COPY

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

In Re: Proposed Plan for an Interim Action at PIT 9 at the Radioactive Waste Management Complex.

PUBLIC MEETING

JANUARY 7, 1992

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO

ANN MARSHALL, MODERATOR

PANEL MEMBERS:

JERRY LYLE: Acting Deputy Assistant Manager, Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Division, DOE-ID

DEAN MYGARD: Department of Health & Welfare, State of Idaho

MARY JANE NEARMAN: Regional Project Manager, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency

JIM WADE: Pit 9 Acting Project Manager, DOE-ID

BILL CRAFT: Pit 9 Project Manager, EG&G-ID

BOB NITSCHKE: Chemical and Radiological Risk Assessment Unit, EG&G-ID

Reported by:
Karen Konvalinka, C.S.R.

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

THE MODERATOR: Good evening and welcome to tonight's meeting on the Proposed Plan for an Interim Action at Pit 9 at the INEL. We're really glad all of you came out tonight on this cold and blustery night, and we look forward to a productive meeting.

I am Ann Marshall. I work for Advance Sciences, and DOE Idaho has asked me to moderate this meeting. As Moderator, I see my task as two-fold. First, to move us through the agenda in a way that assures that everyone who wishes can participate fully in the meeting, and secondly, to try to help you get out of the meeting quickly enough to go home and spend some time with your family. In fact, we recognize that's probably one of a dozen things you'd rather be doing tonight, and we appreciate the fact that you've come out for the meeting.

First, let's introduce the folks up front. On my left and your right we have the representatives of the three agencies. At the far end of the table is Jerry Lyle. He's the Acting Deputy Assistant Manager of DOE Idaho's Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program. Next to him is Mary Jane Nearman. She's the EPA Regional Project - - Remedial Project Manager, and I believe this is your first meeting at the INEL, and I'd like to welcome you,

Mary Jane. Next to Mary Jane is Dean Nygard. He's with the Idaho Department of Health & Welfare. He's the Project Manager for the Federal Facilities Agreement & Consent Order.

On the other side we have Jim Wade, who is DOE Idaho Pit 9 Acting Project Manager, the first person here. Right next to him is Bill Craft, who is EG&G's Project Manager for Pit 9. And at the end of the table is Bill Nitschke - - I'm sorry, Bob Nitschke is EG&G Unit Manager for the Chemical & Radiological Risk Assessment Unit. Both Bill and Bob have been working with DOE Idaho to prepare the respective documents for the Pit 9 Interim Action.

There are a couple of other people I'd like to point out. At the back of the room standing there is Reuel Smith. He's the INEL Community Affairs Representative. He's probably the person who greeted you at the door. He's responsible for meetings like this and for a variety of public involvement activities.

At the front we have Nick Nichols. He's the INEL Public Affairs Officer. As you know, tonight's meeting is focused on the Pit 9 Interim Action. If you have other questions you'd like to have answered, we ask that you direct them through Nick, and he will help you get your questions answered.

Let's take a moment to look at the agenda. In

just a moment. Jim will take over to set forth the purpose of the meeting, give you a little background of Pit 9, provide an overview of the Pit 9 project concerns and objectives, describe the proposed remediation alternatives and answer some questions on issues that have come up to date. He'll conclude with a sequence of events of how the process will work, and after that we will have a period for questions and answers. These will be questions of clarification on the presentation or on the interim remedial action.

Finally, there will be a formal comment session when you can make your interests and concerns on the Pit 9 Interim Action known to the agency representatives.

A couple of little administrative matters. The comment period for the Pit 9 Interim Action or Proposed Plan for the Interim Action began on December 13th and will end on January 12th. If you need a copy of the Proposed Plan, there are copies at the back of the room.

You will notice that we have a Court Reporter here tonight. She will prepare a transcript of tonight's meeting, and it will be placed in the information repositories.

And now I'd like to turn the meeting over to Jim Wade.

MR. WADE: Thank you, Ann. I'd like to take a

minute and thank you folks for coming out tonight, also. I understand the weather and the time constraints, and we're very appreciative you're here to help us figure out the best solution for remedial activities at the INEL.

We're going to jump right into the purpose of the meeting. The purpose of the meeting, as is the purpose of the Proposed Plan, is to select the preferred alternative for remediating the Pit 9 out at the RWMC. Our proposed Plan has identified several alternatives that we have evaluated against the evaluation criteria, and it identifies what we, as the agency, believes is the preferred alternative.

The purpose of the meeting tonight is to get your input on not only the preferred alternative, but all the alternatives identified, and to make sure that we're going to do the right thing at the RWMC and at the INEL with regards to remediation.

The bullet here about describing other remedial options, if we have an option or an alternative that wasn't considered as part of our Proposed Plan, we still take comments on those. If we're not looking at all the problems or issues, we need your help to help us make sure we're going to do the right thing.

We're going to jump now into a little history on the RMWC and where is Pit 9. This picture here shows - -

and I'm going to have to step away from the microphone. If you have trouble hearing, let me know. Let me grab the pointer. This picture shows - - this is the RWMC, located in the southwest corner of the INEL. This area here - - this area here is called the Subsurface Disposal Area. This corner right here - - can you hear me okay, or should I stand by the microphone?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Stand by the mike.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can hear you.

MR. WADE: Okay, I heard a "mike" and a "I can hear you," so I'll stand by the mike.

This corner right here is where Pit 9 is located within the Subsurface Disposal Area, and we have another slide - - Doug?

Now within the Subsurface Disposal Area, this kind of clarifies it as to where Pit 9 is located.

REUEL SMITH: Jim, can we ask you to move the slide to the top of the screen as much as possible there?

MR. WADE: Forgive us for having to do it. We had a wireless mike set up, and it wasn't working right, so we've got to try to make this work this way. Can everybody see this now? Okay, Doug?

Now Pit 9 is an inactive waste disposal site that was active in the pre-1970 days when this is the way

transuranic waste was disposed of prior to 1970. Transuranic waste consisting primarily of long-lived radioactive isotopes. It was containerized and then dumped in the pit, covered with soil, and then covered with another bed of soil to help minimize the chance of it spreading to existing or surrounding areas.

What is in Pit 9? We have radioactive and hazardous wastes. These wastes are made up of process sludges and other materials from processes involved, and, I'm sorry, process sludges and graphite and other equipment from Rocky Flats and also from the INEL. Our waste forms are the drums for approximately the drums, approximately 4,000 drums and 2,000 boxes of - - and now if we could switch over to that other slide, Doug.

This is an example of a sludge drum. This is not actual waste. It's an example of how the drums were packaged with the waste, and then the next slide is how the boxes were packaged with the waste. These are examples of how the waste was packaged prior to being buried in the pit.

The volumes of waste we're talking about, the waste itself is approximately 150,000 cubic feet, 110,000 cubic feet of transuranic waste and 40,000 cubic feet of INEL low level waste. This waste buried in the pit, as the previous slide showed, and then covered with soil is where we get the interstitial soil, the soil that surrounds the boxes and

barrels, and could possibly have become contaminated based on breaching of the drums or the boxes degrading.

We then cover that soil with the overburden soil, which is approximately 250,000 cubic feet that is used to cover, to prevent the contaminated waste from being on the surface. It gives us a total volume of 750,000 cubic feet.

Now what's the problem with - - oh, I'm sorry, I'm jumping. We got confused. How is this waste arranged in the pit? This area down here is where the majority of the Rocky Flats transuranic contaminated waste is at. Now we know that it's actually intermingled throughout the pit, based on some flooding that's occurred out at the Site and some other reasons. We believe it's just all through there, but some of the INEL low level waste that we know of, these large metal objects located at the north end of the pit that is low level waste that we believe will be relatively easy to decontaminate or actually might not even have to remediate, based on
the - - they're not part of the transuranics.

What's the problem? The problem is that Pit 9 has approximately 18 kilograms of uncontained americium and plutonium. To put that in perspective of 18 kilograms, it's roughly 40 pounds. And when you think of - - I'm trying to think how best to relate this to what is what. The only thing I can think of, if you look at what's in your smoke

detector in your house, believe it or not your smoke detector in your house has a small amount of americium in it, on the ten nanocurie level. So we're talking about a miniscule amount, as opposed to what we believe is roughly 40 pounds spread out throughout this entire pit. Why is so much in there being a problem? Because americium and plutonium have long-lived half lives, in the thousands of years. This stuff will be there for a long time, and the problem will exist far into the future, which leads us into the problem of the americium and plutonium could present a risk to the RWMC workers if migration occurs to the surface.

How do we think migration to the surface occurs? Most people think it's going to be rain. Well, you have plants growing out there and animals burrowing in the dirt. They could be bringing this stuff to the surface. Once it gets to the surface, then dust or wind or workers in the area could then cause it to be in inhalation problem, and it could also lead it to be an exposure problem. And those are two primary risks identified in a Preliminary Risk Evaluation, which has led us into this Interim Action.

What are we trying to accomplish? What are our project objectives? We want to implement an Interim Action, which is also going to be - - which is going to be an effective solution, but also lead us toward a final action. An interaction is there to reduce the risk immediately, and

the final action is something that you're going to do so that you can, basically, close it up and not have to worry about it anymore. We want to make this Interim Action lead to a final action with minimum extra work required to perform a final action.

We want to eliminate the near term risks. By removing the plutonium and americium from the pit, we're eliminating the risks to the workers at the RWMC, should it migrate to the surface.

We want to accelerate the start of remediation at the RWMC. We want to be responsive to what the public and concerned citizens are asking us to do. We've got a lot of waste buried out there. We want to be responsive, and if we can start to clean it up now, we want to do that. This project is going to help provide data to us in planning remediation to the rest of the Site. Pit 9 is a small area as compared to the 88 acres of the SDA, Subsurface Disposal Area. Any information we can help gather that's going to help us remediate the entire Site is going to be beneficial.

We also want to ensure cost-effective use of funding. We don't want to be wasting money on a project that isn't going to work.

Now we're going to get into the Proposed Plan.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could I ask you something on the slide?

MR. WADE: Yes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: What do the years mean from 1990 to 1992?

MR. WADE: Okay, we have what - - we've negotiated with the State a Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order, or it was formerly referred to as an Inter-Agency Agreement, IGA - - IAG, I'm sorry. I want to go shopping.

In that document, we identified the Pit 9 activity as remediation activity starting in approximately 1999. We have accelerated that schedule to commence remedial activities right now. Does that answer your question?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes, thank you.

MR. WADE: Did everybody hear that question? Should I repeat the question or - - yes, no? Okay.

Okay, in our Proposed Plan, we evaluated five alternatives. These are the alternatives and a brief summary of what they were:

No Action Alternative, simply use institutional controls, such as fences or an access-type control to protect the workers.

In-Situ Vitrification is a process which uses large amounts of electricity to melt the material in place. You don't have to excavate it or do those things.

Ex-Situ Vitrification uses the same classifying or melting process, only you pull the waste out of the ground,

run it through this process, and then re-dispose of the waste.

The preferred alternative, Chemical Extraction and/or Physical Separation. We will excavate the waste, decontaminate the waste and the soils, and re-dispose of the materials that are treated to below the clean-up standards back in the pit and take the concentrated plutonium and americium and store those, pending off-site disposal.

The last remedy or the last alternative evaluated was Complete Removal, Storage, and Off-Site Disposal, where we would simply dig up everything that's in the pit and the soil, package it up and store it until an off-site disposal site becomes available.

We, at the agencies, have determined that the Alternative 4, Chemical Extraction and/or Physical Separation is the preferred alternative. Why did we pick this as a preferred alternative? We feel that - - or we believe that we can remove a minimum of 90 percent of the americium and plutonium. We feel that the processes we've been - - that the companies we've been involved with have told us that they have a high confidence level that we can meet the standard. We also believe that the currently - - and this is the key point - - that the currently available decontamination processes will ensure that the required clean-up levels that

are agreed to by the agencies can be met. Not only can they be met, but they have the greatest potential to exceed these minimum clean-up levels.

We at the agencies will agree to clean-up levels, but if we can get a process that does a better job than the minimum, then that's what we want to do. And we also believe that the preferred alternative will have the greatest potential to cost effectively reduce any other contaminants that are in the pit that could at some time, or for whatever reason, be potential hazards.

The preferred alternative allows us to store the concentrated contaminants at the INEL pending off-site exposure. While we feel it's better to have these materials stabilized and stored where we can monitor them and keep track of them and do it that way in the pit where we can't play the migration scene of where they're going or how they're doing it.

By removing the contaminants from the pit as in the preferred alternative, the contaminants pose little or no near long-term risk, as they would remaining in the pit - - I'm sorry, contaminants posing little or no long-term risk would stay in the pit or be re-disposed of in the pit.

Questions - - as Ann said, our comment, public comment period started December 12th - - or December 13th, and extended through January 12th. We've had several

scoping meetings throughout Idaho. We've also had letters coming in from various citizens throughout the State, giving us their opinion and asking their questions. We've tried to summarize some of those questions and issues, and in summarizing the majority of the letters, we've come up with three basic questions that the public is asking us that we want to try to aggressively answer here, as well as they'll be answered in the Responsive Summary.

Why was the preferred alternative selected over Alternative 2, which is In-Situ Vitrification? There are several reasons for this. Number one, we've been approached by the commercial industry, and they've told us that they have on the shelf commercial processes that could come in and remediate this kind of waste. We are giving them a chance to show us what they've got. The In-Situ process is not ready yet to be used on this level. It's two to four years away, with some research and development needed to do this. We're not discounting In-Situ. We're saying it's not ready now. Let's see what else is out there. When I say not ready for use, some of the problems that could occur because of the large amount of drums and boxes, there is a high metal content in the pit. The high metal content could lead to arcing, which is kind of a short - - because it's an electrical process, it's going to short circuit the process and cause potential problems.

Also, there's a question that was noted in the Nuclear Waste News, which is a publication that some of you guys might not see, but it dealt with or it had an article in there on volatile emissions control, and the fact that I-SV still has some problems with their off gas system and how they're going to equate these kind of problems or handle those kind of things. We're not discounting the process. We're just not ready to - - we want to go in, and we don't want to do a research and development on Pit 9. We want to do an Interim action and take a positive approach to remediation.

The next question, why wasn't capping considered? For those of you not familiar with capping, it's, basically, taking the pit now and covering it with a concrete-type cap or some kind of cap so that the stuff can't migrate to the surface. We didn't feel like that was actually an Interim Action. We felt like that's kind of a temporary action that reduces the immediate risk, but doesn't reduce any long-term risk. It also doesn't meet our project objectives or the objectives of the CERCLA process in leading towards a final action. It would actually almost make a final action more difficult. So we did look at capping, but it wasn't an alternative that we evaluated in our Proposed Plan.

And the last question that we're getting is much like the question that we got over here: Why are we

accelerating the schedule? If we've got a schedule that says we're going to do this in 1999, why are we pushing so hard to do it in 1992? We - - I keep wanting to call it the IAG. The Federal Facility Agreement that had it in 1992, had it listed as a technology demonstration. We've changed it from a technology demonstration to an Interim Action. We don't want this to be a testing phase. We want to actually go in and remediate waste. We want to be responsive to what the public is looking for, what the State is looking for, and what we, the DOE and the agencies feel is an aggressive approach to clean up of some inactive waste sites. So we're accelerating the schedule, basically, because we can, because we think it's a good idea and because we want to take an aggressive approach to remediation at the Site.

Sequence of events. Many of these things have already occurred. We've issued the Interim Action or the Proposed Plan, and we've had public workshops to help brief and give you, the public, a background on what we're talking about.

Public comment period is in effect, and is scheduled to be completed January 12th. Our public meeting, that's tonight. We're holding that now.

Now you've got address public comments and prepare Responsiveness Summary. That's already started. We're

answering the questions and comments that are coming in in letters and the comments and formal comments that you folks make tonight are going to be addressed in the Responsiveness Summary, and that becomes a part of the Record of Decision. The Record of Decision being what we, as the agencies, finally decide as to what alternative we are going to use and what the clean-up criteria will be, and then it's signed by the agencies, and that then becomes our Record of Decision, how we're going to remediate Pit 9.

Following a Record of Decision, we are then going to - - we've got a Testing of Processes and Equipment Phase. Now this kind of leads into another question that we've got. You know, we said that In-Situ Vitrification requires two to four years of research and development prior to using, so that's kind of a test phase for I-SV. Yet here we're talking about a test phase. What's the difference between the two? This test phase isn't a testing of the process to see if it works. It's a testing to make sure the process works here in Idaho. You know, there's been a - - as an example, there was a plutonium clean-up effort that occurred in Johnson Island, that they went in and actually cleaned up plutonium and americium contaminated waste. So we know there is a system that works. We have to make sure it works here in Idaho. So that's this phase. It's not making sure the process works. It's making sure it works here in Idaho

for the kind of constituents we have in our pit.

Full-scale remediation is expected to commence by late 1992 and continue, roughly, two to three years. Now these last times, again, are estimates based on several things. The comment period can be extended if it's requested, so there are several things that are going to affect these three things. So those times are estimates, but we really believe that we can begin full-scale remediation by the end of 1992.

That concludes the background and history of what's Pit 9, where it's at and what the proposed plan says. Now I'm going to turn it back over to Ann and we'll begin the question and answer period to clarify questions on the Proposed Plan or the presentation, so that we can make sure that we're providing you folks with the right information to provide us with your comments. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: This portion of the meeting will be handled informally. I ask that you please raise your hand, and then when you're recognized, stand and speak loudly so that all can hear.

If it appears that your question falls in the category of a comment, then we'll ask that you hold that for the comment portion of the meeting. This portion of the meeting should focus really on clarifying issues and information that Jim presented or anything else related to

the Proposed Plan for Pit 9.

All questions raised and responses provided will be recorded by the Court Reporter and included in the transcript of this meeting. In general, however, they will not be included as a part of the Responsiveness Summary.

Out of fairness to the panel, please ask one question at a time.

So let's take the first question. We'd like to keep this section of the meeting, by the way, to about a half an hour. In the back there?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have a question about - - did you say that there's an independent contractor or another company that's offered to do the alternative, that's the preferred alternative? And what other qualifications - -

THE MODERATOR: Could we do one question at a time?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Right, well, why would you choose this contractor? Who is it?

THE MODERATOR: The question is, is there an independent contractor that has been identified to carry out the remediation, and what are the qualifications of this contractor, why was that contractor chosen?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Uh-huh.

MR. WADE: Okay, let me give you a brief history on how we're handling this part.

The Department of Energy has issued a Request for Proposal to the private industry, that gives them the guidelines on what's in Pit 9 and how we want this -- what's in there, and then we're waiting, we have not selected a contractor yet. We are waiting for prospective bidders to answer this Request for Proposal with how they are going to come in and do this.

We have established, you know, I could go through the whole Request for Proposal package, but in there there's a multitude of criteria they have to meet, including health and safety plans, sampling and analysis plans. They have to conform to all the requirements and regulations stipulated by the agencies and by DOE orders.

When we get the proposals in, we evaluate them against the criteria that we're using to select the right contractor, and from that point on, we'll know who it is and what the process is.

At this time we don't have a contractor identified. We don't have a process identified.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: So you haven't received any bids? Do you have a date for the submission of bids?

MR. WADE: Yes, we do. The bids are due on January 20th. We have had two pre-bid conferences, and we've had several inquiries from prospective bidders. We do believe that we're going to get approximately four or five

bids from several major companies who have expressed interest.

Also, up to this point they have been telling us informally that they have these processes, they have these technologies, and if given the chance, they can come in and show us what they can do for us. So through our Request for Proposal package and this Interim Action, we're giving them the opportunity to show us what they can do.

THE MODERATOR: In the white shirt there?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: My question is directed to Mr. Craft. Are you an EG employee, then?

MR. CRAFT: Yes, sir, EG&G.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is EG&G eligible to contract this for Pit 9?

THE MODERATOR: The question is, is EG&G eligible to compete for this contract?

MR. CRAFT: No, sir, we are not competing. We will - - excuse me. We are going to - - we will act as the agent for DOE to implement the contract. So it has gone out. We sent the contract out. We're expecting bids back on
January 20th. EG&G will perform the evaluations, the technical evaluations to select the technically best contract. And after that is done, then we will go into price negotiations to determine fair and equitable price for

the contract.

THE MODERATOR: In the back, the woman with the brown dress?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, are they - - are the companies that are bidding companies that are in the nuclear industry now? And if not, why - - I guess I don't understand why the people, the companies that are already out at INEL aren't the ones who are handling this, since they are the most knowledgeable.

THE MODERATOR: The question is, are the companies who are bidding in the nuclear industry now? Why are the companies that are already at the INEL not bidding on this or handling the problem? Is that right?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.

MR. CRAFT: These are commercial industries that have approached the Department of Energy and said, "We have a process on the shelf that can remediate the type of situation you have in Pit 9."

So we are going out, we initially went out, and I think there was somewhere in the vicinity of 40 companies that showed an interest in coming in to do the work. After the initial conference with these companies, we had, I believe, 18 companies represented at the last conference. And from these companies, with the information, as Jim described it, that we provided them, the technical

information that they will have to meet, the levels that they will have to decontaminate the waste and the clean-up criteria they'll have to meet, we expect to get four or five bids.

But, again, it is from companies that have proven technologies on the shelf. We do not want to do a research and development project.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: So they're involved in the nuclear industry right now?

MR. CRAFT: Yes, ma'am.

THE MODERATOR: The gentleman over here?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes, I noted from the handout about the summary of Site risks, some of which, based on the risk of dust, fugitive dust, et cetera, from the Pit 9 area, that they're rather high risks from that area. I guess my question is, based on that, does Pit 9 have an Air Quality Permit, and is it and its emissions and potential emissions included in the emission inventory at the INEL?

THE MODERATOR: Did everyone hear the question? I won't belabor it to repeat. I take your silence for yes.

MR. NYGARD: No, there is not an Air Quality Permit for Pit 9, and one is not required. The clean up for
Pit 9 is being handled under the Federal Facilities Agreement.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, I didn't say under clean up, I mean now. It isn't being cleaned up - -

MR. NYGARD: No, there's not a permit for that, and that's why we're undertaking this effort.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Shouldn't there be one now? Shouldn't they have applied for one, considering - -

MR. NYGARD: Okay, I see what you're getting at. You're getting at whether or not the substantive requirements for the Permit would be met, which is required by the Federal Facility Agreement & Consent Order, that those specific controls will be addressed in the design and remedy.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm not talking about during the remedy phase. Apparently there's a real risk, and it's the basis of the clean-up, and I'm real supportive of the clean-up. But because of that risk, according to Idaho Air Quality Regulations and the potential for the emissions, why hasn't that particular site put in for and applied for an emission for an Air Quality Permit, because apparently they could
be - - it looks like there's a real risk to human health.

MR. NYGARD: Right. My understanding where the emissions inventory is right now is the Air Quality Bureau is putting together an emissions inventory for INEL. There are people in the Air Quality Bureau that are looking at

that for the Site. That's an ongoing kind of thing.

However, what we're talking about tonight is the Pit 9 and the clean-up of Pit 9 and how, I believe where you're coming from, there's a risk out there through the air pathway, why isn't something being done or shouldn't there be a Permit? Is that the angle?

If it is, what I can tell you is that all of the State requirements for an Air Permit will be addressed in the Remedial Design for this clean-up. And this is - - what this is, is a Proposed Plan. And in this Proposed Plan, under the section on applicable and relevant and appropriate requirements, you'll see that those issues will be addressed. And I have already talked with the air people in DEQ about coordinating review on that.

MR. NITSCHKE: I'd like to add one thing. That particular result was more of an artifact of the modeling assumptions and isn't a reflection of reality out there.

What it did do is help indicate to the decision makers were the substances to migrate to the surface, then it does pose that inhalation, ingestion and direct exposure risk. We're in the process of refining that model risk assessment interim process, and we'll provide them better information. But those particular numbers aren't reflection of reality.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, isn't it - - so it's not

an accurate model?

MR. NITSCHKE: No, it's an accurate for the purpose it served. We're refining it for yet a more rigorous decision, and we don't wait until we can do things perfect in the risk assessment business. We do what we can, provide information back, see where the weaknesses are, see where we ought to put our resources to better do it, identify the risk drivers and go from there.

THE MODERATOR: Yes?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: The 1980 WIPP Manual says that there's no suitable geology at the INEL for burying the long-lived radionuclides, but since we've planned to put ten percent of them back in the ground or leave ten percent of them there, the americium and the plutonium, does that mean that the DOE has changed its mind on that?

THE MODERATOR: Could you hear the question in the back? The question was that the WIPP - - what was the document?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: The 1980 WIPP Manual for the - - to plan WIPP.

THE MODERATOR: The 1980 WIPP - - perhaps it was the EIS - - document said that there was no suitable geology at the INEL for burying wastes, and yet the question is, why is that ten percent of the radionuclides might possibly go back into the ground?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: The plutonium and americium, that 90 percent would be removed. That's the goal. And what about the remaining ten percent, given that there is no suitable geology at the INEL to bury any of them?

THE MODERATOR: Ninety percent would be removed, what happens with the remaining ten percent, since there is no suitable geology at the INEL for burial of radionuclides?

MR. WADE: I want to answer this in two different ways. Number one, the 90 percent is merely a goal. We believe we can get much better than that.

Number two, the clean-up criteria is based on risk. If we are removing plutonium and americium, we're doing it to get the risk to acceptable levels to where the public and the environment will be considered not at risk per the risk evaluation criteria. Returning some amount of this to the pit or returning some amount of this waste to the ground is, perhaps, not suitable geology in Idaho, but you're removing the risk and we're removing what we consider to be the risk - - the contaminants that are putting the workers at the RWMC and, perhaps, the environment, we're removing that amount of risk. And what is left, what is returned to the pit will be below the risk criteria to be not considered risk drivers.

MR. LYLE: Keep in mind this is also an interim action, and this will - - whatever waste is back in the

ground or left in the ground will be evaluated for the final action, the Remedial Investigation Feasibility Study for that same area.

THE MODERATOR: You've been really patient in the back there.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Jim, in his comments, alluded to clean-up strategy that was done at Johnson Island for removing some americium and plutonium. As I understand, the clean-up strategy over there involved contaminated soils, and as with Pit 9, we're dealing with the buried waste phenomenon, which you've got drums of waste, and I have some question as to in evaluating these "proven technologies", are we looking at apples and comparing them to an orange grove, you know, that type of thing? Are we - - is the proven technology actually applicable to the true pit, the transuranic pits and trenches, namely Pit 9?

THE MODERATOR: Did everyone hear the question?

MR. WADE: That's a very valid comment, and I guess my reference to the Johnson Island clean-up was merely a way of saying there is a process that cleans up plutonium and americium. That was a soil-washing technology. We know that. We understand that, but the same, you know, this is an example of this type of clean-up with this type of constituents. We are not going to select a remedy that is merely a soil-washing type remedy. We're going to select a

remedy that meets our full criteria, our request for proposal package indicates that can do what's in Pit 9. We supplied these prospective bidders with an inventory of what's in the pit, and again, that was merely an example of a known process that requires no tests or no phases to prove the process works. It would just be applying that test to the INEL and then having that company prove that it would work at the INEL.

MR. LYLE: And we believe what we'll actually get is proposals made up of a train, if you will, of processes that will treat different waste types. That soil-washing technique may be there as part of that proposal and used to clean up plutonium contaminated soil, some of the interstitial soil that Jim talked about, if we find that's plutonium contaminated. And that could be next to some other process that may be able to deal with the sludge or whatever else.

THE MODERATOR: The gentleman in the turquoise V-neck.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes, my question relates to the same thing. You're talking about these as proven technologies. Are you specifying in the RFP that the outputs of these technologies have to meet waste acceptance criteria? Will they have to meet current WIPP acceptance criteria, or what do you anticipate to be the appropriate

criteria in the future? You're talking about storing this stuff for 15 years before it goes anywhere. What's being done to assure that the product will be able to go somewhere?

THE MODERATOR: Did everyone hear the question?

MR. CRAFT: You actually asked two questions. One, you've got a criteria for the soils that can be put back into the pit. And there is a criteria that must be met before it can be placed into - - back into Pit 9. And that, as Jim discussed earlier, is based on risk. We have levels that will be based on the final risk assessment that we must meet, and that will reduce the risk to the EPA guidance shooting for a ten to the minus six risk level, which means one chance in a million.

The other is the product. The product, we take the americium, plutonium and concentrate it. And that will be stored in an interim storage for 15 - - up to 15 years is what we said in the Proposed Plan. And hopefully within that 15-year period, there will be developments on either how we can further treat that waste or a permanent disposal area.

And in answer to your last question, as of today there is not a permanent disposal area for that product.

MR. LYLE: What we have done in the Request for Proposals, is we have provided incentives for the bidder to

meet as many different acceptance criterias as they can. If they can reduce the waste, clean it up to the point where we can throw it in the landfill or if we can dispose of it strictly as low-level waste or dispose of it as just a hazardous waste at a commercial facility, what we plan to do is provide them incentives to minimize the amount of waste that we have to set aside and figure our what to do with later.

So we are trying to encourage them to meet whatever waste acceptance criterias there are out there for different types of facilities, if that makes sense to you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I don't think you're answering my question. My question has to do with the 90 percent or the 95 percent that's cleaned up. What form will that be in? If that were done today, would it meet the waste acceptance criteria? If there were a WIPP available, could you ship that to WIPP?

MR. LYLE: The answer to that is no. We could not ship it to WIPP. WIPP is only available for what we call stored transuranic wastes, the material that has been stored after 1970. This waste was disposed of prior to 1970. WIPP is not available for that material at this time. Now it may be in the future, okay? So the WIPP waste acceptance criteria right now is not a criteria.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is it not a guide to what you

might expect to have to meet in the future?

MR. LYLE: Sure, sure.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Do you anticipate that the product from this process will meet the WIPP criteria?

MR. LYLE: We ~~would~~ would certainly hope so, yes, or come as close to that as we can, depending - - with the different waste types that we have, okay, we will have to evaluate those waste types against the processes to determine what best we can get out of it. That's why Jim was talking about goals of cleaning up greater than 90 percent. Okay, we're hoping that we can exceed those. Until we get through the proposals and see what's available, I can't tell you what the exact waste forms or product forms are going to be like coming out of this.

MR. WADE: Before we move on, I heard one thing that you had said, and I want to make sure I understand.

The 90 to 95 percent we're talking about cleaning up, that stuff will meet the low-level waste criteria to be re-disposed of back in the pit. The 90 to 95 percent that we're talking about cleaning up will be returned to Pit 9. I want to make sure - - we're talking about hopefully a very minimal amount that will be stored pending off-site disposal. So you had said the 90 to 95 percent is that going to be ready to go to WIPP. That's never going to go to WIPP, because it's going to be cleaned up to be returned

to the pit. We're talking about the percentage that doesn't get cleaned up that might have to go to an off-site disposal facility.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: The definition for TRU waste is 100 nanocuries per gram. The waste in Pit 9 is ten nanocuries per gram or lower, so it's a factor of ten below it already. I think that's the definition.

THE MODERATOR: The woman in the back with the red sweater.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is the Request for Proposal available in the libraries?

THE MODERATOR: Is the Request for Proposal available in the libraries?

MR. WADE: No, it is not.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could it be?

THE MODERATOR: Could it be?

MR. WADE: I'm going to turn this over to Bill Craft. He's in EG&G procurement.

MR. CRAFT: As of right now, the Request for Proposal is not free for the public repository, because the bidders themselves have to sign an agreement not - - because of proprietary information that may be used in their request, and you don't - - it's not just a free document for all people to have. They have to sign a release in order - - when they come in to bid on the process, they had to sign

a release. So it is not free, you know, we're not free to put it in the repository.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: John Horan. I will first make a statement before my question, so don't count this as two questions.

What I see has happened is that there really is no purpose for this meeting tonight for comments or the others that have taken place, because of this action that has already been taken soliciting bids. Because apparently, you're already ruling out some of the alternatives that we would like to talk about tonight and others have talked about. That's the observation.

THE MODERATOR: Could you hold that one for the comment period? I think that that's one that would appropriately - - there's going to be a comment period right after the questions, these clarifying questions. I don't know what your question, your follow-up question is, but if it relates to that, we would really like to capture that for the formal Responsiveness Summary.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: All right, let me ask my question then.

Jim, in your statements you made that justification for doing this is because of migration to the surface and exposure to current workmen near Pit 9. Then you went on, you said that - - and this is the contradiction that I see.

You deny the practicality of the concrete cap, because that would be - - that would not be a long-term solution, but the exposure to the workers is only a short-term solution, or a short-term problem.

MR. WADE: I would say that I don't believe it's a short-term problem, because we're talking about americium and plutonium, which are long-lived radionuclides. If they migrate - - they will be in that pit for thousands and thousands of years. Migrating to the surface doesn't give them a temporary, you know, they're only not going to be there for a little while and then disappear. They will be there for a long time.

And then to follow that up, capping is not - - it does not lead us toward a final action. It reduces the short-term risk, but again, that plutonium and americium will be there long after any concrete-type cap would be eroded away. So it does provide a short-term solution. It does not meet our project objectives or the objectives of an interim action leading you toward a final action, and it doesn't reduce the risk to the environment or the long-term risk to the workers.

Bob might be able to expound on the risk-type part of it.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Let me just comment. The Risk Assessment is based upon worker exposure?

MR. WADE: For this Interim Action, right.

MR. NITSCHKE: We evaluate an occupational exposure, and one of the things that Jim didn't mention, but I'll just yell - - no, one of the things that Jim didn't mention is the Risk Assessment that we're working on now is a more complete one, in the sense of it addresses additional pathways. And one of the things that wasn't done as part of the preliminary health evaluation was the groundwater pathway. And capping technology is such that it's not protective of a long-term thing when you're looking at groundwater travel times of hundreds and thousands of years and contaminants that will persist for that long.

THE MODERATOR: There's someone over here who hasn't had a chance yet in the blue shirt.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: How well do you know that americium and plutonium are the only sources of risk out there? I notice aircraft nuclear propulsion mentioned, and, well, really, just how well do you know what all is buried there?

MR. NITSCHKE: The Risk Assessment that was done is based primarily on shipping records and process knowledge. We feel very good about the records that we have. They were pretty late in the game. It's not like 1952. We have a very, you know, a real good understanding of the Rocky Flats process and their waste streams and what was shipped to us.

And based on that information, then we can sort through those contaminants of concern, identify those that have the most quantity, that are the most toxic, and those are the ones that become the risk drivers.

So, again, you know, of the whole suite of things, those that contribute the most risk under the scenarios presently evaluated are the isotopes of plutonium and americium.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: So you're saying that the whole scheme is based on what you know to be there, but, you know, something like AMP that was a classified program is probably larger uncertainties. And in that regard, do you consider the possibility of unknown items in the Risk Assessment and in the choice of preferred alternatives?

THE MODERATOR: Could you hear the question in the back?

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. LYLE: As far as in the Risk Assessment, I'm not sure how we would take that into account. What we will do, after we get into remediation, we will recover this waste. We'll be looking for things that were unexpected, okay? And what we have tried to do is set ourselves up so that we have the opportunity to identify what that is, work around it, go do other remediation in that pit while we're trying to figure out what that exact hazard is and how we're

going to deal with that specific thing.

In environmental restoration in general, you have to be ready for things like that, you know. As Bob mentioned, as we get into some of the older pits and trenches at the RWMC, back to 1952 where you don't have great records, that's going to be a whole new ballgame, a lot of stuff, maybe a lot of surprises, which is one of the reasons why we're picking

Pit 9. We know more about it, and we can learn from that process before we get into some of those kinds.

THE MODERATOR: Is there someone else on this side that hasn't spoken yet? Yes, sir.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Several years ago I had been asked to participate in an employee Risk Assessment or the risk to employees that would be digging up the waste, and I was pleased to hear Bob Nitschke say that he had included that in the Risk Assessment. I'd like for you to speak further to that, because the In-Situ Vitrification seems to be a method that diminishes risk to employees.

MR. NITSCHKE: I guess that's my question. Thanks, Burt.

Point of clarification, when I talked about risk, it was an occupational worker that was a hypothetical guy that's standing at the pit boundary that turns out to be the leave-as-is option. What if we do nothing?

The question with how we deal the risk to the worker process dependent falls into the balancing criteria of implementability - - it's a bigger word than my mind right now - - but those types of things will be addressed. You know, if the risk to worker cleaning it up is greater than the risk that's gained by cleaning it up, then it's the Remedial Project Manager's decision to say that that is not an acceptable technology.

THE MODERATOR: We've gone about 30 minutes. There's still some hands. What's your pleasure, to maybe extend it another five minutes to try to catch the remaining questions? Okay, good.

Sir, did you have a question?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Am I to assume, or is this a question that you have never sampled the interstitial soils to find out if the contamination is in those soils?

MR. WADE: Part of our Request for Proposal package includes a detailed sampling and analysis plan, which will sample the interstitial soils and sample the whole entire pit to find out specifically how much is in the interstitial soils, how much has migrated into the overburden that we are considering to be the overburden, and where is the cut-off between the overburden and the interstitial soils? We're developing - - our prospective bidders will have to develop

a detailed sampling and analysis plan that will provide us with that information.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Isn't that basic information for any intelligent person to make a response, a logical response?

MR. WADE: We're looking at the inventory of the wastes that are within the pit. We know what's in the pit, and it's what's in the pit that has provided a risk.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: But you don't know whether it's moved out of the package yet, do you?

MR. WADE: No, we don't know where it's at, because we don't have detailed sampling plans - -

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Why not?

MR. CRAFT: Let me go back to do we know if it's moved out of the package. They have done some - - they've gone in and dug up some of the old waste from other areas that had drums, and I'm trying to think - was the Pad A stuff older than Pit 9? It was put in around the same time frame.

MR. LYLE: About the same.

MR. CRAFT: About the same time frame, and whenever they expose the drums and containers, wooden containers were, basically, totally disintegrated. They were there in form only, and there was no structure left.

The metal drums themselves showed different degrees

of deterioration, anything from small pin holes to sides totally rusted away.

So we do have evidence of similar-type buried waste in other areas that these containers are disintegrating away. So that is one of the reasons - -

AUDIENCE MEMBER: But you haven't done any recent sampling as to what those soils actually contain in the way of these hazardous materials? In other words, 20 years ago we were sampling the interstitial soil, and I would assume that after 20 years you would have defined that problem to a more detail?

MR. MCKENZIE: To answer your question, yes, there is - -

THE MODERATOR: Could you identify yourself, please?

MR. MCKENZIE: I'm Doug McKenzie, and I'm with EG&G, as part of the Pit 9 Project.

As part of the retrieval project that took place in the early 1970's, Pit 9 had the surface soils removed and samples were taken in several areas in the pit as part of looking to see if Pit 9 was a candidate for retrieval under an early drum evaluation.

During that period of time, ~~whether~~ - - very high levels of alpha contamination was found in the soil directly above and surrounding those areas that were removed. We're

talking a million counts or better, which at the time was the upper limit of the instrumentation used.

So, yes, there is alpha contamination, which in this case is probably plutonium or americium in the interstitial soils, at least in several areas that were checked during that drum retrieval part.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: When was this done?

MR. MCKENZIE: When was EWR and IWR.

MR. LYLE: Early and mid '70's.

MR. MCKENZIE: Yeah, 1973.

THE MODERATOR: Let's take the woman in the back with the pink - -

AUDIENCE MEMBER: My question is, once you choose the contractor, is the public going to be involved in every - - in - - will they tell us exactly what they're going to do before they start to do it? Because I think the public needs to be involved at that point as well as right now. If this 30 minutes or 35 minutes really counts, I think we need to know exactly what moves they're going to make and why and have an opportunity to comment on that.

MR. WADE: That same concern was expressed in the Public Scoping Meetings that were held in the beginning of December. It is our - - we have every intention to keep the public informed and make sure that we've got - - part of the CERCLA process is community acceptance of the preferred

alternative. Our preferred alternative right now, because we don't have a particular process identified, is, you know, physical separation, chemical extraction. We will keep - - we are hoping now and we are looking at the process of setting up televideo conferences, so that we can keep the public informed on what we're doing, and allow the public to continue providing us input on the process that we're accomplishing.

MR. LYLE: I would suggest that if you have comments on public participation during remedial design/remedial action, which is the phase you're talking about, that you make those part of your comments on this particular project. We're still in the process of determining how to conduct public participation during those follow-on phases. We haven't entered into remedial design/remedial action.

THE MODERATOR: Is there anyone else who hasn't had a first chance to ask a question? Go ahead.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: The gentleman over there, I think Mr. Horan, brought up a point that makes me a little curious.

I can see the reason for having the hearings tonight for a lot of the information that's coming out. What disturbs me is that in the presentation you list the alternatives that are considered, but I get the impression

that you've made a definite choice, and that if all the comments were 80 percent for In-Situ Vitrification or any of the other alternatives, it still isn't going to be quite good enough. I'm real uncomfortable with saying we're considering this on comments, and yet I feel like you've made your decision on the technology you're going to use.

MR. LYLE: We haven't made our decision.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I know you're saying you haven't, but it's all packaged nicely.

MR. LYLE: What we're trying to do to make this happen in a timely manner is, we're accepting some amount of risk by going our with this request for proposals, so that if, indeed, this is the chosen alternative that we can move out smartly with this. When we get the Record of Decision on this Proposed Plan, we're on a pretty tight time schedule. We have to be in the field no later than 15 months later doing real remedial actions.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I understand that.

MR. LYLE: So what we're trying to do is, we're betting on what the outcome is going to be here. We're taking some risks here. If everything shows that we need to go to some other alternative, then, you know, then that's right and we'll not be letting the contract. We're going through the process of evaluating proposals and so forth. We will not be letting the contract before the decision is

made.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I understand that, and I know that the Request for Proposals is not public information. Is it fair to ask, did the Request for Proposal limit anything, or did it list all of the alternatives and say, "Base your Proposal on what you think is best"?

MR. WADE: I'll take that. Our Request for Proposal did not identify any alternative. What we sent out in the Request for Proposal is we have an inactive waste site at the RWMC. This is what is the inventory of that pit. What can you do to clean it up? We have not said, "Come in with this particular process or that particular process."

We are asking the public or the private industry to come tell us what your process is. If I can - - in the Proposed Plan, we have a comment here that says, "The resources and technology necessary to implement this have not been fully identified" and the completion of this Project, upon the successful selection of a cost-effective technology. We have made no decisions. It's like Jerry said. We are hedging our bets, because we believe that. If we don't get a good proposal, or if we get a proposal that, yeah, we can clean up everything in the pit, but it's going to cost you 20 trillion dollars, then we're going to step back and re-evaluate. And we'll change our preferred

alternative, and we'll start this process all over again.

We have not locked ourselves into doing anything. You're right, we are banking that this will work, but if it doesn't work, we're not going to just keep pushing forward to make it happen.

THE MODERATOR: The woman in the black sweater?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I had a question about how the RFP was transmitted to public industries. Was it by comments - - AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could you repeat the question, please?

THE MODERATOR: How was the proposed, the RFP let? Was it advertised in The Commerce Business Daily or what? Was that the question?

MR. CRAFT: Yes, ma'am, it was advertised, and the commercial industry approached us. We gave them a date.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: That would be public information, wouldn't it?

MR. CRAFT: We were requesting people to come in with the technologies.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: So the RFP is public information?

MR. CRAFT: No.

MR. WADE: What went out in The Commerce Business Daily was an announcement that the INEL is interested in obtaining private sector participation in a remediation of the INEL.

We then received input or feedback from the commercial industry that we are interested, we are - - that part of it.

Now then, we had a pre-bid conference and worked out the details and the prospective bidders that said, "Yes, we think that we're going to prepare a proposal," they officially asked for a Request for Proposal package.

The Commerce Business Daily announcement was merely a generic-type "What can you do for us?"

Once they approached us and told us, we then supplied them with the details and will come back with a detailed proposal. So it was kind of done in two phases.

MR. CRAFT: I'm sorry if I understood your question.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, I was just curious.

THE MODERATOR: We have four hands still remaining up. The gentleman here in the front, black shirt. Let me list you, and then let's move onto a break. Way back, the gentleman there in the turquoise sweater and the gentleman here in the plaid.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Bill and Jim, can you clarify for me how much of the plutonium and americium you plan to re-bury and how? Is that known yet?

MR. WADE: No, it's not.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: What are the parameters and what

is the possibility on that?

THE MODERATOR: The question was how much of the americium and plutonium do you plan to rebury, what are the parameters on that? And the answer?

MR. WADE: That's - - we have established some clean-up criteria, but we don't know how much is going to go back, because we have to wait and see what we get from our prospective bidders.

Our goal, as identified, is to remove 90 percent of the plutonium and americium from the pit.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: That would be stored above ground until some permanent - -

MR. WADE: The remaining product, so to speak, the concentrated - -

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.

MR. WADE: That would be placed in an above-ground storage, similar to what's out at the RWMC right now, pending future off-site disposal.

THE MODERATOR: Sir, in the back?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have a question regarding the RFP and how the language on preferred alternative is into the RFP, namely with technologies, with some of the other alternative technologies that you have. Are you excluding those technologies from being a combined tie-in with the physical segregation? Is that some of the - - have you made

that decision that Alternative 4 is the only thing you're going to accept bids on?

MR. CRAFT: No, sir, we have not. I think it was explained earlier. I think Jerry said it may be a combination of one, two, three, four or five alternatives or processes. I shouldn't say alternatives.

Going the preferred alternative, one of the reasons it's our preferred alternative is because the commercial industry have implied that these are the alternatives that are on the shelves immediately available to us today. Now they may use a combination of two or three, and nothing in the RFP prohibits them from two companies, three companies joining together and saying, "We, as a group, are making a bid to come in and we're going to use the combinations of one, two, three technologies."

AUDIENCE MEMBER: In the evaluation, however, is there an advantage for being tied to the preferred alternative? Do you get bonus points as part of the evaluation for being part of the preferred alternative? If, for instance, a certain person were to come with either one of the five technologies or another technology and show that they have the ability to do that, will that be judged on the same level as one that is a preferred alternative for?

MR. WADE: The answer to that is no. Our criteria in the Request for Proposal package is to meet the clean-up

criteria that we've identified. I don't want to say it that way, but, "You show us your process and how it's going to meet our clean-up criteria, and we evaluate that." That kind of leads back to the lady over here's question. We're not hedging our bets that we want this particular preferred alternative. We, at the agencies, have determined this is what we feel is the best alternative right now. If you or the private industry or anybody can show us there's a better way, then we're going to do it. Our goal is not to do it this way. Our goal is to clean up the INEL and the RWMC to the appropriate clean-up standards.

We're not concerned with how it's done. We're concerned that it's done in a proper way to meet and get rid of the things that have created a risk for us.

So all evaluations are based on the criteria of meeting clean-up standards, not on doing it the way that we want it done.

THE MODERATOR: Sir, you were next.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is it because this whole process is outside of NEPA that this is going forward without anyone evaluating whether or not there is a net benefit for doing this? We don't know what the effluence from these processes are going to be. There are a lot of unknowns. We don't know what, you know, what form the material is going to be in. Is the reason that this hasn't been done because this

is outside of NEPA? Is that why nobody has looked at the big picture yet.

MR. WADE: No. First off, we're not outside of NEPA. The appropriate NEPA documentation - - for NEPA, in case there's people that don't know, National Environmental Protection Act - - excuse me, I'm getting confused, excuse me. Did we get it now?

National Environmental Policy Act. There's required documentation per that Act that we have to do. We're not outside the NEPA world. We are doing a NEPA determination right now to see what level of documentation is necessary. An Environmental Assessment is being performed and will be performed. We have to wait until we identify a subcontractor and a process before we can talk about some of the things that you're asking, effluence and this and that and the other.

Once we get a process, then we finalize an Environmental Assessment. We're not doing this outside of the NEPA process and those answers or those questions will be answered as we develop a subcontractor, and as we identify a process. It's hard to encompass anything and everything, so once we identify a process, we finalize our Environmental Assessment.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Assessment, not Impact Statement?

MR. WADE: Again, we're working on the pact now of

doing an Environmental Determination. What level of NEPA documentation will be necessary. We can't make that determination until we see a process.

THE MODERATOR: We made one final commitment to the gentleman in the plaid shirt. And then I would encourage any of you who have remaining questions, we've been asking questions for 50 minutes now, to buttonhole the folks up front during the break and get your questions answered.

Sir, in the plaid?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could you just explain one more time how, based on this more recent questions that have been asked, that in your response that you're being so open abou contractors' ability to use innovative design to make this clean-up possible, and yet how can you be so open about taking any kind of shot that any contractor can take at cleaning it up, and yet on the other hand say that the information given to those people is somehow - - cannot be made public. I still can't understand, even though that question was asked earlier, now after hearing your response to how open you are about taking a shot at cleaning the stuff up, how is it that that information given to those contractors is somehow not available for the public?

MR. CRAFT: Let me answer your question. I was just informed that anybody that would like to look or request the RFP can do so through our procurement office,

the EG&G procurement office. And they will, at that time, inform you of any restrictions that would apply if you, you know, want to look at or get a copy of the RFP, same type restrictions we do apply to the contractors that requested one.

So if you want to request or look at it through the procurement office, you can request it.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm not a bona fide contractor, so I'm sure they would not let me or other members of the public look at it.

MS. STIGER: The Request for Proposal that's - -

THE MODERATOR: Excuse me, could you identify yourself, please?

MS. STIGER: I'm Sue Stiger with EG&G.

THE MODERATOR: Sue Stiger with EG&G. I can't hear you very well, so I'm sure the other folks can't either.

MR. LYLE: The answer to the question, as Bill just explained, that document is available through the EG&G procurement office, okay? That's what the man just said.

MR. CRAFT: Right, and the RFP itself should be available to the public. There are some supporting documentation that is not available. So you have to go through the procurement office so that they can clarify what you would have to do to go through the RFP, because some of

the supporting document is not available.

THE MODERATOR: Let's take a 15-minute break, and after that we'll come back and receive formal public comment.

If you'll return to your seats, the room and the seats about 8:15 p.m. Thank you.

(A brief recess was taken.)

THE MODERATOR: This portion of the meeting is designed for you to present your, what we call, more formal comments, express your thoughts and opinions to the agency about the Pit 9 Proposed Plan for the Interim Action.

To help the Court Reporter, I'm asking that you come to the microphone in the center here, please, and speak very clearly, state your name and address so that we can have that for the record and record your comments as accurately as possible.

If you choose not to comment at this meeting or if you wish to submit additional comments, you may do so, using the form at the back. It's on ivory-colored paper, and there's an address on the back of the agenda to whom you can send the actual comments, Jerry Lyle.

Those comments need to be turned in or submitted to DOE by January 12, 1992, as we've mentioned.

You may want to know or you may ask, logically, what happens to your comments after you've made them? Your

comments will receive thoughtful consideration. After the comment period has ended, DOE will summarize all of the questions asked and the comments made during this period and, also, the ones that are mailed or submitted in other ways. And then we'll respond in a document called a Responsiveness Summary.

DOE Idaho expects to complete the Responsiveness Summary and release it to the public some time this spring as part of the Record of Decision on the Interim Action for Pit 9. The Responsiveness Summary will be sent to the INEL information repositories, to everyone here who signed in tonight with an address, and to anyone else who has specifically requested it.

This is your opportunity to comment. The agencies will listen to your comments, but they will not interrupt the flow of what you have to say with any reaction to your comments this evening. Their responses and their comments or reactions to your comments will come then in a Responsiveness Summary.

If someone makes a comment that is unclear, however, or that the agencies do not understand, they may ask you for clarification. That's the advantage of the verbal comments at this time.

The purpose is to make sure they understand clearly what the individual's statements are. When you make your

statement, you are advised to take a single turn of five minutes, up to five minutes, and this limitation should ensure everyone who wishes will have an opportunity to comment.

I'll signal when you've got about a minute left, so that you can wrap your comments up. If you feel that you can't put all of your comments into that five-minute period, please then do take a comment form or submit additional comments in writing.

With that said, let's start with the first comment. Who would like to volunteer?

MR. DAY: My comment is addressed to the Board, and - -

THE MODERATOR: What is your name?

MR. DAY: Kim Day, and I don't understand the criteria for the employment of the contract company that will be coming in. And I would like to see, and I'm sure a lot of other people in the public would like to see that the contractor coming in would hire the Idaho employee instead of bringing in outside people in to do the work.

I'm sure that higher technical positions will be filled by the subcontract company, but I would definitely like to see an employment increase of the Idaho people, Idaho Falls, Blackfoot, Shelley, the whole Snake River Valley area involved.

That's all I have, thank you.

THE MODERATOR: May I ask one question, Mr. Day? Could you state where you're from, please?

MR. DAY: Shelley, Idaho.

THE MODERATOR: Next? Mr. Horan, did you want to come back and make a comment, as a part of this comment period?

MR. HORAN: No, I think I'll let it stand at that.

THE MODERATOR: Beatrice?

MS. BRAILSFORD: My name is Beatrice Brailsford. My address is 310 Center, Pocatello 83201. I am the Eastern Idaho Coordinator of the Snake River Alliance, and the comments, questions and concerns I'm presenting this evening are on behalf of our 1,100 individual, family and business members. We will be submitting further comments based on the excellent questions we've heard tonight.

One. What is the purpose of this Interim Action? The brochure states on Page 1 that it is, "To reduce the potential of external exposure and inhalation hazards to workers, and to expedite overall clean-up at the RWMC." Pages 5 says that the primary objective is, "To reduce exposure of workers, the public, and the environment to contaminants." One of the Preferred Alternatives' prime public relations supports, which is evidently to provide an opportunity for private contractors to give a shot at it,

does not seem to be part of the statement of intent.

Two. The administrative record notes that information on the inventory of contaminants in Pit 9 is both incomplete and unanalyzed. The public brochure says that the waste inventory is based on available shipping records and the Radioactive Waste Management Information System, which I understand is itself based on available shipping records and, perhaps, a single retrospective letter from the Rocky Flats Plant. From my notes of the August National Academy of Science Meeting on the INEL's Buried Waste Program, I understand that 30 percent to 40 percent of the Rocky Flats shipping records contain discrepancies from this period. How certain is the inventory of contaminants in Pit 9?

Three. The Idaho National Engineering Laboratory has distributed material at that same NAS Meeting that indicate that in August, plutonium was the focus at Pit 9. The administrative record now states that the major risk driver was americium 241, which contributed approximately 92 percent of the calculated total cancer risks for radionuclides. Should the public expect further significant changes in the Site characterization?

Four. At that same NAS Meeting, Leo Duffey remarked that he thought clean up should be delayed until it can be done remotely. Now that Mr. Duffey has been

nominated to be Assistant Secretary for Environmental Restoration, do you see any possibility that funding for Pit 9 clean up will be delayed?

Five. Most members of the Snake River Alliance live in Idaho, and Alternative 1 - - no action - - is not acceptable to us. Please understand, however, that the Alliance supports effective and environmentally responsible clean up over quick clean up.

Six. Alternative 2 - In-Situ Vitrification: Our understanding is that there is a record of volatile organic compounds moving away from the melt zone in In-Situ Vitrification. Please discuss that in the Responsiveness Summary.

Seven. Alternative 3 - Ex-Situ Vitrification: What material would you return to Pit 9 and why? Would its return mean that Pit 9 would become a RCRA disposal site?

Eight. Alternative 4 - Chemical Extraction and/or Physical Separation: Thought we appreciate the disclaimer on Page 4 that, "The resources and technology necessary to implement this Interim Action have not been fully identified," you must describe the envisioned processes for Alternative 4 in more detail if you expect public understanding. If you do not gain public understanding, you cannot gain public support. Again, what material would you return to Pit 9, and why? Would its return mean that Pit 9

would become a RCRA disposal site? What opportunities for public review will be available for the two test phases of Alternative 4? The Proposed Plan promises that TRU mixed waste will be stored and managed in accordance with all ARARs and TBCs "until an ultimate disposal facility is identified under the TRU Contaminated Pits and Trenches ROD or the WAG-7 Comprehensive ROD". Those Records of Decision are scheduled for 1999 and 2000. What has led you to believe that an ultimate disposal facility will be identified by then?

I would also like to note that having made it five minutes before 8:00 on January 7th, portions of the RFP made available to the public, after we go through a process of application, a comment period deadline of January 12th - -

THE MODERATOR: You have a minute left.

MS. BRAILSFORD: - - seems a little short.

Nine. Alternative 5 - Complete Removal, Storage, and Off-Site Disposal: As is true for Alternative 4, we are interested in learning at how you arrived at the cost estimates for long-term disposal. For this alternative you project $116 million; for the preferred alternative, $23 million. These are totals, presumably for 10,000 years. The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico is the closest thing we have to a reality - - I use the term loosely - - check for long-term disposal. WIPP costs $110 million a

year now and the only thing disposed of in WIPP thus far are some very large chunks of salt.

Ten. For Alternatives 3, 4 and 5: When do these actions cease to be guided by CERCLA and become RCRA Waste Management activities?

Eleven. Among the most helpful portions of the information packets on Environmental Permit Applications are the comments of the regulatory agencies, which help the public understand the technical information and put the significant issues in perspective. They also give evidence that what usually appears to be a bureaucratic model is, in fact, a group of individual minds. We find that reassuring. Now I understand that the Department of Energy need no longer bear the Environmental Permit burden in clean-up actions at INEL, but there's no indication in the material available in the Pocatello Public Library that the State of Idaho or the Environmental Protection Agency are involved in Pit 9 clean-up in any way. You would better serve the public - - and yourselves - - if the administrative record included more of the give and take found in Environmental Permit Application packets.

THE MODERATOR: Could you wind it up fairly quickly, Beatrice? Thank you.

MS. BRAILSFORD: There's more, but - -

THE MODERATOR: Beatrice, could we have a copy of

your comments so that we could make them part of the record? Thank you.

Is there someone else? And if you would like, Jerry, we can extend individual times, if there's not a lot of comments.

Beatrice, we just had a ruling. If you would like to finish your comments, because we don't have people jumping up and down yet.

MS. BRAILSFORD: John Horan is going to. You've got to volunteer. I'll go after you, John.

MR. HORAN: Let her finish first.

THE MODERATOR: Everyone is so polite.

MS. BRAILSFORD: Twelve. On September 9, 1991, the Snake River Alliance submitted comments on the Warm Waste Pond at Test Reactor Area. Those comments essentially recommend that the process be redone. To our surprise, since you've never before failed to heed our advice, they were ignored. Now I see that our comments are not in the Warm Waste Pond administrative record, and I'm resubmitting them this evening.

Thirteen. And this is my last point. At the Idaho Falls public meeting on the RWMC Vados Zone, the State of Idaho and the DOE made comments indicating that a conscious effort had been made to avoid the inconvenience of public participation, first by avoiding an Air Quality

Permit requirement (and its attendant public comment) and then by avoiding an Interim Action Proposed Plan (and its attendant public comment). I suggest you be very careful with that approach. Someone sometime might call you on it. More important, consider fully the degree to which avoiding the inconvenience of public participation got us in this mess to begin with. Burying waste in Pit 9 was a cheap, easy, quick, quiet fix. We're here tonight to try to fix the fix. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: John Horan?

MR. HORAN: Beatrice, I never like to come between a lady and her last sentence.

MS. BRAILSFORD: Which was "thank you".

MR. HORAN: John Horan, Idaho Falls, a constituency of one.

The Three Mile Island Reactor accident occurred in March of 1979. A Presidential Commission investigated the causes for the accident, as well as the public reaction. One of their major conclusions was, "There is inadequate public understanding of the effects of low-levels of ionizing radiation or strategies to mitigate the health hazards of exposure to radiation."

The same situation exists today in Idaho 12 years later. DOE is more willing to spend a guestimated $115 million dollars to clean up Pit 9, while they are unwilling

to spend one percent of that effort to educate the laymen that the radiological and environmental risks are actually well below similar risks we already accept on a day-to-day basis.

An expenditure of $115 million on low to intermediate levels of radioactive waste is itself a waste of taxpayer's money. All the emphasis is on radioactive containment, with apparently no interest or effort on cost containment.

In the years when the INEL was a center of excellence, it took only $18 million to build the Materials Testing Reactor. And I recognize that these were 1950 dollars. John Q. Public is in no position to comment knowledgeably on this proposal. The Proposed Plan provides very little guidance to help him. Nowhere is he told that not a single person is at risk for cancer from Pit 9 over the next 100 to 1,000 years. As a result of the radiation phobia which EPA and the State have always encouraged, for political and other self-serving purposes, one can only expect emotional and biased responses from individuals and groups in the name of cleaning up the environment.

Of course, they don't know that all of us have measurable quantities of transuranic isotopes in our food, water and bodies from the nuclear weapons testing of the '40's through '60's. If the program - - if the Proposed

Plan were presented to an independent technical group for peer review, which it really should be, it would be rejected out of hand as a ridiculous waste of money and effort. In no way would it be considered "an immediate Site threat requiring a quick reduction in risk". Instead, I feel confident it would be judged a political boondoggle, a frivolous waste of tax dollars, which with such a plan, it is no wonder that the Governor of Idaho, in his ignorance or seeking political headlines, wants no more waste shipped to Idaho.

I also feel it's an insult to American technology, and I'm very pleased with tonight's presentation to hear that you have gone out and asked American industries to come in with their best technology. But the current estimate for 6500 contaminated drums, 1500 of which are believed to be empty, will require $19,000 per drum to recover, store and relocate. And - -

THE MODERATOR: You have one minute left.

MR. HORAN: Thank you. The same containers were safely shipped to Idaho by truck in full accord with International Safety Guides. So if only ten percent of these taxpayer dollars could be used creatively, say, for the Neutron-Boron Capture Therapy Project, which could save thousands of lives each year. Realize, not hypothetical ones such as the person with an excess cancer risk of one

out of three for external exposure.

To wrap up, Madam Chairman, one final point: Nowhere in this proposal is real consideration given to cost benefit analysis. Some scale is needed to interpret the use of tax dollars. Despite the thinking of bureaucrats and Congressmen, there is only so much money available to waste on waste clean-up. Are we getting the best value out of the mega bucks being spent or proposed? Costs should be the driving factor. Based on any criteria of cost benefit, the minimum amount of money should be wasted on this project at this time. The no-action alternative might be the wisest choice to allow technology to develop further with more experience over another ten years. Nothing is lost by delay. There will be no change i the so-called environmental risk, but if one must act, if one must spend the money, by all means select the In-Situ Vitrification and save $60 million in tax money.

Thank you for the extra time.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. Horan.

Next?

MR. VOILLEQUE: I'm Paul Voilleque from Idaho Falls. I didn't come with comments, but I've written some while I was here. The risks stated in this Plan are not realistic. There is currently no significant risk to the INEL workers. There will not be any significant risk during

the institutional control. There is a five-foot layer of soil overburden on the original cover. That's why there's no Air Quality Permit required for this location. There's no radioactivity on the soil, on the surface soil.

A large risk, quote unquote, was fabricated by assuming that all the waste was uniformly mixed with all the soil and all the material in the pit and the overburden. These details are not provided in the Plan that's distributed. It doesn't say anything in here about how that calculation was done.

This Proposed Interim Action was described earlier as the reason for it was to eliminate the near term risk. There is no near term risk.

Natural processes are not expected to bring those nuclides to the surface for hundreds, if not thousands, of years. It seems to me that in Appendix G of a previous assessment of alternatives for dealing with this waste, it was clearly thousands of years anticipated to bring these things up. If you include biologic mechanisms, you may reduce that time. But it's not a near-term risk.

You'd like us to endorse a $100 million pig in a poke. There's no description of the technologies, their effluence, their wastes, the consequences of their operation, the risk to the workers who are involved in this. The budget in here indicates no construction is required to

do this. This is all going to be done in tents or open air, I suppose. It's astonishing that this is a credible proposal. It's not a credible proposal that you presented as one. You present a schedule that assumes that you've made the right selection, one that assumes that no Environmental Impact Statement is required to do this, which is, again, astonishing. Even though you have, as you state, no clear picture of what the technology is going to be or what the effluence or effects are.

There's no assessment of the risks, the overall risks to workers and to the public from doing this.

I'll just close by saying that while it's clear some members of the public are concerned about buried waste at the RWMC, and the DOE is anxious to respond by throwing money at this problem, it's far from clear that the proposed action yields a net reduction in the risk.

THE MODERATOR: Could you spell your last name, please?

MR. VOILLEQUE: Yes, it's V-o-i-l-l-e-q-u-e.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Next?

MR. BALDWIN: My name is Burton Baldwin, and I'm from Idaho Falls.

I'm distressed somewhat by a confusing thing that happened. I thought it was a fairly simple question about criteria, yet one member of the panel stated that there were

indeed criteria for the waste material to be met, while another member of the panel stated there are goals. And we're not quite sure what the contractors, who will be removing the waste, can do for us, and we'll find out.

With that kind of background, I cease to have as much confidence as I had in the ability of this project to proceed with safety. My principal concern about safety is the employees of the contractor selected to do the job and the employees of the present INEL contractors who will be auditing and inspecting and verifying their progress.

Digging up the material in Pit 9 is a risky process, much greater risk than we should allow. We should not increase that risk by attempting to do this very quickly without selecting processes that are very safe. The long-term risk then is the lifetime of those persons exposed during the digging-up process. You have deliberately faulted the In-Situ Vitrification process, which is inherently more safe to the people performing that job, by refusing to acknowledge that the vitrified material left in place can be more safely removed and packaged and ultimately disposed than can the material that you propose to dig up in its present dirt loose form.

With regard to previous comments about long-term waste, there is, in fact, a real experiment, if you will, a real demonstration that radioactive materials from reactor

operations were successfully buried without containment for thousands of years. And that occurred in the OCLA Reactor, a natural reactor in Africa. The migration of the plutonium and fission products and activation products was highly restricted. They were nearly immobile, and from that demonstration, if you will, provided by Mother Nature, the risk, the long-term risk for this material is very small. We ought not to neglect that known knowledge. To proceed immediately to dig it up seems to me to expose it and, thus, our people in the State to unwarranted risk. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Other comments?

MR. FARNSWORTH: Rick Farnsworth, Idaho Falls. I have some - -

THE MODERATOR: Would you spell your first name, please, is it Rick?

MR. FARNSWORTH: Oh, Rick Farnsworth.

THE MODERATOR: Rick Farnsworth, sorry.

MR. FARNSWORTH: That's okay. I have some problems and, again, this isn't a prepared speech, so bear with me. But I have some problems. As has been said, and I agree wholeheartedly, the short-term risk is not high enough, in my opinion, to move this proposed evaluation seven years up, while at the same time doubling the cost of what could be done with this compared to other alternatives. I have a concern that DOE seems to be somewhat leery of the research

and development aspect of various remediation activities, and I have a concern that after all, can not $50 million buy you a better process than an alternative that can lead to nothing more than interim storage of the waste and something that will eventually have to be cleaned up nationally at a later date?

With regard to the evaluation of alternatives, I have a concern regarding Alternative 4. In comments that I have asked in the previous question and answer session, I have reached the understanding that there has been no mention made of the need for contamination control during the retrieval process. Why is that? Estimates I have from friends that I have worked with have estimated contamination control at another approximately $30 to $40 million over what is currently estimated. That doesn't come cheap.

I also have a concern with the criteria in the Request for Proposal. In the Request for Proposal, it is said that the criteria is 90 percent removal of plutonium and americium from Pit 9. The problem I have with that is that eliminates all In-Situ technologies that could produce a more final product that is more valuable in the long-term and more of a final fix than retrieval, putting it in drums and finding someplace that's willing to buy it or take it off our hands.

Anyway, I would recommend that as a minimum in the

criteria, that you start to look at reductions in the expected groundwater contamination levels of the final waste action as opposed to a capricious and arbitrary decision on removing plutonium and americium. That doesn't cut it, because it's going to eventually be put somewhere else, and nobody has looked at the treatment. Nobody has looked at the leechability of that material or eventually treating it. It is not included in this proposal.

With regard to the Proposed Plan, the Proposed Plan talks about the vitrification as being not as good of a long-term effectiveness as the proposed retrieval, segregation and storage somewhere else. I asked why can that be so when various studies, both on nuclear waste glasses as well as preliminary studies on both ISV and exit vitrification have looked at a product quality that increases 1,000 to 10,000 times as a minimum, in terms of value, whereas the proposed concept only plans to remove - - when the proposed concept only plans to remove 90 percent. In essence, all you are doing is reducing the cancer risk by an order of magnitude of ten times.

And for those reasons, I think you need to consider this again. I think you need to evaluate the criteria, and I think you need to develop something that is fair for all of the technologies. I also ask that you delay this evaluation so you can start to do good research and

development in coming at new remediation technologies that are a final solution instead of just an interim solution. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. Farnsworth. The next commentor? Are there other people who wish to comment tonight?

MR. SEALANDER: My name is David Sealander.

THE MODERATOR: Could you spell your last name?

MR. SEALANDER: Yes. S-e-a-l-a-n-d-e-r. I'm kind of late getting here, and I have never worked at the Site, so I don't have much on-the-ground experience out there. I have toured it once, and seen a few things there. I favor research there and studying things and increasing basic knowledge of potential industrial applications and other things.

However, I have some strong feelings in opposition to the manner in which things have been done in the past and feelings about the way they should proceed. There was - - I've heard a lot of talk about technological correctness and technological solutions. What mess there is out there was not made by technology as so much a bunch of cavalier bastards that didn't have enough self respect or enough concern about what they were doing, other than just dump it on the ground. I've heard stories - - I don't know if these are confirmable - - but when that area was flooded out

there, the barrels came to the surface and the security guards went around shooting holes in them with automatic weapons to sink them. I don't know if that's correct or not. But if they were, it's also indicative of the cavalier jerks who might serve as security guards out there.

Now someone said they're not concerned about this stuff coming to the surface, and I'm not sure that's a big risk. But we live under a natural law called gravity, which is drawing that stuff toward the aquifer. And I think this is a serious matter that needs to be addressed, and I do believe that people who have said that we need to go very slow, I'm not saying, you know, we shouldn't go at this ver cooly and thoughtfully, but I don't believe there is such a thing as no risks, no risks, no risks, involved with sitting on this. That stuff is, like I say, being pulled by the force of gravity and groundwater seepage and so on toward the aquifer, and the fact that if we make strong arguments on behalf that there's no risk involved in leaving it where it is, aren't we saying to the rest of the country and the rest of the world, there's no risk involved in this sloppy disgusting manner of dealing with these very very very extremely hazardous materials, and just bring all your trash and dump it out here, because there's no risk in it. I don't know about some technological people or people that work out there, but I am really disgusted by an attitude

that might play into that kind of a message to the rest of the country and the rest of the world. It's not to say we don't have to find places to put things and that someone -- we don't need to take our share of responsibilities. And we don't need to ship it off into somebody else's back yard all the time. I mean, we need to take care of our own mess, but I don't believe we should welcome trash being dumped here, and I want to stand behind whatever Governor Andrus says. This is no place for a waste dump to be welcoming trash in here, and it almost seems to me by some of the things that have been expressed here tonight and other places, that people think that's just hunky dory. I think it's sick.

THE MODERATOR: You have one minute left.

MR. SEALANDER: I do believe that we shouldn't defer too long on this. I think there is cause for some urgency in getting on with the job. We don't know what the national financial situation will be in the future. We don't know what social and economic world situations will be in the future. If we have the ability and have the knowledge and the capability of achieving, rectifying of this problem, we should bloody well get on with it as quick as we can and in as thoughtful way as we can. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. Sealander.

The next commentor? Is there anyone else who

wishes to comment?

MS. PROKSA: My name is Margo Proksa, and I'm from Pocatello.

THE MODERATOR: Margo, if you could pull the microphone down, and spell your last name, please.

MARGO PROKSA: P-r-o-k-s-a. I just wish we were all a lot more intelligent.

THE MODERATOR: Additional comments? If not, that appears to wrap up the comments for tonight's meeting.

Before we leave, I'd like to ask your indulgence for your comments on one-additional thing. If you could help us to improve the quality of the meetings that we hold, we'd like your comments on the yellow meeting evaluation form. For those of you who are in a hurry, you just need to circle from one to five how well we did on a variety of aspects of the meeting tonight. And for those who want to comment in more detail, we encourage that, as well.

We want to make these meetings as fruitful as possible for you, and we know we can improve with your help. Thank you all for attending tonight. I have special thanks to those of you who took the time and effort to ask questions and make comments.

Are there any comments from the agency representatives before we leave the closing remarks? If not, then thank you all very much for coming.

REPORTER'S AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF IDAHO)
)
County of Bonneville)

I, KAREN KONVALINKA, do hereby certify that I am a Certified Shorthand Reporter and a Notary Public in and for the State of Idaho;

That I took down the proceedings aforesaid at the time and place therein named and thereafter reduced the same to typewriting under my direction and control.

I further certify that I have no interest in the event of the action.

WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL this the 31st day of January, 1992.

(Signature)

Karen Konvalinka, C.S.R.,
Notary Public in and for
the State of Idaho,
residing at Idaho
Falls, Idaho.

(Seal)

My commission expires: Perpetual