

001312

EE16088

TECHNICAL SERVICES DIVISION (TSD) BACKFIT
(Documents dated prior to 1 November 1988)

FUSRAP COMMUNICATIONS DISTRIBUTION
DOE/ORO TECHNICAL SERVICES DIVISION (CE-53)
BECHTEL NATIONAL, INC. — JOB 14501

CCN _____

TSD ☐ COMM TYPE 3 T T

COMM REF _____

ADMIN RCD _____

SUBJECT MINUTS PUBLIC HEARING IN OAK RIDGE ON NESS EIS

09/20/84
FROM BIBB TO DIST COMM DATE 09/20/84

ADDR CODE 1 1 CLOSING CCN _____ WBS 202

SUBJECT CODE 2520 DOE FILE NO. _____

AFFECTED DOCUMENT _____

RESPONSE TRACKING INFORMATION

PRIMARY:	
OWED TO: _____	OWED BY: _____ (ORG) _____
(ORG) _____ TARGET DATE <u>1</u> / <u>1</u>	CLOSING CCN _____ COMPL DATE <u>1</u> / <u>1</u> CLOSING REF _____
SECONDARY:	
OWED TO: _____	OWED BY: _____ (ORG) _____
(ORG) _____ TARGET DATE <u>1</u> / <u>1</u>	CLOSING CCN _____ COMPL DATE <u>1</u> / <u>1</u> CLOSING REF _____

COMMENTS _____

PLEASE RETURN TO PDCC FOR CORRECTIONS

001313

EE16088

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
PUBLIC HEARING
AMERICAN MUSEUM OF SCIENCE AND ENERGY
OAK RIDGE, TENNESSEE
SEPTEMBER 20, 1984

MILLER & MILLER
Court Reporters
3100 DeKalb Drive — Knoxville, TN 37920
Phone: 577-2571
Johnny A. Miller Virginia M. Miller

001314

1 BILL BIBB: Good evening. My name is Bill Bibb. I
2 am director of the Energy Programs and Support Division of
3 the Oak Ridge Operations of the U.S. Department of Energy. I
4 will serve as your moderator of this public hearing in
5 connection with the draft environmental impact statement of
6 Long-Term Management of Radioactive Wastes, Residues.

7 This public hearing is being convened on September
8 the 20th, 1984, at 7:30 p.m. at the American Museum of Science
9 and Energy in Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

10 The draft environmental impact statement which
11 is the subject of this public hearing assesses the environmental
12 impacts of various alternatives that the Department of
13 Energy is considering for the long-term management of the
14 radioactive wastes and residues now stored at the Niagara Falls
15 Storage site near Lewiston, New York.

16 Among the alternatives being considered are to leave
17 the wastes and residues at the New York site with improved
18 containment for long-term management; ship the materials to
19 either the DOE Reservation in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, or the
20 DOE site near Richland, Washington, for long-term storage;
21 or dispose of the residues at either Oak Ridge or Hanford and
22 leave a portion of the wastes at the New York site or remove
23 them for disposal in the Atlantic Ocean, should such a
24 disposal be approved in the near future.

25 The radioactive materials in storage at the New York

1 facility are primarily residues resulting from the processing
2 of uranium ores during World War II, and slightly contaminated
3 soils that have been cleaned up from portions of the site and
4 from nearby properties. About 15,000 cubic yards of residues
5 and approximately 240,000 cubic yards of contaminated soils are
6 stored within a diked containment area at the New York site.

7 Although ongoing interim remedial actions have been
8 taken at the New York storage site to improve containment of
9 the wastes and residues, the Department of Energy must decide
10 how to manage these radioactive materials for the long-term.

11 Under the National Environmental Policy Act, the
12 U.S. Department of Energy is required to consider the impacts
13 of its proposed action on the quality of the environment.

14 On October 19th, 1983, a public scoping meeting was
15 held in Oak Ridge, Tennessee to obtain public comment and
16 suggestions on topics or concerns which should be considered
17 in preparing a draft environmental impact statement. The
18 draft statement contains major sections on: purpose and need
19 for decision; comparison of alternatives; affected environment,
20 including a three-site comparison of topography, geology,
21 seismology, hydrology, climate and ecology, land use,
22 population and socioeconomic; and environmental consequences
23 and risks, including radiological impacts and transportation
24 issues.

25 The draft environmental impact statement is subject

001316

1 to review and comment by appropriate federal, state and local
2 environmental agencies and the public. EE16088

3 Copies of the draft environmental impact statement
4 have been distributed to federal, state and local agencies,
5 and to organizations in New York, Tennessee and Washington
6 state, and other locations, for review and comment.

7 To assist in obtaining comments, DOE is conducting
8 public hearings in Lewiston, New York, Oak Ridge, Tennessee,
9 and in Richland, Washington.

10 After such comment, the final impact statement will
11 be prepared, incorporating appropriate comments received on
12 the draft and indicating how any significant issues raised
13 during the review process have been resolved.

14 All comments made at this hearing, plus any written
15 statements received by DOE by October 9, 1984, will appear in
16 the transcript. Written and oral comments will receive equal
17 consideration.

18 Copies of the draft environmental impact statement
19 have been placed on file, for public review at public libraries
20 in Oak Ridge, Clinton, and Kingston, Tennessee, the Lewistown,
21 New York Town Hall, and the public library in Richland,
22 Washington. Copies of the transcript of this public hearing
23 will be available in the public libraries of Oak Ridge,
24 Clinton and Kingston, Tennessee.

25 Persons wishing to make comments at this hearing were

1 invited to register in advance. Those who have not submitted
2 a request in advance may register to speak at the desk in the
3 back of the auditorium. E-16088

4 Copies of the notice which was published in the
5 Federal Register and copies of the draft environmental impact
6 statement are also available at the sign-up desk. If you
7 have earlier asked to be put on our mailing list to receive
8 a copy of the draft statement you need not sign up again to
9 receive a copy of the final statement when it is scheduled
10 to be published in early 1985.

11 I would like to again state that the purpose of this
12 public hearing, convened by the Department of Energy, is to
13 receive public comment on the draft environmental impact
14 statement prepared for the Long-Term Management of Radioactive
15 Wastes, Residues.

16 The hearing will not be conducted as an evidentiary
17 hearing and those who choose to make statements will not
18 questioned. The moderator's role is not to explain or
19 justify the draft environmental statement. My role is to see
20 that anyone who wishes to comment has an opportunity to do so
21 in an atmosphere which encourages maximum public participation.

22 I would like now to call our first speaker, the
23 Honorable Randy McAlley, State Representative from the State
24 of Tennessee.

25 RANDY MCNALLEY: Thank you, Mr. Bibb. Ladies and

001318

1 gentlemen, I'm Randy McNalley. I represent the 33rd **EE16088**
2 Legislative District in the State of Tennessee. I'm opposed
3 to the transfer of radioactive wastes from their present
4 storage site in Niagara Falls, New York, to a site on Oak Ridge's
5 DOE Reservation. My opposition is two-fold. First the
6 cost. The cost involved in removal, transfer and storage at
7 a site over a thousand miles away would be an unwarranted waste
8 of the tax payers' money. There is no justification to spend
9 that money. There would be no benefit. In fact, the only
10 benefit that I can see would be the imagined benefit for those
11 residents who live near the present storage site. The transfer
12 to Oak Ridge of wastes would have an astronomical cost with
13 no real benefit.

14 Second, the removal and transfer would be unsafe.
15 More radiation would be released in the excavation and the
16 transfer process than would be released over many decades of
17 storage. Furthermore, the transfer process would expose
18 large numbers of people to potential hazards on the highways
19 of this nation. In addition, a cross-country transfer would
20 run counter to the Congressional intent of Public Law 96-573,
21 which states that the Federal Government recognizes that the
22 management of low-level radioactive wastes is handled most
23 efficiently on a regional basis, and that the Congress of
24 the United States, in enacting that public law, has provided
25 for and encouraged the development of regional, low-level

001319

1 radioactive wastes compounds for a tool for disposal of such
2 wastes. # 16088

3 As the prime sponsor of Tennessee's Companion
4 Legislation, Southeastern Interstates Low-Level Radioactive
5 Wastes Compact, which is Tennessee Code Annotated 68-23-701,
6 the purpose and intent of the legislature was to insure both
7 the ecological and the economical management of low-level
8 radioactive wastes. Certainly, the transfer of these wastes
9 from New York to Oak Ridge is contrary to good ecological and
10 good economical management, whether you look at this from a
11 state, regional or national propsective.

12 In addition, I have some philosophical concerns. My
13 family has lived in this area for a number of years. I grew
14 up here. I've spent almost 30 years as a resident of
15 Anderson County in Oak Ridge. I have two young daughters
16 that grew up in this community, and we feel that each region
17 should dispose of wastes generated in that region through
18 some regional facility, through some reasonable compact, as
19 Congress has suggested, and we should not force -- we should
20 not be forced to take the radioactive wastes of other states
21 or other regions. Thank you.

22 MR. BIBB: Thank you, sir. Our next speaker is Mr.
23 Ken Yager, Roane County Executive.

24 MR. KEN YAGER: Thank you, Dr. Bibb. I have
25 submitted my remarks, which I will read into the record in just

001320

1 a moment, but I would express appreciation for this invitation
2 here, in spite of our last conversation here.

3 MR. BIBB: I hope we have that problem ironed out.

4 MR. YAGER: Well, I think we do, and I would be
5 remiss if I didn't say -- and I was asked twice why I wasn't
6 at the scoping hearings, and at least I didn't have any
7 knowledge of that, but we're doing better. I did get notice
8 about tonight's meeting. And I would also use the opportunity
9 to suggest to the Department, Dr. Bibb, that perhaps matters
10 of such vital interest to Roane County, that the Department
11 could schedule meetings in the County Seat at Roane County,
12 which is Kingston. For example, the hearing that we had on
13 K-25, that should have been a hearing in Kingston, and I
14 think that -- the statements here will reflect that perhaps a
15 hearing on this subject in Kingston was in order.

16 But, Dr. Bibb, I oppose the storing in Oak Ridge,
17 Roane County, any of the waste or residue presently found at the
18 Niagara Falls Storage Site.

19 The proposed site for the storage of any Niagara Falls
20 waste and/or residue, is drained by the tributaries of the
21 Clinch River, principally Grassy Creek, Bear Creek, and the
22 East Fork of Popular Creek. The Clinch River flows through
23 Roane County to Kingston, where it merges into the Tennessee
24 River. And the Tennessee River provides water for Kingston,
25 and recreational opportunities for thousands of swimmers and

001321

1 fisherman.

EE16088

2 It is easy to see why many people throughout Roane
3 County who depend on the Tennessee River for water, or for
4 recreational uses would be affected by the radioactive
5 contamination.

6 Moreover, the particular site in question is suitable
7 for industrial development -- witness the interest by the
8 Exxon Corporation in past years -- and the location of the
9 proposed site in Roane County would completely take the
10 property out of consideration by industrial prospects.

11 It is the Department of Energy's stated goal that
12 Roane County become self-sufficient to a point that it would
13 no longer depend on the Department's federal assistance
14 payments. A policy of taking the Niagara Falls' waste and
15 dumping it into Roane County is contrary to that goal and
16 would make it more difficult to become truly self-sufficient.

17 I do not support any effort that would make Roane
18 County the "dumping ground" for waste already located at the
19 Niagara Falls site. Leave the waste where it is rather than
20 contaminate other areas of the country, and increase the risk
21 of contamination in five other states, by transporting it
22 almost a thousand miles, from New York to Tennessee.

23 And, indeed, that is one consideration in the
24 DEIS on central waste disposal facilities, that it was
25 hazardous to move the waste out of Oak Ridge, so leave it in

001322

1 Oak Ridge. If the argument rings true in that case **E116088**
2 true here. Help Roane County become self-sufficient, protect
3 its citizens and keep the waste in New York. Thank you, Dr.
4 Bibb.

5 MR. BIBB: Thank you, sir. I'd like to call the
6 Honorable Ruby G. Lucky, mayor of Kingston.

7 MS. LUCKY: Thank you, Dr. Bibb. I too must reiterate
8 what our County Executive has said. I did not have prior
9 notice of the other hearings, and only received notice of this
10 hearing, officially, in our Roane County News yesterday. We
11 have a three-day a weeks newspaper, so if you send something
12 over on the weekend, we don't get it in the Monday paper for
13 a Thursday night meeting. We don't get it until -- you know,
14 until Wednesday. I mean, that's just the way the newspaper
15 works. When they don't -- when you don't have a daily
16 news.

17 I too am opposed to this proposal. The entire
18 City Council of the City of Kingston passed a resolution
19 opposing this waste, and I have a statement to read. "Radioactive
20 waste, a necessary evil: no one wants it in their state or in
21 their neighborhood. The Mayor and City Council of the City
22 of Kingston on September 11, 1984, passed a resolution as
23 follows in part: 'Be it resolved, that the City Council go
24 on record as opposing any and all efforts to bring radioactive
25 waste materials from outside the State of Tennessee to store in

001323

1 Roane County, Tennessee'."

EE16088

2 It is recognized by everyone that the Department of
3 Energy is confronted with a most difficult dilemma, that of
4 providing storage sites for radioactive wastes. Radioactive
5 waste is a frightening prospect to most of us. It presents
6 potential dangers to the health and life of humans, and to
7 inhabitants of the air, water and the earth. It is my fear
8 that many of us, as evidenced by the small crowd, I might
9 add, which includes my family who have lived and worked in and
10 around Oak Ridge for over 40 years, have become too complacent
11 about the dangers of radioactive matters. Many of the dangers
12 are yet to be discovered. Others are already known.

13 My concerns have increased the last few days as I
14 have studied DOE's report on the environmental impact for the
15 proposed construction of a facility for disposal of low-level
16 radioactive wastes in the Oak Ridge Reservation. This is
17 yet another waste disposal that is being proposed. If built,
18 it compounds the problems to be realized from additional
19 dangers of the transporting of radioactive wastes from the
20 State of New York, in Niagara Falls Storage Site.

21 In addition to the present holding ponds and other
22 storage sites in the Oak Ridge Reservation, five states
23 presently have radioactive waste facilities that belong to
24 DOE. Three states support commercial facilities. My question
25 is, is it feasible that the existing facilities be utilized in

001324
1 the storage of the low-level radioactive wastes, and in the
2 future build the necessary storage site in areas which are not
3 located near cities and waterways, which is the way they're
4 doing it now.

5 In closing, I would like to quote two statements that
6 I have taken from the C.W.E.F., environmental impact statement.
7 The Tennessee Department of Health and Environment in 1983
8 states, and I quote, "The present holding ponds in Oak Ridge
9 are leaking into Bear Creek; thereby resulting in discharges
10 to the waters of the State of Tennessee", end quote. In that
11 same statement, the H.E.W. gives June of 1985, and June of
12 1986, deadlines for two facilities to be closed. So we're
13 running over, is what I'm saying, and we're wanting to add
14 more to that. The second quote, under 4.5, cumulative
15 impact in the statement, quote, "Although not planned, there
16 is a potential for overlap with another project. The
17 disposal of Niagara Falls' storage site at the Pine Ridge
18 Site, the U.S. Department of Energy, 1984", end quotes. If
19 the Niagara Falls' project is implemented, the disposal of the
20 waste at the Oak Ridge Reservation, as proposed, one truck
21 hauling radioactive wastes will be brought into the Oak Ridge
22 Reservation every 60 seconds for two straight summers. The
23 central waste project will involve two trucks over those same
24 roads per hour, per eight hour shift, for four years. Thus
25 the accumulative" -- I'm still quoting from their statement --

E-16088

1 "Thus the accumulative transportation impact would result
2 increased traffic congestion, increased accidents, accelerated
3 deterioration of the roads, primarily due to the Niagara Falls
4 storage waste project" end quote.

5 As stated in the beginning, no one wants it, but
6 please don't make us the garbage heap for the whole country.
7 Thank you.

8 MR. BIBB: Thank you, ma'am. The Honorable Walter
9 L. Ford, member of the Kingston City Council.

10 MR. FORD: Thank you. I don't have a whole lot to
11 say tonight. I didn't know about this until really today,
12 I don't believe, the first time I heard about it, but I'm
13 Walter Ford. I'm a resident and city councilman for the City
14 of Kingston. I worked for Union Carbide for 36 years, and
15 retired September the 30th, 1981.

16 I know for a fact that we have enough nuclear waste
17 already stored in Oak Ridge to take care of our situation for
18 many years. The every present mercury pollution is with
19 us, and who knows what the next one will be from all the
20 stuff that's now buried. This is beginning to cause
21 concern to our local residents, to our local state and county
22 officials. We think we have enough of it stored already.
23 I am definitely opposed to the idea of bringing any nuclear
24 waste from the Niagara area or any other areas of the United
25 States and storing it in Roane County. Thank you.

E-16088

001326

1 MR. BIBB: Thank you, sir. Mr. Michael Walker
2 staff representative to the Oak Ridge Environmental Quality
3 Advisory Board.

4 MR. WALKER: Thank you, my name is Mike Walker, and
5 I am the Research and Budget Director for the City of Oak
6 Ridge Municipal Government. In my capacity I also serve as
7 the staff representative to the City's Environmental Quality
8 Advisory Board, EQAB. EQAB is an advisory board appointed
9 by the City Council to give advice and assistance on
10 environmental issues within the community.

11 I appreciate the opportunity to represent the City
12 and to present the official City response to the Draft
13 Environmental Impact Statement for the long-term management
14 of existing wastes currently located at the Niagara Falls, New
15 York Storage Site. This response was deliberated and
16 approved by the Oak Ridge City Council at their September
17 17, 1984, meeting, and is based on the review and
18 recommendations of EQAB.

19 The members of EQAB reviewed the DEIS to see
20 whether the concerns raised in their initial scope review
21 of September 13, 1983, were addressed adequately. In
22 general, they found the statement to be a useful evaluation
23 of the relative merits of the alternative sites. They
24 understand that a number of simplifying assumptions were made
25 for purposes of this evaluation that precluded detailed study

001327

1 of several questions that are potentially important to Oak
2 Ridge. However, the scale of inquiry that was chosen seems
3 adequate for distinguishing the major advantages and
4 disadvantages of the alternative geographical locations
5 within the United States, that being the existing site; Oak
6 Ridge and Hanford, Washington.

EE16088

7 Nevertheless, EQAB identified certain limitations
8 in the scope of the statement that warrants specific comments. The
9 first one is, the selection of one Oak Ridge site. Selection
10 of the Pine Ridge Knolls as the only Oak Ridge facility site
11 seems appropriate for the level of present detail in comparisons
12 among alternative geographical locations within the United
13 States. However, there were several questions raised in the
14 initial scoping comments that relate to the appropriateness
15 of selecting specific sites on the reservation, particularly
16 in relation to the technical siting features, such as soils
17 and drainage from alternative developments, such as other
18 DOE facilities, private sector industrial development. Should
19 Oak Ridge be selected as the preferred alternative, the
20 City would expect a more thorough treatment of these topics.

21 The second limitation was a lack of consideration
22 of the cumulative impacts. Limitation of the scope of the
23 DEIS not to include cumulative impacts of the proposed
24 facility and existing Oak Ridge waste storage facilities seems
25 contrary to the spirit of the National Environmental Protection

1 Act. For example, airborne radiological doses will arise from
2 the total emplacement of waste, not just those from Niagara
3 Falls. The impact on the local ecosystem and human community
4 would seem to depend on the sum, in terms of composition and
5 magnitude, of locally generated waste and that imported from
6 Niagara Falls.

7 The third limitation was land preemption. Beyond a
8 mere statement of preemption, the environmental statement
9 does not explore the consequences to the Oak Ridge area of
10 removing the Pine Ridge Knolls site from other potential
11 uses. Subdividing the original Exxon Tract may reduce its
12 attractiveness for other job-producing facilities. The
13 statement does not explore the compatibility of storing off-
14 site waste with long-range plans for Oak Ridge self-sufficiency.
15 EQAB also identifies specific points of error or omission in
16 the DEIS document that warrant attention in the final impact
17 statement. The first one is, that the Oak Ridge National
18 Environmental Research Park is a designated use for 13,000
19 acres of the Oak Ridge Reservation. This fact is not
20 acknowledged in the report. The second point, the text
21 promises a discussion in Appendix D of off-site sources for
22 fill used to cover the wastes; yet, the appendix does not
23 include it. Three, chemical modification of the wastes and
24 residues is considered for the Niagara Falls site, but not the
25 Oak Ridge site. On-site chemical immobilization was not

E-16088

001329

1 discussed. Four, geological faulting on the Oak Ridge Reservation is mentioned but faults are not located, nor is
2 their capacity indicated. Five, the population area of Oak
3 Ridge is underestimated in figures such as Figure 3.13. The
4 Southwest quadrant contains residences, and these may be the
5 closest to the proposed disposal site. Also, Oak Ridge is
6 located in both Anderson and Roane Counties, not just
7 Anderson, as was indicated in the report. Six, we believe
8 that the Northfork-Southern Railway has access to the Oak
9 Ridge Gaseous Diffusion Plant as well as to the City of
10 Knoxville.

11
12 Although the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
13 does not conclude with a preferred alternative for management
14 of the Niagara Falls Storage Site wastes and residues, the
15 thrust of the material presented leads the reader toward
16 favoring the New York site. This being the case, the City
17 believes that the level of detail on Oak Ridge is appropriate
18 and sufficient. However, if Oak Ridge were the site selected,
19 the level of detail is inadequate to assess alternate facility
20 locations on the Reservation in terms of environmental and
21 socioeconomic impacts.

22 In summary, if DOE were to select Oak Ridge as its
23 storage location, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
24 would require significant additional study and evaluation.
25 In particular, the selection of the Pine Ridge Knolls site and

E-16088

001330

1 exclusion of alternate sites; the cumulative impacts of the
2 proposed and existing Oak Ridge waste facilities; and the
3 preemption of a portion of the Exxon Tract for private,
4 taxable investment and self-sufficiency efforts were
5 inadequately addressed in the statement.

6 In light of the Departmental Environmental Impact
7 Statement deficiencies identified by EQAB, the the separate
8 proposal to build a new central waste storage facility for
9 Oak Ridge facilities-generated wastes, the Oak Ridge City
10 Council opposed the transfer of Niagara Falls waste to the Oak
11 Ridge Reservation. Thank you very much.

12 MR. BIBB: Thank you, sir. I would only comment, I
13 know EQAB has spent a great deal of time in doing this, and
14 it become very helpful, and we appreciate it very much.

15 Mr. James A. Young.

16 MR. YOUNG: I'm Jim Young, a native of Anderson
17 County. I presently live in Roane County. Have for the p.
18 21 years. I was a little surprised a couple of weeks ago to
19 pick up a Knoxville newspaper and see that I was an anti-
20 nuclear activist. I feel very highly complimented to be called
21 an activist, but I'm like Mr. Fuller, I spent most of my
22 working years with Union Carbide at the Y-12 Plant, and I don't
23 ever recall making an anti-nuclear statement. I opposed the
24 Kopper's Plant two years ago that the Department of Energy
25 locally was pushing because it was right across the lake from

1 my home. I oppose this proposal vehemently because I think we
2 have enough problems in this area without importing any more.

3 Apparently, the technicology, from all I can gather,
4 from this thing, the technicology of containing this stuff up
5 there and down here is essentially the same. We've got more
6 rainfall here than they have in Niagara. But the people up
7 there don't want it. So it's become a political thing. Well,
8 we don't want it either. And I think that the past history of
9 those operations of the Department of Energy should be taken
10 into consideration. The mishandling of wastes, toxic and
11 radioactive, have a lot to be desired in the last 30, 40
12 years, let's face it. We're in trouble in this state.

13 Up until a week ago there were radiation signs along
14 New 95 at White Oak Lake. Yesterday they weren't there. I
15 don't know when they were removed or whether there's no more
16 radioactive leakage out at White Oak Lake, or what.

17 But I would direct your attention to a couple of
18 sentences in this draft. It says several creeks in the Oak
19 Ridge area have been found to contain substantial amounts of
20 contamination. Mind you, there's a laundry list of toxics in
21 this soil and stuff that's stored at Niagara, as well as
22 radioactive material. They're the same problems that we've
23 been facing. There's mercury, which we've heard enough
24 about. Mercury and other contaminates have been found in the
25 East Fork of Popular Creek. Bear Creek and White Oak Creek are

1 also contaminated with radioactive materials. Grassy Creek
2 which drains most of the Pine Ridge Knoll site has a mostly
3 undeveloped watershed, and it's relatively uncontaminated.
4 They've found a stream in the reservation that's uncontaminated,
5 so let's go get it. I'm going to propose my opposition in a
6 written statement, and I will submit it to you before the
7 19th of October.

8 In closing, I would like to go back to the newspaper
9 coverage. Last October, in the scoping hearings, we had
10 11 people, I believe, present to oppose the draft. The next
11 day's Oak Ridger -- and Ms. Foster tells me she was not in
12 town, so we won't put the blame on her -- but said most of the
13 opposition came from people from outside. If you'll take a
14 look at the Niagara scoping hearings, about half of those
15 people were from Canada. I wonder what Oak Ridgers would think
16 if the Canadians were coming in and testifying against locating
17 the waste in Lewistown, New York.

18 And I said, I was born in Anderson County. I've
19 lived in this area most of my life, and I consider myself
20 less an outsider than I consider the Oak Ridger. Thank you.

21 MR. BIBB: Thank you, sir. Mr. F. Dalemar Bender.

22 MR. BENDER: Thank you, Dr. Bibb. I'm a retired
23 engineer who is interested as a resident of Oak Ridge. In
24 my opinion, for what it's worth, the Oak Ridge area is not
25 suitable for storage of any waste. As have already been said,

EC-16088

001333

EX-16088

1 Oak Ridge is surrounded by water; Popular Creek on the north;
2 Clinch River on the other three sides; and other streams
3 draining from the area into that water. The streams eventually
4 flow into the water supply for cities downstream. Per the
5 environmental statement that we're discussing tonight, Oak
6 Ridge has a humid environment with an annual 53-inch rainfall.
7 To quote again from the same environmental statement, "ground
8 water will eventually be unavoidably contaminated in all
9 alternatives." That's from the environmental statement that
10 we are discussing tonight.

11 If waste material is to be hauled, let me suggest
12 that DOE's Nevada operation's office is interested in storing
13 the waste and is currently storing waste as its Nevada test
14 site. It just so happens that I have a pamphlet from the DOE
15 Nevada office, and the test site apparently is looking for
16 business. They say, "The Nevada test site covers 800,000
17 acres, 800,000." We have what, 30 some odd thousand --

18 MR. BIBB: Thirty-seven.

19 MR. BENDER: According to their statement here,
20 "Waste burial, large, isolated land areas make N.T.S., Nevada
21 Test Site, suitable for disposal of low-level radioactive
22 wastes from the nation's defense programs." N.T.S. accepts
23 drums and boxes and so forth. The trenches are covered with
24 a minimum of soil. Low Nevada rainfall prevents percolation
25 of the radioactivity through the watertable several hundred

001334

1 feet below. I think that our watertable is a little shallower than several hundred feet. E-16088

2
3 They also say, "Portions of the N.T.S. are being
4 evaluated for possible commercial nuclear wastes isolation
5 sites for three principal reasons. One, the N.T.S. has
6 potentially suitable geological formations available with
7 deep water tables -- low water tables and long flow-paths to
8 eventual discharge areas. Two, the N.T.S. is controlled by
9 DOE and already requires long-term radiological monitoring
10 because of past nuclear weapons testing. Three, N.T.S. has
11 a substantial work force experience in drilling and mining."
12 With 800,000 acres at the test site, versus our 35,000
13 acres here, which includes a 35,000 -- includes the
14 residential, agricultural, commercial, recreational land. The
15 test site to me must obviously have more and better waste
16 storage space available. Thank you.

17 MR. BIBB: Thank you, sir. Ms. Suzanne Williams

18 MS. WILLIAMS: My name is Susan Williams. I grew
19 up in Oak Ridge, and I'm presently a resident of Anderson
20 County. I am opposed to the option of bringing the Niagara
21 Falls Storage Site low-level radioactive waste to Oak Ridge.
22 I feel there are any number of reasons that make Oak Ridge a
23 very poor site for this waste. The cost of bringing the waste
24 here is estimated to be 11 to 40 times the cost of leaving the
25 waste where it is. This additional cost, ranging from sixty

001335

EE16088

1 to a hundred and twenty-seven million dollars of the taxpayer's
2 money would be much better spent in cleaning up the sites here
3 on the Oak Ridge Reservation, sites that contain all sorts of
4 hazardous and radioactive wastes that are right now contaminating
5 ground and surface water. The transportation route proposed
6 would bring 16,000 trucks through Knoxville on I-40 and then
7 onto White Weem Road. This does not include trucks carrying
8 fill material to the burial site, that DEIS says this will
9 be one truck every minute during the two summers. White Weem
10 Road is a curvy, hilly road, which would increase the risk of
11 accidents; especially in the summer with the traffic to the
12 Melton Hill Dam area, which is a recreational area.

13 DEIS says there will be significant transportation
14 related to injuries and death in transportating the waste to
15 Oak Ridge. There is no good reason to cause a significant
16 risk by bringing the waste here.

17 In addition, Anderson County and Roane County are
18 frantically searching for alternate economic development. If
19 this area becomes known as a nuclear waste dump, it's hard
20 to imagine that industry and people from other places would
21 chose to live here, because people will not choose to live near
22 radioactive wastes sites. In addition, the proposed site is
23 a prime potential industrial site. Placing wastes there likely
24 insures that no development will ever take place in that area.

25 Oak Ridge in general is a very poor area for disposal.

001336

EE16088

1 due to the geology and hydrology of the area. The method
2 proposed for the disposal for this material in Oak Ridge looks
3 like little more than a fancy landfill to me. And I've heard
4 all sorts of people say all landfills leak. This looks like
5 a continuation of the policy that dilution is the solution to
6 pollution. It's indeed evident that this waste will eventually
7 leak out polluting surface and ground water.

8 If Oak Ridge is full of scientists who understand
9 methods and technology for disposal, then why do we keep seeing
10 proposals for land burial for wastes; especially wastes that
11 will remain radioactive for thousands of years. The Niagara
12 Falls Storage Site waste consists of about 200,000 cubic meters
13 of radioactive material. The DOE Oak Ridge Reservation already
14 has at least 349,000 cubic meters of radioactive waste. The
15 current radioactive waste in Oak Ridge has already contaminated
16 White Oak Lake, which is fenced off from public use due to
17 the contamination.

18 Most of the waste in Oak Ridge has not yet begun
19 to be cleaned up, which makes it even more absurd to bring in
20 more waste to our area. DOE needs to show good faith by
21 cleaning up this area; not bad faith by using Oak Ridge for a
22 dump for what no one else wants. DEIS says that it is not
23 even known if there is enough space on Pine Ridge Knoll for
24 the waste. If DOE doesn't even know if there's room up there,
25 then it's a wonder what else is not known about that site.

001337

E-16088

1 From DEIS it also looks like there might be limestone underlying
2 parts of the disposal area, which could contain solution
3 cavities, which would increase the potential for groundwater
4 pollution.

5 All I can say is, it looks like the option of bringing
6 waste to Oak Ridge is proposed because someone thought people
7 in this area would not care, not because it was a good waste
8 disposal area. Well, I've asked a lot of my friends and
9 neighbors about this proposal, and I can safely say that
10 people do not want more waste brought here. We've got enough
11 problems here already. Thank you.

12 MR. BIBB: Thank you. Robert Peelle.

13 MR. PEELLE: I'd like to hit the highpoint of my
14 written comments. I'm Robert Peelle. I'm the Roane County
15 Legislator serving Roane County, Oak Ridge. In the draft
16 impact statement my comments as a scope observer are
17 attributed to John Peelle, with the same last name, but I
18 don't say that diligently.

19 I think it's a good report. I believe it will help
20 the decision makers come to a reasonable conclusion. It
21 certainly focused my own views of the matter, in terms of the
22 following rhetorical questions. Once this analysis has been
23 done, why any longer should we consider long-distance
24 transport of the wastes and residues when that action would
25 cause a tenth of a billion dollars and cause death to some

001338

EE-16088

1 transport workers, and the only gain would be to remove some
2 ore treatment tailings from an area adjacent to a hazardous
3 materials site in Niagara Falls and put them on a clean, rural
4 hillside drained by one of the few remaining pristine streams
5 on the Oak Ridge Reservation? If my paraphrase of the report's
6 findings is at all just, such a federal action would be
7 unthinkable.

8 Though I believe the report correctly points toward
9 the right decision, if I read it correctly, I did find some
10 details which should be corrected before the final statement
11 is issued. I think it's -- some of them were not errors. Some
12 of them are what I consider omissions. It does -- the report
13 does refer to a number of deaths that may occur using usual
14 laws of average, mostly in the transportation area. I think
15 it's -- even though quantifications of the value of human
16 life is very imperfect, I think it's worthwhile to consider the
17 assessment to add that cost in. Usually it's some milli
18 dollars per life. It's depending on the age, I suppose.
19 Also I think it should be possible, with detailed minimal
20 effort, to make some estimate of the value of retaining unpolluted
21 land on the reservation. We've heard concerns about that
22 tonight, and I think it's possible to assign a value to it;
23 especially, when we know there is so little clean land left
24 on the reservation.

25 The Department of Energy is long-lived, but it will

001339

1 not last forever, and we must derive substances -- ^{OR OUR} ~~EE~~ 16088
2 descendants must, when DOE is history.

3 The conceptual designs of waste storage areas seem
4 to be at their edges, at least, or long unbroken slopes, which
5 I think was not -- not usually done to help control erosion.
6 Perhaps that a detail that should be -- would be revised in
7 the final design. No details are given of what monitoring
8 would be required other than visual inspection of erosion at
9 the waste site during the 200 years it assumes some care will
10 be given. In order to see what institutions will be required,
11 I think that ought to be probably elaborated a little.

12 The report correctly suggests that it's hard to know
13 what will happen in 200 years in terms of keeping a site
14 with hazardous materials identified. Some people will stay
15 away from it. And I'm -- the report refers to this problem,
16 but essentially says that it's impossible to imagine that
17 Congress has appropriated money into the future to do the
18 monitoring and perfectual care. But I think it's necessary
19 in dealing with such an assessment to assume that that's
20 possible and identify the cause, which apparently -- for 200
21 years, pumping like \$20 million more or less, it's possible
22 that there's a way that could be found. For instance, the
23 Federal Government could make a lump-sum payment to a
24 perpetual entity, like the State of Tennessee, and in the
25 contract that goes with that lump-sum payment require that that

001340

EE-16088

1 has to be invested in federal securities with the income to
2 be used to perform stated tasks at the site. For certainly
3 purposes of cost assessment that could be done, here or in
4 any state.

5 Finally, there are a few things in the report that
6 are errors and don't need to be there, and I think it would be
7 better to remove them. For instance, twice the statement is
8 made that health and emergency services in the surrounding
9 county areas are more than adequate. I'm not sure about
10 Anderson County and Loudon County, but I know that Roane County,
11 in the county area, we do not have police and fire protection
12 that is adequate by any written standards that I've ever seen.
13 It's not a correct fact, and it should be removed from the
14 statement. Thank you.

15 MR. BIBB: Thank you, sir. That's all the speakers
16 who have signed up. Before closing, I'd like to give you
17 more opportunity, if there are those who didn't sign up, that
18 wish to speak. We'd be pleased to hear from you. If not, I
19 want to personally thank each of you for taking time to come
20 out. Those of you who are preparing written statements, we'd
21 appreciate it very much if you'll time your statement -- in
22 review of the draft, the comments will be very helpful, and
23 personally appreciated very much. And I'd like to call this
24 hearing to a close at 8:20.

25 (Whereupon hearing was concluded)