

TPO-0013

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

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

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

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

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

1 | 24                      The nuclear and toxic contamination  
25       already at Hanford is virtually assured to

TPO-0013 (contd)

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

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

1 we're not now aware.

2

But what are my deeper concerns?

3

The repeated failure of the DOE to fulfill its

4

past promises and commitments calls into

5

serious question not just the proposal

6

presented today but the integrity of the entire

7

process of government in this area.

5

8

DOE, your proposals leave me with

9

many unanswered questions. What are your true

10

intentions?

11

Are you negotiating in good faith?

12

Have you fully disclosed all the relevant

13

information in your possession?

14

How does this EIS address risks

15

associated with the transportation of

16

materials?

6

17

How long will additional waste

18

import delay the clean up of the existing

7

19

waste? And how much will it cost?

20

Do you really believe that these

8

21

proposals enable you to comply with all

22

applicable laws?

23

How do you plan to keep us and our

9

24

children safe for the next generation or two or

25

three? Much less, a quarter of a million years

65

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

TPO-0013 (contd)

9 |

1 from now.

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

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

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

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

10 |

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

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

25 MR. DEE WILLIS: Marilyn Lamb.

66

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

TPO-0014

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 |       24                      And so I just wonder, with the debt  
25      that we've got built up in this country, where

67

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

TPO-0014 (contd)

1

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

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

2

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

3

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

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

68

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

TPO-0014 (contd)

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

3 MR. DEE WILLIS: Two minutes.

4 MS. MARILYN LAMB: Thank you.

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

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

11 He's sacrificing this region of the  
12 country. He's flushing us down the toilet.

13 And it's clear for everyone to see that none of  
4 14 these steps are adequate to prevent a serious,  
15 horrible permanent disaster and the destruction  
16 of a water system and the ecosystem.

17 I think that's as obvious to anyone  
5 18 here as it is to the DOE, because they have all  
19 the facts and they know these things too.

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

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

TPO-0014 (contd)

6

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

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

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

14                   MR. DEE WILLIS: Cherie  
15 Holenstein.

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

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

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

70

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

TPO-0015

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

71

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

TPO-0015 (contd)

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

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

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

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

13 We have now had a study out of  
14 Europe that says there's been at least  
15 65 million deaths estimated throughout the  
16 world due to the nuclear industry and weaponry.

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

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

72

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

TPO-0015 (contd)

1                   "Ellen Weinberg, the first director  
2                   od Oakridge National Laboratory, opined in  
3                   1972, that the public ought to trust the  
4                   nuclear priesthood that was responsible for  
5                   guarding nuclear weapons, with managing nuclear  
6                   waste.

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

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

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

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

TPO-0015 (contd)

5 | 1 very much safer truck -- well, I can't do  
2 anything about it.

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

6 | 7 The caps on the trenches also are a  
8 joke. They are dangerous cover-ups. Let's  
9 call them what they are. And the waste should  
10 be classified and retrievable if they start  
11 leaking.

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

7 | 15 We made this mess, we need to  
16 monitor it; we need to make it safe and store  
17 it safely. We don't need to just move it  
18 around and move it around and move it around.

8 | 19 It is also unacceptable to not have  
20 a complete study of the impact to the entire  
21 routes of all the roads, bridges, detours,  
22 communities, and so forth, in case of accidents  
23 along the way.

9 | 24 Many of you have read the articles  
25 about how bad the roads are in Oregon and that

TPO-0015 (contd)

9

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

10

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

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

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

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

11

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

12

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

13

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

TPO-0015 (contd); TPO-0016

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

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

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

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

15                   MR. DEE WILLIS: Tom.

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

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

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

76

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

TPO-0016 (contd)

1 the years.

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

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

1

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

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

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

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

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

77

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

## TPO-0016 (contd)

**1**

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  
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.

78

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

TPO-0016 (contd)

3

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

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

12                   MR. DEE WILLIS: Two minutes.

13                   MR. TOM CARPENTER: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

TPO-0016 (contd)

3

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

4

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

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

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

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

80

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