

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

+ + + + +

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
FOR THE GREATER-THAN-CLASS C
LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO

Thursday, August 30, 2007

Red Lion Hotel on the Falls

475 River Parkway

Idaho Falls, Idaho

The above-entitled meeting was conducted at

6:00 p.m.

BEFORE:

HOLMES BROWN, Facilitator

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ALSO PRESENT:

CHRISTINE GELLES, Director
Office of Disposal Operations (EM-12)
Department of Energy

JAMIE JOYCE, GTCC EIS Document Manager
Department of Energy

GEORGE DIXON, Senior Technical Advisor
GTCC EIS
Department of Energy

JOEL KRISTAL
Office of Disposal Operations
Department of Energy

I N D E X

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SPEAKER

PAGE

Willie Preacher

30

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MR. BROWN: Good evening. Welcome to this
3 public scoping meeting on the proposed environmental
4 impact statement for the disposal of greater-than-class C
5 radioactive waste. The development of an environmental
6 impact statement for this project by the Department of
7 Energy's Office of Disposal Operations is required by the
8 National Environmental Policy Act.

9 My name is Holmes Brown, and I will serve as
10 facilitator for this evening's meeting. My role is to
11 ensure that the meeting runs on schedule and that
12 everybody has an opportunity to speak. I'm not an
13 employee of the Department of Energy, nor an advocate for
14 any party or position.

15 At the registration table you should have
16 received a participants packet. If not, please raise your
17 hand and staff can deliver one to you. It contains
18 important information on the upcoming presentation, and is
19 a convenient place to take notes during the briefing that
20 will follow in a few minutes.

21 There are three purposes for this evening's
22 meeting. First, to provide information on the content of
23 the proposed environmental impact statement, or EIS, and
24 on the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, that
25 governs the process. Second, to answer your questions on

1 the EIS and NEPA. And, third, to receive and record your
2 formal comments on the scope of the proposed EIS.

3 The agenda for tonight's meeting reflects these
4 purposes. We will begin with a presentation by Ms.
5 Christine Gelles regarding the proposed environmental
6 impact statement for the disposal of greater-than-class C
7 waste. Ms. Gelles is the Director of the Office of
8 Disposal Operations, which is the DOE office charged with
9 preparing the EIS.

10 To answer your questions, project staff will be
11 available throughout the evening at the display posters.
12 They can discuss the proposed EIS and NEPA process, the
13 contents of the printed materials, and the contents of the
14 DOE presentation.

15 Following Ms. Gelles's presentation we will
16 recess briefly so the public may pursue further questions
17 with available project staff. Once we reconvene, the
18 court reporter will be available to receive and record
19 your comments and suggestions regarding the scope of the
20 proposed EIS. All your comments will be transcribed and
21 made part of the permanent record.

22 We'll begin with a presentation by Ms.
23 Christine Gelles. She will discuss the background of the
24 project and the basic elements of the proposed EIS.

25 MS. GELLES: Good evening. Can you hear me

1 okay? All right.

2 Welcome to the greater-than-class C low-level
3 radioactive waste environmental impact statement public
4 scoping meeting. I'll refer to the document throughout
5 the presentation as the GTCC EIS.

6 I am Christine Gelles and I direct the Office
7 of Disposal Operations at the Office of Environmental
8 Management in the Department of Energy headquarters in
9 D.C.

10 The Department has been charged by Congress to
11 develop a disposal capability for greater-than-class C,
12 referred to as GTCC, low-level radioactive waste, and to
13 take actions related to the preparation of an
14 environmental impact statement.

15 I'm pleased to be here tonight, and I thank you
16 all for joining us to discuss the GTCC EIS. This meeting
17 is the public's opportunity to present your comments,
18 concerns, issues and suggestions regarding the proposed
19 scope of the GTCC EIS.

20 Your involvement and input is very important to
21 us, and we will be taking careful note of what you have to
22 say here tonight. All comments received through the
23 scoping process will be carefully considered as we work
24 towards -- through the process of analyzing and developing
25 a disposal capability for GTCC low-level waste.

1 The National Environmental Policy Act, referred
2 to as NEPA, requires that an environmental impact
3 statement be developed for any major federal action that
4 has the potential to impact the quality of the
5 environment. The Department has determined that the
6 development of a GTCC disposal capability constitutes a
7 major federal action, and appropriately must be utilized
8 in an environmental impact statement.

9 We are in the very beginning stages of the NEPA
10 process, with the primary focus at this time being the
11 identification of the scope of the EIS, including the
12 proposed disposal alternatives, such as the locations and
13 possible methods.

14 The comments we receive here tonight, and
15 throughout this public scoping process, will be considered
16 as we develop the draft environmental impact statement.
17 We'll provide that draft document for public comment, and
18 any comments considered on the draft document will be
19 carefully considered as we develop the final EIS.

20 After we complete the final EIS, we are
21 required to provide a report to Congress that summarizes
22 the alternative, or alternatives, evaluated, and await
23 their action before implementing a record of decision, or
24 ultimately implementing a disposal alternative.

25 And I'm going to mention this several times

1 throughout the presentation, because it is -- it's a
2 significant point and a significant factor in our project,
3 what you'll find is that we're going to be unable to take
4 action without the help and support of Congress. And we
5 have several years of work and analysis ahead of us before
6 we're to the point of implementing any action.

7 Before we get started with the slides, I
8 thought it would be helpful if we provide just an
9 introductory understanding of what greater-than-class C
10 low-level waste is. It's generated from commercial
11 activities such as the production of electricity at
12 nuclear reactors. It's also generated when radioactive
13 sealed sources, which are used in common every day
14 industrial and medical purposes, become discarded or
15 disused.

16 The volume of greater-than-class C low-level
17 waste is very small when compared to the volumes of the
18 other three classes of commercial low-level waste. But
19 greater-than-class C low-level waste has a higher
20 concentration of radioactivity, and therefore requires
21 special disposal considerations. And for that reason the
22 NRC regulations have required the federal government to
23 provide for the disposal capability.

24 A copy of the presentation is in the green
25 folder that you received, and you certainly can refer to

1 it as we go throughout this presentation. If you have any
2 questions, we'll be happy to answer that when we take a
3 recess.

4 The other thing I'd like to mention is that the
5 slides alone don't tell the whole story here. These
6 poster boards in the back and the fact sheets that are
7 also in the folder really work together to really tell you
8 as much information as we have available today.

9 And then our GTCC project website, which is
10 listed on the next to the last slide, the web link is on
11 the next to the last slide, is a repository for a lot of
12 other supplemental information, including some historical
13 reports and our more recent inventory report.

14 The Notice of Intent was published on July 23,
15 2007, and a correction to the inventory table was
16 published on July 31. That correction was required to fix
17 a printing error that occurred at the *Federal Register*.

18 Publication of the Notice of Intent serves
19 several purposes for us. It announced our intent to
20 prepare an environmental impact statement under NEPA. It
21 also announced our intent to analyze the DOE greater-than-
22 class C-like waste as well as the commercial greater-than-
23 class C waste, which is our primary statutory requirement.

24 It did formally initiate the EIS process, it
25 requested the public's comment on the proposed scope, and

1 it announced these public scoping meetings. It provided
2 information on the greater-than-class C low-level waste
3 inventory, and the DOE greater-than-class C-like
4 inventory, which together are estimated to be 5,600 cubic
5 meters.

6 That includes both the inventory that exists in
7 storage today, and that which will generated through the
8 year 2062. And there are some very specific assumptions
9 that go into those future projections and the end date of
10 that inventory estimate, which we'll talk through in the
11 slides to come.

12 The Notice of Intent identified the purpose and
13 the need for action, and it identified the Department's
14 proposed action. It identifies the proposed disposal
15 alternatives, both the methods and the possible locations.
16 It also responded to the public comments that were
17 received on the advance Notice of Intent which was
18 published in May 2005.

19 And finally, to announce that the Environmental
20 Protection Agency will be acting as a cooperating agency
21 in this document, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission as
22 a commenting agency.

23 The purpose and need for action. The reason we
24 have to do something is the NRC and agreement state
25 licensees have generated, and will continue to generate,

1 greater-than-class C low-level waste for which there is no
2 permanent disposal facility. We, the Department of
3 Energy, have the statutory responsibility for developing
4 the capability to dispose of the waste.

5 We also own and generate certain low-level
6 waste streams and transuranic waste streams which have
7 characteristics similar to the commercial greater-than-
8 class C low-level waste, but which today do not have a
9 disposal pathway. And those waste volumes we refer to as
10 DOE greater-than-class C-like waste.

11 And we will get into that waste stream here in
12 a little bit more detail, but I want to be clear that not
13 all of our low-level waste and transuranic waste that is
14 similar to commercial greater-than-class C falls into this
15 category.

16 There are large volumes that we generate that
17 we can safely dispose of today. What is included in our
18 DOE estimate has some specific characteristic, or origin,
19 that makes it unable to be disposed of in our current
20 disposal facilities.

21 There are three primary legislative drivers for
22 us developing the greater-than-class C low-level waste
23 disposal capability. The first and most basic is the Low-
24 Level Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1985. This is the
25 statute that gave the federal government, specifically the

1 Secretary of Energy, the responsibility for developing a
2 disposal capability for commercial greater-than-class C
3 low-level waste.

4 The National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA,
5 of 1969 is the Act that requires federal agencies to
6 consider the environmental impacts of our proposed
7 decisions, and alternatives to those decisions, and it
8 establishes the framework for public input through the
9 process.

10 And more recently the Energy Policy Act of 2005
11 had specific report requirements related to the EIS. The
12 first was that we produce a report that estimated the cost
13 and schedule for developing the environmental impact
14 statement. We did meet that report requirement in July of
15 2006. That report is available on our project web page.

16 It also requires us to issue the report that
17 summarizes all of the alternatives evaluated in an EIS,
18 and a number of other individual data elements have to be
19 provided in this report as well.

20 This is the report I mentioned previously that
21 we will produce after we complete the EIS, and it is the
22 report that Congress will consider, and hopefully act
23 upon, before we can issue a record of decision as a result
24 of this NEPA document.

25 So what is low-level radioactive waste, and

1 specifically greater-than-class C low-level waste? I'm
2 sure most of the people in this room, because I know many
3 of you, you know what it is. It's radioactive waste that
4 contains items that have become contaminated with
5 radioactive material, or become radioactive through
6 exposure to radiation.

7 It comes in many forms, clothing, equipment,
8 tools, discarded household items, soil, building debris,
9 water treatment residues. It's generated from a variety
10 of commercial and government activities such as production
11 of electricity from utilities, medical treatment and
12 research.

13 The statutory and regulatory definition is
14 quite complicated because it defines low-level waste by
15 what it is not. It's not high-level waste, it's not spent
16 nuclear fuel, and it's not byproduct material. Anything
17 else that has sufficient concentrations of radioactivity
18 is probably going to fall into the category of low-level
19 waste.

20 The NRC classifications in 10 C.F.R. 61
21 classify low-level waste into four classes, class A, B, C,
22 and greater-than-class C, which is what we're focused on
23 in this document. Those classifications are based on the
24 concentration of specific long-lived and short-lived
25 radionuclides with, again, greater-than-class C having the

1 radionuclide concentrations.

2 A, B and C low-level waste can be commercially
3 disposed of today in existing near surface disposal
4 facilities. The NRC regulations assume that greater-than-
5 class C low-level waste are not appropriate for near
6 surface disposal, and, in fact, require deep geologic
7 disposal, unless an alternative disposal methodology is
8 proposed and approved by the NRC. And it is that caveat
9 that allows us and drives us to consider a range of
10 disposal alternatives as the proposed scope of this EIS.

11 Low-level waste, greater-than-class C low-level
12 waste that exceeds the concentration limits of
13 radionuclides established for class C waste under the NRC
14 regulations is the definition for commercial greater-than-
15 class C waste.

16 Again, it's generated by the NRC and agreement
17 state licensees throughout the United States. As we were
18 prepping for the release of the Notice of Intent, we had a
19 number of questions, where does this waste come from,
20 where will it be transported from, and the honest answer
21 is, it could come from anywhere in the U.S., any place
22 that does medical treatments with any radioactive
23 material, any nuclear power plant will be generating
24 greater-than-class C waste, potentially.

25 It can be generally discussed as comprised of

1 three major waste types, each of which we'll talk about in
2 some detail. Activated metals, primarily generated in
3 nuclear reactors when they are decommissioned: They
4 consist of the components of the reactor such as thermal-
5 shields which have become radioactive through neutron
6 absorption that occurred during operations.

7 The photo here shows a radiation survey
8 underway of an activated metal component from the
9 decommissioning of a small research reactor. There are
10 104 operating nuclear reactors in the U.S. today, and 18
11 decommissioned reactors.

12 Some of those 18 have actually stored greater-
13 than-class C generated during their decommissioning in
14 large casks that are adjacent to the spent fuel that is
15 also stored at the decommissioned site and is awaiting
16 geologic disposal at the planned repository at Yucca
17 Mountain. Most activated metal waste requires remote
18 handling because of the extent of its activity and the
19 dose at its surface.

20 Sealed sources, typically these are small
21 highly radioactive materials that are found encapsulated
22 in some sort of metal container. They can be larger.
23 This is a very small example that's pictured here. This
24 is used in both medical and industrial applications.

25 Again, widely used throughout the United

1 States, possessed by NRC or agreement state licensees,
2 used for sterilizing medical products, assisting the
3 diagnosis and treatment of cancers, non-invasive
4 surgeries, and a number of industrial purposes.

5 The -- not all sealed sources are greater-than-
6 class C. Many can be managed, or are appropriately
7 managed, as class A, B, and C waste, and can safely be
8 disposed of today in existing commercial facilities. But
9 some sources are large enough, or have sufficient
10 concentrations of specific radionuclides that they are
11 greater-than-class C and cannot be disposed until we do
12 this EIS and site a disposal facility.

13 As a stop gap measure, since the promulgation
14 of the 1985 Low-Level Waste Policy Act, when sealed
15 sources that were greater-than-class C became disused,
16 somebody had to take care of those. And the Department of
17 Energy formed the Off Site Source Recovery Program, which
18 has been collecting disused or orphan sources to ensure
19 that they were safely stored and secured and did not pose
20 a proliferation risk.

21 And then the third substream of commercial
22 greater-than-class C waste is this other category. It's
23 anything that is commercially generated that meets the
24 definition of greater-than-class C low-level waste but is
25 not an activated metal or a sealed source. It would

1 consist of contaminated equipment, debris, trash,
2 decontamination and decommissioning wastes.

3 We find that -- expect that only a few
4 commercial licensees have or will generate this form of
5 commercial greater-than-class C. Again, the majority of
6 the commercial stream will be in the form of activated
7 metals or disused sealed sources.

8 There are some serious differences in the form
9 of the DOE greater-than-class C-like waste stream. DOE
10 greater-than-class C-like waste, again, it's comprised of
11 any DOE low-level waste or transuranic waste which has
12 characteristic similar to commercial greater-than-class C
13 low-level waste, but for which today we do not have an
14 identified disposal pathway.

15 It's owned by DOE, generated by DOE activities.
16 It's forms are similar to the commercial streams, but the
17 distribution of the inventory by form is different. The
18 vast majority of the DOE greater-than-class C-like waste,
19 both that exist today and will be generated in the future,
20 is transuranic waste that does not have a defense origin,
21 and therefore cannot be disposed of at the Waste Isolation
22 Pilot Plant today because the statutes enabling that
23 facility limit its waste receipt to defense transuranic
24 waste.

25 The use of this term, greater-than-class C-like

1 waste, can be confusing. It does not have the intent or
2 effect of creating a new waste classification, it does not
3 mean that NRC classifications apply to our DOE generated
4 waste streams.

5 This is a comparison of the waste inventories.
6 And, again, I want to remind you that together the
7 currently stored and projected generation of both the
8 commercial low-level waste, the greater-than-class C low-
9 level waste we propose to analyze in this EIS, and the DOE
10 greater-than-class C-like waste we propose to analyze in
11 this EIS, together total 5,600 cubic meters.

12 That is a small volume when you compare it to
13 the volumes of waste that the Department of Energy manages
14 on a yearly basis. It is significantly less than the
15 defense transuranic waste we have disposed of at the WIPP
16 facility this year alone.

17 This year we have disposed of over 7,700 cubic
18 meters of waste, defense transuranic waste. Although it's
19 a very small volume, it has a lot of radioactivity, 140
20 million curies of radioactivity. So it's nothing to, you
21 know, blink at.

22 About half of the volume, more than half the
23 volume, would be contributed by the DOE greater-than-class
24 C-like waste streams. However, our contribution would be
25 just 31 million curies of the 140 million. So although we

1 make up more than half the volume, we make up not quite a
2 quarter -- I guess that's a little more than a quarter, of
3 the curies.

4 The total volume together, this 5600 cubic
5 meters, is less than one tenth of 1 percent of the volume
6 of commercial low-level waste classes A through C that
7 will be generated in the same time period, through 2062,
8 but it has seven times greater the radioactivity of that
9 same much larger volume of commercial waste.

10 We've developed these estimates based on data
11 calls and interviews and reviews of historical documents,
12 and use also of available databases that are maintained by
13 the NRC and DOE and sealed source management.

14 Information on the waste inventories, and the
15 formulas and methodologies we used to estimate the future
16 projection have been summarized in a report that is also
17 on the web page that we published coincident with the
18 publication of the Notice of Intent. It's called GTCC
19 Low-Level Radioactive Waste and DOE GTCC-like Inventory
20 Estimates. Such a descriptive title.

21 You can take a look at it. It is a relatively
22 short document, it's very information packed, it will take
23 you a little bit of time to read though because it is very
24 complicated in the methodology. We put a lot of effort
25 into it. I hope it's useful for you.

1 This is our proposed action, to construct and
2 operate a new facility, or facilities, or use an existing
3 facility for the disposal of GTCC low-level waste and DOE
4 GTCC-like waste. I read that to you verbatim, not because
5 you're illiterate, but because this is the scope that we
6 propose to include in our EIS.

7 This is the range of disposal alternatives we
8 propose to include in the EIS, and they range from no
9 action, which I want to assure you is a very real
10 alternative in this analysis, no action where current and
11 future GTCC low-level waste, both commercial and DOE
12 generated, will continue to be stored at designated
13 locations consistent with current practice and regulatory
14 requirements.

15 The second alternative is disposal in the
16 geologic repository at WIPP. And we intend to analyze
17 both current and future commercial and DOE greater-than-
18 class C-like waste streams for disposal at WIPP. The
19 third is the other repository that's planned, the deep
20 geologic repository at Yucca Mountain.

21 The fourth and the fifth involve the other
22 proposed disposal locations, and these are alternative
23 methods of disposal that the NRC provides us to consider,
24 and that if we demonstrate through this EIS, are safe and
25 protective, we would propose for possible licensing by the

1 NRC.

2 Disposal in a new enhanced near surface
3 disposal facility, or disposal at a new intermediate depth
4 bore hole facility. And we'll talk about what each of
5 those mean here in a few moments.

6 We do recognize the many of these alternatives,
7 if not all of them, would require changes to existing
8 legislation and regulation. However, the existence of
9 such constraints alone is not a reason for us to eliminate
10 an alternative from consideration under NEPA. The NEPA
11 requirements require us to consider a reasonable range of
12 alternatives, notwithstanding the statutory or regulatory
13 requirements that might affect it.

14 And in the EIS analysis, as we develop the
15 draft EIS, we will carefully analyze those constraints and
16 offer some solutions, or resolutions, to those constraints
17 if appropriate.

18 And as I mentioned before, before we can
19 implement any action as a result of this EIS, we must
20 report to Congress on the alternatives, including our
21 preferred alternative, and await their action. So if they
22 don't like it, it won't happen. That's pretty much how I
23 sum that up.

24 These are the disposal methods we intend to
25 analyze. Deep geologic repository, again, that's sort of

1 the de facto configuration required by the NRC
2 regulations, and our two alternatives, intermediate depth
3 bore hole and enhanced near surface. It is possible that
4 there are other ideas or approaches that you would like to
5 see considered, and we look forward to your input on those
6 if you have other ideas.

7 A little bit about each of those. Deep
8 geologic repository, placement of waste in mined cavities
9 deep beneath the earth's surface. It is the method used
10 at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant near Carlsbad, New
11 Mexico, it is that which is planned at the Yucca Mountain
12 repository in Nevada for spent fuel and high-level waste.
13 This is a picture of contact handled transuranic waste
14 safely disposed in the mined cavities in salt mines near
15 Carlsbad.

16 Enhanced near surface involves the placement of
17 waste in engineered trenches, or vaults, or other
18 structures within the upper 30 meters of the earth's
19 crust. These facilities will involve a range of enhanced
20 barriers. We have not settled or developed a conceptual
21 design.

22 This picture here is offered just as an
23 illustrative example of the sort of facility that has been
24 constructed at DOE site for low-level waste, higher
25 activity low-level waste disposal. There's a different

1 rendering, a conceptual drawing on the poster board in the
2 back as well.

3 Again, we invite your comments on these ideas,
4 if you have any input to them. Again, these are just
5 conceptual ideas. The exact design will be developed
6 through the development of the draft EIS.

7 Intermediate depth bore hole disposal is the
8 placement of waste in an augered bore hole that goes
9 deeper than 30 meters of the earth's upper crust. It will
10 also likely entail additional barriers such as drilling
11 deflectors that could provide against -- increase
12 protection against future inadvertent intrusion, as well
13 as engineered barriers within the shaft itself.

14 This method has successfully been demonstrated
15 in the U.S. at a DOE site. It has also been demonstrated
16 in other countries. It is the method of disposal that
17 many foreign nations are considering for intermediate
18 level waste, which is the IAEA waste classification for
19 waste streams that are -- have similar characteristics to
20 what we call commercial greater-than-class C waste here in
21 the U.S.

22 This picture is of the installation of a bore
23 hole at the DOE facility. I believe it's Nevada Test Site.

24 All right. And these are our proposed disposal
25 locations. Again, obviously the inclusion of WIPP and

1 Yucca Mountain are because are geologic repositories,
2 current and planned. And that, again, is the de facto
3 methodology, the assumed required methodology of the NRC
4 regulations.

5 The WIPP vicinity involves use of other land
6 within the WIPP Land Withdrawal that the Department has,
7 or within the geographic location of the Land Withdrawal.
8 And it need not be a geologic repository. It could be an
9 enhanced near surface burial facility or intermediate
10 depth bore hole there as well.

11 The other sites, the DOE sites that are
12 identified here, were identified based on criteria we
13 established through a very long and arduous process of
14 discussion. And this criteria involved mission
15 compatibility, the fact that there are ongoing low-level
16 waste operations at these sites, and the presence of an
17 infrastructure that would support this sort of waste
18 disposal activity for at least a number of decades, as
19 well as the physical characteristics of the site, which
20 hopefully are the reasons why there are ongoing low-level
21 waste operations at these sites in the first place.

22 We are also going to analyze a generic
23 commercial location in an arid environment, and a generic
24 commercial location in the humid environment, the reason
25 being that this is a commercial waste stream -- at least

1 part of it is a commercial waste stream, and to date
2 commercial players have been providing the solution for
3 commercial class A, B, and C waste.

4 We did publish a request for expressions of
5 interest in 2005 to see if commercial industry had any
6 interest in being part of the solution, and we did have a
7 number of responses that confirmed there was some
8 interest. They -- unfortunately, just -- none of those
9 respondents were ready to offer up a specific site, or to
10 pursue a specific license or design, and for that reason
11 we're forced to analyze a commercial configuration.

12 DOE does intend to evaluate each of the GTCC
13 waste types individually and in combination for each of
14 these disposal alternatives, taking into consideration the
15 specific characteristics of each sub-waste stream type,
16 the volumes, and the rate at which that waste stream would
17 be generated.

18 We will, again, describe the statutory and
19 regulatory requirements for each alternative, and whether
20 legislative or regulatory change would be required in
21 order to implement the alternative.

22 It is conceivable that the recommendations of
23 the EIS would entail combinations of facilities based on
24 the different waste types and other considerations; again,
25 the rate of generation might be a specific consideration.

1 It will also give us the flexibility to issue
2 records of decision in a phased approach, as the various
3 contributors to the waste stream are generated, which it's
4 all not going to be generated at one time. It really has
5 a -- we have defined, or estimated, the rate of generation
6 based on certain assumptions, based on where the various
7 waste types come from. And, again, that inventory report
8 describes that in far more detail.

9 And this is a summation of our EIS process.
10 Again, it began with the advanced Notice of Intent.
11 That's not a required step in the NEPA process, but when
12 the Department knows it's going to do something, it's nice
13 for us to give our stakeholders a little bit of advanced
14 notice and get some early comment and input.

15 We took two years to refine our inventory
16 estimates and come up with the policy decision to include
17 the DOE greater-than-class C-like waste in this EIS as
18 well, which was surprisingly a difficult decision for us
19 to arrive at. We did publish the Notice of Intent, the
20 official first required step in the NEPA process, in July,
21 and we are now in the public scoping period.

22 The scoping period ends on September 21, and
23 any comments received during that will be carefully
24 considered as we move into the next phase, which is
25 development of the draft EIS. And, again, that draft EIS

1 will be made available for comment. Those comments will
2 be considered as we move towards the final EIS.

3 And when it's all said and done, we'll report
4 to Congress on everything that we did. And it's not
5 exactly clear how long we'll have to wait for their
6 action. But eventually, hopefully, they'll act, and then
7 we'll proceed with the publication of a record of
8 decision. And if it's something other than the no action,
9 we'll move into the implementation phase.

10 And what's not on this slide is that there will
11 be a number of steps required to implement, depending on
12 exactly what the legislative requirements involve at that
13 point, but it is quite possible that there will be a
14 licensing process involving a third part such as the
15 Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

16 The NEPA process does provide the public
17 several opportunities for participation. You can
18 participate tonight by providing oral or written comments
19 here. Written comments can also be provided after the
20 scoping meetings, before the close of the scoping period
21 on September 21, by mail, via our website, or by fax.
22 There is a written comment form in the folder if you'd
23 like to work on it for homework and get it to us later.
24 That's just fine.

25 And you can continue to stay informed of this

1 project and the development of the EIS by visiting our
2 website. I do encourage you to do so. We put a lot of
3 work into it. It's a -- it has the interactive comment
4 form available on it. It's really something I'm very
5 proud of, and there's a lot of folks here in this room who
6 have everything to do with that. I had very little to do
7 with it, other than saying, Yay, you can do that. So the
8 credit goes to them.

9 And these are -- this is our contact
10 information. Again, I'm Christine, and you're welcome to
11 call me or e-mail me at any point if you have questions.

12 Jamie -- if you'd stand for a second -- is the
13 document manager, and our team leader back at
14 headquarters. He will be your primary point of contact.
15 George Dixon is here tonight. He's a member of the GTCC
16 team. Joel is here in the corner, and those are the
17 federal staff who are supporting this document.

18 And we're supported by members of staff from
19 the Argonne National Lab, Mary Picel and Bruce Biver.
20 Where's Bruce -- oh, way over here hiding behind the post.
21 And Sandia National Laboratory, John Cochran, is here with
22 us tonight.

23 And that's not the whole of our team. There is
24 actually a number of other players who support us, because
25 this is a very technically oriented document, and there's

1 a lot of information and interfaces, and we have
2 representatives from the sites that are being analyzed as
3 well, and some of those staff are here tonight. And I
4 thank you guys for being there. Brian and Mary, thank you
5 for coming out.

6 So that concludes my statements, and we'll be
7 available for some questions.

8 MR. HOLMES: We'll now take a brief recess to
9 allow you to pose any additional questions that you have,
10 either on the presentation or on the posters. I'll make
11 an announcement when we're about to resume the formal
12 portion of the meeting and begin taking oral comments.

13 If you'd like to provide an oral comment and
14 have not yet signed up to do so, there is a sign up sheet
15 out at the desk at the entrance.

16 So, again, we'll take a brief recess. There's
17 a number of experts here who were introduced, so feel free
18 to track them down and pose any questions that you've got.

19 (Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

20 MR. HOLMES: It's now time to receive your
21 formal comments on the scope of the proposed EIS. This is
22 your opportunity to let DOE know what you would like to
23 see addressed in the draft document. The court reporter
24 will transcribe your statements.

25 Let me review a few ground rules for the formal

1 comment period. Step up to the microphone over there when
2 your name is called and introduce yourself, providing an
3 organization affiliation where appropriate. If you have a
4 written version of your statement, please provide a copy
5 to the court reporter after you've completed your remarks.
6 Also, if you have any additional documents that you would
7 like to see included in the formal record, you may hand
8 them in at the same time and they will be marked and made
9 part of the record.

10 We only have one person at this point signed up
11 to speak, so I will call that name, and also at this time
12 ask if there's anybody else who would like to make a
13 statement. Again, you can sign the sign up sheet out
14 front and I will call you.

15 And Ms. Gelles will be serving as the hearing
16 officer for the Department of Energy during the formal
17 comment period.

18 And, with that, I will call our first speaker.
19 Willie Preacher, please.

20 MR. PREACHER: Hello. My name is Willie
21 Preacher. I'm a member of the Shoshone-Bannock tribes,
22 and they're a tribe that's here that used the INL for
23 aboriginal and treaty right areas.

24 Some of the concerns I think that the tribe has
25 is if we was to receive, or this site was to be designated

1 as a repository for the GTCC, their concern would be, how
2 is it going to be shipped? The safety factors of it being
3 shipped, what type of shipment is it going to be? Is it
4 going to be rail, is it going to be highway, you know, all
5 of those factors that need to be involved.

6 We also would like to see, as this progresses,
7 the program come and address the tribes's issues. I am
8 also a member of CAB and some of those views are also
9 shared by the INL CAB. And I guess one of the main
10 concerns is if it's going to be here, how long is it going
11 to be here?

12 If it's a permanent storage site, what type of
13 other waste may be designated for Idaho. We have a clean
14 site here in Idaho compared to all the rest of the sites
15 that have been identified. And the concern is just we
16 would not to have this as a dumping ground classification
17 for some of these wastes.

18 And like I say, the shipments coming in and out
19 go through the reservation. Now I don't know if these
20 shipments are going to be designated to go through the
21 reservation based on the type of waste that it is, but
22 that is something I think that we would like the program,
23 your program, Christine, to maybe come and address the
24 tribes, some of their issues.

25 I'll go back and I'll discuss some of these

1 issues with the tribe itself, and then from that point on,
2 you will probably see some comments from us, you know,
3 regarding this. So thank you.

4 MR. HOLMES: Okay. Thanks very much.

5 Again, let me ask if there's anyone else at
6 this time who would like to add any further comments?

7 (No response.)

8 MR. HOLMES: Okay. We are scheduled to remain
9 in session to receive comments until 9:00. What we
10 customarily do when we have nobody signed up to speak is
11 we will take a recess.

12 But if anybody arrives later, or if anybody in
13 the audience, after, say, asking other questions, looking
14 at posters, if someone would like to add any comments,
15 just see me and we will reconvene, the court reporter will
16 remain here, and we can receive further comment.

17 So, again, with that by way of background, we
18 will recess. Thanks very much.

19 (Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

20 MR. HOLMES: Okay. Noting that the 9:00 hour
21 has arrived, which is the scheduled time to end this
22 meeting, and noting that no member of the public has
23 expressed an interest in adding further comments, this
24 meeting is officially adjourned. Thanks very much.

25 (Whereupon, at 8:45 p.m., the meeting was concluded.)