PUBLIC COMMENTS SUBMITTED VIA LINE COMMISSION WEBSITE
Week of December 10, 2012

Dr. Steven Piet 173 Springwood Lane Idaho Falls, ID 83404

(208) 535-7580 pietsteven@hotmail.com 1st half of comments since your website isn't accepting my comments with 7,700 characters.

Dear LINE

Although I am a 30-year engineer employee of the INEL-INEEL-INL, I provide these comments as a private citizen, a proud resident of Idaho. I would not want the INL thought police to think I intended to attempt to speak on behalf of the INL.

I basically agree with the contents of the draft, but there are five subjects that require more attention and emphasis: current electricity needs of Idaho, water, waste, outreach, and history.

Current Electricity Needs

Depending on year, for more than a decade, Idaho must import between 1/3 and 1/2 of the electricity it uses. On this basis (fraction imported), Idaho is the worst state in the union! Idaho is an energy pauper no matter how we look at it inadequate electricity, no coal, no natural gas, no oil, no uranium. Thus, Idaho is more dependent on other states than is any other state. When we import electricity, we export decision-making authority, tax revenue, and jobs to other states. Of course, we also export pollution and use of water to other states. Do Idahoans realize this trade-off? Is this trade-off what Idahoans want?

People get confused because they read that windmill X or powerplant Y would export electricity. Such statements only refer to the contractual obligation of that particular installation. I'm speaking about the total electricity generated in the state divided by the total electricity used in the state. Any electricity exported is more than compensated by what we import.

Idaho's electricity rates are lower than surrounding states. The only ways that this occurs while we import from those states are that (a) we are currently benefiting from long-term contracts and (b) some states require buying more expensive wind power even if other electricity options are available. As those contracts expire, our rates will increase. If Idaho also requires buying wind-generated electricity, then we get to keep our most expensive electricity. Oh joy.

Look at a map of nuclear power plants around the U.S. We are about as far from any plant as is any place in the nation. ISU, UI, BSU students trained in nuclear power plants must go elsewhere. Those in other states can rightly complain that we develop nuclear technology but don't have it near ourselves. Can Idaho remain a leader in nuclear power, when we are so distant from nuclear power plants?

The point for LINE is that you should point out this situation to fellow Idahoans and explore what nuclear means in this context. Should Idahoans support hosting a nuclear power plant? (Personally, I vote yes, but LINE's role is not to say yes or not, but to pose the above issues.)

Water

Over the past decade or so, multiple proposed power plants in Idaho have been opposed - successfully in large part because of (or through the bureaucracy associated with) water usage. This has doomed proposals for electricity from natural gas, coal, and nuclear power. The failures of these projects have contributed to Idaho importing so much of its electricity. It is always easier in today's society to stop a project than finish a project. Will Idahoans have a managed approach to use of water for electricity, or will each project be forced to run the gauntlet by itself?

Nuclear, natural gas, coal all use water in the cooling system, in the process of rejecting heat to the environment. The amount of water usage can be reduced in each case by higher temperature (more thermally efficient) systems such as the Next Generation Nuclear Plant (NGNP). Should Idahoans reward or mandate more thermally efficient, water-efficient electricity-generating options?

The amount of water usage can also be reduced by the heat-rejection technology. Once-through heat rejection does not waste water into the environment, but does increase the temperature of the body of water being used. Wet cooling towers waste water into the atmosphere, but do not change the temperature of bodies of water. Dry cooling towers waste far less water than wet cooling towers, do not change the temperatures of bodies of water, but are far more costly and less efficient than wet cooling towers. How should Idahoans view these options?

The INL itself has a water right, associated with its status as a federal institution. The INL uses only a small fraction of that water right. How should that fit into the picture?

Mr. Michael Peterson 3127 E 650 N Menan, ID 83434

(208) 419-8351 mjohn_peterson@yahoo.com Regarding the Line Commission draft report, INL should not be required to accept all vacant buildings from DOE-EM (the other site prime contractors) unless there is a need for the buildings as part of the continuing INL mission. All of these old facilities, even if they are cleaned up so they are no longer a radiological hazard, require continued maintenance. Unless there is a mission need and a future use for the old buildings, INL doesn't have the funding to pay for the maintenance.

Ms. Nancy Greco 442 S. Garfield Pocatello, ID 83204

(208) 232-2607 nanbaker@cableone.net I am very concerned about the ongoing discussion about bringing nuclear waste into Idaho. We have had this discussion for decades now. Both Governors Andrus and Batt delivered to the citizens of Idaho a firm agreement with the federal government which prohibits Idaho from becoming the nation's dumping ground for spent nuclear fuel. As citizens, we voted on this agreement. No means no, both then and now. As far as the INL is concerned, there is much research to be done in the areas of reducing the danger to the environment from the use of nuclear energy. There is also much work left to be done in the area of safe storage of spent nuclear waste at the site of its production. I believe the INL could be a useful location for these and other research projects, without being the dumping ground for the nation. Do not be fooled: we, the citizens of Idaho will stand our ground. We have done so in the past. We will do so as long as is necessary. NO MEANS NO.

Mr. Ted Stout 310 First St, Picabo Bellevue, ID 83313

(208) 721-7402 ted.stout1@gmail.com No potential employment opportunities are worth endangering the Eastern Snake River Plain Aquifer. I am strongly opposed to bringing nuclear waste into the state. Please support the continuance of Governor Batt's wise agreement with the Department of Energy.

Mr. Douglas Harmel 9450 North River Road Idaho Falls, ID 83402

(208) 525-8856 dharmel@ida.net Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to address the LINE Commission and it's current path. I will be straight and to the point with my comments.
First, I do not like to see the attempt to "dumb down" the public by the LINE Commission by attempting to rename spent nuclear fuel to now refer to it as "used fuel". That insults my intelligence and that of the Idaho citizens. I believe there is one member of your commission who is leading this effort and tactic. I believe you should call it what it is, Spent Nuclear Fuel which will include all the long-lived actinides associated with it.
Second, this same member and it appears now that most of the local mayors are in support of a round-about attempt to circumvent the 1995 Settlement Agreement (you call it creating a conversation, I call it another attempt to dumb down the public). Idaho does not need to be the interim repository for spent nuclear fuel since the Federal government failed to provide long-term storage at Yucca Mountain. We have the second largest and purest aquifer in the US and to even think about adding a spent nuclear fuel repository in addition to the waste that will not be removed from the pits which I might point out includes nuclear reactors, beryllium blocks, and much more. Whoever thought of this preposterous idea without actually taking in to regard the risks of transporting spent nuclear fuel in the tens of thousands of metric tons across the US to Idaho should be removed from the Commission.

It about time that the people of Idaho realize that the INL will need to be reduced due to funding short falls (massive debt by the government) and the fact that the site facilities and infrastructures are way past their useful life for the intended purposes. Redirecting your efforts should be more towards research in alternative energy sources not storage or processing of spent nuclear fuels or materials.
Thank you.

Dr. John Tanner 2175 Tasman Ave. Idaho Falls, ID 83404

(208) 529-5605 pust@datawav.net The governor's LINE commission has made many valuable suggestions for Idaho's participation in the national nuclear enterprise. The proposal to accept large quantities of commercial spent fuel for interim storage could help as a first step toward dealing with the nation's nuclear waste. But Idaho must not do this alone. It is important that this be a part of a larger national effort. Fortunately other states, especially New Mexico, are already taking the initiative on announcing a willingness to accept spent fuel for interim storage. Concurrently a national effort must also be directed toward a location for permanent disposal of nuclear waste in the event that Yucca Mountain is finally ruled out. New Mexico seems to be having thoughts about that, too. Perhaps Idaho could also find a site with geology suitable for permanent high level nuclear waste disposal, but the investigation would need to start from scratch. Obviously the Snake River Plain would not be appropriate.

With our experience on testing Navy fuel, Idaho is well equipped for research on commercial spent fuel, for the purpose of improving composition and cladding to allow higher enrichment, higher burnup, and less frequent reactor shutdowns for changing fuel. Such research would be a valuable contribution to economical nuclear power. However proponents of this research should take pains to explain to the Idaho public why the large quantities being suggested are necessary, so that it is not thought of as interim storage in disguise. Interim storage is a separate activity which can and should be advocated for on its own merits.

Hopefully Idahoans will agree to whatever changes are needed in the Settlement Agreement to allow these activities. Like any contract, it can be changed by agreement of all parties.

The Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Plant should not stand idle after it has finished processing Idaho waste. It is too valuable and expensive to do that. Bring in and send out whatever other nuclear waste is appropriate. The schedule in the present Settlement Agreement for doing this should be adhered to.

As a believer in free trade, I have no objection to importing electricity or manufactured goods into Idaho. Conversely, I see nothing bad about building electrical power plants to export electricity, even to California. Why not a nuclear reactor in southeast Idaho? It would bring much useful, skilled employment, contribute to climate friendly energy production, and help guarantee low electrical rates when long term hydro power contracts expire.

On technical grounds, dealing with the calcine does not need a high priority. The radioactivity is much lower than normal reprocessing waste, such as is produced in France or England, because of dilution with many other materials of very low radioactivity, including the cladding and the uranium. Plutonium content is also very low

because of the high enrichment of the original fuel. Furthermore the calcine is already stored in stainless steel tanks inside of concrete silos, all of this in a dry climate. But any changes in present intentions need agreement with the rest of Idaho.

Hopefully there will be peer review of R&D projects considered, to select the ones with the best technical prospects and potential usefulness.

Water usage of the new facilities proposed would not be expected to exceed that of years ago, when reprocessing, many small reactors, and test facilities were operating.

Mr. Jeff Miller 390 Advantage Ln Idaho Falls, ID 83406

(208) 524-7153 familyjsm@yahoo.com I believe that Idaho has the recourses, expertise and land available to store Spent or used nuclear fuel. Alaska and Wyoming have their oil Nevada has its gaming; Idaho can have its fuel. With triple containment, monitored, retrievable vaults Idaho could store this fuel or waste indefinitely and charge huge fees for this service. All Idaho citizens would then benefit from this service and infrastructure.

Mr. Jon Johnston 3241 East Couonty Line Road Idaho Falls, ID 83401

(208) 716-3751 jon.johnston@vandals.uidaho.edu I feel that this county needs a viable option for long term storage of spent nuclear fuel and the INL has the knowledge and technical base to do this work. It would bring new jobs and a much needed boost to our local economy. The utility companies around the county would pay for us to store their spent fuel. It would also promote more options for a recycling this spent fuel and create more opportunities for spin off businesses. We would also have ready access to more spent fuel to help us further study the effects of long term dry storage and different ways to "burn up" the long lived by products of this spent fuel to make it safer in the long term.

Mr. Dean Groetzinger 2225 W Broadway Suite C Idaho Falls, ID 83402

(208) 521-1739 dgroetzinger@alleghenyst.com I recently attended the LINE Commission Meeting in Idaho Falls. I was unfortunately not able to attend the entire meeting due to other commitments but was able to hear the majority of participants.
You have a very important responsibility in providing an implementable plan to the Governor, and in regard to this I would like to provide some candid input for your consideration.
I was an employee of the INL from 1991 through 2006; in that time like many others I have worked in a variety of areas and have had the opportunity to I think garner a perspective on the Lab and how it operates, and unfortunately, some of the things that to this day get in the way of it s true potential. I will cover some of that but want to address the current state as it relates to what some of the presenters covered.
The Advanced Test Reactor the first person to reference this was the gentleman from EPRI; the thing that stuck in my mind was that he mentioned this facility as world class ; my company recently assisted DOE-ID is performing a review of the ATR facility which focused on the basis of scope for the facility, its operations and costing practices. A briefing on the report and its initial finding was presented to a group that included DOE-ID Senior Managers, DOE-NE Senior Management, and INL Senior Management including John Grossenbacher. The findings were not particularly positive and highlighted issues with the charging practices relative to funding and the considerable problems with maintaining a suitable operating environment. To be honest, the personnel operating the facility are to be credited for maintaining a safe and operating facility under less than ideal circumstances. The ATR is particularly important to DOE-NE, and apparently to industry as well, but needs a serious amount of funding to be all it could potentially be. This is being addressed albeit slowly; Mr. Grossenbacher is aware of this but The Loop 2A experiment was also mentioned; this particular experiment was so badly managed by the INL that DOE-NE had to pull $2M from other NE programs in order to complete. Nevertheless the INL considered it a success.

Technology Transfer On this you should just ask Linda Martin s husband his opinion; I suspect that he would tell you that the INL is just not interested in supporting this process. That said, it could if the right effort was taken.
Working with others Of the numerous Programs that the Federal Government, particularly the DOE, conducts or are a part of, the INL, for whatever the reason, does not choose to participate. Many of the researchers too many are content to just get enough funding to cover their time for the fiscal year. There is limited outreach to other Labs, even when they are asked if they want to participate. I suspect that this is not encouraged or not funded.
The INL costs too much this is not a new issue, but recently DOE-NE Programs routinely ask how much is this going to cost us? . The bottom-line is that the INL will provide a price to do something that most Labs or other can do for a third or less of what the INL is asking. Based on my own experience with this, the INL pricing includes the cost of doing the work, plus other mysterious costs for personnel that may or may not really be a part of the task. Competition among the Labs is very real and this is a major contributing factor for sending work to the INL. The bottom-line is that the INL is garnering reputation for being just too expensive.
The INL is not respected by other Labs I saw this first hand when I worked for the Lab Director under Lockheed; while there were ten National Labs, the INL was not considered a part. There was a Laboratory Operations Board that reported to the Secretary of Energy, and the INL was deliberately not included. In addition, in 1998 there was a visit by the Undersecretary of Energy at the time, Dr. Ernest Moniz (basically to look at shutting down the Lab portion of the INL) after which an effort was undertaken to identify and cultivate the value of the Laboratory. As Staff to the Laboratory Director, I was tasked with investigating this aspect and the resulting report was a part of the actions undertaken by BBWI when they took over the O&M Contract in 1999. What Dr. Moniz saw at the time was the tremendous potential that they (the INL) have if they would only apply themselves basically to know what they wanted to be and worked to properly engage themselves in the activities that are out there (I have that report if you d like it). What I ve seen is that too many of the INL s researchers are happy to just get enough funding to cover their work for another year.
When I worked for Bill Shipp under BBWI, a considerable amount of his time was spent on the road, at Headquarters and elsewhere, repairing the reputation of the INL. While the Moniz Report was a big part of the Lab s focus, at the time the Lab was still heavily involved in Clean up (to the extent they deliberately focused on Clean up and not the Lab to maximize fee) and was still very seriously being considered as just a clean and close site. Nevertheless the INL and its personnel continues to be the odd man out in an environment where relationships and respect are paramount.
Poor Politics the INL has endeavored over the years to hire personnel with strong reputations at other Labs; this has been the case with BBWI and with BEA. The result has unfortunately been a lot of money spent (salary, bonuses, relocation, etc.) for rainmakers that can t seem to recreate the same successful track record they once had, at the INL. Based on personal experience, current INL personnel (Laboratory Directors), including these rainmakers are trying to work the DOE-NE Senior Management, circumnavigating the various personnel responsible for the actual Programs. This has done nothing more than distance the INL from the people that would do them the most good. The result unfortunately is just spoiling the soup.
Where is Battelle? Since BEA took over in 2005, the INL has continued to be an island . While the Battelle model works very well for the majority of other Laboratories operated by Battelle, the INL still seems to remain isolated when it comes to what can best be called capitalizing on their respective relationships. In my opinion, simply sharing 10% of actual/legitimate scope from the other labs under their purview or actual/legitimate participation in other directly related scope could dramatically help the INL to really, really, increase their presence and capability across the DOE complex.
The INL is technologically an Island among the other National Labs this relates to the fact that the INL no matter what they may say otherwise (IRON is very, very limited!) is not connected to the ultra-high speed links that connect the other National Laboratories to one another (as well as to another global data network). In simple terms, this link currently runs from PNNL to Salt Lake and across the US, with a junction in American Falls. The INL has known about this since 2003, and it is a major complaint by various researchers who could utilize the same to connect/share data with other Labs or to utilize their respective supercomputing facilities.
Morale As I have been in a Consultant role since leaving in 2006, I have only heard this: that the morale under BEA is worse than it has ever been under any other Contractor. As an employee for 14 years, it was never, ever good (but I ve seen far worse elsewhere), but as a fundamental element of how things get done at the INL, this just isn t good.
There are many, many more narratives to tell that you need to know that you should know that you are not going to hear from the folks that you are dealing with at the INL. What I would recommend is that you personally sit down with an unbiased group of INL employees and get their perspective on the Lab and what it needs to do to be successful.

What I ve conveyed here was put together rather quickly and unfortunately may come across negatively; that is not my intent. How you proceed from here is your call; my interest is in seeing your effort with the LINE Commission be successful and I m certainly available to speak with you further on the forgoing.
Respectfully,

Dean A. Groetzinger

Jim Banholzer

Let's learn from Japan disaster
Letter in Idaho Mountain Express
March 30, 2011

Sometimes, 100-year events occur in our lifetime. It's remarkable how some Idahoans who are connected with the nuclear industry are downplaying the horrific events in Japan. While some of these officials say they are confident that a similar event could never happen here, I sense a credibility gap and I'm unsure whether they are seriously taking into account all contingencies.

For instance, what about the fact that the INL operates amid an earthquake zone—one strongly active in recent times? On the 20th anniversary of the 1983, 6.9 Borah earthquakes, Stephen Weiser, assistant deputy director of mitigation for the Idaho Bureau of Disaster Services, said, "Central Idaho is extremely vulnerable to earthquakes and has a great deal of seismic activity."

Besides occasional earthquakes, other challenges that the purportedly fail-safe and "clean" nuclear industry needs to contend with are the possibilities of terrorist attacks, infrastructure wear and tear, discontented employees, and plain old human error. Then there's the proud legacy of nuclear waste. Our country stores more spent fuel rods than Japan does, and this insidiously deadly radiation will endure an epoch longer than the most ancient Egyptian pyramid.

One-hundred-year events sometimes do occur within our lifetimes: 9/11, Pearl Harbor, Hurricane Katrina, the Indonesian and Japan tsunamis, Mount St. Helens exploding, the Teton Dam bursting or even spring flooding in Woodside. It's downright disingenuous for putrid plutonium prophets to claim that a nuclear accident could never occur here; especially when one already has.
We will be stuck on the road to ruin if our leaders continue to be too shortsighted to plan no further than the next election, muffle whistleblowers so we don't learn from our mistakes and neglect to upgrade nuclear plants to high modern standards, trading short-term gain for long-term environmental disaster.

~ ~ ~
Beware of Putrid Plutonium Propheteers
SUNDAY, APRIL 27, 2008
Idaho Conversation League
http://privateidahoconversationleague.blogspot.com/2008/04/beware-of-putrid-plutonium-propheteers.html

The powerful nuclear industry has been campaigning to construct new plants in Idaho and many in our desperate energy state are anxious to buy it. Some have written letters beseeching Idahoans to embrace nuclear power, so that we can be first in something for once.

To paraphrase Lee Halper from a recent radioactive-hot forum, "Idaho is already first in many things. We're almost first in cow-pies. We're first in lack of ethics in the Legislature. We're first in ignoring what doesn't work in other states will work here and we're first in having the most NUCLEAR waste seeping into our drinking water. We could be first in geothermal, wind, solar, hydrogen and conservation of energy but people who look for the silver bullet like NUCLEAR, are those who want us to be first in line for Superfund status."
I agree with Lee; let us not be first in foolhardiness. The poisonous nuclear industry kills much more than charging windmills do birds. For the next 40,000 years, we will have todevelop warning signs decipherable long after the

English language has died out. Think about it, the proud legacy nuclear waste leaves, will endure an epoch tenfold longer than our most ancient Egyptian pyramid. The gist of it is; no one wants to be known as the one who killed the goose that lays golden eggs, even if they are speckled with plutonium.

Now a French company "committed to fueling the nuclear renaissance," is at the ready to receive generous tax breaks for mining Idaho uranium. Let's be first in common sense again, by swatting away pests who desire to salt our fragile freedom-fry spuds with a radioactive twinge. While it is true that France uses 80 percent nuclear power, don't think that there is not a big brouhaha going on, over the pond, about this wasteful thinking. And where are the elite French trying to lay their insidiously deadly toxins to rest for millennia? Why it's being shoveled into poor peoples backyards, of course. Affecting many Muslim communities. And that's just dandy?

Perhaps Idaho newspaper editors should convene to develop a writing contest, for us to draft letters of apology to our grandchildren's grandchildren, for how we have wrongly 'warshiped' Mother Earth, to insert in a time capsule, next to the Yucky Mountain radioactive warning cryptograms. Winners could receive protection suits, fitted with alarming Geiger counters.

The bad spin about wind turbines is very overblown. Inspired visionaries have already developed improved energy gaining methods from the wind, using large high-tension vibrating bands, which kill no birds. Think how much better off we will be, when we rise up to invest one-tenth as much Research and Development into the dozens of other viable solar and wind parametered projects, as we do into killing innocent civilians over Oil-Euros.

Although most of us are now war-weary, it's inspiring to see that many Idahoans are not allowing themselves to be blinded by plutonium propheteers, who rush in with desperate short-term energy solutions, which leave long-term environmental stains, ten thousand-fold worse than stinky cow-pies.

Regarding the South Hills wind towers
Friday, May 08, 2009

With the vast potential Idaho has for utilizing wind power, I would be interested in learning more about how the bird-diverters work. Many of the powerful interest blowhards, who speak out against wind power, amplify bird deaths and because of this, say that wind should be out of the question; instead of remarking, "Hey, wind is simply a great idea! Why can't we inject more research and development into ways to prevent bird windmill casualties?"
Last year Popular Science Magazine featured an award-winning invention that employed wind power from Ginormous rubber bands. If developed further, such devices could help our country emerge from the current economic and energy Dark Ages. While inventions like this hold great possibility for our future, naysayers will probably find ways to claim that whippoorwills and hummingbirds will be fatally attracted to the buzzing sound.

Before our country started becoming a lazy fast food TV nation, we held our inventors in higher esteem. While the next generation of Tesla's Edison's, Kamen's, Hurtibise's and Farthsworth emerge, we should give these ingenious energy saviors more enthusiastic support, instead of sticking our heads in South Idaho sand to avoid wind.
http://www.magicvalley.com/articles/2009/05/12/opinion/letters/161621_119.txt
http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/04/23/AR2009042303809.htm

Thank you,

Jim Banholzer

~ ~ ~

Regarding the South Hills wind towers
Friday, May 08, 2009
With the vast potential Idaho has for utilizing wind power, I would be interested in learning more about how the bird-diverters work. Many of the powerful interest blowhards, who speak out against wind power, amplify bird deaths and because of this, say that wind should be out of the question; instead of remarking, "Hey, wind is simply a great idea! Why can't we inject more research and development into ways to prevent bird windmill casualties?"
Last year Popular Science Magazine featured an award-winning invention that employed wind power from Ginormous rubber bands. If developed further, such devices could help our country emerge from the current

economic and energy Dark Ages. While inventions like this hold great possibility for our future, naysayers will probably find ways to claim that whippoorwills and hummingbirds will be fatally attracted to the buzzing sound. Before our country started becoming a lazy fast food TV nation, we held our inventors in higher esteem. While the next generation of Tesla's Edison's, Kamen's, Hurtibise's and Farthsworth emerge, we should give these ingenious energy saviors more enthusiastic support, instead of sticking our heads in South Idaho sand to avoid wind.
http://www.magicvalley.com/articles/2009/05/12/opinion/letters/161621_119.txt
http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/04/23/AR2009042303809.htm

CECIL D. ANDRUS

RECEIVED
DEC 11 2012
IDAHO DEPT. OF COMMERCE

Dec 10, 2012

Jeffrey Sayer
Chairman
Leadership in Nuclear Energy Commission
c/o Idaho Department of Commerce
700 W. State Street
P.O. Box 83720
Boise Idaho 83720-0093

Dear Mr. Sayer:

I have carefully read the LINE Commission's Progress Report and the Subcommittee recommendations issued for public review and comment on December 2, 2012. Nothing in that document warrants any amendment for any reason to the "Batt Agreement" of 1995 negotiated between the state of Idaho, the Department of Energy and the United States and then ratified by the people of Idaho in a statewide vote.

I have every confidence that Governor C.L. "Butch" Otter understands the 1995 Agreement carries the force of the law and requires being upheld against any proposed amendments that anyone anywhere might suggest for any reason.

Idaho and her citizens have for decades been trying to remove nuclear waste from above the Snake River Aquifer. I am opposed to importing and placing more high level waste directly above the water supply of our people and industries. Such an action would be dangerous and politically unwise.

The 1995 Agreement is unique to the state of Idaho and provides assurance to its people that the great Snake River Aquifer will be protected as will the health, security and future economic well-being of the entire state. Therefore, I am strongly opposed to any amendment to the Agreement.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Cecil D. Andrus

cc: Gov. Butch Otter
Gov. Phil Batt

Supporting initiatives that are

for the region

for the Nation

for the planet

Right

Chairman Sayer

As a business Owner in Idaho Falls for over 35 years I support the INL & look forward to many more years. I support the Line Commission to go forward with Nuclear energy

Thank you

Robert Dunkley

Supporting initiatives that are

for the region

for the Nation Right for the planet

Chairman Sayer & members of the Line Commission

We support the INL and their leadership in the Nuclear Energy Industry

Thank you for your support

Chantal Wenkley

[redacted]

The Idaho Statesman

RE: Leadership in Nuclear Energy Commission
Commissioned by Governor Butch Otter

I commend this group and Chairman Jeff Sayer for their thorough and thoughtful work in assessing the challenges and opportunities regarding nuclear energy in Idaho. It's difficult and time-consuming work and is important to our state.

As pointed out in the proposed progress report, Idaho Falls and much of each Idaho is highly reliant, economically, on the INL. Idaho must do, responsibly, what it can to preserve the jobs and economy of that section of our state.

Many of the proposed expansions and preservation of INL and other nuclear dependent facilities can be obtained only with greatly increased federal and state funding. I doubt these would be forthcoming.

I do not support modification of my nuclear waste agreement nor extending the deadlines specified therein. I doubt that there would be more than a small percentage of ~~voters~~ Idahoans who would vote to do so, if the question ~~would be~~ were put before the electorate.

The LINE Commission proposes to continue its work. I believe that is appropriate. However, the recommendations for the creation of more and ~~duplicitous~~ duplicative Idaho agencies make little sense to me.

Philip E. Batt

Former Governor of Idaho

RECEIVED
DEC 13 2012
IDAHO DEPT. OF COMMERCE

Dear LINE

Although I am a 30-year engineer employee of the INEL-INEEL-INL, I provide these comments as a private citizen, a proud resident of Idaho. I would not want the INL thought police to think I intended to attempt to speak on behalf of the INL.

I basically agree with the contents of the draft, but there are five subjects that require more attention and emphasis: current electricity needs of Idaho, water, waste, outreach, and history.

Current Electricity Needs

Depending on year, for more than a decade, Idaho must import between 1/3 and 1/2 of the electricity it uses. On this basis (fraction imported), Idaho is the worst state in the union! Idaho is an energy pauper no matter how we look at it – inadequate electricity, no coal, no natural gas, no oil, no uranium. Thus, Idaho is more dependent on other states than is any other state. When we import electricity, we export decision-making authority, tax revenue, and jobs to other states. Of course, we also export pollution and use of water to other states. Do Idahoans realize this trade-off? Is this trade-off what Idahoans want?

People get confused because they read that windmill X or powerplant Y would export electricity. Such statements only refer to the contractual obligation of that particular installation. I'm speaking about the total electricity generated in the state divided by the total electricity used in the state. Any electricity "exported" is more than compensated by what we import.

Idaho's electricity rates are lower than surrounding states. The only ways that this occurs while we import from those states are that (a) we are currently benefiting from long-term contracts and (b) some states require buying more expensive "wind" power even if other electricity options are available. As those contracts expire, our rates will increase. If Idaho also requires buying wind-generated electricity, then we get to keep our most expensive electricity. Oh joy.

Look at a map of nuclear power plants around the U.S. We are about as far from any plant as is any place in the nation. ISU, UI, BSU students trained in nuclear power plants must go elsewhere. Those in other states can rightly complain that we develop nuclear technology but don't have it near ourselves. Can Idaho remain a leader in nuclear power, when we are so distant from nuclear power plants?

The point for LINE is that you should point out this situation to fellow Idahoans and explore what nuclear means in this context. Should Idahoans support hosting a nuclear power plant? (Personally, I vote "yes", but LINE's role is not to say yes or not, but to pose the above issues.)

Water

Over the past decade or so, multiple proposed power plants in Idaho have been opposed - successfully – in large part because of (or through the bureaucracy associated with) water usage. This has doomed proposals for electricity from natural gas, coal, and nuclear power. The failures of these projects have contributed to Idaho importing so much of its electricity. It is always easier in today's society to stop a project than finish a project. Will Idahoans have a managed approach to use of water for electricity, or will each project be forced to run the gauntlet by itself?

Nuclear, natural gas, coal – all "use" water in the cooling system, in the process of rejecting heat to the environment. The amount of water "usage" can be reduced in each case by higher temperature (more thermally efficient) systems such as the Next Generation Nuclear Plant (NGNP). Should Idahoans reward or mandate more thermally efficient, water-efficient electricity-generating options?

The amount of water "usage" can also be reduced by the heat-rejection technology. Once-through heat rejection does not "waste" water into the environment, but does increase the temperature of the body of water being used. "Wet" cooling towers "waste" water into the atmosphere, but do not change the temperature of bodies of water. "Dry" cooling towers "waste" far less water than "wet" cooling towers, do not change the temperatures of bodies of water – but are far more costly and less efficient than "wet" cooling towers. How should Idahoans view these options?

The INL itself has a water right, associated with its status as a federal institution. The INL uses only a small fraction of that water right. How should that fit into the picture?

Waste

Sadly, the main headlines associated with LINE so far are associated with management of nuclear waste. Demagogues have run wild. I wish nuclear experts would stand up to such demagogues and fear-mongers. Nuclear waste has and will harm no one. I'd rather have nuclear waste stored in my community than chemical wastes; nuclear wastes become less dangerous with time; most chemical wastes do not. Nuclear wastes are easy to monitor; most chemical wastes no so much.

I would certainly support Idaho serving as a temporary storage of nuclear waste, of Idaho reducing the waste management challenge by recycling used nuclear fuel, and even of Idaho serving as a permanent waste disposal site. (Not necessarily at the INL.) Recycling used fuel will happen eventually; it is becoming a societal imperative to recycle everything that can be recycled. Why not recycle in Idaho? When we recycle used nuclear fuel, about 95% of the used fuel can become new fuel. The other 5% becomes less dangerous than natural uranium ore in less than 1,000 years. We know we can engineer protection for such lengths of time; there are structures around the world that have lasted that long.

Outreach

Will LINE engage the citizens of Idaho by more than writing reports? I submit that LINE should establish and maintain two-way dialogue via every possible forum in the state. I offer my services, however and whenever you wish. I am, of course, pro-nuclear. I am also certified as a public facilitator by the International Association for Public Participation. And, I'm experienced in speaking, being a long-time member of Toastmasters International.

Washington DC is a long way away. Neither Congress nor DOE have shown the ability to propose and sustain a vision of nuclear technology R&D. One former INL manager, Dr. Jim Lake, was a visionary in this regard. He didn't wait for leadership from DC; he catalyzed formation of a vision and then expanded buy-in with leadership forums and working with other national laboratories. We've lost that vision; we've lost that leadership. We need to develop an Idaho-based view of the future of nuclear technology and then expand and sustain that vision. We do that through dialogue and outreach and listening – not demagoguery nor hidden agendas as seems the style these days.

History

It is a sad fact that nuclear engineers around the world know more about Idaho than Idahoans know what the INEL-INEEL-INL have contributed to the world. What LINE has written is true, but likely unclear to the average Idahoan. Clear, crisp tag lines would help, such as …

Every nuclear installation in the world is safer because of Idahoans.

Idaho has and does the safety, sensor, and material R&D that has led the world.

This story of Battelle striving to make us world leaders has always been misleading. The INEL (including Argonne-West) led the world and we were proud of the word "engineering" in our name. Lockheed and Bechtel lost our edge. Adding the second E and then deleting both E's in our name has been confusing. Battelle is merely trying to get us back to the world-leadership we used to have. Let's tell our fellow Idahoans about it.

Sincerely,

Dr. Steven J. Piet
173 Springwood Lane
Idaho Falls, ID 83404
pietsteven@hotmail.com
208-535-7580 home

THE SNAKE RIVER BEND
GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK, WYOMING

POCATELLO, ID 83201

Open Yucca Mountain for
storage of Nuclear Waste, that
is what we taxpayers paid
billions for. Do not store
it above Idaho's or
anyone else's aquifier.
Do not admend the 1995
Idaho settlement agreement.
O.S. Pocatello, Idaho
83201

U.S. POSTAGE
83201
FOREVER
12 12
08259590
APC
FE0037700105450 062S

ADDRESS

Line Commission % Idaho
Department of Commerce

700 W. State Street
Box 83720
Boise, Idaho
83720-0093

Published by © Grant Mountain West Supply S.L.C. Utah 84115

DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE - SPACE RESERVED FOR U.S. POST OFFICE USE ONLY

Mountain West Prints
WP-JH30
PHOTO BY: Scott Breen
0/0093
PRINTED IN JAPAN