC-316

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING ON
IDAHO HIGH-LEVEL WASTE
AND FACILITIES DISPOSITION
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2000

SNOW KING RESORT
JACKSON HOLE, WYOMING

Reported by:
Kimberly Carpenter, CSR #600

EASTERN IDAHO COURT REPORTERS
P. O. Box 50853
Idaho Falls, ID 83405
(208) 529-0222

- New Information -

S-H-U-P-T-R-I-N-E.

THE FACILITATOR: Got it.

Ken Cady will follow Ms. Shuptrine.

MS. SANDY SHUPTRINE: My name is Sandy Shuptrine. I am a Teton County Commissioner, but I am, at this moment, speaking on behalf of myself as an individual.

36-1 IX.C(4) I would like to begin -- actually, I assume on behalf of our whole board -- at this point to thank you for the opportunity to hold this hearing in Jackson Hole. We very much appreciate the responsiveness in bringing both the information and the formal hearing to Jackson Hole.

With that, I would like to say that as I try to shift gears and become informed on the high-level waste EIS -- and after listening tonight, I do have a rather sinking feeling at the enormity, complexity and, most of all, the lack of certainty about the alternatives that are being suggested.

The fact that there is no preferred alternative -- alternative recommended makes it even more difficult for those of us as laypersons to present focused comments. So, I will have to

keep mine general. And I would like to say that my ultimate request is that human health and the environment be protected and that the alternative that best accomplishes that be the chosen alternative. 36-2 11.A(5)

There was a comment made by Beverly Cook that included tight budgets as one of the considerations in choosing alternatives. And I would like to say, because of the implications for human health and our environment, I think that tight budgets should not be one of the primary considerations. 36-3 X(9)

It was mentioned that a billion dollars was gained in recovering spent nuclear fuels. I'm wondering how many billions the ultimate chosen alternative will cost and if those billions would not be better spent up front on more complete cost/benefit analyses, which include all closure implications. 36-4 X(1)

It appears that DOE finds itself regrettably in the position of having to fix or rectify past actions that were taken without full understanding of where they were headed.

And I would like to suggest that we be very careful. This does not relate specifically 36-5 X(3)

to this EIS, but that DOE, our Congress, and all of us, pay particularly close attention to new technologies that we are willing to experiment with, that we put some of -- perhaps consider it -- put some of those resources, both the technical resources and the financial resources, into renewable technologies, especially for energy production.

36-6 VIII.A (9) And I will have to say that burial of waste at INEEL over the Snake River aquifer is always a concern, as is any emissions that may occur into the atmosphere.

36-8 VII.A(7) Finally, I would like to commend the Idaho Oversight Committee for acting as a cooperator. I would also like to just put a word of caution in there, because they are also the regulators at some point, and there is a fine line, and it has to be crossed. And I hope everybody will be extremely careful about making that transition -- transition from a cooperator on the EIS to a regulator.

36-9 VII.D(3) One more question that I have that I was unable to ask is regarding regulatory standards that are set by DEQ and EPA.

My question is: Are these standards

fully documented, in terms of both scientific and health considerations?

I would hope that none of them have political considerations but that they're based on science and human health.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your comments, Commissioner.

Ken Cady, followed by Jeffrey Joel.

I don't see Mr. Cady, so is Mr. Joel here?

MR. JEFFREY JOEL: I'm here.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Mr. Joel will be followed by Darryl Siemer.

MR. JEFFREY JOEL: My name is Jeffrey Joel. My mailing address is Post Office Box 70, Kelly, Wyoming. And I have mostly some questions to ask.

I realize this is a very complicated problem, and so the first question I ask is: 3601-1 II.A(3) Why can't some mixture of these alternatives be used?

For example, why might there be -- might there not be no action on already existing bin sets?

3601-2 II.A(3)

Secondly, I just looked at these process diagrams over here for the various alternatives, and I'm struck with how they get more and more complicated as they go along. And it's very strange that the minimum INEEL processing is the most complicated. And with so much handling going on, it seems that the likelihood of some sort of problem for an accident in the processing would be increased.

3601-6 II.E(7)

It also seems certain that some method could be devised that would be simpler. I mean, and such method might not be a normal batch-feed method. It would have -- might very well have some other model as its basis.

3601-3 II.A(3)

Another question is: NEPA, apparently, does not require cost/benefit analyses, as Mr. Wichmann said.

3601-4 X(2)

But it seems that -- to me, that since all the alternatives will have human and socioeconomic effects, then those cost/benefit analyses absolutely need to be included in any final decision amongst the alternatives. And, really, they need to be discussed before then.

3601-5 III.C(6)

And this, finally, is a technical question: Is there any way of precipitating out

salts of the acidic off gasses?

Thanks.

THE FACILITATOR: Thanks for your comments.

Mr. Siemer.

And Mr. Siemer is followed by Malissa Clark Rhodes.

MR. DARRYL SIEMER: So much to say, so little time. I attended the Idaho Falls meeting a couple of days ago and decided, based on what I saw there, that I better come up to this one, too.

I am a Site worker, but I'm speaking for myself. I believe you have my name and address already.

3602-1 VII.D(6)

The problem that we are faced with here is really a straightforward problem that has been addressed and solved elsewhere. I raised the question earlier when I had the opportunity about calcination. It's one of the things that we promised to do. And we do know how to do that.

3602-2 III.C(1)

This is pilot planted. The way to solve this problem was well-known about 30 years ago. It wasn't implemented at the Site because there wasn't any reason to do that. It was implemented

elsewhere, where they have addressed it and solved this problem.

And I -- again, it's hard to understand why it's not being done here. Because calcination was the good thing to do. We've always thought it was a good thing to do, and that's what we reported on at RCRA's meetings.

There are issues related to the volume of waste. The fact is that the volume of waste really isn't all that important. DOE chooses to implement a repository where there's plenty of space, and several places have already been carefully characterized. To implement such a repository where the volume of our waste in at 65-foot cubed is not a real issue.

3602-3 III.E(1)

It is a policy of DOE sometimes to translate one thing into another thing where there isn't any correlation whatsoever. And I raise that in my second point, that somehow the disposition of this much calcine is going to cost $11 billion, and, of course, has to be added to the cheapest and most straightforward way of actually making it suitable for transport. That is the direct cement option.

3602-4 X(8)

Which brings me to my suggestion that we

3602-5 III.D.2.b(1)

simply implement the same approach to dealing with this waste that Great Britain has already implemented successfully; in fact, by a company that now has a pretty good-sized chunk of the work at the Site and also has a pretty good-sized chunk of the work that's going on at Hanford.

The reason being, of course, is that they were able to succeed somewhere. They had good credibility. And now it's going to make money now in this country. Their solution to that problem was by virtue of that direct cement option. Now, they chose it because it's effective and it's cheap. Somehow, the way that this is looked at ID is that it is the most expensive option. You must question some of the things that you hear.

I have some revised comments.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Thank you for your comments.

Malissa Clark Rhodes.

I'm going to introduce as Exhibit No. 1 at this proceeding an eight-page duplex document entitled, "Comments on Draft INEEL HLW EIS, Idaho High-Level Waste and Facilities Disposition," addressed to Mr. T. L. Wichmann, U.S. DOE-ID.

And it is not dated. It will be Exhibit No. 1 of the Jackson Hole proceedings.

Sorry to interrupt you.

MS. MALISSA CLARK RHODES: That's quite all right.

THE FACILITATOR: Please proceed.

MS. MALISSA CLARK RHODES: Okay. My name is Malissa Clark Rhodes. I'm a Jackson resident. I hold a Ph.D. in geology from the University of Pennsylvania. As a former adjunct assistant professor at Rider University, I taught basic environmental science, as well as geology courses.

Therefore, INEEL's problems with waste disposal, both stored mixed hazardous and TRU-contaminated waste, and, separately, the underground high-level waste, have caused me some concern. These issues are separate but parallel. They're dealing with problems of Waste Acceptance Criteria. We need to get the waste out of Idaho somehow.

3603-1 VII.D(6)

Wyoming is the geology state. Our economy is driven by our underground resources; i.e., uranium, natural gas, oil and coal. All of these sources of energy have their own sets of

problems. We have some of the finest geologists and engineers in the country.

I am not totally antinuclear. There is a need for nuclear power at this point in time because we have not solved pollution problems associated with the utilization of fossil fuels. Solar and wind power sources still remain in a state of research and development.

However, dealing with a radioactive waste effectively remains a national problem. The problems at Hanford are on orders of magnitude greater than INEEL's difficulties. We do not wish to see -- or I do not wish to see INEEL become another Hanford.

Good science is the result of interaction between opposing points of view. I and several other concerned scientists would like to hold a technical forum with outside scientists and engineers interacting with the DOE scientists. If we can participate in neutral territory, perhaps we can evaluate the best options in collaboration, rather than opposition.

3603-2 IX.D(3)

To DOE, this is the challenge. Science is a universal language.