this evening and would remind all the folks in
the audience that, if you would like to comment,
you can do so by March 20, 2000, by submitting
written comments, fax comments, Internet
comments, or by attending one of the other public
meetings being held throughout the region.
We did have one commenter who I called
earlier this evening who wasn’t in the room when
I called him. We’ll see if he’s departed or if
he’s here.
Joe Marantette.
I will note for the record that
Mr. Marantette is not here, and ask if there’s
anyone else in the audience who has not yet had
an opportunity to do so but would like to comment
this evening on the Draft Environmental Impact
Statement.
I will note for the record that no one
has so indicated.
With that, we will close this evening’s
hearing, and we will resume tomorrow in Pocatello
at the Quality Inn --
Ms. Carol Cole: No. At Idaho State
University.
The FACILITATOR: -- at Idaho State
THE FACILITATOR: Got it.

Ken Cady will follow Ms. Shuptrine.

MS. SANDY SHUPTRINE: My name is Sandy Shuptrine. I am a Teton County Commissioner, but

I am, at this moment, speaking on behalf of

myself as an individual.

[405x482] I would like to begin -- actually, I

assume on behalf of our whole board -- at this

point to thank you for the opportunity to hold

this hearing in Jackson Hole. We very much

appreciate the responsiveness in bringing both

the information and the formal hearing to

Jackson Hole.

With that, I would like to say that as I

try to shift gears and become informed on the

high-level waste EIS -- and after listening

tonight, I do have a rather sinking feeling at

the enormity, complexity and, most of all, the

lack of certainty about the alternatives that are

being suggested.

The fact that there is no preferred

alternative -- alternative recommended makes it

even more difficult for those of us as laypersons

to present focused comments. So, I will have to

keep mine general. And I would like to say that

my ultimate request is that human health and the

environment be protected and that the alternative

that best accomplishes that be the chosen

alternative.

There was a comment made by Beverly Cook

that included tight budgets as one of the

considerations in choosing alternatives. And I

would like to say, because of the implications

for human health and our environment, I think

that tight budgets should not be one of the

primary considerations.

It was mentioned that a billion dollars

was gained in recovering spent nuclear fuels.

I'm wondering how many billions the ultimate

chosen alternative will cost and if those

billions would not be better spent up front on

more complete cost/benefit analyses, which

include all closure implications.

It appears that DOE finds itself

regrettably in the position of having to fix or

rectify past actions that were taken without full

understanding of where they were headed.

And I would like to suggest that we be

very careful. This does not relate specifically
to this EIS, but that DOE, our Congress, and all
of us, pay particularly close attention to new
technologies that we are willing to experiment
with, that we put some of -- perhaps consider
it -- put some of those resources, both the
technical resources and the financial resources,
into renewable technologies, especially for
energy production.]

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

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

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

My question is: Are these standards

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

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

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
comments, Commissioner.

Ken Cady, followed by Jeffrey Joel.

I don't see Mr. Cady, so is Mr. Joel
here?

MR. JEFFREY JOEL: I'm here.

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

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

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

For example, why might there be -- might
there not be no action on already existing bin
sets?
Secondly, I just looked at these process diagrams over here for the various alternatives, and I'm struck with how they get more and more complicated as they go along, and it's very strange that the minimum INEEL processing is the most complicated. And with so much handling going on, it seems that the likelihood of some sort of problem for an accident in the processing would be increased.

It also seems certain that some method could be devised that would be simpler. I mean, and such method might not be a normal batch-feed method. It would have -- might very well have some other model as its basis.

Another question is: NEPA, apparently, does not require cost/benefit analyses, as Mr. Wichmann said.

But it seems that -- to me, that since all the alternatives will have human and socioeconomic effects, then those cost/benefit analyses absolutely need to be included in any final decision amongst the alternatives. And, really, they need to be discussed before then.

And this, finally, is a technical question: Is there any way of precipitating out salts of the acidic off gasses? Thanks.

THE FACILITATOR: Thanks for your comments.

Mr. Siemer.

And Mr. Siemer is followed by Malissa Clark Rhodes.

MR. DARYL SIEMER: So much to say, so little time. I attended the Idaho Falls meeting a couple of days ago and decided, based on what I saw there, that I better come up to this one, too.

I am a Site worker, but I'm speaking for myself. I believe you have my name and address already.

The problem that we are faced with here is really a straightforward problem that has been addressed and solved elsewhere. I raised the question earlier when I had the opportunity about calcination. It's one of the things that we promised to do, and we do know how to do that.

This is pilot planted. The way to solve this problem was well-known about 30 years ago. It wasn't implemented at the Site because there wasn't any reason to do that. It was implemented.
elsewhere, where they have addressed it and solved this problem.

And I -- again, it's hard to understand why it's not being done here. Because calcination was the good thing to do. We've always thought it was a good thing to do, and that's what we reported on at RCRA's meetings. There are issues related to the volume of waste. The fact is that the volume of waste really isn't all that important. DOE chooses to implement a repository where there's plenty of space, and several places have already been carefully characterized. To implement such a repository where the volume of our waste in at 65-foot cubed is not a real issue. It is a policy of DOE sometimes to translate one thing into another thing where there isn't any correlation whatsoever. And I raise that in my second point, that somehow the dispossession of this much calcine is going to cost $1 billion, and, of course, has to be added to the cheapest and most straightforward way of actually making it suitable for transport. That is the direct cement option.

Which brings me to my suggestion that we

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

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

I have some revised comments.

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

Melissa Clark Rhodes.

I'm going to introduce as Exhibit No. 1 at this proceeding an eight-page duplex document entitled, "Comments on Draft INEEL HLW EIS, Idaho High-Level Waste and Facilities Disposition," addressed to Mr. T. L. Wichmann, U.S. DOE-ID.
And it is not dated. It will be Exhibit No. 1 of the Jackson Hole proceedings.

Sorry to interrupt you.

MS. MALISSA CLARK RHODES: That's quite all right.

THE FACILITATOR: Please proceed.

MS. MALISSA CLARK RHODES: Okay. My name is Malissa Clark Rhodes. I'm a Jackson resident. I hold a Ph.D. in geology from the University of Pennsylvania. As a former assistant professor at Rider University, I taught basic environmental science, as well as geology courses.

Therefore, INEEL's problems with waste disposal, both stored mixed hazardous and TRU-contaminated waste, and separately, the underground high-level waste, have caused me some concern. These issues are separate but parallel. They're dealing with problems of Waste Acceptance Criteria. We need to get the waste out of Idaho somehow.

Wyoming is the geology state. Our economy is driven by our underground resources; i.e., uranium, natural gas, oil and coal. All of these sources of energy have their own sets of problems. We have some of the finest geologists and engineers in the country.

I am not totally antinuclear. There is a need for nuclear power at this point in time because we have not solved pollution problems associated with the utilization of fossil fuels. Solar and wind power sources still remain in a state of research and development.

However, dealing with a radioactive waste effectively remains a national problem. The problems at Hanford are on orders of magnitude greater than INEEL's difficulties. We do not wish to see -- or I do not wish to see INEEL become another Hanford.

Good science is the result of interaction between opposing points of view. I and several other concerned scientists would like to hold a technical forum with outside scientists and engineers interacting with the DOE scientists. If we can participate in neutral territory, perhaps we can evaluate the best options in collaboration, rather than opposition.

To DOE, this is the challenge. Science is a universal language.