decided, based upon government presentations, government statistics, we have a ways to go for them to earn our trust. And that's their responsibility. They are here not because we want them to be here. The government should be listening to us because they have to be here. That's the way our government is run.

So, I would just say -- and I'm not qualified -- and we've had some, I think, excellent speakers, both a week or so ago and tonight, about technological suggestions. That's good. That's a step in the right direction.

3614-3 IX.C(3)

I just ask that if good decisions can't be made by -- by -- considered to be good or in a wide enough scope, let's take some time. In that time, maybe we can build some trust. And maybe we need opinions other than from government officials or those who are going to do this and make a profit by it.

3614-4 VII.A(b)

And so, as far as I'm concerned, in God we trust on this.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your comments.

Mr. Fulton will be followed by Bertie

Herschfield.

If I may interrupt for a moment, Mr. Fulton.

Ms. Herschfield is the last preregistered commentor. I will remind you, if you would like to comment this evening, if something was said earlier that sparked a thought, go register. They'll bring your name to me, and we'll get your comments here on the record.

Sorry to interrupt. Please proceed.

MR. DAN FULTON: My name is Dan Fulton of Wilson, Wyoming, Box 576.

Most of the areas that I would like to cover have been covered by people. But I'm willing to go on record and ask the DOE to provide some information on how they went about hiring the British company to be the contractor to build this facility.

3615-1 XI(b)

I'd also like to point out, with all due respect to the gentleman that spoke earlier, while I think there are a number of good people at the INEEL and DOE, I have grave concerns about their ability to make good decisions. And I base that on what's happened in Rocky Flats, Colorado,

3615-2 IX.D(1)

and their choice of contractor, who's been barred from other countries, Japan and Switzerland.

So, my grave concerns are as to whether or not they're making good choices in things that are going to take a long time to rectify.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your comments.

I'd also remind you that if you want to comment and would like to do so in a private setting that the Department of Energy has set up a mechanism for you to do so if you're feeling uncomfortable speaking in front of a group.

Good evening, Ms. Herschfield.

MS. BERTIE HERSCHFIELD: Hello. My name's Bert Herschfield. I'm president of the board of Keep Yellowstone Nuclear Free. Keep Yellowstone Nuclear Free was formed in opposition to proposed nuclear and hazardous waste incinerator at the INEEL. For the past six months, we've been most closely focused on this complex issue.

3616-1 IX.C(2) Only two weeks ago, the DOE released the Draft Environmental Impact Statement concerning disposal of liquid high-level and low-level waste

at the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center, INTEC. The disposal of these wastes is a serious issue and deserves serious attention.

The disposal of this waste represents the largest single undertaking of waste disposal at INEEL. Considering the gravity of the situation, we feel that a mere two weeks is woefully insufficient to evaluate each waste disposal option. And, furthermore, we consider the long overdue release of the EIS to be suspect and dubious.

3616-2 IX.B(1)

Nevertheless, in any instance where there exists the potential for harm to be inflicted on human life and the environment as a result of onsite operations, we believe that citizens should be involved in the decision-making and implementation processes. As such, we appreciate the opportunity to speak in this forum.

3616-3 VII.A(6)

3616-4 VIII.G(7) Keep Yellowstone Nuclear Free is very concerned about the treatment and disposal of liquid high-level and low-level waste at INTEC. We support the DOE's and Idaho's desire to dispose of this waste. However, safety must be the overriding concern.

And we ask, is it and will it be?

3616-5 III.D.1(1) Will the DOE select a method that threatens to release toxins into the air?

If it does, we will oppose it.

3616-6 III.A(1) This waste has been in underground tanks for 50 years, 20 years longer than originally intended. Although DOE claims the tanks are not leaking, the service lines to the tanks have experienced severe leaks.

What would it take in cost and time to repair these leaks as a temporary holding-pattern measure while it's investigated in terms of safe ways and alternatives?

3616-7 IX.D(1) As we know, the DOE's past record of dealing with low-level waste is horrific. For example -- and we don't have to look to other areas. We can look right in Idaho. The DOE has caused low-level waste to reach directly into the Snake River aquifer, resulting in a large plume of contaminated radioactive isotopes beneath the plant.

The DOE's record of dealing with high-level waste is equally irresponsible, as witnessed by the substantial radioactivity from the calciner plant into the atmosphere. The

3616-8 III.C(4) calciner is an antiquated system which began operating in 1963 and is currently not operating. We firmly oppose any efforts to restart the calciner and advocate for a safer alternative which poses the least threat to our environment and our health.

3616-9 VI(1) Keep Yellowstone Nuclear Free acknowledges that this high-level waste stream needs attention. As in the case of our opposition for proposed incinerator, we advocate for technology to deal with the waste in which containment and safe long-term stewardship, not expediency and profit, are emphasized.

3616-10 III.F.2(5) We feel that potential methods of disposal being considered have not been reality-tested. And, therefore, the consequences associated with these methods are difficult to predict and impossible to guarantee. As such, it is difficult to favor any one particular method of disposal. And there must never be any effort

3616-11 V(9) to reclassify these wastes in order to meet the criteria for a more convenient form of treatment; i.e., incineration.

And so I ask: Are there any plans to reclassify the waste?

3616-12 VI(1)
3616-13 VII.A(6)

The reprocessing of nuclear waste has resulted in what can only be described as a dangerous mess in the state of Idaho. Please consider our input as an effort to be part of the solution to the serious problem of waste treatment and storage with emphasize on the safe and long-term stewardship of hazardous and nuclear waste, not on expediency and profit. Together, we can chart a course that will protect all of us from some of the most dangerous waste on earth.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your comments.

We have a couple of additional commentors who have preregistered.

Christy Gillespie, who will be followed by David Henneberry.

And if you would like to comment, please go to the registration desk and register. And they'll bring your name up to me, and we'll get you on the record.

Good evening.

MS. CHRISTY GILLESPIE: Hi. My name's Christy Gillespie, and I live in Jackson,

Wyoming.

And tonight I would like to tell you about some of my concerns. I'm concerned about British Nuclear Fuels building this incinerator. Their past history has been inexcusable. I wonder how such a decision could be made to use a company like this, especially in the United States.

3617-1 X1(5)

I'm concerned about my health, my future, and my family's health and my neighbors' health. Given the recent public hearings that have been held in other towns with incinerators, people have come out and said that there's been years and years of people having problems of health effects, retardation, childhood leukemia.

All of these things are very serious problems, and they're just now becoming public. And these are towns just like ours that have had this happen to them years ago. And I don't want to become another statistic. I don't want to be standing here in ten years telling you how my kids have leukemia, how I have cancer.

I think I'm going to ask you once more to reconsider your decision. Put the money into research, please, until a better solution can be

3617-2 X(12)

found.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your comments.

David Henneberry.

Good evening.

MR. DAVID HENNEBERRY: Hello. My name's David Henneberry. I live here in Jackson, Wyoming, P.O. Box 6962.

I understand that something does need to be done. We have created a problem, and we do need to fix it. I have nothing against that. One of the things -- okay. A plant does have to be built.

3618-1 II.A(2)

Why here?

Why in our area?

Why not where it's -- the problem is located?

Why ship it all the way over here, do one thing, ship it someplace else?

Isolate it and take care of it.

Okay. If the plant were problem-free, then there would be no problem or less of an issue. But, so far, the plants in operation are having continuous problems. And all these have

3618-2 XI(5)

to be addressed. They're not being adequately handled, and the situations aren't stopping. The dangers still exist.

Another thing is acceptable level.

3618-3 VIII.G(2)

How does somebody come up with an acceptable level?

It's like a population. You say, okay, well, it's okay to kill 200 people out of 200 million. That's still wrong. Say, okay, a billion parts per -- just as a figure -- a billion parts -- or one in a billion you can inhale.

Is that safe?

How much volume of this room is a billion parts?

You know, if there's 200 billion parts in here right now, that's enough to kill you then. I would like to see these figures properly addressed, know exactly where they come from.

And all the statistics aside -- excuse me -- who is saying this is acceptable?

Did someone come up with a figure?

That's my concern. For everybody's health hazards, the environment, everything. And I think this is something that really needs to be

addressed, making it for everybody's sake.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your comments.

I don't have -- I have no more preregistered commentors. I would remind you if you would like to comment this evening that you can register at the registration desk. We'll get you on the record.

We're scheduled to be here until nine. We'll be here until nine o'clock. And if you would like to comment between now and then, register, and then we'll go back on the record.

In the meantime, I think we'll go off the record subject to call from the hearing officer.

But, before we do so, I want to remind you March 20 is the deadline for submitting written comments, as the postmark date. And there's a variety of other methods for submitting written comments that you may take advantage of, and those methods are detailed at the registration desk.

So, with this, we will take a break. We'll be subject to call of the hearing officer

until nine o'clock, when we're scheduled to conclude.

Thank you.

(A recess was taken.)

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. We'll be back on the record.

This is a continuation of the February 9 hearing. And we're in the private setting for taking oral comments for the record.

And you understand that your comments, although made in a private setting, will be part of the public record?

MR. DAN BENNETT: I do.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Please state your name and make your comments.

MR. DAN BENNETT: My name is Dan Bennett, P.O. Box 592, Jackson, Wyoming.

3619-1
X1(10)

Two weeks ago I attended the town meeting's comment period at the middle school high school here in town for the incineration that's being proposed over at INEEL.

And although I realized that is not exactly the subject of tonight's meeting, I would want to request that the minutes of that town meeting and comment period be included in

tonight's record.

And the reason I am doing that is because it was a very remarkable meeting. The comments were very bright and informed. And it was a much larger attendance than tonight's meeting. And there has since been some kind of disrespect by the Idaho DEQ, saying that they are not going to regard -- or take into account any of the comments that were made at that hearing.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. You understand that your comments are part of the public record, but what you just asked to be made part of the public record would have to be submitted by you to be in the record at this proceeding?

And I do believe that those comments are transcribed and available for your review at the reading rooms. There is one at the Teton County Library here.

So, just understand that this is -- this is on the record, but things that you ask to put in the record, if you don't submit them, won't be part of this record.

MR. DAN BENNETT: I'll be glad to do

that, if I have the time to do it. I mean, if there's a time period available --

THE FACILITATOR: Through March 20.

MR. DAN BENNETT: And I wasn't here for the entire duration of tonight's comments, so I don't know if someone made that same request.

THE FACILITATOR: No.

MR. DAN BENNETT: Okay. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you, sir.

(A recess was taken.)

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. We'll be back on the record.

We're in continuation of our taking comments in private for the public record. And Mr. Henneberry had a comment.

MR. DAVID HENNEBERRY: Okay. I want the record to state that my comments were not directed at the proposed incinerator project. My comments were about my concern with hazardous waste treatment, containment, transport and storage, and the health and safety to everyone in the environment if a contamination situation should occur during any of the above-mentioned areas.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

And, Mr. Henneberry, you understand that, although your comments are made in a private setting, they will be part of the public record?

MR. DAVID HENNEBERRY: Yes, sir.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

MR. DAVID HENNEBERRY: Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: We will be off the record.

(A recess was taken.)

THE FACILITATOR: We're back on the record, people.

I will ask that if anyone in the audience has -- who would like to comment orally this evening formally on the record and who has not commented yet would like to do so.

We've given you an opportunity to register at the front desk, and I will report, for the record, that no one has so registered. If there is anyone who has not commented and would like to do so, this is your final opportunity to do that this evening at the Jackson Hole hearing.

HLW & FD
EIS PROJECT - AR/PF
Control # DC-37

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING ON

IDAHO HIGH-LEVEL WASTE

AND FACILITIES DISPOSITION

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2000

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY
POND STUDENT UNION BUILDING
POCATELLO, IDAHO

Reported by:
Kimberly Carpenter, CSR #600

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