TSE-0010 (contd); TSE-0011

waste that's already there, not add to it. Thanks.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Charles Weems.

TSE-0011 DR. CHARLES WEEMS: Thank you. I am Charles Weems. I am a member of the Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility.

I notice that there has been a significant tone of the discussion, alteration in the last few months, and it seems to me that we get the impression that the administration

1 is moving by fiat.

This seems to be that this fiat is on the fallacy of the accelerated plan, which is to use a whole lot less money and do things quicker.

Now, the impression is also that of a certain amount of arrogance, and I think that

2 these recent activities, such as not allowing an adequate amount of time for the analysis of this EIS, is part of it.

And there have been a number of things that would suggest that there is an arrogant stand on the part of the Department of

TSE-0011 (contd)

Energy. And I don't want in any way to have you personally feel that this is being directed at you. I admire your ability to take the shots, as it were.

But I think that there is a moral imperative on the part of the leaders at Richland to let the administration know what the reality is, and what it is that the citizens of Washington and Oregon really think about this area.

3 Hanford was not originally designed as a waste area. We have two other waste areas, Yucca Mountain, and the WIPP in New Mexico, which are actually designed as geologically safe areas to put waste.

Hanford has in no way been designed for the placement of waste. So it's a secondary type of thing. And I think that it has become perfectly clear that the citizens of this area feel very strongly about the

4 groundwater. It's been talked about for a number of years. And there seems to be a continued failure on the part of the Department of Energy to address the groundwater.

5 The scope of this EIS is extremely

TSE-0011 (contd)

narrow. And as a result, it makes little tiny packages out of a huge problem.

5 But it also allows the DOE to avoid any analysis of what the whole accumulative effect of all this waste is.

So we never get a sense of cumulative waste.

I would draw your attention to something that you did say in your presentation about an analysis, and you talked about a huge amount of material being analyzed.

The problem with that, and I hope everybody understands, it is a jargon, they have analyzed, meaning they have discussed the placement of waste in the ground. They haven't analyzed any of the waste in the ground.

So that which we think of as an analysis, that is, knowing what is actually in

6 the ground, as waste, and as contaminants, has not been analyzed.

There are a lot of things that have been brought up, and I would just simply add, or place a couple of points.

A recent publication by the National Academies of Science has recommended in direct

TSE-0011 (contd)

statement about Hanford wastes, they state that there should be retrievability and it should be contained.

Well, clearly containment is not a problem. Or I shouldn't say it is not a problem. It's not a problem they have addressed. What they are trying to do is

7 contain the public by putting up institutional controls that will fail to have the public get to an area which is massively contaminated. It is not being contained.

Secondarily, it's not going to be

8 retrievable in the form that it's being currently put.

So I would suggest that this EIS, as have the previous speakers, I would suggest

9 that it be put in abeyance, and that at such time as the current waste can be both analyzed in a proper manner and cared for properly, then it could be reinstituted.

Thank you.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Gerry Pollet.

MR. GERRY POLLET: Why don't you have someone else. I have given -- I will come back and give more testimony after other

TSE-0012

people have a chance.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Bob A-e-g --

TSE-0012 MR. BOB AEGORTOR: That's fine. I am Bob Aegortor, retired environmental facilities planner, and a grandfather. I wish I had three other grandfathers here standing with me.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. Much, much earlier in my career, all the questions like this would have gotten an individual is a comment in his FBI file.

1 The EIS must be amended to address cumulative impacts of burial of hazardous wastes, past, present and future.

2 The groundwater contamination levels must be stated at the boundary levels of the containers, the sites. It's the only thing that makes sense, and it's the only thing that truly can be subject to analysis.

3 For the low-level waste, as well as all other wastes, line the trenches, install legal groundwater monitoring, provide leachate collection, install weather proof caps, and do it now.

4 The EIS does not address the

4 interaction of hazardous chemicals such as carbon tetrachloride, the interaction with the radioactive chemicals. This is a serious and fatal flaw in the EIS.

5 Do not ignore or minimize the impacts to the groundwater.

6 You once told us it would take 2000 years for these contaminants to reach the Columbia River. It didn't. Groundwater, or water quality, potable water quality, will be a major issue in the United States within 40 years. It may be a much more serious issue than energy, which seems to pre-occupy us all at the present time.

And finally, I regret to say that you have no credibility. You have contracted to clean up the Hanford soils by 2018, but you propose to carry on putting materials in unlined trenches until the year 2046.

Thank you.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Jim Trumhold.

TSE-0013 DR. JIM TRUMHOLD: Dr. Jim Trumhold, Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility. Now I am here making my own comment.

TSE-0013 (contd)

1 I first would like to concur with Congressman Inslee's read statement and his interest in prohibiting any more waste put in unlined trenches. And the statement that I read from Congressman McDermott, I certainly endorse those thoughts.

One of the new thoughts in there that should concern us all that talked about the DOE complex possibly producing more nuclear material in terms of weapons, and that would be additional waste streams. But we are not doing well with the waste that we have.

2 And I would second what Dr. Weems said, that it just, when I first heard, the first EIS, and this one, without being a real student of this, or rocket science approach, it seems very basic, maybe a junior high student would say.

You know, does it seem right if you have most of the nation's nuclear waste in this location, does it make sense, if you don't know exactly what you have in this huge legacy of nuclear waste, it's not accurately characterized, it is in unlined trenches. A very potent and pertinent question is, how can

3

TSE-0013 (contd)

3

you possibly have the luxury of talking about, for political reasons or other reasons, of relieving wastes from other sites?

It's not we are not willing to do our share, it's not in our backyard. It is about the health and safety of human beings and the environment to get a handle on what you have, handle on what we have, enough to satisfy at least some of us in the public.

And incidentally, the DOE people are human beings, and they are part of the public, too. We have a serious present and future public health problem that if they could step forward and say, well, we have adequately characterized it, we have lined the trenches, and we have a national problem, and we need a national dialogue about how we all share that burden nationally, then maybe, and maybe it would be years from now, we'd say we could entertain possibly bringing in some of that if there's a place for it to be handled properly.

4

I think it's totally out of the question to be even talking about it until we have done a safe job as far as public health and the environment with what we have.

5

TSE-0013 (contd); TSE-0014

6

So, I think this impact statement should be withdrawn, we should start over, and we should work with what we have there. Thank you.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Tina Schulstad.

TSE-0014 MS. TINA SCHULSTAD: Hi. My name is Tina Schulstad, and I am the chair of the Sierra Club's Cascade chapter. I represent 26,000 members in Washington state, and we are very concerned with what -- about the current plans for the Hanford Nuclear Reservation.

1

Every President wants a legacy, and it seems that President Bush wants his legacy in Washington state to be enlarging our already dangerous Hanford Nuclear Reservation into the nation's toxic waste dump.

Since he came into power the administration and top Republicans in Congress have been diligently working to pump new life into the nuclear industry which was a top contributor to their campaigns.

This plan threatens our health and our environment here in Washington.

To begin, the Bush administration's

TSE-0014 (contd)

budget inadequately funded the Tri-Party cleanup agreement in 2002.

For 2003 and 2004 we don't know that the funding is adequate because the Department of Energy refused to disclose how it is spending money and what the cost of legally required cleanup work will be by specific project.

Ecology and EPA have recently issued a notice of violation letter for the lack of disclosure.

Thanks to Senator Patty Murray, the funding levels have increased, but cleanup is still behind schedule and the degree of cleanup is proposed to be drastically cut by the Bush administration's new cleanup goals and Hanford acceleration plans.

In the Bush Administration's energy policy which was developed behind closed doors with representatives from the nuclear industry, a high priority was placed on investing in new nuclear capacity.

While the administration attempted to paint the technology as new and improved, the real facts are much scarier. We still

TSE-0014 (contd)

don't know how to deal with the wastes we already have, and accidents still happen and threaten our public health.

Subsidies to create new nuclear plants don't make sense. Soon the Senate Republicans will push a bill that is closely based on the Bush/Chaney plan. The Senate Bill provides 2.4 billion dollars in subsidies over the next five years to support new nuclear plants. They are offering an estimated 14 to 16 billion dollars in federal loan guaranties to build seven new plants.

As President Bush and Vice-President Cheney aggressively pursue their attempts to resurrect the nuclear industry, they are still woefully ignoring the basic problem: How to safety and securely manage waste that will be around for thousands of years and how to safely and securely transport this waste around our country.

The administration and the Department of Energy are attempting to play a shameless shell game with dangerous radioactive waste, and the people of Washington won't play along.

TSE-0014 (contd)

We applaud Washington Attorney General Christine Gregoire's efforts to for the Bush administration and the Department of Energy to stick to their promises about cleaning up Hanford.

In addition, the Sierra Club and other concerned organizations were recently successful in obtaining a preliminary injunction against the Department of Energy.

2 The DOE cannot transport anymore of the highly radioactive, plutonium transuranic waste to Hanford from other nuclear weapons plants until it fully considers the risks and the health and environmental impacts of trucking the waste to Hanford and storing it at Hanford.

This Revised Draft EIS fails to consider those site and route specific risks.

3 The U.S. Department of Energy does not even know what is in the highly radioactive remote handled transuranic waste that it wants to ship to Hanford. It has designated them nonverifiable.

4 Hanford lacks any facility to analyze the waste as required to meet hazardous

TSE-0014 (contd); TSE-0015

4 waste laws and to ensure safe storage.
Accidents, fires and earthquakes will release
5 plutonium, chemical, and radioactive wastes in
6 waste containers will degrade while stored at
Hanford for 20 or more years.
We believe that shipments to Hanford
should end. The priority for the health of our
7 people, fish and rivers is to safely contain
the ever threatening toxic soup that sloshes
around the Columbia Basin.
Focus this EIS on the effort to
8 clean up what is already in the soil, rather
than planning to add more to the nation's worst
contaminated area.
Thank you.
MR. DEE WILLIS: Tina, could
we have a copy of that?
MS. TINA SCHULSTAD: Yes.
MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you.
Becky Stanley.
TSE-0015 MS. BECKY STANLEY: Hi. My
name is Becky Stanley, and I am a botanist, and
an activist with the Sierra Club, Cascade
chapter.
The Columbia River supported 16