TSE-0020 (contd); TSE-0021

1 man, as it were. And I just want, I have a
2 very brief comment to follow up on the
3 physicians that were up here representing WPSR,
1 4 which that it is unwise, unfair, and
5 unacceptable for the DOE to ask the citizens of
6 Washington or Oregon to assume the additional
7 health risks that will come with additional
8 wastes imported to Hanford. That's my
9 statement.
10 But, I am not quite done. I also
11 have a friend who regrettably could not be here
12 this evening. He is a citizen, a taxpayer, a
13 voter, and a friend of mine, and he asked me to
14 read his statement to the DOE, which I also
15 delivered to Yvonne in writing. And this is
TSE-0021 16 from Dane Spencer, and he lives on Bainbridge
See L-0020 17 Island.
18 Statement to the Department of
19 Energy.
20 Let me see if I have this right. I
21 am a little confused about all this nuclear
22 waste and I want to see if it makes sense to
23 you, because it doesn't make sense to me.
24 In 1945 U.S. citizens paid taxes for
25 the Manhattan Project, a project we knew

TSE-0021 (contd)

See L-0020

nothing about, that resulted in producing nuclear waste, as well as the two bombs that were dropped on Japan.

Less than one year after the bombing of Japan we created and detonated another atomic bomb that continued to spread fallout, spending U.S. citizens taxpayer money, again without our knowledge or permission.

The Atomic Energy Commission, which is now the Department of Energy, continued to create and detonate atomic bombs, spending U.S. citizen taxpayer money, again without our knowledge, continuing to contaminate every man, woman and child in the United States, and parts of Canada and Mexico, with fallout, while accumulating large amounts of radioactive waste in various parts of this country.

The AEC/Department of Energy, in fact, from 1945 to 1962 detonated over 1,000 atomic and nuclear bombs, many above ground, contributing to at least 20,000 deaths of U.S. citizens from thyroid cancer, according to figures released by the United States Centers for Disease Control.

In other words, the AEC/Department

TSE-0021 (contd)

See L-0020

of Energy killed U.S. citizens using U.S. taxpayer money and did so ostensibly without our knowledge.

Additionally, the production of these atomic and nuclear weapons created huge amounts of nuclear waste that has never been cleaned up or taken care of.

The DOE wants to transport 70,000 shipments of nuclear waste in a steady stream on our roads, railways, and shipping lanes, to the Hanford Nuclear Reservation with U.S. taxpayer money, mostly without our collective knowledge, and definitely without our permission. This steady stream of nuclear waste will be in transit on our highways and railways or several generations.

The DOE is using the legal system to leverage its enormous power against the democratically elected government of the State of Washington, with U.S. citizen taxpayer money, to slow down, no, to halt the U.S. taxpayer funded nuclear waste clean-up in the State of Washington, South Carolina, and Nevada just to name a few.

The DOE, with U.S. citizen taxpayer

TSE-0021 (contd)

**See L-0020**

money, is threatening to sue the State of Washington, which will have to use U.S. citizen taxpayer money to legally defend itself from the DOE's lack of commitment to clean up the nuclear waste that the AEC/DOE created over the last 58 years.

The DOE wants to reinstate nuclear testing of nuclear bunker busters and mini nukes at the Nevada Test Site which will create more radioactive fallout across the country, and will continue to create nuclear waste that will need shipping somewhere, probably Hanford, funded with U.S. citizen taxpayer money, again without our permission.

The DOE has no intention of ever cleaning up Hanford, the Nevada Test Site, Rocky Flats, North Carolina, etc., etc., and in fact, wants to expand the production of nuclear waste through the continued production of nuclear bombs and nuclear reactors, funded with U.S. citizen taxpayer money, again ostensibly without our collective knowledge and without our permission.

For 58 years from 1945 to the present, the DOE has funded the manufacturing

TSE-0021 (contd); TSE-0022

**See L-0020**

of radioactive nuclear waste with U.S. citizen taxpayer money, without our collective knowledge or our permission, and is responsible or past and future deaths of U.S. citizens resulting from radioactive contamination from its waste sites and its facilities.

No, I have looked at this every way I can and it still doesn't make sense.

This is outrageous. Take a look in the mirror and tell me what you see. Tell me that you're doing this for the good of the country.

I will settle for nothing less than the complete halt of the manufacturing of radioactive nuclear waste, and the immediate cleanup of the DOE's deplorable legacy DOE has left our children to contend with. The people of this country will not stand for this type of irresponsible behavior.

Sincerely, Dane Spencer.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you. Tom Carpenter.

**TSE-0022** MR. TOM CARPENTER: My name is Tom Carpenter, and I am with Government Accountability Project. And I am here to speak

TSE-0022 (contd)

in favor of bringing in 12 and a half million cubic --

Oh, wait. No. No. I am not in favor of it. But I got Michael going there for a second.

But we have been to a lot of these hearings together. I recognize a lot of the faces in the audience.

And, you know, we have heard a lot about these volumes tonight, 444 billion gallons of nuclear waste, contaminated liquids, already put into the ground at the Hanford Site over 45 years.

But, you know, what does that really mean? Well, if you stood next to the Columbia River and watched it flow by for five days, that's about how much water that is.

We just heard a scientist from Battelle describe that if you were to put that volume of liquid into tanker cars holding about 20,000 gallons each that you see on the railway, and you were stopped waiting for that train to pass, it would be about 250,000 miles of tanker cars going by.

So, I mean, we are talking some

TSE-0022 (contd)

major volumes here. It's not 450 billion gallons, and we are talking oceans of nuclear waste that have already contaminated the Hanford Site.

And the really tragic part about this is, it's really not even about volume. Because we are talking about materials in such tiny, tiny amounts that one pound of plutonium, for instance, evenly divided among the lungs of the people of the planet earth, would kill everybody. So.

1

Microscopic, miniscule quantities of some of this stuff, dangerous for thousands and thousands of years, and I don't think it's 30 and 40 years, I think it's probably 3,000 years of a half-life for most of these radionuclides, it's a real threat.

And it's not enough. We've got to add more to it. We've got to bring in another 70,000 truck loads. And there's something wrong with this picture.

Already the fish in the Columbia River are so poisonous that people eating these fish face a big risk of cancer. Tribal children in particular face, according to the

TSE-0022 (contd)

EPA, a one in 50 chance of getting cancer from eating fish. That's generally in the Columbia River.

2 At Hanford, it is the most contaminated, chemically contaminated, of course radiologically contaminated fish in the Columbia River.

This isn't discussed in the EIS. Big surprise.

This is a national nuclear waste dump and it's going to become much more of one when the DOE gets through, because you have heard tonight that they have foreshortened comment, and in fact the Hanford Advisory Board has said we want another two weeks to be able

3 to comment, because we legally cannot comment. I am a member of that board. The DOE said, nah, forget it.

So, look, the conversation at Hanford is over. Okay? They're not listening. None of the comments here tonight will be taken into account, it's not going to mean a damn thing. We have had lots and lots of these hearings.

So, folks here, I really urge you to

TSE-0022 (contd); TSE-0023

go up to the tables up there, sign the forms, saying you're interested in helping to work on an initiative to ban nuclear waste from being brought into the Hanford site for this year, and the initiative process is being pulled together by Heart of America, and Government Accountability Project, and PSR and Sierra Club and others, who are interested in doing something about it, not just coming to hearings and talking about it.

I urge you all to get involved. There is litigation going on. There's things that mean something that is more than just sitting around talking to somebody who is not listening. So I urge you, get involved in some way, and let's do something about this.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Frank Zucker.

**TSE-0023** MR. FRANK ZUCKER: My name is Frank Zucker.

And I agree with most of the comments that I have heard here tonight. In fact all of them, as far as I can tell.

So I am just going to add a small

1 part. Clean water is a scarce resource. It is even scarcer than oil, according to some

TSE-0023 (contd); TSE-0024

reports from national agencies. Water, not oil, is what we will be fighting wars over in the future.

1 So this plan to add more uncharacterized waste to inadequately monitored, unlined trenches, and to fix it in maybe five years from now, it is not just immoral and illegal, it is a national security risk, and even without considering what happens

2 when a truck full of transuranic waste is intentionally or accidentally breached.

3 So I think we've definitely got to start all over on this EIS. Thank you.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Atis Muehtensachs.

**TSE-0024** MR. ATIS MUEHTENSACHS: My name

1 is Atis Muehtensachs, and I think the EIS is unacceptable, and I am sad that the EPA doesn't agree with that.

I think the comment period is too

2 short, and what does a couple of weeks mean in regards to the thousand year half-lifes of the radionuclides.

I also think that an Environmental

3 Impact Statement, I don't know if it is under

TSE-0024 (contd)

3 the NEPA law, but you should be aware all of the federal laws, state laws and local laws that are being broken by your actions.

4 I would like to comment on the light pollution, that is very good, something to consider.

5 And in regard to this groundwater contamination, I think the word commitment. I think that I personally believe that this groundwater is more valuable than the plutonium that the DOE can produce, and also the salmon in the river, is also more valuable than all of the plutonium that you have. So. . .

Naturally, my big comment I want to reply in your view of this, is I understand it is the policy of the DOE to reimburse corporate contractors for legal expenses that have been obtained by litigation due to environmental or health or whistleblower concerns.

6 And so with this Environmental Impact Statement, you will have the lowest bidding contractor come, they are going to want to cut a lot of corners, and they are going to get sued for whatever crimes that they do, and when the federal government pays them, I don't

6

want the federal government to use taxpayer money to reimburse their legal fees. That should come out of the corporation's pockets. Thank you.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you. Fred Miller.

**TSE-0025** MR. FRED MILLER: Thank you. My name is Fred Miller. I'm a member of the Board of Directors of Peace Action of Washington, which is supported by 16,000 households throughout Washington State.

And, Tom, when you get the petitions, we will have people to help gather those signatures.

I won't add to the comments that have been made on the handling of waste at Hanford. I will talk a little bit about economics. Conservative and liberal economists all say that when you subsidize, you are subsidizing waste.

When the federal government subsidized irrigation in the west, even the Reagan administration admitted that more than 65 percent of that water was wasted.

The studies that have been put forth

TSE-0025 (contd)

1 in peer review journals show it's more like 90
2 percent of the water is wasted. When you
3 subsidize legal fees, then you encourage
4 criminality. Whatever you subsidize, you are
5 encouraging somebody to go ahead and waste it.
6 And in this case, the federal
7 government, the Department of Energy is
1 8 proposing to subsidize the production of
9 nuclear garbage.
10 They are saying, go ahead and
11 produce it, we're going to let somebody else
12 pay for it, somebody else somewhere down the
13 road. We are going to minimize not only the
14 economic cost but the political cost by
15 shipping it away to some desert someplace in
16 Washington. A desert in Nevada, which has
17 remarkably little political clout.
18 So the question is, who's being
19 subsidized? And it's the nuclear industry,
20 especially the nuclear weapons production
21 industry, so that the federal government can
22 pretend that nuclear weapons are cheap, so that
23 the federal government can pretend that just a
24 few billion dollars will give us bunker busters
25 and mini nukes.

TSE-0025 (contd); TSE-0026

The problem is that the few billion dollars that they could be spending now, adding to the cost of producing those weapons right away, will turn into a few trillions of dollars when we get around to cleaning it up.

2 Actually, I don't think that the way things are going, we will ever get around to cleaning it up. And that the peacocks and the giraffes will be long extinct, and probably human beings will be long extinct, and Hanford will still be producing its toxins.

3 And so if the Department of Energy is not going to produce an Environmental Impact Statement that honestly says what the costs of producing that waste are, what the costs of mishandling that waste are, then the people are going to have to do it ourselves, are going to have to take the law into your own hands and use the initiative process to do what Congress has failed to do.

Thank you.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Valerie Rose.

**TSE-0026** MS. VALERIE ROSE: My name is Valerie Rose, and I am a cancer survivor, so far I'm a survivor. I am not a downwinder by

TSE-0026 (contd)

birth, though I did work in the fruit ranch near the Tri-Cities for several years.

So my response to any discussion of radioactive waste and other carcinogens is very personal.

1 The DOE's own model of current and projected groundwater contamination at Hanford is a terrifying death sentence predicting preventable cancer deaths among people and animals, fish and birds, who will be exposed to contaminated groundwater for years.

2 Lined landfills, groundwater monitoring and leachate collection are clearly the minimum necessary to begin to cope with the existing contamination, let alone any additional waste. This is where the DOE's focus should be, on dealing with the waste that is already contaminating Hanford.

3

4 The stop alternative is not a real alternative. The EIS is an insult. It should be withdrawn. The DOE must be made to comply with state and federal environmental laws, no more exemptions.

5

And since the DOE has not yet adequately contained and cleaned up the

existing waste, they should immediately stop producing more waste. No more nuclear weapons. No more nuclear energy. Thank you.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Nancy Kroening.

**TSE-0027** MS. NANCY KROENING: I am Nancy Kroening from Seattle and Arizona.

1 I agree with former speaker, no more waste at Hanford.

The Draft EIS describes mistakes that have been made in the past and all the ways cleanup is being done, it needs to be done in the future. I believe that the Draft EIS is just plain inaccurate and disingenuous.

2 The numbers of people and animals that have been harmed over time must be greatly underestimated. It's like .005 or something like that.

When I read those statistics, I was just blown away.

Let me describe how I know that this just cannot be true. On a beautiful sunny morning I was swimming with approximately 38 other women in Arizona. We were chatting about Richland where I had some family members

TSE-0027 (contd)

living.

One woman from Richland said that two more people that she knows have turned up with cancer. I do not think all the truth

3 about this matter is in this EIS. How do we get it in there? Reading the DEIS was a real eye opener. The amount of toxic chemicals is

4 amazing. And then all the mixes of wastes are mind boggling.

We regularly travel I-5. We are very unhappy that we are unlikely to be able to avoid exposure to nuclear waste and transport in this plan.

5 But I didn't see anything in the EIS about people who were traveling in these highways and who lived near Hanford and who would be having increased exposure to nuclear materials. I simply don't believe the charts and the numbers.

The DEIS contains a lot of material,

6 but for instance, very real problems like drinking whatever water in the Tri-Cities is just sort of glossed over.

I saw no mention of systems to filter the water adequately. The health

TSE-0027 (contd)

7

effects of company staff were higher than those of DOE staff. Why?

Shouldn't we be doing something about this and requiring the companies to be more careful? And have their employees have less exposure? Admittedly Hanford is a mess. The DOE has been working on cleanup since about 1995, was when the DOE stopped releasing the waste en masse into the ground.

Why did the DOE wait so long?

Now we are being promised liners and caps maybe on some of the trenches.

8

The problems of liners and caps are legendary and they are discussed in the DEIS. Water in and around the trenches need to be collected and treated. We need to clean up first, prove it is really done, and then that's enough. No more. Let it be. I am for the initiative so people can really know what is happening.

9

I agree with the young man who said the water and the fish are far more valuable than the nuclear materials.

Thank you. Thank you all for being here.

TSE-0027 (contd); TSE-0028

MR. DEE WILLIS: Next, Gerry Pollet.

**TSE-0028** MR. GERRY POLLET: Thanks. What started much of the concern about the import of waste was a Freedom of Information Act document we obtained a year ago that said Hanford will make receiving remote handled transuranic waste from off-site generators a priority over award fee work scope. That means a priority above Hanford cleanup work.

Remote handled transuranic waste is extremely radioactive. As radioactive or more so than spent nuclear fuel.

But it is not shipped in the same casks as spent nuclear fuel, and they are less resistant to many different types of vulnerabilities.

They are tested, however, and we do know that, for instance, a spent nuclear fuel cask is not designed to withstand a fire of 1,400 degrees for greater than 30 minutes.

We also know that shipments of spent nuclear fuel and remote handled transuranic waste will go through tunnels and be exposed to many hazards that will involve fires, potential