

TPO-0005 (contd); TPO-0006

4

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

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

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

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

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

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

22 MR. DEE WILLIS: Now Doug
23 Riggs.

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

TPO-0006 (contd)

1 ever get.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

40

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

TPO-0006 (contd)

1

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
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.

2

23 There remains no significant
24 analysis of waste from prior to 1970 for
25 transuranic waste.

TPO-0006 (contd)

2

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

3

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

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

4

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

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

TPO-0006 (contd)

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

3 Assuming that someone got the
4 document on the 11th of April and wanted to
5 read the whole thing by May 27th, that would be
6 50 to 75 pages a day.

7 And I challenge anyone in this room,
8 technical or not technical, to read 50 to
9 75 pages a day for a month and a half and still
10 be able to retain their sanity.

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

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

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

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

25 We acknowledged the fact that there

43

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

TPO-0006 (contd)

5

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

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

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

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

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

44

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

TPO-0007

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 | 20 We also consider that this is a much-improved
21 document over the previous one.

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

2 | 25 However, we still have some serious

TPO-0007 (contd)

2

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

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

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

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

3

15 We're concerned about the tone of
16 the Environmental Impact Statement also. This
17 statement was intended to tier down from the
18 Programmatic EIS, and should have analyzed
19 whether the decisions made in the Programmatic
20 EIS were right for Hanford.

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

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

TPO-0007 (contd); TPO-0008

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

5 MR. DEE WILLIS: Frank
6 Gearhart.

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

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

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

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

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

47

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

TPO-0008 (contd)

2 | 1
2 | 2
3 | 3
4 | 4

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

3 | 5
6 | 6
7 | 7

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

4 | 8
9 | 9
10 | 10
11 | 11

And what are the estimated overall 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.

12 | 12
13 | 13
14 | 14

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

5 | 15
16 | 16
17 | 17

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

18 | 18
19 | 19
20 | 20

Now, if we continue to put stuff in there, this is going to be an ongoing thing.

21 | 21

And it will drain the treasury or the taxpayers.

6 | 22
23 | 23
24 | 24
25 | 25

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

We've got the EPA, the Department of

TPO-0008 (contd); TPO-0009

6

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

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

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

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

15 MR. DEE WILLIS: Sandy Polishuk.

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

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

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

TPO-0009 (contd)

1 finish the whole box of cookies.

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

5 And I tell you this story only
6 because all I can think is that this is the
7 same sort of reasoning that the DOE looks at
1 | 8 Hanford and says "Oh, the place is ruined. We
9 might as well put more there."

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

14 And I do not want that river
2 | 15 contaminated. I want Hanford cleaned up, I do
16 not want it increased. Thank you.

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

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

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

TPO-0009 (contd); TPO-0010

3

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

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

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

9 MR. LYNN FORD: I'll just wait.

10 MR. DEE WILLIS: Okay. Joyce
11 Fouingstad?

12 (Ms. Hostenstein's comment inaudible,
13 no microphone. Wanting to speak
14 at a later time.)

15 MR. DEE WILLIS: You bet.
16 Pat Timberlake.

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

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

TPO-0010 (contd)

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

1

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

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

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

2

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

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

TPO-0010 (contd); TPO-0011

2 | 1
2
3
3 | 4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
1 | 24
25

about.

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

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.

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)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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)

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

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

8 And the fact that this
9 glassification was originally what was
10 intended, and now it's only going to be
11 20 percent, because it's cheaper.

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

16 And another interesting thing that
17 I've been hearing about is that the DOE does
18 not need to follow the law. That's the whole
19 point: The DOE never has had to follow the
20 law.

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

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

TPO-0011 (contd)

7 | 1
2
8 | 3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
9 | 11
12
13
14
10 | 15
16
17
11 | 18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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

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.

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

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

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 | 1 keeping energy industry centralized.
2 Alternative methods are not being found.
3 And this is intentional. This is
4 not some thing, this is, you know -- need I say
5 that I know damn well that the people in power
6 right now are part of that whole problem.
7 And we know it too. And we
8 shouldn't let them forget that we know it. And
9 that we know that this is a part of that. And
10 that's what this is really about. And this is
11 what this has always been about.
12 And I've said before, Eisenhower
13 went against -- he was republican, but he knew
14 and he warned against the military industrial
15 complex. Maybe the republican party wasn't
16 comprised of the same individuals at that time.
17 And this thing about -- that also is
18 new to me about the fact that we have to get
19 40 percent complete by 2006.
12 | 20 Look, this is about cleanup. This
21 should only be about clean up. This is
22 bullshit. And I think we all know that.
23 MR. DEE WILLIS: Gerry Pollet.
24 **TPO-0012** MR. GERRY POLLET: Use the
25 overhead too.

TPO-0012 (contd)

1 1997, the U.S. Department of Energy
2 issued its national waste management
3 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement,
4 which said although DOE intends to select sites
5 for waste management activities based on the
6 WMPIS, the WMPIS will not be the basis for
7 selecting specific locations for facilities at
8 sites.

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

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

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

25 Under Regionalized Alternative 3,

58

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

TPO-0012 (contd)

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

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

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

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

17 The number of latent cancer
18 fatalities in the offsite population range to
19 200 at Hanford.

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

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

TPO-0012 (contd)

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

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

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

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

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

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

TPO-0012 (contd)

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

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

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

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

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

22 MR. DEE WILLIS: Time's up.

23 MR. GERRY POLLET: May I finish
24 my quote?

25 MR. DEE WILLIS: Yes.

61

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

TPO-0012 (contd)

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

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

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

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

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

24 MR. DEE WILLIS: Harvey
25 Clawson.

62

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