Document 36, Public Comment Hearing, February 9, 2000, Jackson, WY Page 40 of 54

```
decided, based upon government presentations,
          government statistics, we have a ways to go for
          them to earn our trust. And that's their
          responsibility. They are here not because we
          want them to be here. The government should be
          listening to us because they have to be here.
          That's the way our government is run.
                   So, I would just say -- and I'm not
          qualified -- and we've had some, I think,
3614-3 10
          excellent speakers, both a week or so ago and
1x.c(3) 11
          tonight, about technological suggestions. That's
          good. That's a step in the right direction.
      12
                   I just ask that if good decisions can't
          be made by -- by -- considered to be good or in a
3614-4 14
VII.A(b) 15
          wide enough scope, let's take some time. In that
      16
          time, maybe we can build some trust. And maybe
          we need opinions other than from government
          officials or those who are going to do this and
          make a profit by it.
      19
                   And so, as far as I'm concerned, in God
      20
          we trust on this.
      21
      22
                   Thank you.
      23
                   THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
      2.4
          comments.
      25
                   Mr. Fulton will be followed by Bertie
                                 85
```

Document 36, Public Comment Hearing, February 9, 2000, Jackson, WY Page 41 of 54

Appendix

New Information

```
Herschfield.
                    If I may interrupt for a moment,
          Mr. Fulton.
                    Ms. Herschfield is the last
          preregistered commentor. I will remind you, if
          you would like to comment this evening, if
          something was said earlier that sparked a
          thought, go register. They'll bring your name to
          me, and we'll get your comments here on the
          record.
                    Sorry to interrupt. Please proceed.
      11
                   MR. DAN FULTON: My name is Dan Fulton
      12
          of Wilson, Wyoming, Box 576.
      1.3
                   Most of the areas that I would like to
      14
          cover have been covered by people. But I'm
          willing to go on record and ask the DOE to
3615-1
 XI(b)
          provide some information on how they went about
          hiring the British company to be the contractor
          to build this facility.
      19
                   I'd also like to point out, with all due
3615-2
1x.D(1) 21
          respect to the gentleman that spoke earlier,
          while I think there are a number of good people
          at the INEEL and DOE, I have grave concerns about
          their ability to make good decisions. And I base
          that on what's happened in Rocky Flats, Colorado,
                                  86
```

Document 36, Public Comment Hearing, February 9, 2000, Jackson, WY Page 42 of 54

```
and their choice of contractor, who's been barred
           from other countries, Japan and Switzerland.
                    So, my grave concerns are as to whether
          or not they're making good choices in things that
          are going to take a long time to rectify.
                   Thank you.
                   THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
          comments.
                   I'd also remind you that if you want to
      10
          comment and would like to do so in a private
          setting that the Department of Energy has set up
      11
          a mechanism for you to do so if you're feeling
      12
      13
          uncomfortable speaking in front of a group.
      14
                   Good evening, Ms. Herschfield.
                   MS. BERTIE HERSCHFIELD: Hello. My
      15
          name's Bert Herschfield. I'm president of the
      16
          board of Keep Yellowstone Nuclear Free. Keep
      17
      18
          Yellowstone Nuclear Free was formed in opposition
      19
          to proposed nuclear and hazardous waste
          incinerator at the INEEL. For the past six
      21
          months, we've been most closely focused on this
          complex issue.
      22
                  Only two weeks ago, the DOE released the
      23
3616-1
          Draft Environmental Impact Statement concerning
IX.C(z)
          disposal of liquid high-level and low-level waste
                                 87
```

Document 36, Public Comment Hearing, February 9, 2000, Jackson, WY Page 43 of 54

at the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center, INTEC. The disposal of these wastes is a serious issue and deserves serious attention. The disposal of this waste represents the largest single undertaking of waste disposal at INEEL. Considering the gravity of the situation, we feel that a mere two weeks is woefully insufficient to evaluate each waste disposal option. And, furthermore, we consider the long overdue release of the EIS to be suspect 3616-2 and dubious. 1Y.B(1) 11 Nevertheless, in any instance where 12 there exists the potential for harm to be 13 3616-3 inflicted on human life and the environment as a VII.A(6) 14 result of onsite operations, we believe that 16 citizens should be involved in the decision-making and implementation processes. As such, we appreciate the opportunity to speak in 18 19 Keep Yellowstone Nuclear Free is very 3616-4 concerned about the treatment and disposal of VIII.G(7) liquid high-level and low-level waste at INTEC. We support the DOE's and Idaho's desire to dispose of this waste. However, safety must be the overriding concern.

Document 36, Public Comment Hearing, February 9, 2000, Jackson, WY Page 44 of 54

```
And we ask, is it and will it be?
        1
                    Will the DOE select a method that
 3616-5
           threatens to release toxins into the air?
111. D. 1(1)
                    If it does, we will oppose it.
                    This waste has been in underground tanks
3616-6
           for 50 years, 20 years longer than originally
111 . A(1)
           intended. Although DOE claims the tanks are not
        8
           leaking, the service lines to the tanks have
           experienced severe leaks.
                    What would it take in cost and time to
       10
           repair these leaks as a temporary holding-pattern
           measure while it's investigated in terms of safe
           ways and alternatives?
       13
                    As we know, the DOE's past record of
3616-7
           dealing with low-level waste is horrific. For
(I) a.xI
       16
           example -- and we don't have to look to other
           areas. We can look right in Idaho. The DOE has
       17
           caused low-level waste to reach directly into the
       18
           Snake River aquifer, resulting in a large plume
           of contaminated radioactive isotopes beneath the
       20
           plant.
                    The DOE's record of dealing with
       22
           high-level waste is equally irresponsible, as
           witnessed by the substantial radioactivity from
           the calciner plant into the atmosphere. The
                                  89
```

Document 36, Public Comment Hearing, February 9, 2000, Jackson, WY Page 45 of 54

```
calciner is an antiquated system which began
  3616-8 1
  111.0(4) 2
            operating in 1963 and is currently not
            operating. We firmly oppose any efforts to
            restart the calciner and advocate for a safer
            alternative which poses the least threat to our
            environment and our health.
                    Keep Yellowstone Nuclear Free
 3616-9
VI(1)
            acknowledges that this high-level waste stream
            needs attention. As in the case of our
            opposition for proposed incinerator, we advocate
            for technology to deal with the waste in which
            containment and safe long-term stewardship, not
            expediency and profit, are emphasized.
                     We feel that potential methods of
3616-10
111.F.2(5)15
            disposal being considered have not been
            reality-tested. And, therefore, the consequences
            associated with these methods are difficult to
            predict and impossible to guarantee. As such, it
            is difficult to favor any one particular method
            of disposal. And there must never be any effort
            to reclassify these wastes in order to meet the
3616-11
 V(9)
            criteria for a more convenient form of treatment;
        23
            i.e., incineration.
                     And so I ask: Are there any plans to
            reclassify the waste?
                                   90
```

Document 36, Public Comment Hearing, February 9, 2000, Jackson, WY Page 46 of 54

```
The reprocessing of nuclear waste has
3616-12
VI(1) 2
          resulted in what can only be described as a
          dangerous mess in the state of Idaho. Please
3616-13
          consider our input as an effort to be part of the
VII.A(6)
          solution to the serious problem of waste
          treatment and storage with emphasize on the safe
          and long-term stewardship of hazardous and
          nuclear waste, not on expediency and profit.
          Together, we can chart a course that will protect
     1.0
          all of us from some of the most dangerous waste
     11
          on earth.
     12
                   Thank you.
                   THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
     13
          comments.
     14
                   We have a couple of additional
     15
          commentors who have preregistered.
     16
     17
                   Christy Gillespie, who will be followed
          by David Henneberry.
     18
                   And if you would like to comment, please
     19
          go to the registration desk and register. And
     20
          they'll bring your name up to me, and we'll get
     2.1
          you on the record.
     23
                   Good evening.
                   MS. CHRISTY GILLESPIE: Hi. My name's
     24
         Christy Gillespie, and I live in Jackson,
                                 91
```

Document 36, Public Comment Hearing, February 9, 2000, Jackson, WY Page 47 of 54

```
Wyoming.
                    And tonight I would like to tell you
           about some of my concerns. I'm concerned about
  3617-1
           British Nuclear Fuels building this incinerator.
  X1(5)
           Their past history has been inexcusable. I
           wonder how such a decision could be made to use a
           company like this, especially in the United
        9
                    I'm concerned about my health, my
           future, and my family's health and my neighbors'
           health. Given the recent public hearings that
           have been held in other towns with incinerators,
           people have come out and said that there's been
       13
       14
           years and years of people having problems of
       15
           health effects, retardation, childhood leukemia.
                    All of these things are very serious
           problems, and they're just now becoming public.
           And these are towns just like ours that have had
           this happen to them years ago. And I don't want
           to become another statistic. I don't want to be
           standing here in ten years telling you how my
           kids have leukemia, how I have cancer.
      23
                   I think I'm going to ask you once more
           to reconsider your decision. Put the money into
3617-2
           research, please, until a better solution can be
X (12)
                                  92
```

Document 36, Public Comment Hearing, February 9, 2000, Jackson, WY Page 48 of 54

```
found.
                    Thank you.
        3
                    THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
           comments.
                    David Henneberry.
                    Good evening.
                    MR. DAVID HENNEBERRY: Hello. My name's
           David Henneberry. I live here in Jackson,
           Wyoming, P.O. Box 6962.
       10
                    I understand that something does need to
           be done. We have created a problem, and we do
           need to fix it. I have nothing against that.
           One of the things -- okay. A plant does have to
3618-1 14
           be built.
 11.A(2)
                    Why here?
                    Why in our area?
       16
       17
                    Why not where it's -- the problem is
           located?
       18
       19
                    Why ship it all the way over here, do
           one thing, ship it someplace else?
                    Isolate it and take care of it.
       21
                    Okay. If the plant were problem-free,
       22
3618-2
       23
           then there would be no problem or less of an
X1(5)
           issue. But, so far, the plants in operation are
           having continuous problems. And all these have
                                  93
```

```
Document 36, Public Comment Hearing, February 9, 2000, Jackson, WY Page 49 of 54
```

```
to be addressed. They're not being adequately
          handled, and the situations aren't stopping. The
          dangers still exist.
                  Another thing is acceptable level.
                   How does somebody come up with an
3618-3 5
VIII. G(2) 6
          acceptable level?
                   It's like a population. You say, okay,
          well, it's okay to kill 200 people out of 200
          million. That's still wrong. Say, okay, a
          billion parts per -- just as a figure -- a
          billion parts -- or one in a billion you can
      12
      13
                   Is that safe?
                   How much volume of this room is a
      14
          billion parts?
      15
      16
                   You know, if there's 200 billion parts
          in here right now, that's enough to kill you
          then. I would like to see these figures properly
          addressed, know exactly where they come from.
      19
      20
                   And all the statistics aside -- excuse
          me -- who is saying this is acceptable?
                   Did someone come up with a figure?
      22
                   That's my concern. For everybody's
      23
          health hazards, the environment, everything. And
          I think this is something that really needs to be
                                 94
```

Document 36, Public Comment Hearing, February 9, 2000, Jackson, WY Page 50 of 54

```
addressed, making it for everybody's sake.
 2
             Thank you.
             THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
    comments.
             I don't have -- I have no more
    preregistered commentors. I would remind you if
    you would like to comment this evening that you
    can register at the registration desk. We'll get
    you on the record.
             We're scheduled to be here until nine.
   We'll be here until nine o'clock. And if you
    would like to comment between now and then,
    register, and then we'll go back on the record.
             In the meantime, I think we'll go off
    the record subject to call from the hearing
    officer.
16
17
             But, before we do so, I want to remind
   you March 20 is the deadline for submitting
    written comments, as the postmark date. And
19
    there's a variety of other methods for submitting
    written comments that you may take advantage of,
    and those methods are detailed at the
    registration desk.
             So, with this, we will take a break.
    We'll be subject to call of the hearing officer
                           95
```

Document 36, Public Comment Hearing, February 9, 2000, Jackson, WY Page 51 of 54

```
until nine o'clock, when we're scheduled to
          conclude.
                   Thank you.
                        (A recess was taken.)
                   THE FACILITATOR: Okay. We'll be back
          on the record.
                   This is a continuation of the February 9
          hearing. And we're in the private setting for
          taking oral comments for the record.
                   And you understand that your comments,
          although made in a private setting, will be part
          of the public record?
      12
                   MR. DAN BENNETT: I do.
      13
                   THE FACILITATOR: Okav. Please state
      14
          your name and make your comments.
                   MR. DAN BENNETT: My name is Dan
      16
          Bennett, P.O. Box 592, Jackson, Wyoming.
                  Two weeks ago I attended the town
3619-1
X1(10)
          meeting's comment period at the middle school
          high school here in town for the incineration
          that's being proposed over at INEEL.
      22
                   And although I realized that is not
          exactly the subject of tonight's meeting, I would
          want to request that the minutes of that town
          meeting and comment period be included in
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

24

25

Document 36, Public Comment Hearing, February 9, 2000, Jackson, WY Page 52 of 54

```
tonight's record.
         And the reason I am doing that is
because it was a very remarkable meeting. The
comments were very bright and informed. And it
was a much larger attendance than tonight's
meeting. And there has since been some kind of
disrespect by the Idaho DEQ, saying that they are
not going to regard -- or take into account any
of the comments that were made at that hearing.
         Thank you.
         THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. You
understand that your comments are part of the
public record, but what you just asked to be made
part of the public record would have to be
submitted by you to be in the record at this
proceeding?
         And I do believe that those comments are
transcribed and available for your review at the
reading rooms. There is one at the Teton County
Library here.
         So, just understand that this is -- this
is on the record, but things that you ask to put
in the record, if you don't submit them, won't be
part of this record.
        MR. DAN BENNETT: I'll be glad to do
```

97

```
Document 36, Public Comment Hearing, February 9, 2000, Jackson, WY Page 53 of 54
```

```
that, if I have the time to do it. I mean, if
    there's a time period available --
 3
             THE FACILITATOR: Through March 20.
             MR. DAN BENNETT: And I wasn't here for
    the entire duration of tonight's comments, so I
    don't know if someone made that same request.
 7
             THE FACILITATOR: No.
 8
             MR. DAN BENNETT: Okay. Thank you.
 9
             THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you,
10
    ir.
11
                 (A recess was taken.)
             THE FACILITATOR: Okay. We'll be back
12
    on the record.
14
             We're in continuation of our taking
    comments in private for the public record. And
    Mr. Henneberry had a comment.
17
             MR. DAVID HENNEBERRY: Okay. I want the
    record to state that my comments were not
18
   directed at the proposed incinerator project. My
    comments were about my concern with hazardous
    waste treatment, containment, transport and
    storage, and the health and safety to everyone in
    the environment if a contamination situation
    should occur during any of the above-mentioned
    areas.
```

98

Document 36, Public Comment Hearing, February 9, 2000, Jackson, WY Page 54 of 54

```
Thank you.
 1
             THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.
 2
 3
             And, Mr. Henneberry, you understand
    that, although your comments are made in a
 5
    private setting, they will be part of the public
 6
    record?
 7
             MR. DAVID HENNEBERRY: Yes, sir.
             THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.
 8
 9
             MR. DAVID HENNEBERRY: Thank you.
             THE FACILITATOR: We will be off the
    record.
12
                 (A recess was taken.)
             THE FACILITATOR: We're back on the
13
    record, people.
14
15
             I will ask that if anyone in the
    audience has -- who would like to comment orally
16
    this evening formally on the record and who has
17
18
    not commented yet would like to do so.
19
             We've given you an opportunity to
    register at the front desk, and I will report,
20
21
    for the record, that no one has so registered.
22
    If there is anyone who has not commented and
    would like to do so, this is your final
23
    opportunity to do that this evening at the
24
25
    Jackson Hole hearing.
                           99
```

Document 37, Public Comment Hearing, February 8, 2000, Pocatello, ID Page 1 of 6

HLW & FD EIS PROJECT - AR/PF

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING ON

IDAHO HIGH-LEVEL WASTE

AND FACILITIES DISPOSITION

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2000

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY
POND STUDENT UNION BUILDING
POCATELLO, IDAHO

Reported by: Kimberly Carpenter, CSR #600

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