accordance with our Tri-Party Agreement and regulatory requirements. The impact of offsite wastes on the inadequate budget of Hanford and the environmental impacts of any diversion of Hanford cleanup funds must be factored into decisions on offsite wastes and should be thoroughly analyzed in this EIS. The Hanford cleanup dollars should not be used to subsidize the receipt, treatment, and/or storage of offsite wastes.

52-4
VII.A(6)

We would appreciate being consulted as this process continues forward, particularly when a preferred alternative or other decisions are being considered which might impact Hanford.

Very truly yours,

Merilyn B Reeves

Merilyn B. Reeves, Chair
Hanford Advisory Board

cc: Keith Klein, Manager, DOE-RL
Dick French, Manager, DOE-ORP
Tom Fitzsimmons, Director, Washington Department of Ecology
Chuck Clarke, Regional Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Wade Ballard, Acting Designated Federal Official
The Oregon and Washington Congressional Delegations
Michael Gearheard, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Dan Silver, Washington Department of Ecology

2000O-004
Page 2
March 6, 2000

HLW & FD EIS PROJECT AR PF
Control # DC-53

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
IDAHO OPERATIONS OFFICE

PUBLIC HEARING

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

IDAHO HIGH-LEVEL WASTE AND FACILITIES DISPOSITION

February 24, 2000
6:00 p.m.
Doubletree Inn
Pasco, Washington

BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES
Certified Shorthand Reporters
P. O. Box 223
Pendleton, OR 97801
(541) 276-9491 - (800) 358-2345

formal hearing and a recorded proceeding with a full transcript being prepared.

And finally I would like to take the opportunity to personally thank you all for attending and for your cooperation in observing the procedures I have just outlined.

Our first scheduled commenter is John Swanson. Mr. Swanson? If you are not in the room when I call your name, I will go back and recall names. Harold Heacock.

MR. HEACOCK: Thank you. I am Harold Heacock of Kennewick, Washington, and I am presenting a statement tonight for the Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council. The possible utilization of the Hanford waste vitrification plant for the processing high-level fuel processing wastes at Hanford could have a significant impact on the Hanford cleanup program. 53-1 II.E(5)

Based on currently available preliminary information the use of the Hanford vitrification plant for processing and vitrification of the Idaho high-level wastes would provide significant cost savings to the Department of Energy over other realistic alternatives. 53-2 II.E(4)

The environmental impacts of this

alternative appear to be equivalent to or less than those of other alternatives. 53-3 II.E(4)

However, this alternative has not been studied in sufficient depth to support a firm position for or against it at this time. 53-4 VII.A(2)

If the use of the Hanford vitrification plant for the processing of high-level wastes is to be considered further, a more detailed environmental impact analysis of this alternative must be prepared and reviewed by the public, including the state of Washington agencies having an interest in the subject.

In the preparations of this analysis, there are several considerations which must be included.

The Hanford waste vitrification plant must be adequately funded, completed, and in full operation before any consideration can be given to the processing of off-site wastes. 53-5 II.E(2)

Processing of Idaho wastes cannot delay or interfere with the planned or accelerated process of Hanford wastes. 53-7 II.E(5)

Consideration must be given to the impact that additions to the plant will have on local governmental services, police, fire, roads, schools and so on. 53-8 VIII.I(2)

Any off-site wastes which will be processed

or vitrified in the plant must be returned to the center or to a national repository. Interim or permanent disposal of the waste at Hanford is not acceptable. 53-9 II.E(6)

Full funding for all transportation, processing, and storage costs must be provided as an added increment to the Hanford environmental management project program funding. 53-10 II.E(3)

Consideration must be given to the local environmental impacts resulting from the 53-11 VIII.H(3) transportation and processing of the Idaho wastes.

53-12 VIII.H (3) Off-site transportation corridor safety, environmental impacts, and traffic issues must be thoroughly reviewed in cooperation with local and tribal governments. Provision must be made to alleviate any additional costs which may be incurred by local or state government agencies. 53-13 II.E(3)

We believe these issues are a reasonable requirement and provide a bottom line basis for evaluation of the importation of high-level waste to Hanford for processing and vitrification.

53-14 VII.A (2) In view of the potential significant savings from the Hanford alternative that would accrue to the Department as compared to other feasible alternatives, this alternative should be given more

comprehensive evaluation than is currently available.

Thank you for the opportunity to present our views on this subject.

MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you for your commenting, Mr. Heacock.

Is Mr. Swanson in the room? I would ask if there is anyone in the room, Mr. Heacock and Mr. Swanson were our only registered commenters, if there is anyone in the room that would like to comment formally on the record this evening, let me know by raising your hand, or just standing up and walking up to the podium, and we will get your comments on the record.

In the meantime I will take care of a housekeeping matter. I am going to mark as Exhibit Number 1 of this evening's proceeding a multi-page document entitled Idaho high-level waste and facilities disposition Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Tom's Talking Points-- Pasco, that would be Exhibit Number 1.

I will mark as Exhibit Number 2 a two-page document on TRIDEC, Tri-City Industrial Development Council letterhead entitled statement prepared for Department of Energy public hearing on Draft EIS regarding Idaho High-level Waste and Facilities

Disposition, Pasco, Washington, February 24, 2000. That will be Exhibit Number 2 of this evening's proceeding.

I will note that no one has indicated that they have not had an opportunity to comment who wanted to. Mr. Swanson is not in the room. At this point I will stand at ease, subject to call of the chair, in the event Mr. Swanson returns, or another individual of the public would like to come up and make a comment. So we will be off the record, subject to call of the chair. It is 11 minutes before the hour.

(Recess taken).

MR. RICHARDSON: Okay. We will be back on the record. It is now 8:15. I understand Mr. John Swanson who pre-registered decided not to comment and left the hearing.

I will remind you that you have until April 19 in which to submit written comments. That's the postmark date. And there are a variety of ways that you can submit comments to the Department of Energy on this Environmental Impact Statement. I will ask if there is anyone in the hall who would like to comment and who has not had the opportunity to do so. If so, would you raise your hand.

I will note for the record, no one has so

HLW & FD EIS PROJECT - (AR) PF
Control # DC-54

Citizens Advisory Board

Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory

00-CAB-031

RECEIVED APR 10 2000

April 3, 2000

Beverly Cook
U.S. Department of Energy
Idaho Field Office
850 Energy Drive, MS 1146
Idaho Falls, ID 83401

Dear Ms. Cook:

Note: The Site-Specific Advisory Board for the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL), also known as the INEEL Citizens Advisory Board (CAB), is a local advisory committee chartered under the Department of Energy's (DOE) Environmental Management SSAB Federal Advisory Committee Act Charter.

The INEEL Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) recently completed its review of the Idaho High-Level Waste and Facilities Disposition Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and preparing our recommendation on that document. We have submitted our comments, in consensus Recommendation #73, to those responsible for preparing the environmental documentation.

We are concerned, however, that the document preparers may determine that one of our most important comments falls outside the scope of acceptable comments for a document written in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). That recommendation states that that DOE should develop a mechanism for informing the decision-maker and the public regarding the compliance issues arising under each alternative considered in the EIS if implemented under a flat budget to support comparison with impacts under a fully funded budget. We cannot believe the decision-maker will ignore this information during the decision process, regardless of the requirements under NEPA. The public similarly requires such information to support informed review of this EIS. Precluding provision of this information to the public jeopardizes the adequacy of public participation conducted to support this EIS. In our recommendation, we identify three approaches that would achieve our objective.

Should DOE determine that none of the three approaches is acceptable in compliance with NEPA, we request that DOE revise its cost analysis to include the recommended information and release that revised cost analysis for public review before issuing a record of decision for the HLW program at the INEEL.

We await your response to this request.

Sincerely,

Stanley Hobson, Interim Chair
INEEL CAB

cc: Thomas L. Wichmann, DOE-ID
Carolyn Huntoon, DOE-HQ
Carol Borstrom, DOE-HQ
Martha Crosland, DOE-HQ

Chair:
Charles M. Rice

Vice Chair:
Stanley Hobson

Members:
James Bondurant
Wynona Boyer
Ben F. Collins
Jan Edelstein
Dieter A. Knecht
Dean Mahoney
R.D. Maynard
Linda Milam
Roy Mink
F. Dave Rydalch
Monte Wilson

Ex-officios:
Kathleen Trever
Wayne Pierre
Gerald C. Bowman

Jason Staff:
Carol Cole
Amanda Jo Edelmayer
Kathy Grebstad
Wendy Green Lowe
Trina Pettingill