HLW & FD EIS PROJECT - (AR) PF
Control # DC-75

HLW EIS Web Comments

From: HLWFDEIS Web Site
Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2000 3:03 PM
To: web@jason.com
Cc: web_archive@jason.com
Subject: HLW EIS Web Comment

Name: Kevin Ward
Affiliation: Foothills School of Arts and Sciences
Address1: 1900 N 29th street
Address2:
City, State Zip: Boise, ID 83702
Telephone: 385-0746
Date Entered: {ts '2000-04-19 15:03:11'}
Comment:
Apr. 19 '00

Dear Thomas L. Wichmann,

75-1 III.A(i) I know that you and your colleagues have a very important, frustrating job and that you get a lot of these letters but I am concerned. I wish to state a few of my points why I am concerned. One is that the waste can leak out of the metal containers it is stored in. In doing so it could very possibly leak into the Snake River aquifer and then it could go from there into the Snake River itself. That would not only would affect me, but it could affect all of Idaho and further we don't know the timespan of this (I know that this may never happen or it could happen in 7 years), but I don't want it to affect the generation of the future. You may not be thinking so far ahead but I am and think that I want everbody to have a long-lived life. 75-2 VIII.G(1)

75-3 III.D.2.c(1)
To stabilize the waste, I think that you should turn it into glass. I know that this a very expensive process but I know, and hope you know, that you can't put a price on life. Thank you for your time and for taking my letter into consideration. Please write back. 75-4 IX.C(1)

From,
Kevin Ward - age 11

1

HLW & FD EIS PROJECT - (AR) PF
Control # DC-76

Name: Dean Taylor
Affiliation: Idaho Falls resident
Address1: 3110 Hartert
Address2:
City, State Zip: Idaho Falls, ID 83404
Telephone: (208)523-8519
Date Entered: {ts '2000-04-19 22:18:44'}
Comment:

76-1 VIII.A(6) 1) The information used in making the assessments in the EIS is based on fragmentary data, at best, and on non-existent data (GUESSES!) at worst. I have little faith in any decision based on these data. The potential costs of implementing some of these options are measured in Billions of dollars. Why doesn't DOE fund work to provide GOOD data for ALL the options under consideration so that an INTELLIGENT choice can be made? The direct cementation option, for example, appears to have had little or no funding support to provide reasonable data on which to assess its merits.

76-2 X(12)

76-3 III.F.2(1) 2) Mr. Wichmann claimed in one of the public meetings that DOE has 170,000 MTHM of HLW to dispose of, while the current allocation for such waste at Yucca Mtn is for only 4,400 MTHM. These numbers suggest that the only way to "fit" the INEEL's HLW into the Yucca Mtn repository is to separate the high-activity portion and send only that to YM, leaving the low-activity portion to be disposed of elsewhere. Mr. Wichmann's numbers, however, don't agree with those published in the Sandia Report, "Performance Assessment of the Direct Disposal in Unsaturated Tuff of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Waste Owned by U.S. Department of Energy" (SAND94-2563/1, 1995). This report indicates that the term MTHM (Metric Tons Heavy Metal) applies to the parent fissionable fuel mass from which the waste was derived, not the actual mass of the final waste form. The report further indicates there is a total of only 12,060 MTHM waste in the DOE complex, only 320 MTHM of which is at the INEEL. Based on this data, the INEEL's
waste would use roughly 7.3% of the 4,400 MTHM allocation, regardless of whether it is separated into high- and low-activity portions or not.

76-5 X(4) 3) If the INEEL's HLW is NOT separated into high- and low-activity fractions, the final waste form will consume more space at the repository and thus incur a higher disposal cost. However, when comparing these costs for the various candidate options, only INCREMENTAL costs BEYOND "sunk" costs associated with development of the repository, should be considered. The latter costs must be paid REGARDLESS of which treatment option is selected. Only those costs incurred as a DIRECT consequence of choosing a specific option should be considered when comparing all options if TOTAL cost to the taxpayers is to be minimized.

To put it more simply, the TOTAL cost to the taxpayers for treatment and disposal of DOE's HLW will be the sum of three cost items: (a) the research