statement to be disregarded by INEEL, Idaho DEQ and the United States Department of Energy.

Certainly the issues concerning the disposition of the high-level waste from the Idaho Chemical Processing Plant appear complex even to the scientists hired to study it. Let us at least learn from our mistakes in addressing this important issue. Two examples of attempting to solve problems with untested technologies or technologies that have been shown to be a mistake come to mind.

3608-2
IX.D(1)

In Denver, Colorado, in 1989, the Shattuck Corporation spent $28 million turning their radioactive waste into concrete grout and burying it under clay on a 6-acre site under the approval of the EPA and the DOE. A short ten years later, the EPA has ordered Shattuck to construct a huge tent over the concrete and proceed to break up the hardened material for further disposal.

Or we could look at the situation of the DOE and Lockheed Martin in charge of the tank waste at the Hanford site near Richland, Washington. This 20-year-old underground tank named SY-101 holds almost one million gallons of

nuclear bomb waste that produces unwanted hydrogen as radiation fields bombard organic chemicals that were added years ago in what officials now say --

THE FACILITATOR: Ms. Maxwell, the court reporter's having a difficult time keeping up, so if you would slow down a bit.

MS. TATIANA MAXWELL: -- in what officials now say was a mistaken strategy to reduce the waste's volume.

As recently as June of '96, the DOE crossed SY-101 off its list of problems and in October of that year announced that all safety issues with the tank are now understood.

Alas, in another example of where saying it's so doesn't necessarily make it so, the DOE now acknowledges that this tank is in danger of exploding. And as one consultant for the DOE puts it: I'm not convinced that anyone understands the chemistry and physics involved in this. And this is the best thinking of the best minds in the DOE.

All that being said, while the issue of stabilizing the high-level waste is integral in avoiding the further pollution of the Snake River

3608-3
III.D.1(4)

aquifer, let us not again use untested means or disproven technologies to create a larger waste stream.

3608-4 III.D.2.b(5)

3608-5 III.D.2.c(1)

I urge the Idaho DEQ, INEEL and the Department of Energy to fully examine the results of the failed grouting policy at Hanford, Washington, and to expand their vitrification processes and deal with the existing liquid waste at its current location without separation, especially as a permanent storage facility at Yucca Mountain, or elsewhere, is, at best, decades away.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your comments.

Ms. Maxwell, I noticed that you were reading your comments. If you could make that -- a copy available to me, I will make it an exhibit for the hearing this evening. Or mail it in, because we want to make sure that the court reporter got all of that accurate.

MS. TATIANA MAXWELL: All right.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

I would remind you that if you have material that you would like to use to supplement your written -- your oral comments this evening,

you can submit them in writing through the close of the comment period on March 20.

Good evening.

MS. SOPHIA WAKEFIELD: Good evening. My name is Sophia Wakefield, P.O. Box 2813, in Jackson, Wyoming, 83001.

I am coming without papers. I am not a technical person. I received the environmental impact study two days ago. It was sent to me. I had no time to look through that.

My chief concern is that we are only starting to learn to understand this very complicated problem we have next door. And I am very concerned that we are -- which we currently adhere to a time constraint, that we make decisions because four years or five years ago we set a subjective time that we have to comply to.

3609-1 VII.D(1)

I would ask the State of Idaho and DOE and the DEQ to let go of these time constraints and to reconsider really what we have at stake here, to start involving us in lay terms so we all can learn what the problem is.

3609-2 IX.A(7)

I am extremely concerned, also, not to have heard anything about the clean air shed. We have two in our neighborhood. One is the Crater

3609-3 VIII.B(2)

of the Moons, one is Yellowstone National Park and Grand Teton National Park.

And what it means, from what I understand, is that these areas are reserved in this country for the cleanest air we have. And I think there are a little more than one dozen. Two of them in our state and the state of Idaho.

I want to know from the permitting air quality how models are used to allow any emissions, or any emissions that we don't now how to carcinogenically come together, and how these affect our clean air sheds. I have learned that the model is only done for the Crater of the Moons, and then there is some quantitative assumption done how this may affect Yellowstone or Grand Teton National Park, but nothing else is done for them.

We also have learned that the models are used for the other -- the incinerator are models that are faulty. I am very concern that we are using models that are not putting into consideration foremost human health and the health of all life forms.

Another concern I have is that in the solution to the problems we have can only be

3609-4 VIII.B(2)
3609-8 VIII.B(2)
3609-5 VIII.B(2)
3609-6 VIII.B(2)
3609-7 IX.D(5)

conceived on a new level of consciousness and not on the level that the problem was created. And I'm asking all the people we have elected to pay by our tax monies to use that new level to find solutions to this problem we have as a nation and as a whole word.

Thank you very much.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your comments.

Benn Linn, followed by Whit Clayton.

MR. BENN LINN: My name is Benn Linn. I live in Jackson at Box 71, Wilson.

And I would like to thank the DOE for holding a public hearing where we get a chance -- and open a public hearing where we get a chance to come make comments. I think that's a step forward from where you have been in the past.

And I do wish that you would also be as open with your historical history of the past 50 years and let us, as the public, understand probably quite a bit more clearly why you make decisions and what you have to make decisions about.

I have been in the process -- the process of the low-level waste and have educated

3610-1 IX.C(4)
3610-2 IX.D(2)

myself to that to some extent. Then I think that we have all realized much more clearly that we have problems. We all agree that we have problems. We disagree on how we might want to go about solving them.

And I -- my greatest concern is that
3610-3 we're treating the atmosphere like we treated the
III.D.1(5) ground above the aquifer in the '50s, in that it solves our short-term problem. It gets rid of waste. But I -- you know, I question whether that's a long-term solution. To my mind, it's not a long-term solution to use the atmosphere to absorb any part of the waste.

I can't really comment on this EIS. I haven't seen it yet. It's all new material. But
3610-4 my general comment is that I think that we should
VI(1) avoid a short-term solution like your predecessors did in the '50s. I think that we should deal with the problem now in an as long-term situation as we can.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your comments.

Whit Clayton, followed by Avril Currier.

MR. WHIT CLAYTON: Thank you. Whit Clayton, Box 12, Moose, Wyoming.

My wife and I have attended the INEEL invitation and took a tour of the institution about three weeks ago. I had a wonderful time and learned a lot.

If I am a proponent, I am a proponent of the INEEL and the professionalism we saw over
3611-1 there -- 8-, 9-, 10,000 people over there doing a
IX.D(7) wonderful job. If there's any question in my mind, it would be the British Nuclear Fuels,
3611-2 which put a company after their name so they
XI(6) could become an American company. A lot of objections made to them or about them and the problems that they have.

I got an M.D. in 1947, one year after the first bombs were dropped. And so I date through this whole affair. I've spent a lot of time in the last few months doing a lot of reading on nuclear matters. And then when we had a chance to do the INEEL tour, we took it, and we're happy that we did. I would recommend that you all take the tour, without a doubt.

I think the Oversight Committee of Idaho has done a wonderful job of this little piece

here that you've all seen. Maybe you have not. The Settlement Agreement -- we saw most of these installations. Not the ones with the rods in the water, but we saw the others. The high-level waste is a problem, and it's going to continue.

Transuranic wastes, those wastes that go beyond uranium to neptunium and cerium, americium, they're there, and they're going to continue.

We've been flooded with information about plutonium. I would recommend, before you overreact to this, that this -- this is the "Atlantic Monthly" of April '95. Before you react to plutonium too much, do that, read it. From "Nova," two articles on plutonium. And, from the "Encyclopedia Britannica," another article on plutonium. We understand it's there. There's a challenge.

If we are reminded of anything -- I think I can speak for my wife and myself -- okay -- it's like the "Sorcerer's Apprentice." It's not going to go away. It's going to get worse and worse and worse if we don't support and help these people to move in the right direction. So, I think we're a proponent of

getting things done in the best way.

3611-3 X1(1) If there's any question in your mind and in our mind, we would recommend the National Academy of Sciences, who can undoubtedly find honest and impartial people who can help with the solution to this huge problem. And we would recommend that it be done.

We -- in medicine, we're used to solving problems. All my life that's all I ever did was take the challenge that was presented and try to solve it. When I was on the hospital board, we had a challenger, and we built a new hospital. And it's a pleasure to see things being done positively.

And I feel that we should be positive about this. We should support these people. 3611.4 1X.D(7) I think the INEEL people are wonderful. They're well-trained. They're doing a wonderful job, and they're doing their best. I'm not speaking for British Nuclear Fuels. I do not know anything about them.

And I thank you very much.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your comments.

Avril Currier, followed by Roxanne

Weaver.

And, Mr. Clayton, I will remind you that -- you referred to a couple of documents up there -- if you want those documents to be part of the record, you can bring them up to me or submit them by or before the close of the comment period.

Good evening.

MR. AVRIL CURRIER: Hi. Well, I've never talked in front of a group ever in my life before, but I feel very passionate about this. I'm from Jackson, been a resident here for 13 years.

And I've done -- I know that we have a problem. I know that we've got some very good people working on the problem. But we have a global community, because we have a global problem.

3612-1 VII.D(1) One thing that may be a viable solution would be to, as some people have said, back down from our timetables, take a little bit better look, 3612-2 II.A(2) grab some of these local people and come up with solutions that will take this nuclear waste away from populated areas, where you have a lot of animal life, human life, maybe like the Sahara

Desert.

I'm sure people from Morocco would love to have a couple of billion dollars to spend for a few acres of their desert, in which we could build a plant that would not pollute. We could contain the stuff where it's never going to be bothered by seismic activity.

And how do we get this to happen?

Well, we build a fleet of semi tractor-trailers that can transport this stuff. Put Americans to work on developing this stuff. We have a lot of Naval ships -- they're in mothballs -- that we could outfit to transport this stuff over to the Sahara Desert, putting more Americans to work to solve this problem and building this plant over there using American companies. Being the most technological country in the world, we should be able to handle our own problems. And with other nations that have waste, we'll have the facility to handle their stuff. And we can charge them for it and, therefore, make money on it.

Why should we be sending our money to someplace else when we have an economy here to support?

3612-3
III.D.1(1)

You know, the gold mine up in Cooke City, Montana, was really small potatoes to what the potential hazards of this plant is. And I'm talking to you folks. We have a national treasure. Our forefathers worked hard and diligently to make sure that this is available for our grandchildren.

Just like airplanes fly the air, cars break down, shit happens to us, and we don't want to pay the price. We don't want our grandkids for the next 245,000 years to pay the price. Let's deal with this smartly, please.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your comments.

Roxanne Weaver.

And Ms. Weaver will be followed by Horton Spitzer.

Let's go off the record just a second.

(A brief discussion was held off the record.)

THE FACILITATOR: Ms. Weaver, let me interrupt you for just a moment.

I've been handed a document I need to introduce, an exhibit entitled, "Comments on Draft EIS and Idaho High-Level Waste Facilities

Disposition," dated 2/9, 2000, Jeffrey Joel, P.O. Box 78, Kelly, Wyoming, 83011. I'll introduce that as an exhibit.

But, also, you can drop written comments off at the comment box out front, as well.

I apologize for interrupting.

MS. ROXANNE WEAVER: No problem.

THE FACILITATOR: Please proceed with your comments, Ms. Weaver.

MS. ROXANNE WEAVER: Thank you.

My name's Roxanne Weaver. I live in Jackson Hole.

And the first thing I'd like to do is, for the record, have placed in the record -- all of Sandy Shuptrine and Ken Cady's comments, I concur with all of them. There's no reason for me to repeat them.

3613-1
IX.C(2)

I would like to remind you all that this is DOE's largest undertaking, one in which they will be spending billions of your tax dollars. It took them three years to compile these documents. And, at best, they gave us three weeks to read these. I don't think that's quite fair. In fact, I think it's a major insult to all of us in Jackson Hole.

3613-2
11.A(3)

3613-3
X1(2)

And then I'd like to ask, as some others have, that you change direction and that you start looking at -- only at processes which will not put hazardous toxins into the air. And, to that end, I ask that you stop all plans for the incinerator at INEEL and spend that money, as was suggested earlier, on research and development, to find ways to deal with this hazardous waste safely.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your comments.

Mr. Spitzer will be followed by Dan Fulton.

Good evening.

MR. HORTON SPITZER: Good evening. Horton Spitzer, Box 1307, Wilson. I'm sorry I couldn't have been here earlier to hear some of the other discussions. I was at another meeting.

But I did want to come and voice something which was expressed wholeheartedly a week ago. Trust. Trust. At the time they wrote the Constitution, they adopted a phrase -- it was interesting -- in God we trust. In God we

trust.

The writers of the Constitution had the opportunity to say, in government we trust. But they knew better. Because the Constitution protected us from the government. Unfortunately, there's been a long history -- and it's a good history in this country -- that you question your government.

3614-1
X1(5)

I feel we got a cheap shot a couple weeks ago. One thousand people spent hours there giving some excellent technical information relative to -- to the proposal that's been put forth in one method of disposal of hazardous waste.

We had people there in the government who could have said, wait a minute, you're not talking about the right thing. I'm sorry. They could have said that and moved on -- and might have given the same comments -- but that wasn't the case. We spent until eleven o'clock at night in heartfelt honest discussion, and then we're told it's not a part of the public record.

3614.2
1X.D(2)

This is a good step forward. I'm pleased that this is happening. This may be a step forward with trust. But before anything is