

THR-0002

1 MR. DEE WILLIS: No questions
2 yet.

3 Any other questions about the
4 approach?

5 All right. So, if you need to get
6 home, if you have pressing concerns,
7 obligations, would you raise your hand, and you
8 want to make a comment. Raise your hand.

9 Okay. So we will start first with
10 Amber Waldref, Heart of America.

11 One more thing. I'm sorry. When
12 you start speaking, give us your name and
13 affiliation. All right.

14 **THR-0002** MS. AMBER WALDREF: Thanks.
15 Hi. I am Amber Waldref with Heart of America
16 Northwest, Hanford watch dog group.

17 I'm just going to give my comments
18 and I have a few slides to show with them. I
19 will get organized here.

20 So, like Greg was saying, we are
21 also very dissatisfied with this Environmental
22 Impact Statement, and we've done some analysis
23 of the document, and I want to say why. We are
24 still feeling like it's not meeting the needs
25 under NEPA.

26

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

THR-0002 (contd)

1 So, what's going on? DOE wants to
2 double the amount of radioactive waste at
3 Hanford.

4 This is a really good article that
5 was in the Spokesman Review. There are some on
6 the back table. Came out last week.

7 And like Greg was saying, the types
8 of waste, they want to bring in transuranic
9 waste, low-level and mixed. Not the high-level
10 waste.

11 So, just because waste is called
12 low-level doesn't mean that it's not
13 radioactive. And it basically is a catchall
14 category for all sorts of waste that doesn't
15 fall into other categories. So I just wanted
16 to note that.

17 So, why are we concerned about this
18 EIS? Well, this plan calls for importing a
19 massive amount of waste, as Mike showed us in
20 the number of football fields stacked on top of
21 each other. And we are really concerned
22 because, as Greg mentioned, the cumulative
23 risks we feel haven't been analyzed fully.

24 DOE has not prepared a complete
25 inventory and classification of the waste

27

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

THR-0002 (contd)

1

1 that's at Hanford already. So how can this EIS
2 adequately analyze the risks of adding more
3 waste. We don't know the cumulative risk from
4 what's already in Hanford soil. So that's our
5 huge concern.

2

6 Number two, disposal practices.
7 DOE, the Solid Waste EIS proposes to continue
8 dumping low-level waste in unlined dirt
9 ditches. And that's the way DOE has been doing
10 it for the last 40, 50 years.

3

11 DOE does not have a plan in this EIS
12 to line and monitor all the burial grounds at
13 Hanford, which should be in this EIS.

14 And this is an example of old
15 disposal practices at Hanford. This is
16 probably from the '70s.

17 And last week in that same Spokesman
18 Review article that I was showing, this is a
19 quote from the manager of DOE, Keith Klein, and
20 he states that we aren't seeing evidence of
21 releases from the modern practices of the last
22 20 years, and that's modern practices of waste
23 disposal, including the low-level burial
24 grounds.

25 Well, this is a picture of the

THR-0002 (contd)

1 modern disposal practices from last summer.

2 So they are still disposing of waste
3 in unlined trenches.

4 But are these trenches contaminated?
5 This is an order by the Department of Ecology
6 in Washington State from two weeks ago stating
7 that the containers of hazardous and solid
8 radioactive waste have exceeded their design
9 life and they are causing soil and eventual
10 groundwater contamination.

11 And they found DOE in violation,
12 that the waste stored in their burial grounds
13 pose a potential threat to human health and the
14 environment. And they have known and
15 threatened spills and releases from these
16 containers.

17 These things are not -- Oh. DOE
18 needs to acknowledge that these contamination
4 19 risks are going on right now, and these need to
20 be included in the Environmental Impact
21 Statement so we know what the risks are from
22 adding more wastes to these burial grounds.

23 Another note, all landfills are not
5 24 alike. And in this EIS DOE wants to dump
25 low-level, mixed and the low-activity tank

THR-0002 (contd)

5

1 waste all together. That's one of the options,
2 the alternatives. And although basically this
3 would mix very different radioactive and
4 chemical wastes all together in the same burial
5 ground, which can cause reactions and different
6 deteriorations of the liners.

7 So this is another concern of the
8 way they are disposing of wastes, or presenting
9 it in this EIS.

6

10 So, another point -- Well, this is
11 another, I wanted to note that one of the
12 chemicals that's leaching into these low-level
13 burial grounds is carbon tetrachloride, a
14 carcinogen. It was measured in air samples
15 from some of these low-level burial trenches
16 at levels reaching 176 times the OSHA standard
17 for worker exposure.

18 So there is also, you know, not only
19 groundwater concerns, but worker health and
20 safety concerns. And these need to be
21 addressed in the EIS, and they are not.

7

22 Getting to groundwater. Current
23 groundwater monitoring around the burial
24 grounds is not adequate to meet regulatory
25 requirements. And this is another statement

THR-0002 (contd)

7 | 1 from the Department of Ecology in Washington.
2 They have concluded that the low-level burial
3 ground monitoring networks and programs are
4 significantly deficient.

8 | 5 And so if they are already
6 significantly deficient, I wouldn't trust the
7 Department of Energy to bring in more waste and
8 promise to monitor this waste and keep the
9 waste from entering the soil and groundwater.

9 | 0 Some of the monitoring wells right
1 now do not reach groundwater, and this is the
2 analysis that DOE is using in the EIS.

9 | 3 They are using this lack of data
4 from groundwater wells that don't reach
5 groundwater to claim that there won't be any
6 impact from the DOE waste at Hanford. And we
7 disagree.

9 | 8 Okay. I will just make my final
9 point, transportation. I think Greg covered
0 most of the transportation issues that we also
1 found in the document.

10 | 2 But just to add, the analysis of
3 transportation risks in the EIS is being done
4 with 1990 census data and early '80s data for
5 the amount of traffic on I-5 and I-84 in

THR-0002 (contd); THR-0003

10

11

1 Oregon.

2 So this is not adequate, if you are
3 looking at risks right now in 2003 to these
4 trucks on the roads.

5 Finally, just the public
6 involvement. Like Greg, you know, we are
7 really concerned that this is -- the DOE did
8 not grant an extension for the public to
9 comment on this document, because there is so
10 much to look at, so much to consider.

11 And, you know, it really makes me
12 suspicious, if DOE really wanted to hear our
13 comments and make a decision based on these
14 concerns that we are voicing tonight, they
15 should give us the extra time necessary to
16 revise -- to review this EIS.

17 Thanks.

18 MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you.

19 Laura Applegate.

20 **THR-0003** MS. LAURA APPELEGATE: Hello.
21 My name is Laura Applegate. I work for the
22 Department of Natural Resources, Natural Area
23 Preserves, and I am here representing the
24 Columbia River. I have lived on its
25 tributaries all my life.

32

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

THR-0003 (contd)

1 I have a few concerns I would like
2 looked at in the EIS.

3 My first is the salmon populations
4 that use the Hanford Reach in that area. Now,
5 we all know salmon migrate out to the ocean.
6 Are they, is that species of salmon
7 contaminated and does that contamination reach
8 the ocean? Is it effecting the ecology in the
9 ocean?

10 Also the elk populations. There is
11 a real large elk population around Hanford
12 Reach area that we aren't able to manage right
13 now because of the questions around
14 contamination of the elk. And I wonder if that
15 meat is huntable at this point, is edible, if
16 that will, Fish and Wildlife could allow
17 hunting in that area to manage the herds so
18 that we wouldn't have to damage to the
19 ecosystem.

20 Another concern I have is fire, as
21 far as this radioactive waste is concerned,
22 what are the fire hazards. I have no idea at
23 this point.

24 And also irrigation downstream. The
25 shrub-steppe area is very dependent on

THR-0003 (contd); THR-0004

4

1 agriculture economically, and the irrigation is
2 key to allowing this agriculture to exist in
3 areas around the Hanford Area.

4 And those are my concerns. Thank
5 you.

6 MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you.
7 Tom Stoops.

8 **THR-0004** MR. TOM STOOPS: Good evening.
9 I am Tom Stoops. I am with the Oregon
10 Department of Energy. The legislature just
11 approved our name change last week. And they
12 are also revising the Oregon Hanford Waste
13 Board to the Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board. So,
14 progress does happen.

15 I want to thank all of you for being
16 here. It is really important for the
17 Department of Energy to get to hear from the
18 public. We are, like most of you, we are still
19 completing our review. We have had about five
20 people looking at the document.

21 And I'm going to reiterate points
22 that you have already heard, but only through
23 reiterating the points do they become clear and
24 do they become manageable.

1

25 We are disappointed at the refusal

THR-0004 (contd)

1

1 to extend the deadlines. It came from many of
2 the stakeholder groups that have been
3 continuously involved with the cleanup, and I
4 know that some of the requests have come from
5 Oregon Senators and Representatives also.

6 The document is 3,000 pages. That's
7 not counting references. And so for somebody
8 like me who is a hydrogeologist, I need to look
9 at references. So, you know, we will just add
10 a few hundred extra pages, maybe a few thousand
11 more to look at.

12 We want the review to be deliberate
13 and thorough, so we want to encourage the
14 Department of Energy to rethink their decision
15 to not extend the review period to allow a
16 deliberate and thorough comment from the
17 public, and to rethink that point.

2

18 The document is improved. The
19 previous document was skimpy, and it didn't
20 make it, and DOE quickly made the decision,
21 we've got to do better, so they did hear the
22 public. I want to reiterate what Dee said
23 there.

24 That doesn't mean we don't have
25 serious concerns. My review has mostly looked

35

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

THR-0004 (contd)

1 at groundwater, the groundwater monitoring
2 modeling, risk levels. And the concern that I
3 have from a hydrology point of view and doing
4 hazardous waste site cleanup, is I need to know
5 the inventory that I am putting in place.

3

6 The document reviews a portion of
7 the total inventory at Hanford. So one of our
8 comments or series of our comments will be
9 central around please look at the entire
10 inventory so that we understand the whole
11 impact. That's our concern, because there's
12 the pre-'70s waste, there's the tank leaks,
13 there's the residual waste when they are done
14 with some of the environmental restoration
15 cleanup.

4

16 You need to look at it in the
17 totality to see what is the total risk. As
18 Greg mentioned, there are process concerns
19 also, because we have the Programmatic EIS that
20 was developed back in the late '90s.

5

21 Things have changed. Things have
22 modified. We've improved. We know more now
23 than we did then. Let's incorporate that
24 information.

6

25 One of the things we do really want

THR-0004 (contd); THR-0005

6

7

1 to recommend to the Department of Energy as
2 they go through and finalize the EIS is that
3 they go back and they look at themselves for
4 some of the engineering accomplishments they
5 have had in the past.

6 One of the phrases that the
7 Department of Energy used to use was a defense
8 in depth. When you develop nuclear reactors,
9 you develop redundant systems so you have
10 defense in depth. We want to encourage them as
11 they design landfills, as they design waste
12 forms, and as they make performance
13 specifications to their contractors, that they
14 use a defense in depth concept.

15 It's a way to help with the
16 uncertainty that was talked about in the
17 numerical models.

18 Finally, the last one I am going to
19 leave you with, is we are not convinced that
20 this analysis is complete. And we believe that
21 there is more work that can be done. Thank
22 you.

23 MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you.

24 Judy Merrill.

25 **THR-0005** MS. JUDY MERRILL: Thank you.

37

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

THR-0005 (contd)

1 My name is Judy Merrill, and I live in The
2 Dalles.

3 First of all, I have been a nurse
4 for 28 years, and public health is a very
5 strong issue for me, and a part of my
6 profession.

7 I also have kayaked the Reach last
8 May, a year ago this week. And I did it in a
9 day's time, 45 miles. And I saw a lot of
10 salmon, and I saw a lot of elk, like the woman
11 from Natural Resources spoke of. That brings
12 chills to me as I think about it now. I, too,
13 wonder about the salmon and the elk. The
14 salmon as they goes down the Columbia River out
15 to the ocean and what the overall effect it
16 has.

17 I'm healthy. And I would really
18 like to prefer to stay that way. And I would
19 like all of you to stay that way, too.

20 I think this is an issue about our
21 children and about our future.

22 There's three areas of concern that
23 I have. And the first one is public input. I
24 feel strongly that 45 days no way is enough
25 time to have a public comment. And it is not

THR-0005 (contd)

2 | 1
| 2
| 3
3 | 4
| 5
| 6
| 7
| 8
| 9
| 10
4 | 11
| 12
| 13
| 14
5 | 15
| 16
| 17
| 18
| 19
| 20
6 | 21
| 22
| 23
| 24
| 25

sufficient, and it is totally unacceptable.

Transportation. I'm in total awe regarding the information I have received about the nine bridges that do not take the weight of the 70,000 or 20,000, which I can't even believe, and to think of those trucks going through towns, and cities, neighborhoods.

What happens of an accident? And the transportation route, which of course would include going by our beautiful Columbia River.

Thirdly, the cumulative risk. As a citizen in Oregon, I strongly feel I deserve an analysis to be done on the cumulative risks that have already been done on the Hanford Site. In addition, an in-depth analysis on the potential risk. But most important, of what's there already.

As Amber stated from the Heart of America Northwest, my garbage, your garbage, is not allowed to be dumped on the waste site in any ditch. Why is the mixed low-level waste disposal going into a trench? The plan is that.

The first speaker spoke about the big picture. I strongly feel that the big

THR-0005 (contd); THR-0006

1 picture is an alternative that will focus on
2 what is already there at Hanford, what I
3 kayaked by for 45 miles. Not about planning on
4 bringing 70,000 trucks of waste to Hanford.

5 Thank you.

6 MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you.

7 Cathy Snieder. Is Cathy here?

8 Diedre Duffy.

9 Clay Smith.

10 **THR-0006** MR. CLAY SMITH: I am not
11 really affiliated with anybody, except
12 everybody. I'm just a concerned citizen.

13 And I guess the only two things I
14 would like to say right now is that I think the
15 idea of mixing all the wastes together is a bad
16 idea, dumping it all together. That is not
17 going to let you clean it up later, which is
18 what's going to have to happen.

19 And so that part of it I think is a
20 really bad idea. And I think also that we need
21 more time to research this, and I think the
22 Department of Energy needs to give us more time
23 rather than the short amount of days that they
24 said we have to have this, all the comments in
25 by.