

1 Thank you.

2 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
3 comments. J. T. Stephens, followed by Jim
4 Laybaum.

5 I will remind you, while Mr. Stephens is
6 coming to the microphone, that if you would like
7 to comment tonight that you can do so by
8 registering at the table out at the front desk.
9 And they will bring your name up to me, and we
10 will get you on the record and get your concerns
11 addressed by the Department for the final
12 document.

13 Sorry to interrupt you. Please proceed.

14 MR. J. T. STEPHENS: My name is Tom
15 Stephens, and Post Office Box 212. I'm a
16 physical science technician retired from Puget
17 Sound Naval shipyard, 14 years of experience with
18 hazardous waste, radiological waste. Mostly I
19 watched other people work in a radiological safe
20 manner.

21 And when I reviewed the Environmental
22 Impact Statement here proposed, I saw several
23 flaws up here that the general public is not
24 aware of.

25 The first thing I'd like to make

3604-1
IX.A(5)

1 everybody aware of is what the limits are for
2 NAV SEA, which is the Department of Defense's
3 agency -- federal agency that governs
4 radiological work.

5 [The permissible airborne and detectable
6 airborne limit is measured in microcuries per
7 milliliter. In other words, how much air we
8 breathe. And it's 1 times 10 to the minus 9 is
9 the limit. Then we have another limit. One
10 times 10 to the minus 8, we put on respirators to
11 work in a radiological area.

12 Then 1 times 10 to the minus 7, we
13 evacuate. We get out of the shipyard, we get out
14 of the town, because the whole place is
15 contaminated. We can't breathe. We're all going
16 to die.

17 Then I looked up here and it says 3.2 to
18 the minus 5.

19 What does that mean?
20 They don't say it's microcuries per
21 milliliter, which I'm familiar with, even if the
22 general public is not. Then they put another one
23 here, 5 times 10 to the minus 4.

24 What does it mean?
25 [They don't tell you on the Environmental

3604-2
IX.A(8)

D-63

DOE/EIS-0287

1 Impact Statement because they are misleading
2 people, because the general public doesn't know.
3 Minus figures are clean figures. I think that's
4 what they're saying. It's not true.]
5 [So, the Environmental Impact Statement
6 should be geared to the general population, to
7 facts and figures to what they can understand.]
8 [Another -- another thing: What is a
9 millirem?
10 What is a rem?
11 Most people don't know.
12 Thank you. I've got the time.
13 They also know the quote here of
14 minus -- let's say 4 times 10 to the minus 4
15 millirem.
16 What does that mean?
17 Nothing. Not a thing. I can measure
18 with an instrument .05 millirem. Well, that
19 means something. That's a figure. One millirem
20 is -- I can measure and give it in a dosimeter
21 reading. I can't read minus 4 millirem. The
22 only way you can do that is by mathematics.
23 And that's what they've done,
24 mathematically given you figures that mean
25 nothing.]

3604-3
IX.A(3)

3604-4
IX.A(5)

1 Thank you very much.
2 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
3 comments.
4 Before Mr. Laybaum comes up, Mr. Cady is
5 in the audience. And we called him second.
6 So, go ahead and come on up and make
7 your comments, Mr. Cady.
8 And Jim Laybaum is next, followed by
9 Dave Hensel.
10 MR. KEN CADY: My name's Ken Cady. I'm
11 a resident of Jackson.
12 And I haven't had a chance to read the
13 Draft EIS yet on the high-level waste. But what
14 little bit I do know, [I see one fundamental
15 flaw. It looks to be a lot of good engineering
16 work on different processes. But the idea that
17 we can -- we -- there's a standard that we can
18 pollute to is unacceptable. These processes --
19 the first thing the DOE should have is a
20 requirement of no releases. And once that's
21 done, look at the processes that fit the bill.]
22 [Now, as we look at these things,
23 there's -- you know, there's a lot of thermal
24 activity in these things, and it's very difficult
25 to have zero pollution. But, in concert, having

3605-1
VIII.B(5)

3605-2
II.A(3)

- New Information -

Idaho HLW & FD EIS

1 two or three processes combined may well bring
2 the pollution level to such a small level that
3 it's insignificant.]
4 [We don't need tall stacks or we don't
5 need a great deal of modeling expertise, because,
6 right now, the air model is incorrect, so if
7 there is a release, we're not exactly sure where
8 it's going to go.]
9 [What we -- what I would just ask you to
10 do is change the requirements, from an
11 engineering standpoint to task the engineers with
12 zero releases and see what they come up with.
13 And that will change -- you know, a lot of these
14 processes will go away.]
15 I'll have some written comments in about
16 60 days, after I've read the EIS. But I think
17 that would be the first order, if we could get
18 that -- just that element down.
19 Thank you.
20 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
21 comments.
22 I would remind you that you have until
23 March 20 to submit written comments, and to the
24 postmarked date by March 20. And there's a
25 variety of ways that you can submit written

1 comments, and we mentioned them earlier, all of
2 which are detailed on the desk outside.
3 Jim Laybaum.
4 MR. JIM LAYBAUM: Hi. I'm Jim Laybaum.
5 First, [I'd like to say that I'm glad to
6 see the DOE finally having hearings in Wyoming on
7 INEEL projects that could have serious impacts on
8 this region] [But I am deeply disturbed at the
9 timing of this hearing.]
10 [I would also like to question why no
11 hearings on this EIS are scheduled to be held in
12 Montana or Utah, as I believe the citizens there
13 also have a right to be heard on such important
14 regional issues.]
15 [I understand the DOE has spent several
16 years with a large number of experts in this
17 field creating this document. And the Wyoming
18 public, which was not involved in the scoping
19 process, most with no background in nuclear waste
20 treatment, are expected to make an informed
21 decision on these proposals which could affect
22 them, as well as future generations, in less than
23 a month.
24 I personally received my copy of the EIS
25 somewhere around January 17, only 22 days before

D-65

DOE/EIS-0287

1 this hearing. I find this completely
2 unacceptable, and I do not see how the DOE can
3 claim that this is a reasonable amount of time
4 for lay people to even begin to understand the
5 many complex technologies outlined in this
6 document.]

7 In spite of the seemingly intentional
8 effort to deny us the necessary time to research
9 these issues, I have personally come to some
10 conclusions.

3606-5
111.C(4)

11 First, I believe the New Waste Calciner
12 must not operate any longer with or without
13 modification due to the lack of understanding of
14 emissions and that decommissioning should begin
15 as soon as possible.]

3606-6
111.D.3(1)

16 Second, proposals to dissolve the
17 calcine for transuranic separation are
18 unacceptable in that this is taking a step
19 backwards with no proof that chemical separations
20 are feasible on an industrial scale.]

3606-7
111.D.3(1)

21 Third, all separation proposals are
22 unacceptable and unrealistic, given the
23 difficulties that DOE has experienced with
24 separation projects at INEEL's Pit 9, the Waste
25 Treatment Plant, and at other DOE facilities.]

1 Fourth, the amount of shipping necessary
2 to process this waste at Hanford and return it is
3 an unacceptable hazard to the region, especially
4 to the people living along the transport route.]

3606-8
111.E(8)

3606-9
111.D.2.b(6)

5 Finally, I do not believe grout will
6 retain its physical integrity for the extended
7 time spans necessary to safely immobilize the
8 waste from the environment.]

3606-10
111.D.2.c(1)

9 This leaves only early vitrification as
10 an acceptable alternative. While I am concerned
11 about the potential emissions from such facility
12 and would want to see much more specific details
13 on the emissions control and the emissions
14 monitoring technologies for such a facility, I
15 believe the end result would be the safest form
16 this waste can be converted to.

17 It is of utmost importance that all of
18 this waste be immobilized in glass without
19 separation or high-level reclassification, as
20 there is, at present, no high-level waste
21 repository operational and the potential that
22 this waste may be waiting for a repository into
23 the next century.]

3606-11
111.E(3)

24 It is not enough to simply make this
25 waste road-ready. It must be put into its safest

- New Information -

Idaho HLW & FD EIS

1 form for temporary storage and, later, permanent
 2 disposal.] [Costs should not be an issue.
 3 Ultimate safety should be.]
 4 [I believe that the necessity for
 5 constructing a waste vitrification plant to
 6 further -- to prevent further contamination of
 7 the Snake River aquifer and the citizens of this
 8 region clearly shows that the plutonium
 9 incineration project should be canceled
 10 immediately and its budget devoted to this much
 11 more serious and pressing issue.]
 12 Thank you.
 13 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
 14 comments.
 15 Dave Hensel will be followed by Tatiana
 16 Maxwell. Ms. Maxwell, I guess, we'll say.
 17 MR. DAVE HENSEL: Hi. My name is Dave
 18 Hensel. I live at 303 South 200 East in Driggs,
 19 Idaho.
 20 I'm a member of the Snake River
 21 Alliance, but I'm speaking as an individual
 22 tonight. And -- but I know that the Alliance has
 23 been looking forward to cleaning up the Chem
 24 Plant for 20 years now.
 25 As an Idaho resident, I have to take a

1 little bit of -- just a second to comment on the
 2 term "road-ready." It seems to recur quite often
 3 in this EIS. And [I feel that the term
 4 "road-ready" is basically defining a political
 5 goal that's driven by a political agenda.]
 6 [And I think that the ultimate goal of
 7 this cleanup process should be safer treatment
 8 and storage of the waste. Where it is less
 9 critical than that it be stored in -- stored
 10 safely.] [I mean, we have high-level waste coming
 11 into Idaho all the time and will in the
 12 foreseeable future, and it is, theoretically,
 13 road-ready.]
 14 [I'm concerned with the various
 15 separation options. I think that these
 16 alternatives will just generate higher volumes of
 17 waste, just give the DOE more waste stream stock
 18 to keep track of, and are probably going to be
 19 infeasible technology. They certainly are
 20 unprovable.] I tended -- [I tend to feel that
 21 early vitrification is the most economically and
 22 environmentally sound process presented in the
 23 EIS.]
 24 I do want to commend the DOE and the
 25 State of Idaho for working together. [And I want

D-67

DOE/EIS-0287

1 to specifically emphasize the fact that the
2 cleanup process should be driven by the ultimate
3 need to coordinate the treatment of all forms of
4 contamination -- the soil, the water, the
5 facilities and the high-level waste.]

3607-8
IV.C(1)

6 [I do have a lot of questions about
7 facility disposition. And I realize that the
8 technical and engineering problems faced by the
9 Department of Energy are huge.

10 And what do you do with a 300,000-gallon
11 tank that's contaminated with radioactive waste?

12 However, on top of that -- or, rather, I
13 should say, under it and around it, are immense
14 quantities of contaminated soil. And I do not
15 want to see that what the solution is is to
16 simply put a cap over the problem and kind of
17 sweep things under the rug and walk away from
18 it.]

3607-9
VII.B(1)

19 [A lot of effort should be put into
20 examining the consequences of what is done in the
21 cleanup to make sure that it doesn't compound the
22 problem of dealing -- of the possibility of
23 having to deal with this contaminated soil at a
24 later date.]

25 Thank you.

67

1 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
2 comments.

3 Ms. Maxwell, followed by S. Wakefield.

4 I apologize if I mispronounced your
5 name.

6 MS. TATIANA MAXWELL: It's happened for
7 about 36 years. That's okay.

8 Tatiana Maxwell. My address is P.O.
9 Box 4856, Jackson, 83001.

10 I apologize for coming without my visual
11 aides and support staff, but I'm really glad to
12 see that my tax money has paid for this kind of
13 elaborate setup here. You know, the next time
14 I'll try to come a little more prepared.

15 I would like to take this opportunity to
16 thank Brian Munson and the Idaho DEQ for making
17 this second arduous journey over the pass to
18 Jackson, although he assured us in his statement
19 last week that the opinions of more than 1,000
20 U.S. citizens don't make a whit's worth of
21 difference in his decision-making process. But
22 it looks to me like you folks have hired a better
23 PR firm.

3608-1
IX.D(2)

24 [As just another ignorant citizen today,
25 I would like to take a stab at making one more

68

- New Information -

Idaho HLW & FD EIS