

NY/NFSS

PSM-NRN-831019

NIAGARA FALLS STORAGE SITE

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

OAK RIDGE, TENNESSEE

October 19, 1983

NFSS\_0298

GIBSON - SHERROD - CARRU

1 MR. BIBB: Ladies and  
2 gentlemen, it's a few minutes past 7:30. If  
3 everyone would take their seats we could get  
4 started. On behalf of the Department of  
5 Energy, I would like to welcome you to this  
6 public scoping meeting for the Niagara Falls  
7 Storage Site Environmental Impact Statement.  
8 I would also like to thank you for coming  
9 out tonight.

10 My name is Bill Bibb,  
11 Chief of the Environmental Programs and  
12 Support Division of the Oak Ridge Operations  
13 Office of the Department of Energy. We don't  
14 have an agenda for our program, printed  
15 agenda for our program tonight. What we will  
16 do is essentially three parts. First, we  
17 will ask a member of the impact statement  
18 writing group from the Argonne National  
19 Laboratory to briefly discuss the impact  
20 statement. Then one of the members of the  
21 project team will discuss the project for  
22 which the statement is being written. Then  
23 we will have public comment on the statement --  
24 on the project. I will serve as a moderator  
25 for the meeting. Once we have had our two

1 formal presentations, I will explain in a  
2 little more detail exactly how we will handle  
3 the public comment.

4 I might add that if any  
5 of you want to make comment, then we  
6 encourage you to do that. If you have not  
7 given us your name in advance, please, if you  
8 go back to the back, to the back table back  
9 there, Jake Alexander from the Department of  
10 Energy is at the table. We would be more  
11 than happy to have you sign up so we can call  
12 on you for comments after the formal  
13 presentation.

14 Now, as I have said and  
15 I think you have seen in the press, the  
16 purpose for tonight's meeting is to obtain  
17 your participation in the very early stages  
18 of the Environmental Impact Statement as  
19 called for under the National Environmental  
20 Policy Act. We are soliciting your  
21 assistance in determining the issues and  
22 alternatives to be considered in the  
23 Environmental Impact Statement for the  
24 Niagara Falls Storage Site.

25 As I said earlier,

1 before we take any speakers, I would like to  
2 call on two members to briefly give you some  
3 information on the process before we hear  
4 from our speaker. To explain the EIS  
5 process, we are very fortunate to have this  
6 evening, Pamela Merry-Libby from the Argonne  
7 National Laboratory. Mrs. Libby will speak  
8 to us about the EIS process in general.

9 MRS. MERRY-LIBBY: Both  
10 of these viewgraphs I will be showing are  
11 printed. If you have them, you might want to  
12 follow along if you can't see up here too  
13 well. I'm Pam Merry-Libby a member of the  
14 team that will be writing the Environmental  
15 Impact Statement at Argonne. The first  
16 viewgraph here shows the DOE decision-making  
17 process of which the Environmental Impact  
18 Statement is a part. Back in December of  
19 '82, DOE decided that there was a major  
20 Federal action requiring a Federal  
21 Environmental Impact Statement and that they  
22 would write an EIS. So they put out a notice  
23 of intent in January. And then we went into  
24 scoping up in the Niagara Falls area at the  
25 town of Lewiston and had public meetings in

1 February. This process has been going on of  
2 narrowing down what issues we are going to  
3 look at and what the alternatives are. And  
4 it was also decided to hold this public  
5 meeting down here in Oak Ridge. Now, after  
6 we have this meeting, you can send in written  
7 comments if you don't care to speak here  
8 today. And the Department of Energy asks  
9 that you have them in by the 31st of this  
10 month. And on the back side of the pink  
11 sheet is an address to which you can send  
12 those written comments.

13 I would like to  
14 emphasize that oral and written comments are  
15 given equal consideration. We listen to what  
16 people down here say and what people in  
17 Niagara Falls say, and if anybody else cares  
18 about what should be in this Environmental  
19 Impact Statement. Then a Draft Environmental  
20 Impact Statement is issued. Right now it's  
21 scheduled for the spring of '84. After some  
22 public review and comment on that, a final  
23 statement is written. And in that final  
24 statement changes are made based on some of  
25 those comments. And then there is another

1 public review and comment period and then DOE  
2 publishes a Record of Decision. Now, that  
3 Record of Decision will take into account  
4 findings of the Environmental Impact  
5 Statement given in the EIS, such as how much  
6 it costs to implement various alternatives or  
7 any policy issues. That's all laid out in  
8 that Record of Decision as to why the DOE  
9 decided to take a certain course of action.

10 Now, right now we are in  
11 the scoping process. There are two key words  
12 you have got to remember in the scoping  
13 process. One is issues, the other is  
14 alternatives. Mr. Campbell will be getting  
15 into some of the alternatives that the DOE  
16 has identified thus far which will be in the  
17 Environmental Impact Statement. The notice  
18 of intent had a list of, a preliminary list  
19 of issues that the DOE thought would be major  
20 and should be addressed in the EIS. Of  
21 course, anything you say today in addition to  
22 previous scoping will be considered in  
23 revising that list of issues that will be  
24 given detailed consideration. In addition to  
25 identifying the most important and

1       significant issues, they are also to identify  
2       the minor ones that will not be treated in  
3       detail in the EIS. This is the purpose of  
4       scoping. And it comes out of the Council of  
5       Environmental Quality Regulations for  
6       implementing the environmental Policy Act  
7       which tries to focus on reducing paperwork  
8       and truly make the EIS a decision-making  
9       document. We want to focus on what are the  
10      real major issues that will affect the  
11      decision. And also the alternatives, if you  
12      have ideas of alternatives that should be  
13      considered or modifications to present  
14      alternatives that are listed, then we would  
15      like to get your opinions on this.

16                               And then a general  
17      thing, and that's just to exchange  
18      information. Of course, since I'm involved  
19      in the impact statement, we are scrounging  
20      around for information about the environment  
21      down here in Oak Ridge. And any other things  
22      that you have, if I come around after this  
23      meeting and say, "Give me your name and phone  
24      number. You said something that's  
25      information we didn't have," we appreciate it

1       if we can work with you and get that  
2       information.

3                               These documents, like  
4       the notice of intent and the Draft  
5       Environmental Impact Statement and later the  
6       minutes of these meetings will be in several  
7       locations around here, the Oak Ridge Public  
8       Library, City of Kingston Public Library,  
9       Clinton Public Library, and in the Federal  
10      Building here in Oak Ridge they have a Public  
11      Reading Room. Public written comments should  
12      sent to Lowell Campbell by October 31. We  
13      will be in the process of doing analysis and  
14      stuff. We appreciate it if you can get your  
15      comments in by then. I might say that this --  
16      if you look at the list of tentative issues  
17      that DOE has identified, they span everything  
18      from socioeconomic questions, to hydrology  
19      and geology and water quality and things like  
20      that. At Argonne we have assembled a team of  
21      scientists who are experts in these various  
22      fields and we work together with the  
23      Department of Energy to look at the  
24      alternatives and the issues and do the  
25      analysis. And if any of you have any



1 questions specifically, you can come see me  
2 afterwards. Thank you.

3 MR. BIBB: Thank you  
4 Mrs. Libby. To explain the decision-making  
5 process that has already begun, we have  
6 Lowell Campbell, Deputy Director of the Oak  
7 Ridge Operations Technical Services Division.

8 MR. CAMPBELL: Good  
9 evening. I'm going to try to give you a very  
10 short summary of the project at the Niagara  
11 Falls Storage Site in New York. I will cover  
12 some background, site description at the  
13 Niagara Falls Storage Site, and a brief  
14 statement on the sites that we are looking at  
15 Oak Ridge. I will cover the estimated  
16 volumes and characteristics of the wastes  
17 that we have stored at the Niagara Falls  
18 Storage Site and the residues. I will cover  
19 what we are doing right now to come into  
20 compliance with our DOE criteria, our near  
21 term plans to clean up the project site, and  
22 I will cover very briefly our long range  
23 plans which will include this Environmental  
24 Impact Statement. Next slide please.

25 Niagara Falls Storage

1 Site is about a 190 acre DOE owned site. It  
2 is fenced with limited access. It's part of  
3 a former 1500 acre Manhattan Engineering  
4 District site which was part of the former  
5 Lake Ontario Ordnance Works. Back in 1944,  
6 the site was used to store residues resulting  
7 from processing uranium ores or pitchblende.  
8 Here recently, the Federal Government has  
9 helped with a contractor and we now own all  
10 the wastes and the residues stored at the  
11 Niagara Falls Storage Site. Very briefly, to  
12 show you the location of the site, you can  
13 see that it's located within the town of  
14 Lewiston, in Niagara County, New York. I  
15 won't say much more than indicating that's  
16 the location. We can go onto the next one.

17 This is what I call the  
18 site plan. That didn't come out very clear,  
19 but in general it shows you where we now have  
20 some of the residues. It shows some of the  
21 waste on site. I will cover a little bit  
22 later what our plans are to clean up the site  
23 and where in particular we will contain the  
24 material and store the material, the waste  
25 and the residue. We have been working right

1 along in the early phase of this and we have  
2 come up with estimates of materials stored at  
3 the Niagara Falls Storage Site. We have  
4 about 24 thousand cubic yards of residues and  
5 then 108 thousand cubic yards of contaminated  
6 soils. We have some contaminated rubble from  
7 the cleanup activity and then we will cover  
8 it a little bit later. But in general we are  
9 going to store this in a clay-lined dike  
10 area. When we do this, we will build an  
11 interim cap and put some clean fill. and  
12 when you do all this, you come up with some  
13 additional volumes of dirt that would be very  
14 slightly contaminated. We have to add these  
15 volumes in when we talk about moving it to  
16 another location.

17 You may have heard a  
18 number on the contaminated soils previously  
19 around 90 thousand cubic yards. Our estimate  
20 has been updated. We have been doing some  
21 surveys on the vicinity properties to the  
22 Niagara Falls Storage Site. We find there is  
23 going to be as many as 26 additional vicinity  
24 properties that will require some cleanup  
25 which will be mostly contaminated soils. Our

1 total volume that we feel like we may have is  
2 estimated right now to be about 250 thousand  
3 cubic yards.

4 Just to give you an idea  
5 of what concentrations we have up there,  
6 basically we have radium and uranium for the  
7 low level activity that we have there. As  
8 you can see, the residues contained range  
9 from a hundred to 30 thousand parts per  
10 million. The radium ranks in a range of  
11 .00001 to .3665 parts per million. The  
12 higher level of radium is essentially in K65  
13 material. Contaminated soils which were put  
14 on the site from vicinity properties and  
15 cleanup of the site, the ditches, etcetera,  
16 on site, range in the area of .00005 parts  
17 per million and we use an average volume of  
18 50 picocuries per gram. Of course, our near  
19 term plans will be to clean up offsite  
20 contamination, stabilize the onsite  
21 materials, and we want to prevent any future  
22 runoff of contamination. We want to assure  
23 we are complying with all applicable  
24 standards including DOE standards. Our plan  
25 is to complete this interim action by the end

1 of calendar year 1985.

2 A brief look at what we  
3 plan to do onsite to contain the material, we  
4 have an area there where you see R-10  
5 residues and spoils. It will be a clay-lined  
6 area with clay underneath, a dike around it,  
7 and as you can see, that talks about the 1983  
8 Remedial Action Plan. Well, this work will  
9 continue through 1985 because we need to  
10 clean up the vicinity property work. And  
11 that is essentially contaminated soils as I  
12 said previously. We need to move the K65  
13 material. That's for the leg up there.  
14 That's where it's stored in the concrete  
15 silo, down into Building 411. Other residues  
16 will be concentrated in 411. We will have  
17 some in 413 and 414. These are concrete  
18 structures that will also be on top of a clay  
19 liner with the dike completely around it so  
20 the material will be contained in a concrete  
21 structure covered with a cap that will be  
22 designed and this supposedly and hopefully  
23 will keep this contained until we can get  
24 through our process of the Environmental  
25 Impact Statement and make a determination of

1        what we will do for our long-range plans on  
2        the material.

3                                Of course, this is why  
4        we are here tonight. What are our long-range  
5        plans? We want a complete engineering  
6        analysis of alternatives. Basically we have  
7        two. We can either store the material onsite  
8        or remove it and take it to another site like  
9        Oak Ridge. We have to, in addition to  
10       considering engineering costs, engineering  
11       and cost, excuse me, we must consider  
12       environmental impacts. We do plan to prepare  
13       an EIS to assess and compare alternatives for  
14       long-range management of the waste residues.

15                              Basically what we have  
16       now in these essentially has been changed  
17       slightly in the notice of intent. We have  
18       the first alternative is a no action  
19       alternative. In other words, clean up the  
20       site for interim storage. We continue to  
21       leave it in that condition and monitor it.  
22       The second alternative we are looking at is a  
23       decision to manage the material onsite for  
24       long-term, improve the storage, make a  
25       permanent cap so we completely contain and

1 maintain the site so that we would have  
2 complete control of the site. There is  
3 another alternative, and I believe that's why  
4 we are here tonight and that's to talk about  
5 moving it to another site. We can look at  
6 two or three. One would be to remove the  
7 residues and wastes from Niagara Falls and  
8 transport them to an existing DOE-owned low  
9 level waste burial site located in an arid  
10 environment, Hanford. The Hanford,  
11 Washington site is one alternative we are  
12 looking at. And we will probably have many  
13 comments tonight because we are looking at  
14 the Oak Ridge site. It's another humid site.  
15 It's a DOE-owned low level waste burial site.  
16 We are looking at the Oak Ridge Reservation.  
17 We have looked at a couple of sites.

18 We haven't decided yet  
19 where it will be. But in general, we will be  
20 looking at the Oak Ridge Reservation on this.  
21 We are looking at ocean disposal for  
22 contaminated wastes or soils only. If we do  
23 get past this two year moratorium, we may be  
24 able to consider using the ocean for the  
25 disposal of the wastes. However, residues

1 would not be moved to the ocean. Our other  
2 alternative, we would look at putting  
3 residues into the Hanford site, or into the  
4 Oak Ridge site. In Oak Ridge, we are  
5 considering moving all the material down here  
6 as an alternative. And the other alternative  
7 is to move only the residues to Oak Ridge.  
8 One last alternative and I will be finished,  
9 we are talking about moving the residues to  
10 Hanford and leaving the lesser -- excuse me,  
11 less radioactive waste at Niagara Falls  
12 Storage Site for long-term storage. That's  
13 basically a quick summary of the project.  
14 Thank you.

15 MR. BIBB: Thank you,  
16 Mr. Campbell. Tonight's meeting is an  
17 informal meeting. That is to say it is not --  
18 we will not be cross-examining any witnesses.  
19 Our whole purpose is to ask you to provide us  
20 with your comment so that we can consider  
21 those comments in preparing the Draft  
22 Environmental Impact Statement. We want you  
23 to feel free to come forward with those  
24 comments. Procedurally, I would like to ask  
25 if you possibly could, try and point towards



1     about five minutes or less. I don't want you  
2     to feel that you are somehow restrained. If  
3     you have a little more to say than that,  
4     please feel free to say it. I would also  
5     like to point out that you need not have to  
6     come up and express yourself orally if you  
7     choose not to. As I indicated earlier, there  
8     are sign-up sheets in the back. If you want  
9     to take a sign-up sheet and say on there I  
10    agree with the last speaker, or I feel this,  
11    or you ought to do this or do that, you are  
12    just as free to do that. I assure you that  
13    oral and written comments receive exactly the  
14    same weight.

15                               Now, our proceedings  
16    tonight are being recorded by a Court  
17    Reporter, Mr. Gibson with the firm of  
18    Gibson-Sherrod-Carruth of Knoxville.  
19    Everything that has been said is being taken  
20    down. If you want a copy of the meeting  
21    transcripts, they will be available for  
22    purchase from Mr. Gibson's company. We will  
23    have the transcripts placed in the public  
24    document rooms which you saw in Mrs. Libby's  
25    slide, the libraries and the DOE Public

1       Reading Room. They will be available for use  
2       at that time.

3                               Now, when you come up,  
4       because we are transcribing it and to make it  
5       as easy on our Court Reporter as we can,  
6       would you please spell your name for him?  
7       And I would like to apologize in advance, I  
8       would do the best I can at pronouncing your  
9       name as I call you. We would ask you to come  
10      forth and use this microphone over here in  
11      the order in which you signed up. There is  
12      no effort on our part to decide who talks  
13      first. It's just who signed up first. And  
14      the first person who signed up that I would  
15      like to call now is Frances Pleasonton, 111  
16      Pleasant Road, Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

17                           MS. PLEASONTON: One of  
18      my major concerns about any waste disposal at  
19      some of the buildings is the geology,  
20      underground hydrology of this region. The  
21      open channels that you can get through the  
22      limestone base that underlies this can do all  
23      sorts of strange things. I understand that  
24      one of the difficulties in tracing where the  
25      mercury and well-publicized spills at Y-12

1        may have gone may be impossible to discover  
2        for that very reason. So that any new  
3        disposal should take that into consideration  
4        very seriously. If it's any better at  
5        Niagara Falls, let's leave it there.

6                                But this also concerns  
7        the question of what waste has already been  
8        buried at Oak Ridge National Laboratory.  
9        Where is it? Nobody, at least according to  
10       the Oak Ridge reports, seems to know. There  
11       are reports that records were destroyed in a  
12       fire. I forget what year, but sometime, I  
13       think, in the mid-fifties. I was working  
14       there at that time. My many friends were  
15       working there at that time and nobody  
16       remembers anything about that fire, even  
17       though one person, a friend of a friend  
18       supposedly was working in the same building  
19       where it supposedly occurred. I would like a  
20       thorough investigation of that whole bit. I  
21       certainly don't want you to get going on a  
22       site that looks very nice and get into  
23       something that you don't know about.

24                                The other concern that I  
25       have is related to the general problem of

1       transporting radioactive materials of any  
2       kind, particularly over long distances.  If  
3       you are already going to this amount of  
4       trouble to give interim protection up where  
5       it is, why not go all the way if geology is  
6       suitable and give permanent burial there.  
7       From here to Niagara Falls seems far enough,  
8       but when you start talking to Hanford, if I  
9       had enough hair, it would really go up.  I  
10      think that covers my main points of concern.  
11      Thank you.

12                               MR. BIBB:  Doctor  
13      Coutant.

14                               DR. COUTANT:  Good  
15      evening.  My name is Charles Coutant.  I'm  
16      here representing the City of Oak Ridge  
17      through the Environmental Quality Advisory  
18      Board which advises it in matters related to  
19      the environment.  And at the request of City  
20      Council, our Board reviewed the information  
21      that was available on the proposed  
22      radioactive waste management plan and we have  
23      made recommendations to City Council.  City  
24      Council has requested that we send these to  
25      DOE.  We have prepared these in a written

1 form and have submitted them to you.

2 I would like to just  
3 summarize a few of those because it may be  
4 relevant to the comments that other people  
5 might make this evening. The Federal  
6 Register announcement of the potential  
7 management plan had several scoping  
8 alternatives listed. I won't repeat those.  
9 We think that's a good list as a starter. We  
10 have several additional ones that I think our  
11 Board feels are important. We feel the  
12 potential radiological impacts DOE has  
13 planned can be accomplished with a minimum of  
14 radiological hazard. We think though that  
15 particular issues that have come up in the  
16 local area ought to be considered, such as  
17 the questions of thermal inversion and air  
18 stagnation with relationship to airborne  
19 radionuclides, particularly the radon  
20 emissions from the waste. We would like to  
21 see the cumulative hazard of the new waste  
22 proposed for the site be brought together.  
23 We feel that there ought to be an integrated  
24 approach to waste evaluation on the  
25 Reservation. We think that the existing

1       Nuclear Regulatory Commission and EPA  
2       standards relative to radiological wastes  
3       ought to be evaluated in the impact statement  
4       and ought not to be considered in the absence  
5       of those regulations.

6                       Secondly, in the area of  
7       potential socioeconomic impacts, that's an  
8       area that we think would be particularly  
9       important. The siting of the disposal site  
10      on the Reservation could potentially impact  
11      future uses of the Reservation for other  
12      large energy-related projects. We think that  
13      that ought to be examined. The question of  
14      taxable land in Oak Ridge for industry in  
15      general and nuclear related industry ought to  
16      be considered in its various ramifications  
17      related to self-sufficiency of Oak Ridge,  
18      potential uses of the industrial land for  
19      other purposes and cost benefit relationships  
20      for the City relative to the various options  
21      of handling the waste.

22                      We have comments about  
23      several technical issues, engineering issues  
24      which I won't go into in the quick summary,  
25      but again mention the question of existing

1 waste sites, the engineering related to the  
2 relationship of these new sites, new wastes  
3 to the existing waste on the Reservation, and  
4 the potential joint treatment of existing  
5 waste sites and the new sites, how they might  
6 be handled profitably, jointly rather than as --  
7 taking up independent areas on the  
8 Reservation.

9 Potential chemical  
10 impacts again, just briefly, there are  
11 standards developed by Environmental  
12 Protection Agency under the Resource  
13 Conservation Recovery Act relating to  
14 hazardous materials. We think those  
15 regulations ought to be considered in the  
16 non-radiological potential chemical impacts  
17 because wastes of this sort have materials  
18 other than radionuclides in them which leads  
19 to potential institutional issues. We think  
20 the questions of the relative domains of the  
21 various regulatory agencies, EPA, NRC, DOE,  
22 who has responsibility for what, State of  
23 Tennessee, all of these we think the impact  
24 statement ought to help come to some mutually  
25 agreeable way of interpreting the various

1 regulations that are out there so that we  
2 don't wind up with conflicts as we have seen  
3 in the past.

4 Also the City of Oak  
5 Ridge has either in place or long-range  
6 development plans and we think the  
7 institutional questions of how the waste  
8 treatment handling on the DOE Reservation  
9 fits into the long-range plans for Oak Ridge  
10 and DOE for the use of the Reservation ought  
11 to be considered. A number of issues related  
12 to mitigation and monitoring a site like this  
13 is going to take long-term care. We are  
14 fairly confident that can be done. As we  
15 mentioned earlier there is a difficult  
16 geologic structure out there. We have a  
17 large population. All of these things ought  
18 to be considered in careful monitoring of the  
19 waste storage area.

20 That very briefly  
21 summarizes the concerns of our Board and we  
22 appreciate the opportunity to review the  
23 material that's been brought to date. And we  
24 hope we can help in the preparation of the  
25 statement any way we can. Thank you.



1 MR. BIBB: Mr. Gary  
2 Davis.

3 MR. DAVIS: My name is  
4 Gary Davis. I'm representing the American  
5 Environmental Association, a foundation that  
6 has been concerned about waste disposal to  
7 Oak Ridge Reservation for several months now,  
8 particularly after the revelations that we  
9 have had recently about past disposal  
10 practices on the Oak Ridge Reservation.  
11 Before I get into specifics about the Draft  
12 Environmental Impact Statement that will be  
13 prepared, I will do something I'm not  
14 normally able to do in my profession. I will  
15 present the emotional reaction to dumping  
16 radioactive wastes on the Oak Ridge  
17 Reservation Site. And that reaction is  
18 haven't we got enough problems to deal with  
19 in Oak Ridge due to the disposal of wastes on  
20 the Reservation in the past without  
21 considering dumping tons and tons of new  
22 wastes?

23 Now, recent inspections  
24 by the State on the Oak Ridge Reservation  
25 have revealed wide-spread contamination from

1 both chemical and radiological waste being  
2 stored by inadequate means on the Oak Ridge  
3 Reservation by literally dumping them into  
4 unlined trenches filled with groundwater. I  
5 know that in an Environmental Impact  
6 Statement, the possibility that the  
7 implementing agency will violate the law in  
8 conducting these activities is not necessary  
9 to be considered, but in looking at an  
10 Environmental Impact Statement for the  
11 Department of Energy, that has to be  
12 considered a definite possibility. We are  
13 particularly concerned about the fact that  
14 the Department of Energy remains  
15 self-regulating under our own environmental  
16 statutes concerning radiological wastes.

17 Now I would like to talk  
18 a little bit about the specifics of the Draft  
19 Environmental Impact Statement. First of  
20 all, looking at the alternatives that will be  
21 considered that were listed in the Federal  
22 Register, most of these alternatives imply  
23 some form of land disposal of these wastes.  
24 Now, in my previous two positions I have  
25 assessed the management of hazardous waste

1       for the Governor's office of California and  
2       for the (inaudible). The assessment and the  
3       conclusion I came to at looking at wastes in  
4       general is that landfills leak. And to put  
5       it very simply that there is no such thing as  
6       a secure landfill for waste disposal. The  
7       first experience in this country with  
8       so-called secure landfill was a landfill for  
9       low-level radioactive waste in West Valley,  
10      New York. Shortly after that landfill was  
11      constructed and wastes were disposed of  
12      there, there were problems with settling of  
13      the top of the landfill with leachate  
14      collection inside the landfill and with  
15      leaking of radionuclides from the trenches in  
16      the landfill.

17                       I could go on with  
18      several other examples of landfills that were  
19      thought to be secure, were thought to be  
20      designed by current and modern standards that  
21      have turned out to be lethal. And I also  
22      need not reiterate the poor geological  
23      conditions in Oak Ridge and this whole area  
24      in general. There is probably no site on the  
25      Oak Ridge Reservation that is an ideal site

1       for land disposal of these wastes.

2                       Secondly, there is  
3       probably no site that would comply with all  
4       of the current standards for land disposal of  
5       wastes. Also on the alternatives, I would  
6       like to suggest that the drafters of the  
7       Environmental Impact Statement include  
8       consideration of above-ground storage as an  
9       alternative to below ground disposal and  
10      shallow disposal. I'm aware of one company,  
11      Container Corporation of American, that is  
12      designing metal boxes that can be stacked  
13      above ground for long-term storage of waste.

14                      Finally, under the  
15      consideration of different alternatives I  
16      would like to object to the inclusion of an  
17      ocean disposal alternative given the fact  
18      that the U.S. Congress has spoken on that.  
19      Right now and until that law is changed,  
20      there should be no inclusion of ocean  
21      disposal in consideration. On the scope of  
22      the Environmental Impact Statement, I think  
23      as was raised by the City of Oak Ridge, there  
24      is a definite preliminary issue here which is  
25      the baseline environmental quality on the Oak

1 Ridge -- and around the Oak Ridge Reservation  
2 and the cumulative impacts of this waste  
3 disposal when added to other activities that  
4 contaminate the environment on the Oak Ridge  
5 Reservation. There has been no comprehensive  
6 Environmental Impact Statement for the Oak  
7 Ridge Reservation so there has been no  
8 detailed assessment of the environmental  
9 impacts that could be used as a baseline.

10 We need to know whether  
11 the disposal of these wastes and how much the  
12 disposal of these wastes will increase the  
13 ambient concentrations of radionuclides in  
14 the air and in the water in Oak Ridge.  
15 Furthermore, we need to know what the current  
16 health impacts are on citizens of Oak Ridge  
17 from all of the DOE operations here and how  
18 those health impacts would be affected by  
19 bringing new wastes into the area. Also on  
20 the general scope of the Environmental Impact  
21 Statement, I would like to suggest that a  
22 comparative risk assessment be done on all of  
23 these alternatives so that when looking at  
24 the total risk involved and the  
25 transportation and disposal of the waste for

1 each of the alternatives, that those  
2 alternatives be compared in some real  
3 fashion.

4 Finally, on the scope of  
5 the Environmental Impact Statement, the  
6 general scope of it, I would like to suggest  
7 that not recommending a preferred alternative  
8 would render the Draft Environmental Impact  
9 Statement inadequate. Without the  
10 opportunity to assess the alternative that  
11 the Department of Energy has selected, there  
12 is really no meaningful way to comment to the  
13 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The  
14 citizens of Oak Ridge are left not knowing  
15 whether the DOE is seriously considering  
16 disposal of wastes here and not really  
17 knowing how to comment without a preferred  
18 alternative being named.

19 Under potential  
20 radiological impacts, I think it's very  
21 important that the wastes be characterized in  
22 detail so that we know whether or not we are  
23 dealing with all low level wastes or all high  
24 level waste, or some high level waste that  
25 couldn't be declassified as low level waste.

1 This is important from a regulatory  
2 standpoint. The Environmental Protection  
3 Agency is currently developing standards on  
4 radioactive waste and I believe the Draft  
5 Environmental Impact Statement should  
6 consider and compare whatever alternatives  
7 are evaluated to these standards. The  
8 radionuclide concentration in the air near  
9 the DOE facilities in Oak Ridge is already  
10 well above the proposed limit for ambient air  
11 concentrations of radionuclides. What I  
12 would like to see is for the Draft  
13 Environmental Impact Statement to look at the  
14 addition of radionuclides to the existing  
15 contamination and see how this will affect  
16 the overall ambient concentration.

17 On socioeconomic  
18 impacts, I would like to reiterate that the  
19 impacts upon the future economic development  
20 of Oak Ridge be considered. For one thing, I  
21 believe and I think other people in this area  
22 believe that Oak Ridge runs the risk of being  
23 known as a nuclear dumping ground for the  
24 whole United States. This proposed dump here  
25 would be cited. And that would not be good

1       for the future economic growth of the area.

2                       Also on socioeconomic  
3       criteria, I believe that siting criteria  
4       should be developed for any kind of a waste  
5       disposal facility such as this and proposed  
6       alternatives should be compared to such  
7       criteria.

8                       On potential chemical  
9       impacts of a proposed waste disposal facility  
10      in Oak Ridge, the applicability of the  
11      Resource Conservation and Recovery Act  
12      regulations should be assessed and comparing  
13      the requirements of that Act that EPA has  
14      promulgated to the proposed waste disposal  
15      alternative is necessary. Furthermore, a  
16      comparative degree of risk should be attained  
17      for each of the regulatory schemes that might  
18      be applicable here to see which would be the  
19      most stringent and which would give the  
20      greatest protection for public health in the  
21      environment.

22                      Finally, under  
23      institutional issues, again I think it's very  
24      important for the regulatory responsibility  
25      to be determined over these wastes. If there



1 is overlapping responsibility, that issue  
2 should be dealt with. And once again I would  
3 like to state that I don't believe the  
4 Department of Energy should be  
5 self-regulating the radioactive waste  
6 disposal on this site.

7 Finally, long-term  
8 monitoring is going to be very important due  
9 to the fact that these wastes remain  
10 dangerous for several years. The methods of  
11 that monitoring should be assessed in the  
12 Draft Environmental Impact Statement as well  
13 as their efficacy and should also be assessed  
14 because this site could become a magnet site  
15 for wastes from all over the country. Thank  
16 you for this opportunity.

17 MR. BIBB: Thank you.  
18 Mr. John D. Williams. Kingston, Tennessee.

19 MR. WILLIAMS: My name  
20 is John Williams of Kingston. And I have my  
21 comments that I will leave with Lowell  
22 Campbell after I speak. I do want to go on  
23 record as being opposed to shipping the  
24 Niagara Falls Storage Site radioactive  
25 residues to the Oak Ridge Reservation for

1 long-term storage. The Federal Register  
2 dated February 1st, '83, from which I got  
3 most of my information, states that the  
4 ownership was retained by Afrimet because of  
5 the valuable and potentially recoverable  
6 materials such as gold and platinum. Now, I  
7 believe material recovery could not only help  
8 offset the cost of this major Federal action,  
9 but also help immobilize the higher  
10 radioactive materials in a solid matrix.  
11 Resource recovery was not clearly defined as  
12 an alternative to remedial action in the  
13 Federal Register. My understanding is it  
14 would be some pre-treatments or beginning  
15 steps.

16 Ocean disposal was  
17 listed as a viable alternative. But I  
18 believe ocean disposal of the Niagara Falls  
19 Storage Site contaminated material is not  
20 being seriously considered as a viable  
21 alternative. At one time, ocean disposal was  
22 the preferred option. Has the potential  
23 issues related to ocean disposal been  
24 completed listed in the Federal Register?  
25 The potential issues relate primarily to

1 shipping to the DOE facility or a DOE  
2 facility. Also has DOE explored the  
3 potential other sites for ocean disposal  
4 other than the EPA 106 site?

5 The Federal Register  
6 states DOE will not select a preferred  
7 disposal alternative in the Draft EIS. I  
8 believe the Draft EIS should give DOE's  
9 proposed action from all the alternatives  
10 that are finally selected in order that  
11 comments should be incorporated in the Final  
12 EIS.

13 Now, Pam Merry-Libby  
14 indicated that stage would be done after the  
15 Final EIS is complete. The question I pose  
16 is what will relocation of the Niagara Falls  
17 Storage Site to Oak Ridge accomplish that  
18 technically cannot be accomplished if  
19 stabilized in the State of New York? The  
20 Draft EIS must certainly address the fact  
21 that the non-radiological risk, I believe,  
22 will be greater than shipping radioactive  
23 waste to Oak Ridge to the associated  
24 radiologic risk. Thank you for allowing me  
25 to speak.

1 MR. BIBB: Mr. Francke?

2 MR. FRANCKE: I'll send  
3 a written letter.

4 MR. BIBB: Barry  
5 McConnell?

6 MR. McCONNELL: Mr.  
7 Campbell, Ladies and Gentlemen, I hope my  
8 statements, purely my own, do not anger any  
9 of us here, but make us think. Today we are  
10 embroiled in a bitter debate, a debate being  
11 waged in town halls, civic centers and  
12 planning commissions all over the country.  
13 It's a debate that the environmentally  
14 concerned of Oak Ridge and in the surrounding  
15 areas is currently losing, for it is we in  
16 this community who are assigned the last  
17 ditch effort to keep toxic, carcinogenic,  
18 mutagenic wastes from being transported by  
19 road and by rail from other concerned  
20 communities across the eastern half of this  
21 United States who refuse to store or to  
22 dispose of such waste in their area, but who  
23 are willing to dispose of it in our back  
24 yards.

25 Since this government

1 project and most of us in in area have ties  
2 either direct or indirectly to the  
3 government, and since this project may be  
4 construed as a research and development  
5 project in waste disposal, we may tend to  
6 think of it as a garnering for East Tennessee  
7 of another well-funded, job-producing,  
8 hi-tech project meted out by our father's in  
9 Washington. The fact of the matter is, it  
10 is a waste repository for nuclear and hi-tech  
11 sewage, waste that no one else wants or would  
12 have.

13 If you want to know the  
14 opinion of environmentalists in Washington,  
15 listen to Robert Roach the Director of the  
16 Environmental Policy Institute. "Tennessee  
17 may be the only state that will literally  
18 choke on its own pork. It is becoming the  
19 garbage dump of the nation."

20 I am not here to speak  
21 on pork-barrelling nor toxic disposal  
22 technology, rather I'm here to express the  
23 concerns of my fellow citizens, friends and  
24 neighbors about the adequacies and worthiness  
25 of our transportation corridors to flood the

1 community with such materials. Recent  
2 reports have indicated, although it may be in  
3 dispute, that even meteorologically small  
4 amounts of radioactivity may cause cancer in  
5 humans. That report on CBS Morning News  
6 today, along with our having won the Nobel  
7 Prize for physics, literature, and chemistry,  
8 our accolades aside, I wish to point out the  
9 primary reason, or at least one of them for  
10 the refusal for the U.S. Synthetic Fuels  
11 Corporation to grant Koppers Company their  
12 loan guarantees for the Oak Ridge project was  
13 because of the inadequacies of the  
14 transportation corridors in this area. This  
15 is not hearsay, but directly from the mouth  
16 given to me in Washington from a Synfuels  
17 Board Member.

18 Let me speak of the  
19 issues. We do not have roads capable of  
20 handling trucks or semitractor-trailers in  
21 any sort of confluence. Such vehicles may be  
22 three times more responsible for deaths and  
23 accidents than any other vehicle besides dump  
24 trucks. Tens of thousands of motorists,  
25 commuters, will have to using the same

1 corridors and at what expense to life, limb,  
2 and health. Rail is by far the safest way to  
3 bring hazardous materials to this area, but  
4 we have a very poor record here and the  
5 facilities may not be around to serve them.  
6 If they are projected, what imminent domain  
7 may gobble up the land? If by road, what  
8 four lane non-commuter controlled access  
9 highway will bring this material and who will  
10 clean up the spills, the debris, and who will  
11 have to be evacuated, and for how long;  
12 problems of which we have a long and not very  
13 happy history.

14 And if to stave my  
15 arguments, let those who would transport such  
16 materials do so. If it is indeed as safe as  
17 some suggest, put it on passenger planes as  
18 carry on baggage and see how many persons sit  
19 next to them. Finally, I suggest that a  
20 major transportation study be carried out and  
21 to evaluate its studies in view of the  
22 affected public, a study using new  
23 information with base data from our own  
24 corridors of traffic and with references to  
25 why other communities see fit to have such a

1 facility located in Oak Ridge rather than in  
2 there own yards. I thank you.

3 MR. BIBB: Thank you,  
4 sir. John Dabbs.

5 MR. DABBS: My name is  
6 John Dabbs. I'm speaking entirely for  
7 myself. I'm going to restrict my comments to  
8 the question of socioeconomic impacts,  
9 particularly impacts upon the City of Oak  
10 Ridge if this waste is moved here. We have  
11 already had a very strong amount of impact, a  
12 lot of publicity, very bad publicity about  
13 waste in this area. And I think this  
14 publicity has had a great deal of negative  
15 impact on the economic future of the City of  
16 Oak Ridge. I don't think any possible site  
17 that might be considered here would fall  
18 outside the boundaries of the -- the legal  
19 boundaries of the City. Therefore, it will  
20 be a City problem. The difficulty that I see  
21 is in finding some way to recompense the City  
22 and its citizens for the impact, the  
23 socioeconomic impact of adding more waste  
24 here.

25 The property upon which



1       this waste would be placed is federally owned  
2       and therefore not taxable, at least by the  
3       general wisdom. And I would ask that this  
4       Environmental Impact Statement look at the  
5       question of the manner in which the  
6       recompense, if waste is to be moved here,  
7       some manner in which to recompense the City  
8       and its citizens, and generously, because I  
9       really believe that this is a problem where  
10      nobody wants this stuff. I think it's pretty  
11      clear. And in that sense it's a sellers  
12      market. Here we are a captive market because  
13      the land upon which this is placed is  
14      government land and we have a real problem  
15      with that. So I want to see that question  
16      addressed and addressed thoroughly and the  
17      idea of if the waste is moved here, generous  
18      compensation should be considered as part of  
19      the cost of doing so. Thank you.

20                               MR. BIBB: Thank you,  
21      sir. Robert Peele.

22                               MR. PEELE: I have a  
23      letter from August 28th which I sent to Mr.  
24      Campbell which I hope will be in the record  
25      as part of this hearing. What I hope to do

1     tonight is to accent a few of the points,  
2     perhaps explain them a little better. Also I  
3     want to express with regret for the County  
4     Executive of Roane County, Ken Yeager, who  
5     couldn't make it only because of a serious  
6     operation in his family. He also has a  
7     written testimony which I hope will be  
8     included.

9                     First I want to thank  
10    you for having us here. I should say I'm not  
11    speaking for Roane County tonight, but I am  
12    speaking as an elected official on the  
13    legislative body representing the west end of  
14    Oak Ridge, the Roane County part of Oliver  
15    Springs and the Orchard View area which is  
16    southwest of Oliver Springs.

17                    Roane County doesn't  
18    have a large staff that can sit and ponder  
19    questions like ought to be addressed in this  
20    environmental statement, so it's very  
21    important to us that functions like this  
22    impact statement effort which is to take  
23    place, an effort such as this do occur and  
24    they are thorough. We depend upon that to  
25    understand what's going on and what's

1       affecting us. As we learned again tonight,  
2       we are in a time when in Tennessee, as well  
3       as in the rest of the country, the attitude  
4       of most citizens is, relative to any waste  
5       material, that we don't want anybody else's  
6       waste in our back yard. If it's our own  
7       waste, we will think about it if we can't  
8       dump it in somebody else's back yard. That's  
9       true in Roane County as well as other parts  
10      of the state. We have been very millitant in  
11      this area.

12                               Now, I recognize that  
13      this particular waste may not be very  
14      hazardous. Parts of it may not be anymore  
15      hazardous than some of the natural minerals  
16      in this part of Tennessee. It's a role of  
17      the impact statement to clarify what the  
18      situation is and do so in an authoritative  
19      way so that the people who don't have ready  
20      access from there own knowledge on how to  
21      make such assessments will trust the results.

22                               What should be the  
23      emphasis in this report? I believe it's  
24      apparent, and certainly a apparent to me,  
25      that in all such matters today, questions of

1 health, safety, and the options for enjoyment  
2 of life for ourselves and for our descendants  
3 is the issue of interest in environmental  
4 assessment. Questions of what will happen to  
5 plants and other organisms are interesting to  
6 many, but only in the sense that they are  
7 canaries to the miner. They give an  
8 indication of problems that may not be sensed  
9 directly. There are, of course, people who  
10 may be concerned about environmental effects  
11 for their own sake. I think that's a  
12 relative minority. It's derivative ways it  
13 is important to many.

14 In the second catagory  
15 is economics for our area both in the short  
16 term, the next few years, and the long term,  
17 because there may not be a Department of  
18 Energy. There may not be an Oak Ridge, only  
19 the land which will remain. Alternatives to  
20 consider. Those that have been mentioned  
21 tonight seem very appropriate. I want to  
22 emphasize, too, we don't normally worry about  
23 unmined uranium ore. That sort of comes with  
24 the earth to us. It would be natural to  
25 consider the possibility of referring this

1       processed ore to a depleted mine. Admitted  
2       it would be a different chemical form and so  
3       forth, but at least this would have a certain  
4       natural tendency to be considered. It might  
5       well raise very little concern since there  
6       might be less uranium in that territory than  
7       there was prior to the beginning of the wide  
8       spread use of uranium.

9                       The second idea which  
10       has come up before tonight is that the  
11       residues which may come up more concentrated  
12       perhaps should be recycled or reprocessed to  
13       remove most of the hazardous materials. I  
14       doubt if this would pay for the process, but  
15       concentration is normally the solution to  
16       pollution, not dilution as we thought in the  
17       fifties. The statement which is produced, I  
18       believe, needs to be extremely specific as to  
19       the forms of the waste that we are concerned  
20       with. It's very difficult to get hold of a  
21       problem if specific hazards and the materials  
22       being dealt with are not defined very  
23       accurately.

24                      Furthermore, the  
25       alternatives, when they are finally stated in

1 the report, the ones that are considered as  
2 being plausible, need to be stated much more  
3 precisely than is often done. If an  
4 alternative is also stated in the form of  
5 some cap, landfill on the Oak Ridge  
6 Reservation for instance, it's impossible  
7 either for the team doing the work to make a  
8 precise assessment or for the public to  
9 understand that assessment. One must have a  
10 definite conceptual design and location and  
11 specifically indicate what efforts are  
12 expected over time, both in the case of  
13 normal successful operation of the device or  
14 the storage area or accidents which are  
15 likely.

16 It's understood as we  
17 have heard tonight in the common  
18 understanding it is understood that capped  
19 landfills probably will leak. This may not  
20 be true, but there is an experience today and  
21 it is a perhaps pessimistic assessment which  
22 is very easy for members of the public to  
23 understand because it is consistent with  
24 their own experience with engineered  
25 projects. This is not, I believe, whatever

1 the hazard level is, it is not short-lived if  
2 I'm not mistaken.

3 The report needs to deal  
4 with the consequences or impacts contingent  
5 upon specific commitments by the Department  
6 of Energy or its following agencies, in other  
7 words, what would be the impact assuming a  
8 certain level of monitoring and by whom, and  
9 a certain amount of maintenance and by whom.  
10 It's not enough to say someone will do a  
11 monitoring job every year without deciding  
12 who pays for it, who decides what's to be  
13 done, who assures what's to be done.

14 As I suggested, impacts  
15 need to be put in relative terms, comparative  
16 terms. If the material is no more hazardous  
17 than Chattanooga shale that's around us in  
18 this part of the country, that's important to  
19 understand. People can grasp that perhaps  
20 better than micrograms per cubic centimeters  
21 of the material. Whatever the hazard from  
22 this waste is, it must be considered in  
23 combination with what we already have and  
24 what we expect to have generated here in the  
25 future.

1                   Such a report normally  
2 looks at costs and benefits, in particular  
3 those costs which are external to the program  
4 and external to those persons who received  
5 the benefit which presumably is the country  
6 at-large from the past atomic energy efforts.  
7 The costs that you obviously need  
8 to consider: The effects of leakage from the  
9 design facility if it works and if it fails;  
10 costs from a need to abandon land and a  
11 failure to be able to use surface or  
12 groundwater in that vicinity; the cost of  
13 monitoring; the cost of transportation, of  
14 course. What are the benefits to be  
15 considered? Would there be any payments in  
16 any decision to make payments to a community  
17 or to the counties based on the -- in the  
18 future, if there is no -- if there is no  
19 Departments of Energy anymore? That's a  
20 serious issue.

21                   If we remove land from  
22 productive use or from any industry in that  
23 land, we have to look into the future. At  
24 the moment since the payments are made to the  
25 Department of Energy, some think they are too



1     small, some think they plenty big. They are  
2     based primarily on the number of employees.  
3     If there are no employees, there would be no  
4     assistance payments. One would then fall  
5     back if there is no repeal upon a portion of  
6     the Atomic Energy Act which provides for  
7     payments in lieu of taxes for the land in the  
8     condition it was at the time it was taken  
9     from the original owners in 1942, whatever  
10    the year was. So that would not allow any  
11    way to consider the extra value that we must  
12    place on a site that's sufficiently secure to  
13    be used as a landfill for waste. We think  
14    about it as worthless land. Those sites are  
15    rare. If we have one, it's very valuable.  
16    That needs to be recognized and somehow an  
17    assessment of the potentials costs and  
18    benefits needs to assert a position on an  
19    issue of this type. Thank you.

20                   MR. BIBB: Thank you,  
21    sir. I'll have to apologize in advance.  
22    It looks like Alma Fulks.

23                   MS. FULKS: Mine would  
24    be repetitious, what I have to say. I would  
25    like to ask a question. Is it true that the

1 State of Tennessee does not have any control  
2 over regulations regarding transportation of  
3 nuclear products in this area or anywhere  
4 else?

5 MR. BIBB: Well, outside  
6 the State of Tennessee, that's true.

7 MS. FULKS: Isn't there  
8 some kind of Federal bill that's been passed  
9 regarding nuclear transport?

10 MR. BIBB: That's an  
11 extraordinary complicated question and it  
12 can't be answered yes or no. This is an  
13 agreement state and the State of Tennessee as  
14 such as the authority over radioactivity in  
15 the state. But it's far more complicated  
16 than that and it's really not the kind of  
17 question -- I will be happy to talk to you  
18 about it later.

19 MS. FULKS: That's all I  
20 wanted to ask you about. Thank you. All the  
21 other statements I agree with so there is no  
22 use going up there.

23 MR. BIBB:: If you have  
24 a written statement we will take it. Susan  
25 Williams.

1 MS. WILLIAMS: My name  
2 is Susan Williams. I have a lot of concern  
3 about the wastes being brought into this  
4 area. A lot of them have been covered except  
5 a few I had on my list. The first thing is  
6 that in TV, newspapers, when this subject has  
7 been covered, I think the impression has been  
8 given that there is only low level waste up  
9 at the Niagara Falls site. And my impression  
10 is from reading the material given out that  
11 there is high level waste also that has to be  
12 dealt with up there. I think that whatever  
13 is up there needs to be covered in this  
14 Environmental Impact Statement and discussed  
15 how toxic it is, and just explain what is up  
16 there so that people understand that it's not  
17 just low level radioactive waste.

18 It seems to me that a  
19 decision to bring waste down to the Oak Ridge  
20 area would just be a foot in the door to  
21 bring further waste to the Oak Ridge area.  
22 And with all the talk in Oak Ridge and Roane  
23 County about alternate industry, private  
24 industry to get off the government rolls, it  
25 seems to me an important factor to consider

1       that most of America is not enticed to an  
2       area that's a toxic waste dump. People tend  
3       to move away from them, not toward them. If  
4       Oak Ridge and Roane County are interested in  
5       alternate industry, then they better be  
6       serious about cleaning up the area.

7                       I would like the subject  
8       to be covered about what State or Federal  
9       agencies besides DOE have any jurisdiction  
10      over this waste and who is going to monitor  
11      DOE because it's obvious to me that DOE could  
12      have used some monitoring in the past. This  
13      place is a mess. And I don't have any  
14      confidence that DOE is going to handle any  
15      other material any better than the material  
16      they have handled the material in the last 20  
17      or 30 or 40 years.

18                      I think that the  
19      preferred alternatives should be identified  
20      in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
21      because I think whatever alternative is  
22      chosen, that whoever is affected needs to  
23      know that in the stage where public comment  
24      is effective and not at a later stage when  
25      the decision has been made. I'm a little bit

1       curious as to why DOE took over  
2       responsibility for the waste from the Belgian  
3       company, Afrimet. Just curious, wondering  
4       what taxpayer expense is going to be involved  
5       in the disposal of this waste that was a  
6       private industry responsibility up until this  
7       summer.

8                       I think the effects of  
9       this waste has to be considered in light and  
10      in connection with all the other wastes that  
11      are all over the Oak Ridge Reservation and  
12      the effects it will have in combination and  
13      not just separately.

14                     And I would like to  
15      request a couple of documents to be placed in  
16      the library or some public office in the very  
17      near future before the public comment period  
18      closes. There is a study called the "Niagara  
19      Falls Storage Site Long-Range Planning Study"  
20      done in May of 1982 by Oak Ridge Operations.  
21      And I would like a copy of that to be placed  
22      in the library and also the transcripts from  
23      the scoping meetings held up in Lewiston, New  
24      York, and any other documents that are  
25      around. Thank you.

1 MR. BIBB: We will see  
2 that those documents get placed in the public  
3 library.

4 MR. BIBB: Jim Young. I  
5 need to ask one thing. Those of you who  
6 filled out the forms looking for a copy of  
7 the Draft EIS, you must give us the address  
8 including the zip code. You must give us a  
9 complete mailing address. I must ask that.

10 MR. YOUNG: My name is  
11 Jim Young. I belong to about three  
12 environmental organizations. I'm here  
13 representing myself tonight because  
14 unfortunately I live downstream from the DOE  
15 facilities. I do have a copy of my comments  
16 which I will leave at the desk.

17 First off, I think the  
18 DOE's past experience in disposing of  
19 hazardous waste, both toxic and radiological,  
20 should be weighed into any considerations  
21 before any thought of bringing others' waste  
22 into the area. For 40 years we have heard  
23 DOE's pet expression "best available  
24 technology" as the solution to all our ills.  
25 BAT sometimes is not enough, let's face it,

1 especially when it is applied as haphazardly  
2 as some disposals have been in this area.  
3 Take for example White Oak Creek. Raw,  
4 radioactive materials have been buried in  
5 open pits back when BAT dictated these  
6 prehistoric measures. What's the half-life  
7 of plutonium? A hundred thousand years?  
8 Bringing us further up to date and you find  
9 the crude disposal right at this moment of  
10 highly toxic materials in the notorious S-3  
11 ponds in the Bear Creek Valley area. One  
12 recent observation from an expert in the  
13 field from this very state stated this is a  
14 "disposal of toxics in the 1940's mentality."  
15 In other words, let DOE clean up its own act  
16 before it volunteers as a repository for  
17 someone else's wastes.

18 For more than four  
19 years, since surveyors lied to me to gain  
20 access to my property, and the DOE sponsor  
21 pushed the hoped for project of a synthetic  
22 fuels project across the lake from my  
23 property, I have witnessed the lack of  
24 concern for the delicate environment which we  
25 have in this area. The giant push DOE

1       exerted to bring this plant into my own front  
2       yard would have polluted the area far beyond  
3       any of our nightmares. This indicated a lack  
4       of concern for our air, our water and our  
5       soil.

6                       Recent revelations of  
7       mercury spills covered up for years by DOE  
8       have not enhanced this department's  
9       credibility among us either. Suddenly  
10      credibility becomes incredibility. Under the  
11      guise of national security, agents have kept  
12      sealed facts highly relevant to our area's  
13      environment. How many other spills, leaks,  
14      and dumpings have been covered up as the  
15      mercury has been? We wonder. The coverup of  
16      the mercury contamination would have been a  
17      disaster when dredging for the synfuels plant  
18      would have been accomplished, yet we did not  
19      hear one peep out of any of the EIS hearings,  
20      nothing. DOE said nothing. It was not  
21      brought up in the EIS hearings for the  
22      synfuels plant. Nobody knew about it. Yet,  
23      the mercury contaminated sediments of Watts  
24      Bar would have been stirred up right in my  
25      own yard. I resent this. This is just



1 another indication of how dangerous a coverup  
2 can be and what it leads to and what its end  
3 results are.

4 Toxics and radioactive  
5 wastes already exist in this area which will  
6 contaminate the water and soil for many, many  
7 years into our future. Why compound an  
8 already existing problem by adding to it?  
9 Simply because the Federal government owns  
10 the land is not enough reason for me. I'm  
11 quite sure that Hooker Chemical Company owned  
12 the property that contaminated so beautifully  
13 a few decades ago Love Canal.

14 Bringing radioactive  
15 wastes into the area last summer set another  
16 precedent when residues from a commercial  
17 enterprise was happily accepted by local DOE  
18 officials for disposal. Why did Rhode Island  
19 managers not dispose of their own nuclear  
20 wastes?

21 Because I have chosen  
22 this area as my permanent home, I do not  
23 relish the thought of its becoming a dumping  
24 ground for wastes of any kind. And because I  
25 distrust DOE's motives, both from its past

1 performance and its continuous efforts to  
2 attract wastes generated from other  
3 facilities, I voice a vehement opposition to  
4 expanding Oak Ridge's role in hazardous  
5 disposal. Thank you.

6 MR. BIBB: Harold  
7 Jernigan.

8 MR. JERNIGAN: Thank  
9 you, Mr. Bibb, for the opportunity of being  
10 here. My name is Harold Jernigan. I am a  
11 member of the Oak Ridge City Council. While  
12 I'm here as an elected representative of the  
13 City, I'm talking as a private individual of  
14 the City. I spoke from the council floor  
15 when the decision for bringing the waste from  
16 Rhode Island was before us. I was opposed to  
17 that under those conditions at that time. As  
18 I spoke out recently in a council meeting  
19 just recently when DOE was before council in  
20 discussing the Niagara Falls problems, I must  
21 compliment DOE on its openness, on its  
22 willingness to evaluate things much  
23 differently now than they have in the many  
24 years past. Just in light of the  
25 consideration of the Niagara Falls, we have

1       this opportunity to speak out, where in Rhode  
2       Island in bringing that here, we did not.

3                       I am concerned with the  
4       people in Niagara Falls and I recognize their  
5       problems and their concerns and their desires  
6       to be able to clean up an area that would be  
7       nice to have. I want us to consider one  
8       thing that would be -- I guess my words will  
9       probably be basically on the socioeconomic  
10      impact of the City, that this transfer of  
11      waste material here is not private  
12      enterprise. And to my knowledge, there has  
13      been no discussion of it being on the tax  
14      roll or any means of reimbursing the City or  
15      the County for the impact that it may or may  
16      not have. I have not heard it discussed  
17      whether it would have, you know, a positive  
18      impact and maybe the City should pay for it  
19      if it does. If it's negative, then I think  
20      the Federal Government that is making this  
21      decision should recognize those things,  
22      should discuss those items with the City, and  
23      let us understand what we are really and  
24      truly talking about.

25                       I have been a member of

1 the City Council for some number of years.  
2 I'm getting tired of the problems of going to  
3 the Federal Government, the DOE, and talking  
4 about their in lieu of tax payments or their  
5 assistance to us, to the City. I think it's  
6 mandatory that the government recognize that  
7 these type of actions create that much  
8 greater problem for us to become  
9 self-sufficient, not only this City, but the  
10 two or three surrounding counties. These  
11 problems have not been addressed. I would  
12 certainly hope that they would be fully  
13 addressed in the decisions.

14 I think we need to, and  
15 it's been talked about, the alternative  
16 number two that was discussed earlier. As I  
17 understand that, that's to store it located  
18 in its original location. The problem of  
19 transporting fuel here, that creates some  
20 problems. So I would just hope that in these  
21 considerations that the full socioeconomic  
22 impact to this community, this county, would  
23 be fully discussed. And if the decision is  
24 made to bring other wastes here, then let's  
25 talk dollars, because I will assure you that

1       it is creating problems when we go out and  
2       try to bring other industry and other people  
3       and other residents into our community. It  
4       creates that problem.

5                       I would hope that we  
6       fully look at the soil conditions of this  
7       area. I think you realize that this City is  
8       having a great problem of trying to find a  
9       place to store its normal residential  
10      landfill and waste problems. We have to  
11      transport it some distance. The perk  
12      conditions of the land will not satisfy  
13      normal household landfills. And then I have  
14      to explain to my constituency that, yes, it  
15      might satisfy the other type storage. If it  
16      will store it, if there is dollars to be made  
17      here, let's talk about those. But please do  
18      not bring additional waste to the City as the  
19      Rhode Island waste was brought here, and as  
20      other waste has been brought here without any  
21      consideration of the problems of the  
22      socioeconomic impact of the City. Thank you  
23      very much for the opportunity to speak.

24                   MR. BIBB: Thank you,  
25      sir. Russ Driver.

1 MR. DRIVER: I speak as  
2 a relative newcomer to Oak Ridge. I have  
3 lived here about three years now. For most  
4 of my time in Oak Ridge, I believe I have  
5 been as enthusiastic as any promoter in Oak  
6 Ridge. I honestly have liked Oak Ridge  
7 better than any place I have ever lived. And  
8 now, in light of recent events, I think that  
9 my endorsement of the City, say to a  
10 prospective resident, would have to be  
11 considerably qualified.

12 Just in recent months we  
13 have learned that a total of 2.4 million  
14 pounds of mercury has been leaked into our  
15 soil here, that 28,700 barrels of undefined  
16 waste which was rejected by Rhode Island was  
17 shipped here as reported in the August 5th  
18 issue of the "Knoxville Journal." And now  
19 the consideration of a reported six million  
20 tons of radioactive waste from the Manhattan  
21 Project.

22 Personally, I have  
23 concern for the health of my son and I have  
24 concerns about property values. And I think  
25 about the economic impact on this community

1       which obviously needs more young families,  
2       more clean industry for economic reasons.  
3       And I can't see any way that the shipment of  
4       all this waste down here can help the City.

5                       Considering the fact  
6       that the nuclear industry is a relatively  
7       young industry, I think it's safe to say that  
8       the full health and environmental impacts of  
9       long-term radioactive wastes are unknown.  
10      And so it's an experiment. So I finally ask  
11      why, in an area of high population density,  
12      bury all this waste, particularly considering  
13      the vast amount of government-owned land in  
14      unpopulated areas.

15                   MR. BIBB: Thank you,  
16      sir. Ladies and gentlemen, that completes  
17      all those who have asked to speak. If others  
18      still want to speak, if you would just let us  
19      know, we would certainly be happy to hear  
20      you. Otherwise, I want to thank you for  
21      coming out. I think the comments that you  
22      have given us tonight have been  
23      extraordinarily helpful. I assure you they  
24      will be considered and again my thanks on  
25      behalf of my colleagues here at DOE, the

1 Argonne National Laboratory Group that is  
2 working very hard to put the Environmental  
3 Impact Study together. I hope we can look  
4 forward to just as many helpful comments from  
5 you in the Draft Environmental Impact stage  
6 which hopefully won't be too far down the  
7 road. That completes this public scoping  
8 meeting. 9:50.

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25