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.

TPO-0010 (contd)

But yet I'm also kind of overwhelmed with the thought of "Why haven't they taken place before?"

1 Should we trust a government agency that is so shortsighted? Why is this occurring now? Why wasn't a plan developed before the need to dispose of the waste?

And why weren't the disposal sites prepared prior to the need for the disposal, while the nuclear waste was being made from our nuclear power plants?

Even more important, it's when we created the ability to make the nuclear power plants. Why weren't the people who envisioned this intelligent and responsible enough to design the safe disposal of the result of these plants?

2 We're haggling over the minimum questions. We argue where the trucks will run, how long the method of disposal, like, for example, in terms of interims of 30 to 50 years. I mean, what is that?

What about the future? We talk about limiting the impact. I can't even get my mind around the smallness of what we're talking

52

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

TPO-0010 (contd); TPO-0011

2 about.

What about the animals that have been mentioned before? What about the birds and the fish? The food chain?

3 We can't impact our environment without impacting the whole interconnection of life itself. That's what we're talking about. Let's don't forget this larger picture.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Ms. Fouingstad, are you ready now?

MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTAD: I prefer to wait until after.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Okay.

Nancy Metrick.

TPO-0011 MS. NANCY METRICK: Hi, I'm Nancy Metrick. And I've heard a lot of new information that I haven't heard before. I've been to these meetings before.

And some of which is -- that I will specifically address. And then I would like to address it on a larger scale, as the woman before me was talking about.

1 The low-level mix that is now mixed with chemical waste, apparently this statement has not addressed that properly, and that they

TPO-0011 (contd)

do not know how the chemicals will mix with the low-level waste.

I've heard of -- so that they don't know how it will mix, so therefore, they don't know what could happen. And they're completely ignoring this, apparently, in this statement.

The other thing, one of the other things that concerned me, was the fact that -- well, part of this chemical mix includes the solvents that allow plutonium to travel more easily.

And that was talked about earlier, when I had heard some information on this. And that is not addressed. And I heard --

The earth will be here long after we're gone. And I think we'll be gone pretty soon if we keep up at this rate. So I'm not too worried about the earth.

I am worried about us and the other animals. The ants will probably still make it, but, you know, they've been here a long time.

But, I mean again, I feel like I'm repeating. I've said a million things before, but for goodness sake, 30 years. I mean, it's so ridiculous.

TPO-0011 (contd)

I mean, when you talk about what is mentioned from ten -- is it ten years, ten minutes or something? Or ten years to -- what was the amount?

I think it was more than a quarter million. Three quarters of a million or something years. That this waste --

3 And the fact that this glassification was originally what was intended, and now it's only going to be 20 percent, because it's cheaper.

4 And the other part that's cheaper is the fact that this is free land that they are wasting it. They are saying this is a loss, a total loss. It is a sacrificed site.

And another interesting thing that

5 I've been hearing about is that the DOE does not need to follow the law. That's the whole point: The DOE never has had to follow the law.

I love the summary, with uncertain, unproven -- everything is uncertain and unproven.

6 The fact that cumulative impacts, again, are not taken into account. The fact

TPO-0011 (contd)

7 that, of course, 9-11, and terrorism is not taken into account.

8 I'd love to ask: How many people it is okay to sacrifice? Did they come up with any numbers?

Maybe the panel could answer that later. What is allowable casualties? What is that called, I forget what it's called, but there's a word for it.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Two minutes.

9 MS. NANCY METRICK: Okay. But the fact that the groundwater, there is no real assessment of what's going to happen to groundwater.

10 Already it's completely leaked into the groundwater. This is insane putting more things there then there is now.

11 But I would like to talk about the larger picture briefly too. Which is basically what this is really about. And it's always the same thing, it's always about money.

The government takes our money to subsidize nuclear, and its cleanup, and all the nuclear capacities.

We are being bilked and we are

TPO-0011 (contd); TPO-0012

11 keeping energy industry centralized.
Alternative methods are not being found.
And this is intentional. This is
not some thing, this is, you know -- need I say
that I know damn well that the people in power
right now are part of that whole problem.
And we know it too. And we
shouldn't let them forget that we know it. And
that we know that this is a part of that. And
that's what this is really about. And this is
what this has always been about.
And I've said before, Eisenhower
went against -- he was republican, but he knew
and he warned against the military industrial
complex. Maybe the republican party wasn't
comprised of the same individuals at that time.
And this thing about -- that also is
new to me about the fact that we have to get
40 percent complete by 2006.
12 Look, this is about cleanup. This
should only be about clean up. This is
bullshit. And I think we all know that.
MR. DEE WILLIS: Gerry Pollet.
TPO-0012 MR. GERRY POLLET: Use the
overhead too.

TPO-0012 (contd)

1997, the U.S. Department of Energy issued its national waste management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, which said although DOE intends to select sites for waste management activities based on the WMPIS, the WMPIS will not be the basis for selecting specific locations for facilities at sites.

DOE will consider the results of relevant existing on new site-wide or project-level NEPA analyses. And similar statements are made throughout the Programmatic EIS.

The Programmatic EIS said that if the quantities of transuranic wastes that are now proposed to be shipped to Hanford were shipped to Hanford, they may require treatment involving incineration at Hanford and that such treatment would result in offsite fatal cancers.

Under Regionalized Alternative 2, treatment accidents would result in two cancer fatalities in the offsite population at Hanford.

Under Regionalized Alternative 3,

TPO-0012 (contd)

treatment accidents would result in two cancer fatalities in the offsite population at Hanford.

The regional alternatives were predicted to result in a total of five fatal cancers in workers at Hanford, five times more than anywhere else.

In the event of an earthquake, the accident analysis assumed that the storage facility would collapse and that there would be significant releases of transuranic waste into the air at Hanford.

Quote "Much higher consequences were predicted for the earthquake accident considered in the WIPP," SEIS II, which is another DOE document.

The number of latent cancer fatalities in the offsite population range to 200 at Hanford.

The accident, quote, "produces a significant airborne release of TRU-W, transuranic waste," unquote.

In light of the stable nature of treated transuranic waste, this set of assumptions may be conservative.

TPO-0012 (contd)

They assumed that the waste was treated when they made that calculation. And we know today that the waste that is being proposed to be shipped to Hanford is untreated waste.

The Department of Energy insists that it is under no legal obligation to treat these wastes during the storage period at Hanford.

And it has convinced the Federal Court this week that it is under no obligation to treat the waste.

That means they are under an obligation, and a serious one, to evaluate the impacts of storing untreated and uncharacterized waste in this Environmental Impact Statement. And those impacts are very serious.

And when they analyze those impacts, they need to come out to the public and present it in another round of hearings and consider and ask the public what should be done in terms of the mitigation of those impacts.

The waste management Programmatic EIS repeatedly states that the site-wide

TPO-0012 (contd)

Environmental Impact Statement, which is the current EIS we're talking about, will be where they analyze where the facilities should be located, if they are safe to be stored, if waste is safe to be stored at Hanford, and how to mitigate the impacts.

The greatest number of estimated cancer incidences resulting from treatment of TRU-W is expected to occur in the offsite populations at INEL and Hanford.

"Thermal treatment of waste that contains plutonium 238 at Hanford, which is previously mentioned, would require special mitigation measures," unquote.

"Specific mitigation measures would be evaluated in site-wide or project-specific NEPA reviews," unquote.

This EIS fails the test that DOE set out for itself in the 1997 document. And I'm pleased to say that Judge McDonald agreed when he wrote this week that --

MR. DEE WILLIS: Time's up.

MR. GERRY POLLET: May I finish my quote?

MR. DEE WILLIS: Yes.

TPO-0012 (contd)

MR. GERRY POLLET: Okay. "The court finds there is a, quote, 'serious question' unquote, whether the language in the PIS limits DOE's obligation to conduct additional NEPA review to a situation to where it would construct additional facilities at Hanford."

Quote, "Specific mitigation measures to reduce radiation exposure from treatment of TRU-W would be evaluated in site-wide or project-level EISs."

The court also goes on to note the same thing about transportation impacts and that the waste management PIS promised site-specific/route-specific impact analyses.

And that would include the condition of Oregon's bridges, additional congestion since 1982, since 1982 computer model is utilized.

1 We urge DOE to withdraw the EIS and come back out after it meets the test clearly laid out by the court and its own 1997 document.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Harvey Clawson.

TPO-0013 MR. HARVEY CLAWSON: I'm Harvey Clawson. I work at Hewlett-Packard in Vancouver, Washington. I've lived in the area for 12 years.

My primary work responsibility at Hewlett-Packard has to do with risk analysis and mitigation and disaster recovery. So that's my background. I'm not representing Hewlett-Packard, of course.

For me, some elements of the natural world are sacred treasures. And these elements are sacred, not in a religious sense or a dogmatic sense, but because of their incalculable worth to ourselves, to the rest of humanity, and to the sustainability of all life.

The element of the Columbia River is one of these natural treasures. It's unique and irreplaceable.

We inherit this type of wonder from our ancestors. And if we treat it with respect, we pass it on, intact, to our descendants.

1 The nuclear and toxic contamination already at Hanford is virtually assured to

TPO-0013 (contd)

contaminate both the water, the land, and the air in our lifetimes, and will continue to accumulate for many generations to come.

Today the DOE has proposed to add to that contamination, of the past, by importing large volumes of additional wastes.

Perhaps some view Hanford area as a national sacrifice zone, that it's already so contaminated that adding more does not affect it, I refuse to give up so easily.

We must focus now on minimizing the existing risks here through the best available means of containment and treatment.

I'm strongly opposed to importing any additional wastes into this region. This must not be the dumping ground for the entire nation.

I'm convinced that the risks involved in transporting waste to the region are high and have not been properly assessed.

We have no adequate plan for prevention or mitigation of the risks involved, the ones of which we're already aware.

And we will continue to discover, in the future, many additional risks of which

TPO-0013 (contd)

4 we're not now aware.

But what are my deeper concerns? The repeated failure of the DOE to fullfil its past promises and commitments calls into serious question not just the proposal presented today but the integrity of the entire process of government in this area.

5 DOE, your proposals leave me with many unanswered questions. What are your true intentions?

Are you negotiating in good faith? Have you fully disclosed all the relevant information in your possession?

How does this EIS address risks associated with the transportation of materials?

6 How long will additional waste import delay the clean up of the existing

7 waste? And how much will it cost?

Do you really believe that these

8 proposals enable you to comply with all applicable laws?

How do you plan to keep us and our

9 children safe for the next generation or two or three? Much less, a quarter of a million years

TPO-0013 (contd)

9 from now.

And, of course, the ultimate question: Can we trust what you say?

But in a larger sense, DOE does not operate in a vacuum, of course. The agency is an arm of the U.S. Government.

And for many, many years, the U.S. has based its entire security strategy on fear, intimidation, and its ability or its intention to dominate other cultures and other regions of the world. We've not based our strategies on peacemaking or on diplomacy.

We continue to research and deploy new generations of nuclear arms. This policy guarantees that the waste will continue to be generated in large quantities.

10 We will never have a sane, responsible process for clean up until we eliminate the source of the wastes.

The challenge before us all today is to look inward with sincerity and with courage, to give up our obsession with fear, to envision a new future of peace and disarmament. Thank you.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Marilyn Lamb.