Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your comments. J. T. Stephens, followed by Jim Laybaum.

I will remind you, while Mr. Stephens is coming to the microphone, that if you would like to comment tonight that you can do so by registering at the table out at the front desk. And they will bring your name up to me, and we will get you on the record and get your concerns addressed by the Department for the final document.

Sorry to interrupt you. Please proceed.

MR. J. T. STEPHENS: My name is Tom Stephens, and Post Office Box 212. I'm a physical science technician retired from Puget Sound Naval shipyard, 14 years of experience with hazardous waste, radiological waste. Mostly I watched other people work in a radiological safe manner.

And when I reviewed the Environmental Impact Statement here proposed, I saw several flaws up here that the general public is not aware of.

The first thing I'd like to make

everybody aware of is what the limits are for NAV SEA, which is the Department of Defense's agency -- federal agency that governs radiological work.

3604-1 IX.A(5) The permissible airborne and detectable airborne limit is measured in microcuries per milliliter. In other words, how much air we breathe. And it's 1 times 10 to the minus 9 is the limit. Then we have another limit. One times 10 to the minus 8, we put on respirators to work in a radiological area.

Then 1 times 10 to the minus 7, we evacuate. We get out of the shipyard, we get out of the town, because the whole place is contaminated. We can't breathe. We're all going to die.

Then I looked up here and it says 3.2 to the minus 5.

What does that mean?

They don't say it's microcuries per milliliter, which I'm familiar with, even if the general public is not. Then they put another one here, 5 times 10 to the minus 4.

What does it mean?

3604-2 IX.A(3) They don't tell you on the Environmental

Impact Statement because they are misleading people, because the general public doesn't know. Minus figures are clean figures. I think that's what they're saying. It's not true.

3604-3 IX.A(3) So, the Environmental Impact Statement should be geared to the general population, to facts and figures to what they can understand.

Another -- another thing: What is a millirem?

3604-4 IX.A(5) What is a rem?

Most people don't know.

Thank you. I've got the time.

They also know the quote here of minus -- let's say 4 times 10 to the minus 4 millirem.

What does that mean?

Nothing. Not a thing. I can measure with an instrument .05 millirem. Well, that means something. That's a figure. One millirem is -- I can measure and give it in a dosimeter reading. I can't read minus 4 millirem. The only way you can do that is by mathematics.

And that's what they've done, mathematically given you figures that mean nothing.

Thank you very much.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your comments.

Before Mr. Laybaum comes up, Mr. Cady is in the audience. And we called him second.

So, go ahead and come on up and make your comments, Mr. Cady.

And Jim Laybaum is next, followed by Dave Hensel.

MR. KEN CADY: My name's Ken Cady. I'm a resident of Jackson.

And I haven't had a chance to read the Draft EIS yet on the high-level waste. But what little bit I do know, 3605-1 VIII.B(5) I see one fundamental flaw. It looks to be a lot of good engineering work on different processes. But the idea that we can -- we -- there's a standard that we can pollute to is unacceptable. These processes -- the first thing the DOE should have is a requirement of no releases. And once that's done, look at the processes that fit the bill.

3605-2 II.A(3) Now, as we look at these things, there's -- you know, there's a lot of thermal activity in these things, and it's very difficult to have zero pollution. But, in concert, having

two or three processes combined may well bring the pollution level to such a small level that it's insignificant.

3605-3 VIII.B(2) We don't need tall stacks or we don't need a great deal of modeling expertise, because, right now, the air model is incorrect, so if there is a release, we're not exactly sure where it's going to go.

3605-4 VIII.B(5) What we -- what I would just ask you to do is change the requirements, from an engineering standpoint to task the engineers with zero releases and see what they come up with. And that will change -- you know, a lot of these processes will go away.

I'll have some written comments in about 60 days, after I've read the EIS. But I think that would be the first order, if we could get that -- just that element down.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your comments.

I would remind you that you have until March 20 to submit written comments, and to the postmarked date by March 20. And there's a variety of ways that you can submit written

comments, and we mentioned them earlier, all of which are detailed on the desk outside.

Jim Laybaum.

MR. JIM LAYBAUM: Hi. I'm Jim Laybaum.

3606-1 IX.C(4) First, I'd like to say that I'm glad to see the DOE finally having hearings in Wyoming on INEEL projects that could have serious impacts on this region. But I am deeply disturbed at the timing of this hearing.

3606-2 IX.C(2) I would also like to question why no hearings on this EIS are scheduled to be held in Montana or Utah, as I believe the citizens there also have a right to be heard on such important regional issues.

3606-3 IX.C(4) I understand the DOE has spent several years with a large number of experts in this field creating this document. And the Wyoming public, which was not involved in the scoping process, most with no background in nuclear waste treatment, are expected to make an informed decision on these proposals which could affect them, as well as future generations, in less than a month.

3606-4 IX.C(2) I personally received my copy of the EIS somewhere around January 17, only 22 days before

this hearing. I find this completely unacceptable, and I do not see how the DOE can claim that this is a reasonable amount of time for lay people to even begin to understand the many complex technologies outlined in this document.

In spite of the seemingly intentional effort to deny us the necessary time to research these issues, I have personally come to some conclusions.

3606-5 III.C(4) First, I believe the New Waste Calciner must not operate any longer with or without modification due to the lack of understanding of emissions and that decommissioning should begin as soon as possible.

Second, proposals to dissolve the calcine for transuranic separation are unacceptable in that this is taking a step 3606-6 III.D.3(1) backwards with no proof that chemical separations are feasible on an industrial scale.

Third, all separation proposals are unacceptable and unrealistic, given the 3606-7 III.D.3(1) difficulties that DOE has experienced with separation projects at INEEL's Pit 9, the Waste Treatment Plant, and at other DOE facilities.

Fourth, the amount of shipping necessary 3606-8 II.E(8) to process this waste at Hanford and return it is an unacceptable hazard to the region, especially to the people living along the transport route.

Finally, I do not believe grout will retain its physical integrity for the extended 3606-9 III.D.2.b(6) time spans necessary to safely immobilize the waste from the environment.

This leaves only early vitrification as 3606-10 III.D.2.c(1) an acceptable alternative. While I am concerned about the potential emissions from such facility and would want to see much more specific details on the emissions control and the emissions monitoring technologies for such a facility, I believe the end result would be the safest form this waste can be converted to.

It is of utmost importance that all of this waste be immobilized in glass without separation or high-level reclassification, as there is, at present, no high-level waste repository operational and the potential that this waste may be waiting for a repository into the next century.

It is not enough to simply make this 3606-11 III.E(3) waste road-ready. It must be put into its safest

form for temporary storage and, later, permanent
3606-12 X(9) disposal. Costs should not be an issue.
Ultimate safety should be.
3606-14 VIII.G(2) I believe that the necessity for
constructing a waste vitrification plant to
3606-15 X(11) further -- to prevent further contamination of
the Snake River aquifer and the citizens of this
region clearly shows that the plutonium
incineration project should be canceled
immediately and its budget devoted to this much
more serious and pressing issue.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your comments.

Dave Hensel will be followed by Tatiana Maxwell. Ms. Maxwell, I guess, we'll say.

MR. DAVE HENSEL: Hi. May name is Dave Hensel. I live at 303 South 200 East in Driggs, Idaho.

I'm a member of the Snake River Alliance, but I'm speaking as an individual tonight. And -- but I know that the Alliance has been looking forward to cleaning up the Chem Plant for 20 years now.

As an Idaho resident, I have to take a

little bit of -- just a second to comment on the
term "road-ready." It seems to recur quite often
in this EIS. And I feel that the term
3607-1 VII.D(3) "road-ready" is basically defining a political
goal that's driven by a political agenda.

And I think that the ultimate goal of
3607-2 III.E(3) this cleanup process should be safer treatment
and storage of the waste. Where it is less
critical than that it be stored in -- stored
safely. I mean, we have high-level waste coming
3607-3 VIII.H(4) into Idaho all the time and will in the
foreseeable future, and it is, theoretically,
road-ready.

I'm concerned with the various
3607-4 III.D.3(1) separation options. I think that these
alternatives will just generate higher volumes of
waste, just give the DOE more waste stream stock
to keep track of, and are probably going to be
infeasible technology. They certainly are
unprovable. I tended -- I tend to feel that
early vitrification is the most economically and
3607-6 III.D.2.C(1) environmentally sound process presented in the
EIS.

I do want to commend the DOE and the
State of Idaho for working together. And I want
3607-7 VII.B(1)

to specifically emphasize the fact that the cleanup process should be driven by the ultimate need to coordinate the treatment of all forms of contamination -- the soil, the water, the facilities and the high-level waste.

3607-8 IV.C(1)

I do have a lot of questions about facility disposition. And I realize that the technical and engineering problems faced by the Department of Energy are huge.

And what do you do with a 300,000-gallon tank that's contaminated with radioactive waste?

However, on top of that -- or, rather, I should say, under it and around it, are immense quantities of contaminated soil. And I do not want to see that what the solution is is to simply put a cap over the problem and kind of sweep things under the rug and walk away from it.

3607-9 VII.B(1)

A lot of effort should be put into examining the consequences of what is done in the cleanup to make sure that it doesn't compound the problem of dealing -- of the possibility of having to deal with this contaminated soil at a later date.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your comments.

Ms. Maxwell, followed by S. Wakefield.

I apologize if I mispronounced your name.

MS. TATIANA MAXWELL: It's happened for about 36 years. That's okay.

Tatiana Maxwell. My address is P.O. Box 4856, Jackson, 83001.

I apologize for coming without my visual aides and support staff, but I'm really glad to see that my tax money has paid for this kind of elaborate setup here. You know, the next time I'll try to come a little more prepared.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Brian Munson and the Idaho DEQ for making this second arduous journey over the pass to Jackson, although he assured us in his statement last week that the opinions of more than 1,000 U.S. citizens don't make a whit's worth of difference in his decision-making process. But it looks to me like you folks have hired a better PR firm.

3608-1 IX.D(2)

As just another ignorant citizen today, I would like to take a stab at making one more