

Presentations (contd)

1 past. They haven't cared.

2 Most of the alternatives to
3 disposal, transportation, and treatment of
4 waste is based on assumptions.

5 And I will go through some of the
6 assumptions you will find if you read just the
7 summary of this document, of this 3,000 page
8 document.

9 You state in different places in
10 this EIS that the amount of waste that would be
11 brought in is uncertain, unknown.

12 I'm worried that the long-term
13 performance of our waste site remedies and
14 closure techniques are unproven.

15 I'm more worried that your risk
16 modeling tool, the Systems Assessment
17 Capability referred to at Hanford as the SAC,
18 is still very young and emerging, that each
19 human's response to dose or exposure is
20 uncertain.

21 In other words, it all evens out,
22 according to your assumptions and modeling;
23 thus, the impacts of bringing more waste in to
24 Hanford are minimal, so benign, not to worry
25 about. So I'm quoting you some things out of

12

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

Presentations (contd)

1 this document.

2 Even cumulative impacts are painted
3 as small, but you also state that the SAC risk
4 model has not yet completed the inventory and
5 classification of waste forms.

6 How can you tell me that the risk is
7 small when you haven't done the inventory and
8 classification?

9 These statements throughout the
10 3,000 page document do not engender credibility
11 or trust.

12 We have many questions that cannot
13 be answered by the time the DOE plans to issue
14 decisions on this EIS.

15 Some of these questions are to be
16 answered in the tank closure decisions for
17 which there is no Draft EIS yet.

18 How can the decisions from the
19 various documents support each other in a
20 holistic and comprehensive way when the
21 Department continues to approach the issues of
22 nuclear waste in a piecemeal fashion?

23 The impacts of the tank waste after
24 treatment, from whatever technologies you plan
25 to use, and those haven't been decided yet,

13

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

Presentations (contd)

1 must be part of this document.

2 Are we going to bury these wastes
3 onsite? Will waste from the tanks and trenches
4 be permanently buried? Will they be
5 retrievable if your assumptions are wrong?

6 We will still have no decisions on
7 the final form of these wastes? How can you
8 show us accurate impacts for the short or long
9 term?

10 This EIS does not address the issue
11 of digging up and treating waste from the
12 Hanford burial grounds.

13 It shows the uses of unlined
14 trenches for waste burial. How can we use
15 existing land and facilities for imported
16 waste, when we have yet to treat and dispose of
17 myriad volumes of our own waste to an
18 acceptable degree of protection?

19 And we want our waste that's there
20 already, treated to an acceptable fashion. We
21 want protection for our grandchildren.

22 Throughout this document, the
23 Department has interwoven many of the premises
24 put forth in last years performance management
25 plan that proposed cost-saving measures that

14

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

Presentations (contd)

1 play havoc with current laws.

2 This administration has been the
3 stealth bomber of environmental laws that lets
4 industry off the hook and the puts the welfare
5 of the environment, and the people, at risk for
6 centuries to come.

7 One of these proposals -- which is
8 found in and denied in, so you find a proposal
9 and it is also denied in this EIS -- is moving
10 the point at which one measures risk away from
11 the source to a further point so as to lower
12 the standards, which was what Nick just
13 explained, is the point of compliance issue.
14 Thus, minimizing the risks.

15 This kind of action constitutes a
16 change in policy which is beyond the purview of
17 an Environmental Impact Statement.

18 The Department of Energy is the
19 bully in the school yard, forcing changes, some
20 which could be for the better, but damaging so
21 much trust along the way, that we cannot afford
22 to accept the alternatives of this EIS with
23 their many assumptions.

24 We need to see more immediate
25 progress in the clean up of Hanford before we

15

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

Presentations (contd)

1 can carry the burdens for the rest of the
2 nation.

3 We need to see tank waste put into a
4 glass form. That still has not been done. We
5 want no further delays and changes of plans for
6 the waste treatment plant.

7 We want the waste at Hanford treated
8 and stored in the safest manner. We want to be
9 assured of a defensible groundwater strategy
10 that will protect the Columbia River.

11 We want our values in this region
12 respected and adhered to. We insist on a
13 quality clean up by our standards.

14 We live here. We rely on the health
15 of the environment for our own survival: for
16 fishing and recreation and crop irrigation for
17 the long haul.

18 MR. DEE WILLIS: Paige, can we
19 have a hard copy of that statement?

20 MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: Oh, you sure
21 can. I have a ton. How many do you want?

22 MR. DEE WILLIS: One.

23 MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: I think you
24 need more. I have these comments in the back.

25 MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you.

16

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

Presentations (contd)

1 Gerry Pollet, there you are.

2 MR. GERRY POLLET: Gerry Pollet
3 with Heart of America Northwest. (Overhead
4 presentation).

5 Why are we here tonight? This
6 headline summarizes the plan. The action in
7 question is to make Hanford a national
8 radioactive waste dump.

9 The action in question should be,
10 "How do we clean up and what are the impacts of
11 what is already in the burial grounds at
12 Hanford?"

13 Saying this EIS is better than the
14 last EIS is like saying we detected a pulse
15 from a dead horse.

16 It's still grossly legally
17 inadequate. It will result in more litigation.
18 And there is no way to salvage this.

19 It needs to be withdrawn,
20 revised to meet the expectations and the law,
21 and put back out, and this time with a comment
22 period that allows you enough time to analyze
23 it before the public hearings and for
24 meaningful notice to be given.

25 70,000 truckloads of radioactive

17

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

Presentations (contd)

1 waste would be shipped through Oregon to
2 Hanford under this plan. 70,000. That's about
3 five a day between now and 2046.

4 Now, why are we talking about making
5 Hanford a national radioactive waste dump? It
6 is not about, quote, "helping to clean up other
7 DOE sites."

8 Hanford is the most contaminated
9 site in the nation. The Hanford cleanup
10 agreement says "We will be done with cleanup of
11 all soil at Hanford by 2018."

12 And Hanford takes longer to get to
13 that cleanup point than any other site in the
14 nation.

15 So why do we have a plan to run
16 landfills, massive landfills, and import waste
17 through the year 2046 from other nuclear
18 weapons production sites?

19 As some of these plans say, it is
20 about new generation of waste from weapons
21 production activities.

22 More than doubling the amounts of
23 low-level waste already at Hanford soil, yes,
24 the Department of Energy dumps waste in unlined
25 burial grounds.

18

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

Presentations (contd)

1 As last year, in his comments,
2 Senator Wyden said: Under federal and state
3 laws, even household garbage cannot be dumped
4 in to unlined trenches.

5 Fortunately, at a hearing before the
6 Senate Energy Committee, I got a commitment
7 from energy assistant secretary Jesse Roberson,
8 there would be no more disposal in unlined
9 trenches.

10 Dumping more waste at Hanford, even
11 in lined trenches, cannot be considered cleanup
12 in any sense of the word.

13 Now, incredibly enough, like many
14 other times including several times this year,
15 that commitment of the assistant energy
16 secretary has been broken.

17 This plan, this EIS does not make
18 any commitment to ending the illegal disposal
19 in unlined ditches, nor even under the
20 alternatives that would move to lined ditches
21 is there a timeline.

22 Now, you need to visualize this to
23 understand what we're talking about. Here's an
24 example of radioactive waste disposal practices
25 at Hanford in the 1970's, 1980's.

Presentations (contd)

1 Soil, you don't know where things
2 are, spreading contamination, reaching
3 groundwater.

4 This EIS should be about "How fast
5 do we dig this up? What are the alternatives?
6 How do we treat it?" That's what it's supposed
7 to be about, not "How do we make new landfill
8 capacity?"

9 The Department of Energy, however,
10 has said taking offsite waste, including the
11 transuranic wastes that we just stopped in
12 federal court, will be a priority above Hanford
13 cleanup work.

14 It is more important to this
15 Department of Energy to import this waste than
16 to clean up Hanford, and that has sure been
17 borne out by the Department of Energy
18 suspending cleanup work this week, in response
19 to an order that they clean up the burial
20 grounds, ironically.

21 In the year 2000, U.S. Department of
22 Energy imported from other weapons plants
23 232,000 cubic feet of radioactive waste and
24 dumped it in unlined burial grounds.

25 Enough to cover a football field

20

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

Presentations (contd)

1 13-foot deep in radioactive waste. That's an
2 astonishing amount.

3 Under this EIS, they would be able
4 to import one million cubic feet a year, it
5 says.

6 What are the conditions of these
7 burial ground? Washington Department of
8 Ecology's order, issued on April 30th, quoted a
9 DOE document saying: Solid radioactive and
10 hazardous waste remain underground in
11 deteriorating containers that have exceeded
12 their design life, causing soil and eventual
13 groundwater contamination, pose a potential
14 threat to human health and the environment due
15 to hazardous constituents and transuranic
16 elements known to have been stored there.
17 Known and threatened spills and releases.

18 Mixed remote-handled transuranic
19 waste, which has not been characterized,
20 because Hanford does not have any facility that
21 is capable of analyzing the chemical
22 constituents of this extremely radioactive
23 plutonium waste that is -- they are trying to
24 import, and the federal court just blocked them
25 from doing -- is going into the burial grounds.

21

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

Presentations (contd)

1 These same burial grounds have the
2 poison and carcinogen carbon tetrachloride in
3 the vapor, in the bottom of the trenches,
4 measured at levels that are nearly double,
5 double the levels, that are fatal to humans.
6 176 times the level at which OSHA regulates it
7 at for exposure for workers.

8 It has reached groundwater, and you
9 won't find a single mention of this in the EIS.

10 Now, as I said, here is now how the
11 smallest, the very smallest of Hanford's
12 unlined burial grounds looks (indicating).
13 This was taken two years ago. Unlined burial
14 grounds.

15 Most of the burial grounds trenches
16 are three football fields long, a thousand feet
17 long.

18 They don't know what is in here, if
19 you had to retrieve it, obviously.

20 The integrity of the drums,
21 obviously, is going to be suspect from doing
22 this. And, heck, you can even see some liquid
23 traces coming in.

24 This is what the Hanford manager,
25 Mr. Keith Klein, calls modern practices. This

22

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

Presentations (contd)

1 was in last weeks Spokesman Review front-page
2 story. "We aren't seeing evidence of releases
3 from the modern practices of the last 20 years
4 including the low-level burial grounds."

5 Apparently Mr. Klein read his own
6 EIS and nothing else. He clearly hasn't read
7 anything else, including the order of
8 April 30th, that clearly quoting DOE's own
9 documents, documents the contamination to
10 groundwater.

11 We'd like to know when, when,
12 Mr. Klein, are you going to install legally
13 adequate groundwater monitoring system around
14 these burial grounds? Why isn't that in this
15 EIS?

16 And when are we going to have all
17 the wastes retrieved from those burial grounds?
18 Where will they be treated? And what are the
19 cumulative impacts of adding anything more to
20 the soil?

21 This is Hanford's own model of
22 groundwater (indicating). This is the edge of
23 the Reservation with the Columbia River running
24 for 50 miles.

25 The red area is their model for what

23

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

Presentations (contd)

1 level of the groundwater that will be
2 contaminated 100 times above the drinking water
3 standard.

4 The drinking water standard is set
5 at a level that kills one adult from cancer
6 from every 10,000 people exposed.

7 MR. DEE WILLIS: Finish up,
8 please.

9 MR. GERRY POLLET: So we're
10 talking 100 out of 10,000 at red. It continues
11 to spread in this model.

12 And DOE has done a grossly
13 inadequate job of looking at the cumulative
14 impacts and has not given any analysis of what
15 the groundwater contamination would be from
16 individual burial grounds as was mentioned
17 before.

18 Sorry that it went longer. Thank
19 you.

20 MR. DEE WILLIS: Now we're
21 going to move in to Section 5 of the agenda,
22 public comment for the record.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How
24 about questions and answers?

25 MR. DEE WILLIS: Do you want to

24

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

Informal Question and Answer Section

1 ask some questions at this point? I want to go
2 ahead and get public comment if I can, all
3 right.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think
5 it will be easier to give comment --

6 MS. NANCY METRICK: -- comment
7 after we understand more of the issues, then
8 ask the questions.

9 MR. DEE WILLIS: Okay. So do
10 you want to do the panel right now, then, for a
11 few minutes at least?

12 MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: Can I
13 suggest something?

14 MR. DEE WILLIS: Yeah.

15 MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: Let's go
16 ahead, people have comments right now, give
17 comments. We'll have the panel, and then we'll
18 have more comments afterwards, because I know
19 people are already prepared.

20 MR. DEE WILLIS: Pardon me?

21 MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: What Dee is
22 trying to do is to accommodate people who want
23 to go home.

24 MR. DEE WILLIS: Yeah.

25 MS. PAIGE KNIGHT: So, if

25

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

Informal Question and Answer Section (contd)

1 people who want to make comments now.

2 MR. DEE WILLIS: Right. So
3 those of you who need to go home, who have
4 other pressing commitments, are there any
5 people that have those commitments? Doug? All
6 right. Everybody.

7 What I'd like to do is, in that
8 case, call your name in the order that you
9 signed up to give comment. All right.

10 We'll do that for a few minutes.
11 And if we really need to go to questions after
12 that, we'll do that.

13 Please limit your comments to five
14 minutes. No discussion back and forth during
15 the comment period.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So
17 you're not going to call the names of the
18 people who need to get out of here first, so
19 that they can do it and then leave?

20 MR. DEE WILLIS: Raise your
21 hands again. Doug, you're close. Sir, what's
22 your name?

23 MR. DON PORTER: Don Porter.

24 MR. DEE WILLIS: Okay. Who
25 else? Greg? Anybody else need to leave early?

26

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

Informal Question and Answer Section (contd); TPO-0001

1 Ma'am?

2 MS. SUSAN FAY: Susan.

3 MR. DEE WILLIS: Susan.

4 MS. SUSAN FAY. Fay.

5 MR. DEE WILLIS: Okay. Ma'am?

6 MS. BARBARA PEREIRA: Barbara

7 Pereira.

8 MR. DEE WILLIS: Barbara

9 Pereira. All right. Please limit your
10 comments to five minutes or less. Most people
11 can do it in less than five minutes.

12 And come up and speak to the mike,
13 give us your name before you start talking; all
14 right?

15 The first will be Don Porter.

16 **TPO-0001** MR. DON PORTER: My name is Don
17 Porter. I've lived in a house on the
18 Willamette River for the past 44 years, time
19 enough to raise six kids. And now I've got
20 about eight grandchildren.

21 And I've heard comments about the
22 clean up of Hanford, and yet all I hear is
23 bringing in more waste and nothing about how
24 much you've cleaned up. And this is very
25 disparaging.

27

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

TPO-0002

1 MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you.

2 Greg. And after Greg, Susan Fay.

3 **TPO-0002** MR. deBRULER: My name is Greg
4 deBruler. And I represent Columbia
5 Riverkeeper.

6 And I am officially, as of two
7 nights ago, the official riverkeeper for
8 Columbia Riverkeeper, so I have a new status.
9 Like I haven't ever talked for Columbia
10 Riverkeeper.

11 The first general comment is: You
12 know, I listen to Gerry and I listen to Paige,
13 and I've read a fair amount of this EIS, and I
14 guess from the public perspective, what you
15 have to think of, this is a shell game.

16 The reason why they're doing this,
17 and Gerry had this wonderful slide up here
18 about how much they want to bring in, that
19 70,000 truckloads is, this is kind of like the
20 initial salvo.

21 Once they get through that 70,000,
22 it could go up to 150,000. It could go higher
23 than 70.

24 But if you think about what they're
25 trying to do and why they're so interested in