

1 statement to be disregarded by INEEL, Idaho DEQ
2 and the United States Department of Energy.]

3 Certainly the issues concerning the
4 disposition of the high-level waste from the
5 Idaho Chemical Processing Plant appear complex
6 even to the scientists hired to study it. [Let us
7 at least learn from our mistakes in addressing
8 this important issue. Two examples of attempting
9 to solve problems with untested technologies or
10 technologies that have been shown to be a mistake
11 come to mind.

12 In Denver, Colorado, in 1989, the
13 Shattuck Corporation spent \$28 million turning
14 their radioactive waste into concrete grout and
15 burying it under clay on a 6-acre site under the
16 approval of the EPA and the DOE. A short ten
17 years later, the EPA has ordered Shattuck to
18 construct a huge tent over the concrete and
19 proceed to break up the hardened material for
20 further disposal.

21 Or we could look at the situation of the
22 DOE and Lockheed Martin in charge of the tank
23 waste at the Hanford site near Richland,
24 Washington. This 20-year-old underground tank
25 named SY-101 holds almost one million gallons of

3608-2
IX.D(1)

1 nuclear bomb waste that produces unwanted
2 hydrogen as radiation fields bombard organic
3 chemicals that were added years ago in what
4 officials now say --

5 THE FACILITATOR: Ms. Maxwell, the court
6 reporter's having a difficult time keeping up, so
7 if you would slow down a bit.

8 MS. TATIANA MAXWELL: -- in what
9 officials now say was a mistaken strategy to
10 reduce the waste's volume.

11 As recently as June of '96, the DOE
12 crossed SY-101 off its list of problems and in
13 October of that year announced that all safety
14 issues with the tank are now understood.

15 Alas, in another example of where saying
16 it's so doesn't necessarily make it so, the DOE
17 now acknowledges that this tank is in danger of
18 exploding. And as one consultant for the DOE
19 puts it: I'm not convinced that anyone
20 understands the chemistry and physics involved in
21 this. And this is the best thinking of the best
22 minds in the DOE.]

23 [All that being said, while the issue of
24 stabilizing the high-level waste is integral in
25 avoiding the further pollution of the Snake River

3608-3
III.D.1(4)

D-69

DOE/EIS-0287

1 aquifer, let us not again use untested means or
 2 disproven technologies to create a larger waste
 3 stream.]
 4 [I urge the Idaho DEQ, INEEL and the
 5 Department of Energy to fully examine the results
 6 of the failed grouting policy at Hanford,
 7 Washington, and to expand their vitrification
 8 processes and deal with the existing liquid waste
 9 at its current location without separation,
 10 especially as a permanent storage facility at
 11 Yucca Mountain, or elsewhere, is, at best,
 12 decades away.]
 13 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
 14 comments.
 15 Ms. Maxwell, I noticed that you were
 16 reading your comments. If you could make that --
 17 a copy available to me, I will make it an exhibit
 18 for the hearing this evening. Or mail it in,
 19 because we want to make sure that the court
 20 reporter got all of that accurate.
 21 MS. TATIANA MAXWELL: All right.
 22 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.
 23 I would remind you that if you have
 24 material that you would like to use to supplement
 25 your written -- your oral comments this evening,

3608-4
III.D.2.b(5)

3608-5
III.D.2.c(1)

3609-1
VII.D(1)

3609-2
IX.A(7)

3609-3
VIII.B(2)

1 you can submit them in writing through the close
 2 of the comment period on March 20.
 3 Good evening.
 4 MS. SOPHIA WAKEFIELD: Good evening. My
 5 name is Sophia Wakefield, P.O. Box 2813, in
 6 Jackson, Wyoming, 83001.
 7 I am coming without papers. I am not a
 8 technical person. I received the environmental
 9 impact study two days ago. It was sent to me. I
 10 had no time to look through that.
 11 My chief concern is that we are only
 12 starting to learn to understand this very
 13 complicated problem we have next door. And [I am
 14 very concerned that we are -- which we currently
 15 adhere to a time constraint, that we make
 16 decisions because four years or five years ago we
 17 set a subjective time that we have to comply to.
 18 I would ask the State of Idaho and DOE
 19 and the DEQ to let go of these time constraints
 20 and to reconsider really what we have at stake
 21 here.] to [start involving us in lay terms so we
 22 all can learn what the problem is.]
 23 [I am extremely concerned, also, not to
 24 have heard anything about the clean air shed. We
 25 have two in our neighborhood. One is the Crater

- New Information -

Idaho HLW & FD EIS

1 of the Moons, one is Yellowstone National Park
2 and Grand Teton National Park.

3 And what it means, from what I
4 understand, is that these areas are reserved in
5 this country for the cleanest air we have. And I
6 think there are a little more than one dozen.

7 Two of them in our state and the state of Idaho.]

3609-4
VIII.B(2)

8 [I want to know from the permitting air
9 quality how models are used to allow any
10 emissions, or any emissions that we don't now how
11 to carcinogenically come together, and how these
12 affect our clean air sheds.] [I have learned that

3609-8
VIII.B(2)

13 the model is only done for the Crater of the
14 Moons, and then there is some quantitative
15 assumption done how this may affect Yellowstone
16 or Grand Teton National Park, but nothing else is
17 done for them.]

3609-5
VIII.B(2)

18 [We also have learned that the models are
19 used for the other -- the incinerator are models
20 that are faulty.] [I am very concern that we are

3609-6
VIII.B(2)

21 using models that are not putting into
22 consideration foremost human health and the
23 health of all life forms.]

3609-7
IX.D(5)

24 [Another concern I have is that in the
25 solution to the problems we have can only be

1 conceived on a new level of consciousness and not
2 on the level that the problem was created. And
3 I'm asking all the people we have elected to pay
4 by our tax monies to use that new level to find
5 solutions to this problem we have as a nation and
6 as a whole word.]

7 Thank you very much.

8 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
9 comments.

10 Benn Linn, followed by Whit Clayton.

11 MR. BENN LINN: My name is Benn Linn. I
12 live in Jackson at Box 71, Wilson.

3610-1
IX.C(4)

13 And [I would like to thank the DOE for
14 holding a public hearing where we get a chance --
15 and open a public hearing where we get a chance
16 to come make comments. I think that's a step
17 forward from where you have been in the past.]

3610-2
IX.D(2)

18 And [I do wish that you would also be as
19 open with your historical history of the past 50
20 years and let us, as the public, understand
21 probably quite a bit more clearly why you make
22 decisions and what you have to make decisions
23 about.]

24 I have been in the process -- the
25 process of the low-level waste and have educated

1 myself to that to some extent. Then I think that
2 we have all realized much more clearly that we
3 have problems. We all agree that we have
4 problems. We disagree on how we might want to go
5 about solving them.

3610-3
III.D.1(s)

6 And I -- [my greatest concern is that
7 we're treating the atmosphere like we treated the
8 ground above the aquifer in the '50s, in that it
9 solves our short-term problem. It gets rid of
10 waste. But I -- you know, I question whether
11 that's a long-term solution. To my mind, it's
12 not a long-term solution to use the atmosphere to
13 absorb any part of the waste.]

14 I can't really comment on this EIS. I
15 haven't seen it yet. It's all new material. But
16 [my general comment is that I think that we should
17 avoid a short-term solution like your
18 predecessors did in the '50s. I think that we
19 should deal with the problem now in an as
20 long-term situation as we can.]

3610-4
VI(i)

21 Thank you.
22 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
23 comments.
24 Whit Clayton, followed by Avril
25 Currier.

1 MR. WHIT CLAYTON: Thank you. Whit
2 Clayton, Box 12, Moose, Wyoming.
3 My wife and I have attended the INEEL
4 invitation and took a tour of the institution
5 about three weeks ago. I had a wonderful time
6 and learned a lot.

3611-1
IX.D(7)

7 If I am a proponent, [I am a proponent of
8 the INEEL and the professionalism we saw over
9 there -- 8-, 9-, 10,000 people over there doing a
10 wonderful job.] [If there's any question in my
11 mind, it would be the British Nuclear Fuels,
12 which put a company after their name so they
13 could become an American company. A lot of
14 objections made to them or about them and the
15 problems that they have.]

3611-2
XI(b)

16 I got an M.D. in 1947, one year after
17 the first bombs were dropped. And so I date
18 through this whole affair. I've spent a lot of
19 time in the last few months doing a lot of
20 reading on nuclear matters. And then when we had
21 a chance to do the INEEL tour, we took it, and
22 we're happy that we did. I would recommend that
23 you all take the tour, without a doubt.

24 I think the Oversight Committee of Idaho
25 has done a wonderful job of this little piece

D-71

DOE/EIS-0287

- New Information -

Idaho HLW & FD EIS

1 here that you've all seen. Maybe you have not.
2 The Settlement Agreement -- we saw most of these
3 installations. Not the ones with the rods in the
4 water, but we saw the others. The high-level
5 waste is a problem, and it's going to continue.

6 Transuranic wastes, those wastes that go
7 beyond uranium to neptunium and cerium,
8 americium, they're there, and they're going to
9 continue.

10 We've been flooded with information
11 about plutonium. I would recommend, before you
12 overreact to this, that this -- this is the
13 "Atlantic Monthly" of April '95. Before you
14 react to plutonium too much, do that, read it.
15 From "Nova," two articles on plutonium. And,
16 from the "Encyclopedia Britannica," another
17 article on plutonium. We understand it's there.
18 There's a challenge.

19 If we are reminded of anything -- I
20 think I can speak for my wife and myself --
21 okay -- it's like the "Sorcerer's Apprentice."
22 It's not going to go away. It's going to get
23 worse and worse and worse if we don't support and
24 help these people to move in the right
25 direction. So, I think we're a proponent of

3611-3
X(1)

1 getting things done in the best way.
2 [If there's any question in your mind and
3 in our mind, we would recommend the National
4 Academy of Sciences, who can undoubtedly find
5 honest and impartial people who can help with the
6 solution to this huge problem. And we would
7 recommend that it be done.]

8 We -- in medicine, we're used to solving
9 problems. All my life that's all I ever did was
10 take the challenge that was presented and try to
11 solve it. When I was on the hospital board, we
12 had a challenger, and we built a new hospital.
13 And it's a pleasure to see things being done
14 positively.

3611-4
IX.D(7)

15 And I feel that we should be positive
16 about this. We should support these people. [I
17 think the INEEL people are wonderful. They're
18 well-trained. They're doing a wonderful job, and
19 they're doing their best.] I'm not speaking for
20 British Nuclear Fuels. I do not know anything
21 about them.

22 And I thank you very much.

23 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
24 comments.

25 Avril Currier, followed by Roxanne

D-73

DOE/EIS-0287

1 Weaver.

2 And, Mr. Clayton, I will remind you
3 that -- you referred to a couple of documents up
4 there -- if you want those documents to be part
5 of the record, you can bring them up to me or
6 submit them by or before the close of the comment
7 period.

8 Good evening.

9 MR. AVRIL CURRIER: Hi. Well, I've
10 never talked in front of a group ever in my life
11 before, but I feel very passionate about this.
12 I'm from Jackson, been a resident here for 13
13 years.

14 And I've done -- I know that we have a
15 problem. I know that we've got some very good
16 people working on the problem. But we have a
17 global community, because we have a global
18 problem.

3612-1
VII.D(1)

19 One thing that may be a viable solution
20 would be to, as some people have said, back down
21 from our timetables, take a little bit better
22 look, grab some of these local people and come up
23 with solutions that will take this nuclear waste
24 away from populated areas, where you have a lot
25 of animal life, human life, maybe like the Sahara

79

1 Desert.

2 I'm sure people from Morocco would love
3 to have a couple of billion dollars to spend for
4 a few acres of their desert, in which we could
5 build a plant that would not pollute. We could
6 contain the stuff where it's never going to be
7 bothered by seismic activity.

8 And how do we get this to happen?

9 Well, we build a fleet of semi
10 tractor-trailers that can transport this stuff.
11 Put Americans to work on developing this stuff.
12 We have a lot of Naval ships -- they're in
13 mothballs -- that we could outfit to transport
14 this stuff over to the Sahara Desert, putting
15 more Americans to work to solve this problem and
16 building this plant over there using American
17 companies. Being the most technological country
18 in the world, we should be able to handle our own
19 problems. And with other nations that have
20 waste, we'll have the facility to handle their
21 stuff. And we can charge them for it and,
22 therefore, make money on it.

23 Why should we be sending our money to
24 someplace else when we have an economy here to
25 support?

80

- New Information -

Idaho HLW & FD EIS

362-3
III.D.1(i)

1 [You know, the gold mine up in Cooke
2 City, Montana, was really small potatoes to what
3 the potential hazards of this plant is. And I'm
4 talking to you folks. We have a national
5 treasure. Our forefathers worked hard and
6 diligently to make sure that this is available
7 for our grandchildren.

8 Just like airplanes fly the air, cars
9 break down, shit happens to us, and we don't want
10 to pay the price. We don't want our grandkids
11 for the next 245,000 years to pay the price.
12 Let's deal with this smartly, please.]

13 Thank you.

14 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
15 comments.

16 Roxanne Weaver.

17 And Ms. Weaver will be followed by
18 Horton Spitzer.

19 Let's go off the record just a second.
20 (A brief discussion was held off the record.)

21 THE FACILITATOR: Ms. Weaver, let me
22 interrupt you for just a moment.

23 I've been handed a document I need to
24 introduce, an exhibit entitled, "Comments on
25 Draft EIS and Idaho High-Level Waste Facilities

3623-1
IX.C(2)

1 Disposition," dated 2/9, 2000, Jeffrey Joel,
2 P.O. Box 78, Kelly, Wyoming, 83011. I'll
3 introduce that as an exhibit.

4 But, also, you can drop written comments
5 off at the comment box out front, as well.

6 I apologize for interrupting.

7 MS. ROXANNE WEAVER: No problem.

8 THE FACILITATOR: Please proceed with
9 your comments, Ms. Weaver.

10 MS. ROXANNE WEAVER: Thank you.

11 My name's Roxanne Weaver. I live in
12 Jackson Hole.

13 And the first thing I'd like to do is,
14 for the record, have placed in the record -- all
15 of Sandy Shuptrine and Ken Cady's comments, I
16 concur with all of them. There's no reason for
17 me to repeat them.

18 [I would like to remind you all that this
19 is DOE's largest undertaking, one in which they
20 will be spending billions of your tax dollars.
21 It took them three years to compile these
22 documents. And, at best, they gave us three
23 weeks to read these. I don't think that's quite
24 fair. In fact, I think it's a major insult to
25 all of us in Jackson Hole.]

3613-2
11.A(3)

3613-3
X1(2)

1 And [then I'd like to ask, as some others
2 have, that you change direction and that you
3 start looking at -- only at processes which will
4 not put hazardous toxins into the air.] And, to
5 that end, [I ask that you stop all plans for the
6 incinerator at INEEL and spend that money, as was
7 suggested earlier, on research and development,
8 to find ways to deal with this hazardous waste
9 safely.]

10 Thank you.

11 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
12 comments.

13 Mr. Spitzer will be followed by Dan
14 Fulton.

15 Good evening.

16 MR. HORTON SPITZER: Good evening.
17 Horton Spitzer, Box 1307, Wilson. I'm sorry I
18 couldn't have been here earlier to hear some of
19 the other discussions. I was at another
20 meeting.

21 But I did want to come and voice
22 something which was expressed wholeheartedly a
23 week ago. Trust. Trust. At the time they wrote
24 the Constitution, they adopted a phrase -- it was
25 interesting -- in God we trust. In God we

83

3614-1
X1(5)

3614.2
IX-D(2)

1 trust.

2 The writers of the Constitution had the
3 opportunity to say, in government we trust. But
4 they knew better. Because the Constitution
5 protected us from the government. Unfortunately,
6 there's been a long history -- and it's a good
7 history in this country -- that you question your
8 government.

9 [I feel we got a cheap shot a couple
10 weeks ago. One thousand people spent hours there
11 giving some excellent technical information
12 relative to -- to the proposal that's been put
13 forth in one method of disposal of hazardous
14 waste.

15 We had people there in the government
16 who could have said, wait a minute, you're not
17 talking about the right thing. I'm sorry. They
18 could have said that and moved on -- and might
19 have given the same comments -- but that wasn't
20 the case. We spent until eleven o'clock at night
21 in heartfelt honest discussion, and then we're
22 told it's not a part of the public record.]

23 [This is a good step forward. I'm
24 pleased that this is happening. This may be a
25 step forward with trust. But before anything is

84

D-75

DOE/EIS-0287

- New Information -

Idaho HLW & FD EIS