TPO-0005 (contd); TPO-0006

4

multi-millions of, you know like in terms of magnitude, the amount of compared to what there is. Maybe not millions.

But I'm trying -- I'm exaggerating. But geometric amounts, more than what there already is there to make it even more difficult.

See, what I'd like to see happen would be that we don't be so glib about this. We don't go, "Well, we did change the statement before, so we listened. So now it's okay."

I don't want that to happen, because I want my kitty cat and the birds and the snakes and the people, for generations to come, to be able to live here in Oregon and be healthy and have the high quality of life that we have. Thank you.

MR. DEE WILLIS: How do you spell your name.

MS. TOBI CANTINE: C-A-N-T-I-N-E.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Now Doug Riggs.

TPO-0006 MR. DOUG RIGGS: I like the chicken story. It's the best analogy you'll

TPO-0006 (contd)

ever get.

My name is Doug Riggs. I'm here on behalf of the Hanford Information Network. And we've only just had an opportunity in the last several days to download the summary of the EIS. And we've taken a quick look at it.

None of us have actually been able to see or read through the 3,000 page document. And we'll do so, if we can bring ourselves to it, in about a week.

But I did want to make a few formal comments. And then we'll submit written comments by the 27th.

First of all, I agree with several of the speakers who say that DOE has done some work in improving the document.

I think for those of us who read the first document, there were some significant problems with the document.

It was not well written, it wasn't well organized, it was impossible to find things, and it was completely inadequate.

So I think that some of the things in this document, from what I've seen initially, are an improvement. We appreciate

TPO-0006 (contd)

1 the DOE spending, obviously, a lot of time.
2 It's grown from 800 pages to 3,000
3 pages. And it's difficult to add 2,200 pages
4 of technical scientific material in the space
5 of seven or eight months without doing a lot of
6 work. So, Mike, we appreciate all the work
1 7 that you've done.
8 Some of the things in the EIS, from
9 what we've seen initially, appear to have
10 addressed some of the concerns about lined
11 versus unlined tanks, trenches in some cases.
12 There's an attempt to do a risk
13 analysis. Although, Greg mentioned that he has
14 concerns about that. And we'll take a close
15 look at it.
16 And there is a discussion of a
17 treatment capability that goes far beyond what
18 was in the first document. And we think those
19 are positive developments.
20 Unfortunately, we also think that
21 there are several shortcomings. And I'll only
22 go into two or three of them at this point.
23 There remains no significant
2 24 analysis of waste from prior to 1970 for
25 transuranic waste.

41

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

TPO-0006 (contd)

2

In our mind, pre-1972 is among the least missed -- of the least understood waste at Hanford. And as a result, I think it has significant potential to pose significant threats. And there appears to be no analysis in this document.

3

There is, apparently, no comprehensive analysis of the impact that groundwater contamination under the tanks might pose in the scheme of all the other contamination that might be eventually caused by solid waste disposals. And that's concerning. Those are two technical questions.

But we also have some procedural questions. One of which ought to be addressed here tonight. And another which probably can't be addressed, because it would delay this significantly beyond what DOE wants to see.

4

And the first is that we are baffled by the DOE's refusal to offer an extension of the public comment period.

And I know this has been delayed. I know that the DOE spent a lot of time on this, but I have absolutely no sympathy for the DOE refusing to delay the public comment deadline

42

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

TPO-0006 (contd)

by, at a minium of 14 days, and if not a full month or more. This is a 3,000 page document.

Assuming that someone got the document on the 11th of April and wanted to read the whole thing by May 27th, that would be 50 to 75 pages a day.

And I challenge anyone in this room, technical or not technical, to read 50 to 75 pages a day for a month and a half and still be able to retain their sanity.

So it's very difficult. I mean, I plan to read all 3,000 pages, as I read the whole 800 pages of the first one.

Two other members of our group have also committed to do so, but it's impossible to prepare thoughtful comments on a comprehensive basis in that time frame.

So I would ask the DOE reconsider their decisions to reject the extension requests.

And finally, and this is something that I know DOE cannot address and they will not address in this system, our formal testimony last summer was very clear.

We acknowledged the fact that there

TPO-0006 (contd)

is a need to develop treatment capabilities, storage treatment and disposal capabilities for additional waste generated onsite by the various Hanford cleanup activities. We think that's reasonable.

We do feel very strongly that we ought to hold off on importation of large amounts of additional waste from offsite until we are confident that the most important treatment facility at Hanford is going to be constructed and meet capability. And that's the vitrification plant at Hanford.

5

So we would like to see this document withdrawn and held in abeyance until we're convinced that the vit plant will be up and running on time.

So those are our initial formal comments. We very much appreciate the DOE coming down here and Mike taking the time to listen to us.

We hope that what we see in reading the document gives us some additional level of certainty. I don't think you'll be able to address all of our concerns, but we do appreciate your being here. Thanks.

TPO-0007

MR. DEE WILLIS: Is there anybody else that has pressing concerns at home and wants to speak now? Okay.

I want to thank the others of you who signed up early, came here early, signed up to speak, and have waited. All right.

And the first one of those is Doug Huston, the state of Oregon.

TPO-0007 MR. DOUG HUSTON: Good evening, everybody. My name is Doug Huston. And I work for the state of Oregon, Department of Energy in the nuclear safety division.

And I'm here representing the Department of Energy and Governor Kulongoski.

I'd like to thank the Department of Energy for holding this public meeting here and allowing us to give them our comments.

And I'd also like to thank them for the effort they put in in this new document.

1 We also consider that this is a much-improved document over the previous one.

We had some significant problems with the previous one. And this one is an improvement from that.

2 However, we still have some serious

TPO-0007 (contd)

concerns with this document. We don't think it's comprehensive enough.

Although it's 3,000 pages long, there are still large volumes of waste that it doesn't analyze.

2 For example, as Doug mentioned, the pre-1970 TRU waste, it doesn't talk about the irretrievable tank heels that will remain once the tank retrievable is done.

It doesn't talk about the tanks themselves, which current plans call for disposal in a landfill fashion onsite, nor the ancillary equipment associated with those tanks.

We're concerned about the tone of the Environmental Impact Statement also. This statement was intended to tier down from the

3 Programmatic EIS, and should have analyzed whether the decisions made in the Programmatic EIS were right for Hanford.

Instead, it assumes they are right for Hanford and tries to analyze the impacts. Those are our major concerns.

We're still in the process of reading the EIS and preparing our comments.

TPO-0007 (contd); TPO-0008

And our final comments will clearly state what our expectations are for future waste disposal activities at Hanford and what should be in this EIS. Thank you very much.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Frank Gearhart.

TPO-0008 MR. FRANK GEARHART: Yes, my name's Frank Gearhart. And I'm here on behalf of Citizens for Safe Water and Citizens interested in Bull Run.

We've been in domestic water issues here since 1985. And I've just got a few comments and concerns that we'd like to address here.

And mainly I'll point them out as questions, which I'm sure they're going to be taken down and maybe they'll be recorded sometime or other.

1 Number one, we've got concerns about the length of time the process is taking to clean up the Hanford complex.

As I recall, back in the '80's, the Congress said "Hey, get busy and clean up Hanford." Where are we now? We're talking about putting more waste in there.

TPO-0008 (contd)

2 And this importing of additional waste, what are the hazards and, if any, benefits of adding to the waste storage at Hanford?

3 Has the EIS addressed all potential containment failures estimated over the next 50 to a hundred years?

And what are the estimated overall

4 costs of the clean up? Of course, it sounds like we're not talking too much about cleanup, it's just putting some more in there.

But what are the overall costs of the clean up, the burial and containment? If there are any reliable estimates.

5 What are the estimated overall costs? And are these costs summarized as to short term, long term, or continuous?

Now, if we continue to put stuff in there, this is going to be an ongoing thing. And it will drain the treasury or the taxpayers.

6 We, the taxpayers, are concerned about accountability. Where does accountability stop in this process?

We've got the EPA, the Department of

48

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

Ecology in Washington state, and the Oregon Departments of Energy, and then there's the U.S. Congress.

Well, I'd like to suggest that we contact our Senators and our representative and let our thoughts be known. After all, they're the ones that make the rules.

And these agencies, we can talk until we're blue in the face, and get nowhere; right?

So where does the safety of the citizens living in the area, affected by Hanford, come to its rightful place in the chain of accountability? Thank you.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Sandy Polishuk.

TPO-0009 MS. SANDY POLISHUK: I'm Sandy Polishuk. I live here in Portland. I've lived in the Pacific Northwest my entire life except for one year.

I want to tell you a little story from many years ago when I was in high school. I used to go on diets.

And if on a particular day I weakened and ate one cookie, I would say "Oh, the day is ruined," and I would proceed to

TPO-0009 (contd)

finish the whole box of cookies.

It became evident that this was false reasoning, because I gained weight on this diet.

And I tell you this story only because all I can think is that this is the same sort of reasoning that the DOE looks at Hanford and says "Oh, the place is ruined. We might as well put more there." 1

Well, I'm committed to the Northwest. As I say, I've lived here all my life. I live within a very short distance of the Columbia River, so do my grandchildren.

And I do not want that river contaminated. I want Hanford cleaned up, I do not want it increased. Thank you. 2

I have one more concern I want -- I have a lot of concerns, but I'm not going to speak to them all.

But the one that I will speak to, as having lived in Portland for 35 years, in watching the geometric increase in our traffic problems.

And I think any of you who've lived here for a few years know that sometimes within

TPO-0009 (contd); TPO-0010

months you become aware of the added congestion on our interstate highways.

3 And it's just mind-boggling to think about those trucks on those crowded highways and the lack of alternatives to I-5. Thank you.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Pardon me if I mispronounce this, Lynn -- Lynn Ford.

MR. LYNN FORD: I'll just wait.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Okay. Joyce Fouingstad?

(Ms. Holenstein's comment inaudible, no microphone. Wanting to speak at a later time.)

MR. DEE WILLIS: You bet. Pat Timberlake.

TPO-0010 MS. PAT TIMBERLAKE: My name is Pat Timberlake. I'm a physician, a naturopathic physician, and a psychotherapist.

And I just have a few things to say tonight, because as I've been listening and I have read some things, but I'm hearing more and more facts, I am really appreciative that these arguments and viewpoints are taking place today. They are necessary.