Panel Discussion (contd); TPO-0026

but it's going to effect the whole nation. And it's going to effect the industry, it's going to effect everything.

So I think it would be a good thing for Move-On. And I thank you for those comments that you made through Gerry, Mike.

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: It was my pleasure.

MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: No, I don't want to get you in trouble.

MR. GERRY POLLET: Mike had nothing to do with that.

MR. DEE WILLIS: We've got another questions back here.

MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: Do you want to make some comments for Gerry, Mike?

MR. DEE WILLIS: We've got a questioner back here. We'll come to you later.

Name, sir?

TPO-0026 MR. TIM STEARNS: Good evening, my name is Tim Stearns. I live in Seattle.

1 And it strikes me that we continue to have a crisis of trust here. And I guess I'd be interested in comments on how we work through it.

TPO-0026 (contd)

2

It's fairly clear we don't have modeling that we really can understand the risks that we're dealing with.

3

It's fairly clear that we don't really have a clear and comprehensive plan of how we're going to deal with the waste across the set of complexes.

4

We have transportation risks, but it's really not clear how we would manage them. We were just in Seattle yesterday where we tested the dirty bomb scenario. And it wasn't pretty.

I mean, essentially all of the rescue workers, the initial responders were contaminated. This is one we planned. And what do we do when we come to other ones?

And I guess, you know, as a range of questions or a final range of a question of, you know, this EIS really doesn't contemplate anything but an import action.

5

It doesn't really look at treating waste really anyplace other than Hanford. It doesn't really consider treating it at a place that actually has adequate facilities, licensed in-place facilities in place before we start

143

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

TPO-0026 (contd); Panel Discussion (contd)

5

moving stuff.

And finally, there's no real consideration of trying to do this in a place that doesn't already have contaminated groundwater and a contaminated river.

So I guess I'm interested in your thoughts. How we bring trust back to this situation between the citizens of the Northwest and the Department of Energy and the Bush administration. Thank you.

MR. DOUG HUSTON: Well, I think I'll start off with this.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Wait a minute. I just want to mark the fact that there are several comments imbedded in his question.

Tim Stearns?

MR. TIM STEARNS: Yes.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Okay.

MR. DOUG HUSTON: Yeah. Well, I want to deal with the trust issue first. I think, and Maryann, you can report this back to Mike, I think that one major way that we can rebuild trust between the citizens of the Northwest and the Department of Energy is to involve all the citizens of the Northwest in a

meaningful way in the decisions made at Hanford.

And speaking as a member of the state of Oregon, we would certainly like to be a full partner in the clean up agreements associated with Hanford.

MR. GERRY POLLET: I thought you were going to say also have a decent comment period.

MR. DOUG HUSTON: Yeah, that's true too. Yeah.

MR. GERRY POLLET: Advisory Board comment?

MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: Yeah. I, frankly, at this particular moment in time don't know if it is possible to build trust between the public and the Department of Energy.

And this is the first time that I have felt this kind of hopelessness on this particular issue.

But who I trust is the public. And I think that our obligation is to get more people educated. Without more people involved in knowing what Hanford is and what's going on

Panel Discussion (contd)

there --

And I'm thinking of the Port of Portland, I'm thinking of the big businessmen, I'm thinking of the barge companies, et cetera, et cetera.

I think we have to start building trust among ourselves. And I think then we put the pressure on the Department of Energy.

I think that we support the Department of Ecology when it takes the steps that it's had to take lately. It's been many a year coming to this.

But, you know, I guess there's -- it happens when it happens, and it's happened. I think some people are believing that the Washington Department of Ecology has to back down a little bit and find some ways to compromise with the Department of Energy.

I would say, no, as long as Ecology makes sure their ego isn't involved in this. I was telling the reporter tonight, I think that there is a little bit of ego both on the Department of Energy and on the Washington Department of Ecology. But I think Ecology's in the right position.

And we need to thank Ecology for making this move in order to support them, because they're sticking their necks out on the line.

So you build their trust, you build trust this way. And, you know, I don't see how one can build trust with the machine of the Department of Energy at this point.

I actually -- I don't know if you can even attempt to answer that, Mike. I mean, you're in a very different position. This probably is off limits for you, right?

How do we regain our trust together? And it's not you personally.

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: I understand. I can't answer the question. I can only answer for myself.

And myopic Mike thinks you trust people, and you just have to go one step at a time to trust individuals. And just keep building up that network.

MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: Well, you know, as much time as some of us spend up at Hanford, I'm always looking for who can I trust.

Panel Discussion (contd)

And the newer people that have been brought in, I can't trust. And I know better than to trust, and I trust my gut pretty much after all these years of living.

So I'm a little floored there. So I look for some of the so-called underlings. And I try to -- I certainly find some people to trust, but they have very little power in the system.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Panel, any others? This gentleman over here and then we'll go to the lady.

MR PAUL MCADAMS: The lady first.

MS. CHERIE HOLENSTEIN: Ladies first. Oh, trust. Cherie Holenstein. I don't know how I can trust anybody in the Department of Energy. The citizens have asked for clean up. Clean up. No more waste.

As I said earlier, it's iterated, it reiterated: Clean up, no more waste. And what are we talking about tonight?

Importing more waste to Hanford when we have not cleaned up the mess we have. It is that simple.

Panel Discussion (contd)

Enlighten me. What am I missing here?

MR. DEE WILLIS: The gentleman in the baseball cap.

MS. CHERIE HOLENSTEIN: Please, please.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Was that a rhetorical question?

MS. CHERIE HOLENSTEIN: No, it's not.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Any responses, panel?

MR. GERRY POLLET: I'd say she's got it.

MR. DOUG HUSTON: I guess I don't understand what the question is.

MS. CHERIE HOLENSTEIN: Do you want me to repeat it?

MR. DOUG HUSTON: No. No. No. No. I heard the question. Actually, I guess I don't have a good answer for that. Mike?

MR. GERRY POLLET: You know, let me answer this question. It is also related to this.

A number of members of Congress have

Panel Discussion (contd)

all said the same thing you've just said. Write them and ask them to act.

They've, you know -- there are statements in the back of the room here from Senator Wyden, Senator Smith, Congressman Wu, last year, Congressman Blumenauer's statement, Brian Beard's statement all saying the same thing: Clean up, don't add more. It makes no sense to anyone.

And all this talk about, you know, is the EIS adequate about this, that, or the other thing, hides the fundamental question, is: Is it wrong to be doing this?

MR. DEE WILLIS: Okay, Nancy.

MS. NANCY METRICK: Well, he actually answered it.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Sir?

MR. PAUL MCADAMS: Paul McAdams. What isotopes will be buried in those trenches? I mean, what type of radioactive material, what are the radionuclides?

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: You could go through the table of radionuclides and pick out most of them.

MR. PAUL MCADAMS: I mean, what

Panel Discussion (contd)

is some of most of the --

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: The most radioactive ones and the ones that end up contributing most to, at least short-term impacts, are cesium and strontiums of the world.

MR. PAUL MCADAMS: Strontium 90?

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: Strontium 90 and cesium 137, I believe it is.

Long term, the impacts end up being the uraniums, the --

MR. GERRY POLLET: Technetiums.

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: Technetiums, thank you. Sometimes Carbon 14. Those type of things. And those long terms are the ones we consider relatively long lived.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Other questions, comments?

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: Yeah, Iodine 129's another one.

MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTED: I'd like to know what the treatment process is going to be --

MR. DEE WILLIS: Joyce

Panel Discussion (contd)

Fouingsted.

MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTED: I'm Joyce Fouingsted.

What is the treatment process for the transuranic waste? Will there be any plutonium put into these trenches? If so, why?

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: You can't say no atom of plutonium will get into these trenches. The treatment process is generally, get rid of the chemical constituents in it, that could be by neutralization or lots of other processes.

And then for the radioactive portion, there's really only two treatments: One is, in some cases, you can put it back through a reactor, which isn't very popular; or, two, time. Those are the two treatments for radioactivity.

So for radioactivity, you contain it. And I think Mr. Carpenter said that very well earlier.

MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTED: Where are the monitors going to be placed under the trenches?

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: In lined

Panel Discussion (contd)

trenches -- for the lined trenches, what will happen is there will be sensors between the two plastic liners, and then there will be some set of groundwater monitoring wells around it.

MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTED: And are there going to be monitors underneath these trenches?

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: I don't know that.

MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTED: Before things get to the groundwater?

MR. GERRY POLLET: That's actually, in history, I just wrote up in there groundwater monitoring strategy.

The law requires an early detection system to its soil column. And DOE has no plans for -- obviously, there's none at the existing unlined burial grounds and there's no plan for it in the new facilities either.

MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTED: So I'd have to agree with you, then, it's not a legal document.

MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: Well, can I also answer your question, Joyce?

MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTED: Uh-huh.

Panel Discussion (contd); TPO-0027

MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: There aren't going to be any monitoring things, they're aren't going to be any of the things you're asking about, because we're not going to let this happen. That's the answer.

TPO-0027 MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTED: Thank you. One last question. We have planes going into buildings; we have, in other countries, cars and trucks going into various compounds, buildings, and so forth, blowing things up, so have they looked at one of the drivers running this truck loaded with all these goodies into some major, you know, like, pick it, the federal building downtown, whatever?

1 MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: Not a -- there's been no specific accident onsite analyzed for a truck loaded with anything crashing --

Well, that's not true. Some of our accident analysis do include just our normal -- a truck just normally operating, accidentally crashing into places and starting a fire, an explosion, and that sort of thing.

We don't look at anything like a federal building, which is outside the