

1 this evening and would remind all the folks in
2 the audience that, if you would like to comment,
3 you can do so by March 20, 2000, by submitting
4 written comments, fax comments, Internet
5 comments, or by attending one of the other public
6 meetings being held throughout the region.

7 We did have one commentor who I called
8 earlier this evening who wasn't in the room when
9 I called him. We'll see if he's departed or if
10 he's here.

11 Joe Marantette.

12 I will note for the record that
13 Mr. Marantette is not here, and ask if there's
14 anyone else in the audience who has not yet had
15 an opportunity to do so but would like to comment
16 this evening on the Draft Environmental Impact
17 Statement.

18 I will note for the record that no one
19 has so indicated.

20 With that, we will close this evening's
21 hearing, and we'll resume tomorrow in Pocatello
22 at the Quality Inn --

23 MS. CAROL COLE: No. At Idaho State
24 University.

25 THE FACILITATOR: -- at Idaho State

HLW & FD EIS PROJECT ~~AR/PF~~
Control # NC-36

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING ON
IDAHO HIGH-LEVEL WASTE
AND FACILITIES DISPOSITION
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2000

SNOW KING RESORT
JACKSON HOLE, WYOMING

Reported by:
Kimberly Carpenter, CSR #600

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

1 S-H-U-P-T-R-I-N-E.
2 THE FACILITATOR: Got it.
3 Ken Cady will follow Ms. Shuptrine.
4 MS. SANDY SHUPTRINE: My name is Sandy
5 Shuptrine. I am a Teton County Commissioner, but
6 I am, at this moment, speaking on behalf of
7 myself as an individual.
8 [I would like to begin -- actually, I
9 assume on behalf of our whole board -- at this
10 point to thank you for the opportunity to hold
11 this hearing in Jackson Hole. We very much
12 appreciate the responsiveness in bringing both
13 the information and the formal hearing to
14 Jackson Hole.]
15 With that, I would like to say that as I
16 try to shift gears and become informed on the
17 high-level waste EIS -- and after listening
18 tonight, I do have a rather sinking feeling at
19 the enormity, complexity and, most of all, the
20 lack of certainty about the alternatives that are
21 being suggested.
22 The fact that there is no preferred
23 alternative -- alternative recommended makes it
24 even more difficult for those of us as laypersons
25 to present focused comments. So, I will have to

1 keep mine general. And [I would like to say that
2 my ultimate request is that human health and the
3 environment be protected and that the alternative
4 that best accomplishes that be the chosen
5 alternative.]
6 [There was a comment made by Beverly Cook
7 that included tight budgets as one of the
8 considerations in choosing alternatives. And I
9 would like to say, because of the implications
10 for human health and our environment, I think
11 that tight budgets should not be one of the
12 primary considerations.]
13 [It was mentioned that a billion dollars
14 was gained in recovering spent nuclear fuels.
15 I'm wondering how many billions the ultimate
16 chosen alternative will cost and if those
17 billions would not be better spent up front on
18 more complete cost/benefit analyses, which
19 include all closure implications.
20 It appears that DOE finds itself
21 regrettably in the position of having to fix or
22 rectify past actions that were taken without full
23 understanding of where they were headed.]
24 [And I would like to suggest that we be
25 very careful. This does not relate specifically

D-57

DOE/EIS-0287

- New Information -

Idaho HLW & FD EIS

36-1
IX.C(4)

36-2
11.A(5)

36-3
X(9)

36-4
X(1)

36-5
X(5)

1 to this EIS, but that DOE, our Congress, and all
2 of us, pay particularly close attention to new
3 technologies that we are willing to experiment
4 with, that we put some of -- perhaps consider
5 it -- put some of those resources, both the
6 technical resources and the financial resources,
7 into renewable technologies, especially for
8 energy production.]

36-6
VIII.A(9)

9 [And I will have to say that burial of
10 waste at INEEL over the Snake River aquifer is
11 always a concern, as is any emissions that may
12 occur into the atmosphere.]

36-8
VII.A(7)

13 [Finally, I would like to commend the
14 Idaho Oversight Committee for acting as a
15 cooperator. I would also like to just put a word
16 of caution in there, because they are also the
17 regulators at some point, and there is a fine
18 line, and it has to be crossed. And I hope
19 everybody will be extremely careful about making
20 that transition -- transition from a cooperator
21 on the EIS to a regulator.]

36-9
VII.D(3)

22 [One more question that I have that I was
23 unable to ask is regarding regulatory standards
24 that are set by DEQ and EPA.

25 My question is: Are these standards

1 fully documented, in terms of both scientific and
2 health considerations?

3 I would hope that none of them have
4 political considerations but that they're based
5 on science and human health.]

6 Thank you.

7 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
8 comments, Commissioner.

9 Ken Cady, followed by Jeffrey Joel.
10 I don't see Mr. Cady, so is Mr. Joel
11 here?

12 MR. JEFFREY JOEL: I'm here.

13 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Mr. Joel will
14 be followed by Darryl Siemer.

15 MR. JEFFREY JOEL: My name is Jeffrey
16 Joel. My mailing address is Post Office Box 70,
17 Kelly, Wyoming. And I have mostly some questions
18 to ask.

19 I realize this is a very complicated
20 problem, and so the first question I ask is: [Why
21 can't some mixture of these alternatives be
22 used?

3601-1
II.A(3)

23 For example, why might there be -- might
24 there not be no action on already existing bin
25 sets?]

D-59

DOE/EIS-0287

3601-2 1 Secondly, [I just looked at these process
11.A(3) 2 diagrams over here for the various alternatives,
3 and I'm struck with how they get more and more
4 complicated as they go along.] [And it's very
5 strange that the minimum INEEL processing is the
3601-6 6 most complicated. And with so much handling
11.E(7) 7 going on, it seems that the likelihood of some
8 sort of problem for an accident in the processing
9 would be increased.]
10 [It also seems certain that some method
11 could be devised that would be simpler. I mean,
3601-3 12 and such method might not be a normal batch-feed
11.A(3) 13 method. It would have -- might very well have
14 some other model as its basis.]
15 Another question is: [NEPA, apparently,
16 does not require cost/benefit analyses, as
17 Mr. Wichmann said.
3601-4 18 But it seems that -- to me, that since
X(2) 19 all the alternatives will have human and
20 socioeconomic effects, then those cost/benefit
21 analyses absolutely need to be included in any
22 final decision amongst the alternatives. And,
23 really, they need to be discussed before then.]
3601-5 24 And this, finally, is a technical
111.C(6) 25 question: [Is there any way of precipitating out

51

1 salts of the acidic off gasses?]
2 Thanks.
3 THE FACILITATOR: Thanks for your
4 comments.
5 Mr. Siemer.
6 And Mr. Siemer is followed by Malissa
7 Clark Rhodes.
8 MR. DARRYL SIEMER: So much to say, so
9 little time. I attended the Idaho Falls meeting
10 a couple of days ago and decided, based on what I
11 saw there, that I better come up to this one,
12 too.
13 I am a Site worker, but I'm speaking for
14 myself. I believe you have my name and address
15 already.
16 [The problem that we are faced with here
17 is really a straightforward problem that has been
3602-1 18 addressed and solved elsewhere. I raised the
VII.D(6) 19 question earlier when I had the opportunity about
20 calcination. It's one of the things that we
21 promised to do.] [And we do know how to do that.
22 This is pilot planted. The way to solve
3602-2 23 this problem was well-known about 30 years ago.
111.C(1) 24 It wasn't implemented at the Site because there
25 wasn't any reason to do that. It was implemented

52

- New Information -

Idaho HLW & FD EIS

1 elsewhere, where they have addressed it and
2 solved this problem.

3 And I -- again, it's hard to understand
4 why it's not being done here. Because
5 calcination was the good thing to do. We've
6 always thought it was a good thing to do, and
7 that's what we reported on at RCRA's meetings.]

8 [There are issues related to the volume
9 of waste. The fact is that the volume of waste
10 really isn't all that important. DOE chooses to
11 implement a repository where there's plenty of
12 space, and several places have already been
13 carefully characterized. To implement such a
14 repository where the volume of our waste in at
15 65-foot cubed is not a real issue.]

16 [It is a policy of DOE sometimes to
17 translate one thing into another thing where
18 there isn't any correlation whatsoever. And I
19 raise that in my second point, that somehow the
20 disposition of this much calcine is going to cost
21 \$11 billion, and, of course, has to be added to
22 the cheapest and most straightforward way of
23 actually making it suitable for transport. That
24 is the direct cement option.]

25 [Which brings me to my suggestion that we

3602-3
III.E(1)

3602-4
X(8)

3602-5
III.D.2.b(1)

1 simply implement the same approach to dealing
2 with this waste that Great Britain has already
3 implemented successfully; in fact, by a company
4 that now has a pretty good-sized chunk of the
5 work at the Site and also has a pretty good-sized
6 chunk of the work that's going on at Hanford.

7 The reason being, of course, is that
8 they were able to succeed somewhere. They had
9 good credibility. And now it's going to make
10 money now in this country. Their solution to
11 that problem was by virtue of that direct cement
12 option. Now, they chose it because it's
13 effective and it's cheap. Somehow, the way that
14 this is looked at ID is that it is the most
15 expensive option. You must question some of the
16 things that you hear.]

17 I have some revised comments.

18 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Thank you
19 for your comments.

20 Malissa Clark Rhodes.

21 I'm going to introduce as Exhibit No. 1
22 at this proceeding an eight-page duplex document
23 entitled, "Comments on Draft INEEL HLW EIS, Idaho
24 High-Level Waste and Facilities Disposition,"
25 addressed to Mr. T. L. Wichmann, U.S. DOE-ID.

D-61

DOE/EIS-0287

1 And it is not dated. It will be Exhibit No. 1 of
2 the Jackson Hole proceedings.
3 Sorry to interrupt you.
4 MS. MALISSA CLARK RHODES: That's quite
5 all right.
6 THE FACILITATOR: Please proceed.
7 MS. MALISSA CLARK RHODES: Okay. My
8 name is Malissa Clark Rhodes. I'm a Jackson
9 resident. I hold a Ph.D. in geology from the
10 University of Pennsylvania. As a former adjunct
11 assistant professor at Rider University, I taught
12 basic environmental science, as well as geology
13 courses.
14 Therefore, INEEL's problems with waste
15 disposal, both stored mixed hazardous and
16 TRU-contaminated waste, and, separately, the
17 underground high-level waste, have caused me some
18 concern. These issues are separate but
19 parallel. They're dealing with problems of Waste
20 Acceptance Criteria. [We need to get the waste
21 out of Idaho somehow.]
22 Wyoming is the geology state. Our
23 economy is driven by our underground resources;
24 i.e., uranium, natural gas, oil and coal. All of
25 these sources of energy have their own sets of

3602-1
VII.D(6)

1 problems. We have some of the finest geologists
2 and engineers in the country.
3 I am not totally antinuclear. There is
4 a need for nuclear power at this point in time
5 because we have not solved pollution problems
6 associated with the utilization of fossil fuels.
7 Solar and wind power sources still remain in a
8 state of research and development.
9 However, dealing with a radioactive
10 waste effectively remains a national problem.
11 The problems at Hanford are on orders of
12 magnitude greater than INEEL's difficulties. We
13 do not wish to see -- or I do not wish to see
14 INEEL become another Hanford.
15 [Good science is the result of
16 interaction between opposing points of view. I
17 and several other concerned scientists would like
18 to hold a technical forum with outside scientists
19 and engineers interacting with the DOE
20 scientists. If we can participate in neutral
21 territory, perhaps we can evaluate the best
22 options in collaboration, rather than
23 opposition.]
24 To DOE, this is the challenge. Science
25 is a universal language.

3603-2
IX.D(3)

- New Information -

Idaho HLW & FD EIS