TPO-0014

TPO-0014 MS. MARILYN LAMB: It's great to see such an informed and dedicated focus group here today.

And I hope this focus group is not as ignored as the one that was protesting the war.

We just finished invading Afghanistan and now we're moving into Iraq, or did.

And the question was: Are we going to be responsible for the clean up of going in and destroying a big area and dropping a bunch of bombs on it and blowing up stuff and killing people?

And the last I heard, the Taliban is back into Afghanistan. And Ben Laden is nowhere to be found. And Saddam Hussein is also not to be found.

And here we are, stuck with this humongous debt that's been created, $6 trillion that's given onto this country with very, very little explanation, very little responsible planning or anything of that sort.

1 And so I just wonder, with the debt that we've got built up in this country, where

TPO-0014 (contd)

1 are the resources going to come from to clean up anything?

Our schools are falling into disrepair. Or states are without adequate funding. Where are we going to get the resources to clean up this hell on earth that is being put in our back door?

Another thing, very soon, water is going to be way more valuable than oil. And if you're going to destroy an area of land and leave it a permanent disaster with no possible cleanup in sight, how are you going to -- why don't you put it somewhere where there's not a big source of water? Because water is going to be worth more than gold in the future.

2

So to bring it to a point: If we can't clean up Hanford as it already is, then how are we going to clean up a thousand times worse than Hanford, when there's not going to be any resources, because we're going to be in debt up to our eyeballs for as far as we can see.

3

We've got a president who thinks "nuclear" has two syllables. I believe he says "nuclear." And that doesn't give me a great

TPO-0014 (contd)

deal of confidence about his understanding of something like radioactivity --

MR. DEE WILLIS: Two minutes.

MS. MARILYN LAMB: Thank you.

-- and the consequences of that on human and animal and vegetation.

I don't think he's dumb. I just don't think he doesn't want to -- know what he's doing. He's turning his back on this region of the country.

He's sacrificing this region of the country. He's flushing us down the toilet. And it's clear for everyone to see that none of
4 these steps are adequate to prevent a serious, horrible permanent disaster and the destruction of a water system and the ecosystem.

I think that's as obvious to anyone
5 here as it is to the DOE, because they have all the facts and they know these things too.

And they have my great compassion, because I can see how painful and uncomfortable it is for them to meet with the public.

And I would be avoiding that situation myself if I was trying to voice this upon someone.

TPO-0014 (contd)

You may think that, "Oh well, we can just get rid -- it's just eastern Washington, that's okay. Who needs eastern Washington, it's just a big desert. Let's just throw it away."

6 But this waste in this kind of concentration, this kind of morbidity, is going to spread in the food, in the water, it's going to blow all over of the country, it's going to blow all over the world.

It's not adequately taken care of. And it's a disaster waiting to happen. So God forbid if we can't stop this.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Cherie Holenstein.

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

MR. DEE WILLIS: I want to remind you that anybody like Joyce Fouingstad has the option of giving public comment the first time again after the panel discussion. Bob Hedlund?

MR. BOB HEDLUND: I'll save my comment until after the panel.

TPO-0015

MR. DEE WILLIS: But would anybody else at this time -- Joyce?

TPO-0015 MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTAD: If I can have two, then I'll go ahead and add later if I have more comments.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Subject to the five-minute limit right now.

MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTAD: Thank you, DOE, for the public hearing. But are you listening?

1 I made approximately a hundred phone calls over the last couple of days. People are discouraged, they're feeling hopeless, they don't feel heard.

2 They're wondering "What in the world is going on that it doesn't seem like much is happening to really clean up Hanford."

3 They do not want waste to be brought in. We've got plenty, thank you very much.

Last fall, we met the man who is now the head of the clean up for Hanford from South Carolina.

He said they did such a great job there, but when I was in South Carolina in March, well, lo and behold there were articles

TPO-0015 (contd)

in the local paper saying they didn't want any more waste coming in there either.

So I think we've got a lot of company among the public of this country that feels totally unsafe to be moving this stuff around.

Hanford is an environmental catastrophe. Cancers are rising throughout the Northwest and the world.

We are now at epidemic proportions for breast cancer, and prostatic cancer's on the way up too.

We have now had a study out of Europe that says there's been at least 65 million deaths estimated throughout the world due to the nuclear industry and weaponry.

This fall, the -- I'm sorry. Okay. Along that same line, I just want to read a quote from this box called the Nuclear Deception.

"Concluding Observations: The state of knowledge of long-term problems on both the security and environmental fronts is today insufficient for society to decide on long-term disposal of spent fuel.

TPO-0015 (contd)

"Ellen Weinberg, the first director od Oakridge National Laboratory, opined in 1972, that the public ought to trust the nuclear priesthood that was responsible for guarding nuclear weapons, with managing nuclear waste.

"The revelations of the past two decades since that time, such as systemic environmental mismanagement, fabricated data cover-ups, and human experiments without informed consent, have eroded any faith in that priesthood that the public may have had.

"In the meantime, reliance on nuclear power has grown. And the already large quantities of weapons, usable plutonium in the world, is rising rapidly."

4 Regarding this EIS, a 60-year liner is a joke, you know. And that's before the earthquake.

5 Secondly, I cannot insure my house against nuclear accidents. So if one of those trucks that runs right by my house, on I-84 through Portland, spills something, leaks something, whatever -- and we just had a leak recently that shut down half the city from a

TPO-0015 (contd)

5 very much safer truck -- well, I can't do anything about it.

I can't sue anybody. I can't insure my place, you know. Like what is this? What kind of a system is this? It doesn't make any sense.

6 The caps on the trenches also are a joke. They are dangerous cover-ups. Let's call them what they are. And the waste should be classified and retrievable if they start leaking.

7 Also, if we're creating half a million year waste, we need half a million years of monitoring.

We made this mess, we need to monitor it; we need to make it safe and store it safely. We don't need to just move it around and move it around and move it around.

8 It is also unacceptable to not have a complete study of the impact to the entire routes of all the roads, bridges, detours, communities, and so forth, in case of accidents along the way.

9 Many of you have read the articles about how bad the roads are in Oregon and that

TPO-0015 (contd)

9 we have to detour trucks through little tiny towns. It's unacceptable to be moving the waste through Oregon at this point.

10 It's also unacceptable to have a method of transportation that allows the emissions to put the truckdrivers and fellow travelers in traffic jams and accidents at risk.

The last EIS allowed for four deaths. How many do they allow in this EIS?

MR. DEE WILLIS: We'll answer that later. Ask that in question session.

MS. JOYCE FOUINGSTAD: Okay, we'll ask that later.

11 We have the DOE dumping for five decades already in Hanford. I distrust anything that's fast track and not thoroughly thought through, thoroughly evaluated.

12 I appreciate that there's some improvements. I appreciate DOE going back and rewriting this thing. But I don't agree with all of the inadequacies and lax in this report.

13 We must contain and treat and store the wastes already at Hanford, not bring in any additional wastes.

TPO-0015 (contd); TPO-0016

We must stop the ongoing production of nuclear wastes at nuclear power plants and stop dumping it on other countries through bombs.

For example, Kuwait now in the last decade has a 400 percent increase in their cancer rates, because there's a lot of uranium that's been left behind because of that war.

David Suzuki, biologist, says, "We cannot live without clean air, clean water, clean soil, clean food." That's all we need. That and community.

And so we need to start by cleaning up Hanford, not making more mess.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Tom.

TPO-0016 MR. TOM CARPENTER: Thanks. So my name is Tom Carpenter. And I'm with the Government Accountability Project. And we're based in Seattle and in Washington, D.C.

I'm the head of the nuclear oversight program. And we've been monitoring the Hanford site since 1987.

And we do that largely through helping workers at the site. And we've represented many dozens of whistle-blowers over

TPO-0016 (contd)

the years.

We also serve on the Hanford Advisory Board. I'm with that and the Hanford Joint Council. We've participated in the openness initiatives by Hazel O'Leary.

And just a few basic kind of observations. Number one is, this site has done a tremendous amount of damage to the environment already.

1 In terms of the nuclear weapons complex overall within the United States, it has the lion's share of nuclear waste.

It has the most amount of high-level nuclear waste, which is waste -- it's almost beyond imagination how dangerous and toxic this stuff really is and for how long.

If you were to be lowered into the vapor space of one of these tanks, you'd last maybe three minutes.

It's going to be radioactive for, in some cases, some of those elements in millions of years.

The bulk of it, for thousands of years. An average half-life of 3,000 years with that waste in a tank.

TPO-0016 (contd)

1 It's also got the highest amount of
2 transuranic wastes, which is plutonium
3 contaminated waste, mostly.
4 It's got the highest amount of spent
5 nuclear fuel stored on site at places like K
1 6 Basin.
7 And it's got the bulk of the
8 radioactivity in terms of curie content within
9 the complex.
10 So Hanford's done its share. It
11 made a heck of a lot of plutonium, which now in
12 and of itself is a big problem, a big disposal
13 problem for the plutonium we're not going to
14 use.
15 And there is a massive clean up
16 program going on at the site. It's going to
17 cost maybe a hundred billion dollars or more
18 just for Hanford alone.
19 And let's get our terms right. Is
20 it really clean up? No. It's immobilization
21 of this stuff, because you can't really clean
22 up radioactive materials; right?
23 You can't dilute it, you can't burn
24 it, you can't destroy it. It is an element and
25 just must be contained.

TPO-0016 (contd)

So in light of this, the DOE has to say, "We're going to clean this place up," and they are doing some things, give them some credit here and there, to protect the river, cocoon reactors. You know, dry out the spent fuel.

All of these are kind of caretaker responsibilities, but, we're here in the Northwest community, very suspicious about the fact that about 12½ million cubic feet of waste is coming our way over the next 45 years.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Two minutes.

MR. TOM CARPENTER: Thank you.

This is a lot of waste. It's about a third the amount of material or a third amount of the cement that went into the Grand Coulee Dam.

So it's just -- if you were to put that on a train and have it go and go and go, it would just go on forever.

It's an estimated 70,000 truckloads in an already overburdened site. It's not clean up. It's a dump site.

That's what really is happening here at the Hanford site is that the Department of

TPO-0016 (contd)

3 Energy and the U.S. Government has given up on cleaning up Hanford and it's just going to take waste from all over the country and dump it here. And we object to that.

4 They're already talking about not cleaning up the high-level waste in the nuclear waste tanks, by simply re-labeling, re-characterizing that waste and leaving it in place, maybe popping some concrete.

And I guess what bothers me most about all of this is that for about ten years now we've been involved in a conversation with the Department of Energy and the Federal Government and the EPA and the states and the public, and that conversation has come to an end.

And it came to an end with the Bush administration, which had a whole different attitude about public participation and about decision making. And we're suffering through that right now.

The conversation has ended. And now it is the time for litigation, it is the time for confrontation, it is the time to organize, it's the time to get Congress get going on