Panel Discussion (contd)

assessment, because they didn't have the tools to do that.

Dennis Faulk came to me from EPA and said, how about if we do the B.C. reactor area and do a comprehensive assessment, look at all of the waste sites, look at all of the critters, look at all of the groundwater issues, and try to do a risk assessment for that.

They made a commitment, Department of Energy came back and made a commitment to the public, made a commitment to the Tribes, that the B.C. risk assessment, comprehensive risk assessment, pilot project, would be the starting point for public involvement. And that they would do this and use that as a template to then move forward to do other risk assessments.

They moved forward this year to do an N-Area risk assessment, and we have not been involved.

Now we hear that they want to do a whole comprehensive risk assessment, when they've never created the baseline to do the B.C. reactor area.

Panel Discussion (contd)

I requested a response from each agency. Not the Tri-Parties. I got a call from the Department of Energy that refused to answer the letter. And said we're going to delay our response required by two weeks. They delayed it, never responded.

I did get a response from U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and they concurred with exactly my assessment. They came back and said they agree and they would like the B.C. reactor pilot project for everything.

Now I get a letter from the Tri-Parties, coming together, that then molds all their issues together, instead of getting an individual response from EPA, an individual response from the State Department of Ecology and DOE.

So, what Nick says, he's been here for seven months, and no punn intended, we have a lot of history, and we have a lot of commitments that the Department of Energy was going to do this. They haven't stuck with their commitment.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Let's move on. Next question. This gentlemen over here,

Panel Discussion (contd)

speak into the mike they I am bringing to you.

MR. MIKE ROCKWELL: Thank you. This one is for the officials up there. Mike Rockwell is my name.

How much volume of cleanup -- Well, let me rephrase that. Is the volume of cleanup that is planned over the next, let's just say two years, going to equal the volume of waste that will be delivered to Hanford over the next two years? The 70,000 truck loads that are coming to Hanford in whatever time frame that is, is there going to be 70,000 truck loads of cleanup, is there going to be a balanced out thing.

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: Nick can help we me with this. Volume up, there will be a lot more cleaned up than we will ever get. What the factor is, I don't know. But it's a lot more.

MR. NICHOLAS CETO: There is a chart. I don't have the document. But there is a chart in the document, I don't have it in front of me but we could probably find it pretty quickly, that gives the volume of the different waste streams, what's been disposed

Panel Discussion (contd)

of at Hanford far and what's going to be managed in the cleanup in the remaining years.

And you can look at those bar graphs and get a feel.

Part of the answer, part of the answer depends on how much comes in from off-site. Because the range of material coming in from off-site is very large in that document.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Panel?

MR. GREG deBRULER: One other comment which we didn't really touch on tonight.

When the first draft came out, Mike, I had the understanding, and actually commented in Portland and asked you the question, the initial salvo, we will call it, is 70,000 truck loads, but in reality it could go much higher than that in the future with an amendment, and I asked that question, and you said yes, it could, it could go higher than 70,000.

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: No, not with an amendment. With a new EIS.

MR. GREG deBRULER: Or a supplement.

Panel Discussion (contd)

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: No. You would have to have a new Waste Management PEIS supplement.

MR. GREG deBRULER: Because the concern I have is the 70,000 is what they have scoped right now. Of course you have got 104 sites. How accurate are they? We did learn, however, in these transuranic waste shipments that there was actually 9 percent, of these 160 barrels that they were shipping, they actually were off by 9 percent. There was 9 percent more volume coming in.

So, I am sitting here in 2003 thinking you have got 70,000 truck loads. Well, is it 80,000? I don't know. I mean, these are rough numbers. And I don't really know. So I will just leave it there.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Do we have a follow-up question here?

Go ahead, George.

MR. GEORGE SANDERS: I was just going to take another slice at what you were heading toward with respect to what's leaving and what's staying and coming.

I use a rule of thumb of, and this

Panel Discussion (contd)

is planned, I won't tell you that this is going to happen in the next year or two, but it's what's supposed to happen in our baseline, we've got about 400 million curies of material on-site right now. If you take the tanks, the spent fuel, everything else.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Curie? What's a curie?

MR. GEORGE SANDERS: Curies. That's a measure of radioactivity. It has to do with how many disintegrations you get any period of time from a nucleus of an atom. It's a measure. And we use curies as one of those measurements.

There is 400 million curies that are on-site. I think we are planning on about 35 million curies of that staying. I think out of that bunch. I think it's about 35. So, 365 million, give or take a few, are supposed to leave. And so that's the balance of things.

Now, when you break that up in shipments, right now if you, that 70,000 may be trucks. I think by the time we are through with this we will be trying to do some rail shipments, we will be trying to send things out

Panel Discussion (contd)

in boxes instead of using trucks. So that's going to cut the shipments down. That's not interstate highways. That's rail. That has its own interesting pluses and minuses. But it will probably be different types of transportation there.

So, you know, that shipment number can vary. But there's a lot of shipments that are going to be on the road outbound as well as some coming in.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Follow-up.

MR. MIKE ROCKWELL: Again for the officials here, I would like to introduce you to my five year old daughter here, Miah.

MR. GEORGE SANDERS: Hey, by the way, she came over to see me a while ago. She had some stickers. And she gave me one. I am going to carry it home on my watch. I really appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. MIKE ROCKWELL: All right. Well, earlier, about an hour ago, we were discussing the fact that we're not really aware of how fast the river will be contaminated, and we had that ongoing discussion a little bit here, and I asked this question at the last

Panel Discussion (contd)

meeting and it wasn't answered, and it was again asked here, and it seems to be a question maybe that's unanswerable.

But my daughter is going to be living along the Columbia River for, she is going to be growing up here, she is going to be playing in the Columbia River, so it is a real concern to me.

And since this meeting is about bringing more waste to Hanford, and yet over the last 15 years of studying this plume that's going towards the Columbia River, we haven't figured out when the river is going to be contaminated so much that she can't safely play in it. And yet you are bringing more stuff to Hanford.

I mean, if she were your daughter, wouldn't you be extremely concerned about bringing more waste to Hanford?

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: At the risk of some one upmanship, I have four children, including a five-year old daughter, and I am extremely concerned, because our water comes six miles downstream from Hanford, in the Columbia River. We go swimming in it almost

Panel Discussion (contd)

every day in the summer. So, yes, I am very concerned about it.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Okay. This lady, the nurse, I have forgotten your name.

MS. JUDY MERRILL: Judy Merrill. You remember I'm a nurse. Judy Merrill from The Dalles.

I'd like to ask one of the officials of DOE or EPA, what specifically do you need from the public, we the citizens, to change your date of 45 days of the analysis to be studied? What specifically do you need from us? Or is it not up for grabs?

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: I would like to leave this one for Greg.

MR. GREG deBRULER: Let's let the EPA do it first and I will give him my interpretation.

MR. NICHOLAS CETO: There is only one agency that can change that. It's not us. It's DOE.

Ms. JUDY MERRILL: Oh. DOE?

MR. NICHOLAS CETO: They are the ones who are going to have to answer this question.

Panel Discussion (contd)

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: The decision is ours, but that's not -- The decision is ours, but I guess, in my position, I'm not at liberty to say what kind of pressures could be put on DOE to change their mind.

MR. GEORGE SANDERS: I'm not going to let Mike take the hit on that one. We will just talk about that.

The decision makers, and that's a whole series of senior folks, because you understand there's a lot of sensitivity here. I'm just going to be straight up.

MS. JUDY MERRILL: I'd like some specific information. I am a citizen, I have taken time off from work to be here.

MR. GEORGE SANDERS: All right. I will tell you, here is the best way we can do it.

You are in the middle of a public process. This is a public meeting. I mean, we have got a court reporter here, this is going to be documented.

I think what you're doing is the best thing I can recommend to you. If you feel

Panel Discussion (contd)

strongly, and I get the sense that there is a lot of people that feel strongly about this 45 days.

Speak your piece. And believe you me, we are going to listen to it. We will have to take your comments, we are going to have to put a report together. We are going to have to talk to our senior management. And we will make it very well known what the comment packages were.

MS. JUDY MERRILL: We only have 45 days.

MR. GEORGE SANDERS: I understand that. And I understand your angst about that.

So my recommendation to you is be very specific in your comments so that we can record them, it will get laid out in front of senior people who will make those decisions, and we will just go from there. That's all I can tell you.

MR. GREG deBRULER: Two things. Do you want to go first?

MS. AMBER WALDREF: You will probably say the same thing.

Panel Discussion (contd)

MR. GREG deBRULER: No.

MS. AMBER WALDREF: Well, i also want to ask the Department of Energy, you know, is this a site, an EIS that's based at the site and that managers at the site can make this type of decision? Because that's one of the questions at hand, I think.

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: The approval authority for the Environment Impact Statement and the decision, the final decision to extend the comment period would rest with the manager of Hanford who would be Keith Klein.

MR. GEORGE SANDERS: And I will tell you this, this is a big deal, an EIS, it is far reaching, and I don't think it is a mystery to you that Keith is consulting with the senior management in DOE on this.

So, there is a lot of collaborations, a lot of discussions about this. This is a very highly visible activity back in Washington. So there will be a lot of consultation. But Mike is right about who has the authority.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Greg.

Panel Discussion (contd)

MR. GREG deBRULER: So, names. Keith Klein is the manager. You could write him a nice letter. Tell him that he's violating NEPA and you will probably be seeing him in court. That might wake him up.

The other thing you could do is write a letter to the Under Secretary of Energy, Jessie Roberson, R-o-b-e-r-s-o-n.

Secretary of Energy Abraham, tell him that you are outraged that the public outreach process is being violated, that NEPA is being violated. That that there is not adequate time.

And the other guy is Bob Card, is that his first name, Bob? Mr. Card, Bob Card. Bob Card is one of the key people that is pushing accelerated cleanup.

Now, once you get done writing those, you could also write a letter to the CEQ, Counsel of Environmental Quality, to the Bush Administration, and basically tell them that the Secretary of Energy and the people that work for the Department of Energy are violating NEPA, not giving adequate time for public involvement, and there are statutes that

Panel Discussion (contd)

basically tell them what they have to do to have adequate public involvement.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Greg, would you repeat those names? I see people writing.

MR. GREG deBRULER: Again, for the Hanford Site it is Keith Klein, K-l-e-i-n, Keith Klein. He is the manager of the Hanford Site for Richland.

Then the other one is Under Secretary of Energy Jessie Roberson, and that's -- pardon me, Assistant Secretary of Energy, and that is Jessie Roberson, and that's in Washington, D.C.

Afterwards I will give you the addresses. I actually have them in my brain. Secretary of Energy Abraham.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Spencer.

MR. GREG deBRULER: Spencer Abraham. There we go. And the other one is Bob Card. And what is his title?

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: I have no idea.

MS. AMBER WALDREF: He is Under Secretary.

MR. GREG deBRULER: Is he

Panel Discussion (contd)

Under Secretary?

MR. GEORGE SANDERS: I think so.

MR. GREG deBRULER: He thinks so. I think he knows, but he doesn't want to mention names, because he is on the record. Some DOE official said he thinks so. I'm having fun, Mr. X.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Go back to the addresses.

MR. GREG deBRULER: Oh. The address for Hanford is P.O. Box 550, Richland, Washington, 99352.

MS. JUDY MERRILL: It's on the fact sheets.

MR. GREG deBRULER: And for Jessie Roberson, it's 2000 Independence Avenue S.W., Washington, D.C., 20055, Washington, D.C., 20055. That's for the Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham, or the Assistant Secretary Jessie Roberson. And for Mr. Bob Card, who is Mr. X.

MS. JUDY MERRILL: And their address again?

MR. GREG deBRULER: 2000

Panel Discussion (contd)

Independence Avenue S. W., Washington, D.C., 20055, I think.

MS. JUDY MERRILL: Greg, what is Bob's last name?

MR. GREG deBRULER: Card, like playing cards. This is a big card game, by the way.

Basically, history, never in the Tri-Party Agreement have we ever requested, since 1989, an extension period that was never granted. It has always been granted.

And the reason why I firmly believe it is not being granted this time is because Washington, D.C., Headquarters, is telling them you shall do this by X date because we need to get a Record of Decision by X date so we can ship the product by X date.

They want to close the sites down by 2006, and they have got to start shipping this stuff.

MS. JUDY MERRILL: My follow-up. Thank you, Greg, for the specifics.

MR. GREG deBRULER: Welcome.

MS. JUDY MERRILL: What I would like to see in The Dalles newspaper, White

Panel Discussion (contd)

Salmon, Hood River, Goldendale, is that specific information.

MR. GREG deBRULER: Okay. I will get it to them tomorrow morning.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Where is the local media here tonight?

MR. DEE WILLIS: The question is, where is the local media.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could the local media stand up, please?

MS. CYNDY deBRULER: You guys need to call them, too.

MR. GREG deBRULER: The local media couldn't make it. They also knew, you know, the meeting notices were in the newspapers, right, so they knew the meeting was there, but they couldn't come because they had a bunch of other meetings.

So what I did was I took a bunch of pictures today. Now what I have to do is write an article for them to get the information so that they will put an article in the newspaper.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It is not Hood River.

MR. GREG deBRULER: No. The

Panel Discussion (contd)

papers all owned by, basically the same, accept the Goldendale Sentinel. I will be writing an article, Cyndy and I will put it together, get the information out and hopefully the press will put it in the Saturday paper and then The Dalles Chronicle and the other papers.

Letters to the editors work, but I'll tell you what, letters to the editor in the Tri-Cities would make more sense. Tri-City Herald in the Tri-Cities, write a letter to the editor about lack of openness and public stuff.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Panel, next question. This lady, and then this gentleman.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Nick, you said EPA fined DOE 76,000. Aren't those both federal agencies. And if you fine somebody, who gets the money?

MR. NICHOLAS CETO: Yes. We are both federal agencies. And it goes back to the treasury. Sometimes I think, and someone from DOE can verify this, that sometimes the contractor that misses the work they are supposed to do ends up paying part of that back to the government, or not getting a fee or something.

Panel Discussion (contd)

So they could probably answer that question.

But it is a difficult thing when one agency fines another. But there is the P.R. value. You know, when a federal agency gets fined by another one, they don't like the press they get, and that's as valuable as the money.

MR. GREG deBRULER: And they don't like explaining it to Congress why they got that either.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Okay. Name.

MR. CLAY SMITH: Clay Smith. I've got a couple of questions.

First of all, Greg, you had some, they are not really slides, but some film you showed earlier. I would kind of like to know where those came from. I mean, --

MR. GREG deBRULER: They came courtesy of the Department of Energy.

MR. CLAY SMITH: So the Department of Energy actually did that evaluation and that was part of their information?

MR. GREG deBRULER: If you're

Panel Discussion (contd)

talking about the risk map for the groundwater?

MR. CLAY SMITH: Yeah.

MR. GREG deBRULER: That was actually done by, it was Pacific Northwest National Labs under contract to the Department of Energy, actually ran the model that did that calculation.

MR. CLAY SMITH: Okay. So they are just putting information that they suppose in a computer and supposedly come out with a supposed map?

MR. GREG deBRULER: They have seven models that they are using, and to do that calculation, I think Tom Stoops could really tell you how they got to these numbers, because this is Tom Stoops, he's a hydrologist, he does this kind of stuff, so maybe he wants to say something.

MR. CLAY SMITH: I have a question about that for Tom also.

How big is the aquifer underneath that area, or is there one? Water travels, you know, underneath the earth at various levels and you have aquifers, and then you don't have any, and some of the earth is porous. So it