

TSP-0009 (contd), TSP-0010

1 ethical issue. Recently the Bishops, the  
2 Catholic Bishops of this region issued their  
3 pastoral letter on the Columbia River, and in  
4 it they strongly encouraged that we look at the  
5 river in terms of the ethical framework, in  
6 terms of the ethics of water and the ethics of  
7 the river; that it is a hugely important river  
8 for many people, that the issues are  
9 contentious, and that the appropriate way to  
10 move forward with problem solving on many of  
11 these issues is with an ethical framework.

12 So, I would encourage that DOE  
13 recognize that the issues here are not only  
14 legal, medical and chemical and biologic and  
15 radioactive, but they are also very much  
16 ethical issues, and they will impact our  
17 communities and impact the river for a very  
18 long time to come.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you.

21 Theresa Potts.

22 **TSP-0010** MS. THERESA POTTS: My  
23 objections to dumping more waste on Hanford are  
24 these. The wastes there should be cleaned up  
25 first. Adding more waste just complicates

5

1

TSP-0010 (contd), TSP-0011

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

matters. 70,000 trucks is an awful lot.

What would happen if there were crashes where I-90 comes so close to water?

It seems unreal not to have some idea of the half-life of low-level waste before it's stored.

How will future populations know how long to avoid this site.

Putting cost above doing the best thing for people in this area and at Hanford by eliminating vitrification is absolutely wrong.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you.

Marion Moos.

**TSP-0011** MS. MARION MOOS: I would like to say that I think that with the homeland security, we are in a red alert. I think we ought to describe it and announce it. With all vitrification glassification, this is really a federal crime. We are in peril.

There are women here, Theresa Potts, who began with the very beginnings of HEAL, Hanford Education Action League. And we have struggled, we people are being victimized here by the incongruous thinking processes of a DOE that is being intimidated by an administration

TSP-0011 (contd)

**1** | 1       that feels that they can make a new strategy  
2       and they are having a different goal.

3                       Well, isn't that just grand? Who  
4       are we? Who are we in this community?

**2** | 5                       This is what I see is this truck,  
6       and I live right above I-90. This is a  
7       population zone. The whole state of Washington  
8       is being threatened. And how long have we been  
9       threatened? How can we really substantiate  
10      being abused like this?

11                      And we need to address this, and we  
12      need to address it as each one of you have  
13      said, with vigor, and with determination that  
14      we will be heard, and we are not going to allow  
15      this.

**3** | 16                     You know, I did also, I was  
17      impressed by the fire last summer. 400 yards.  
18      And we are being told that we can have modern  
19      unlined ditches?

**4** | 20                     It's absurd. And we have to realize  
21      that we have to demand the vitrification and as  
22      taxpayers, and I am not going to be alive when  
23      all of your grandchildren and my grandchildren  
24      are being threatened right this moment.

25                      So, I'm for us voting right now for

TSP-0011 (contd), TSP-0012

1 red alert, with homeland security. Come on.  
2 Here we are.

3 MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you.  
4 Will Moore.

5 **TSP-0012** MR. WILL MOORE: Well, it  
6 looks like everybody else has pretty well  
7 addressed everything I had on my list, but I  
8 thought I would come up here anywhere.

9 Let's see here. They call it river  
10 contamination. I thought the Columbia River  
11 wasn't particularly contaminated. I thought we  
12 really didn't have a really big problem quite  
13 yet.

14 But I see I didn't have any  
15 knowledge before I read it in the paper and  
16 then I came to the meeting, and I have been  
17 thoroughly informed.

18 And I wonder, my question is, how  
19 many other people that are living downstream of  
20 the Columbia River are actually drinking the  
21 water and getting contaminated with all of this  
22 horrible stuff that's underneath the ground?  
23 And there is nothing being done for it. And it  
24 doesn't seem like there is going to be anything  
25 done for it, because the cleanup process is

51

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

TSP-0012 (contd)

1 | 1 | virtually impossible, or difficult, or costly  
2 | 2 | or whatever the word is.  
3 | 3 |           It's irritating. I wish I could do  
4 | 4 | something about it, but I don't know what to do  
5 | 5 | besides stand up here and talk, so I will stand  
6 | 6 | up and talk.  
7 | 7 |           Let's see here. What else is on my  
8 | 8 | list? Oh. This vitrification thing, and these  
9 | 9 | liners. 30 year liners for millions of years  
2 | 10 | of by-product. That's just asinine. Excuse my  
11 | 11 | language. But how can anybody possibly think  
12 | 12 | that a 30 year liner is going to do any good?  
13 | 13 | I mean, what are they thinking? Do they have  
14 | 14 | brains that work? I don't know. I am  
15 | 15 | irritated about this.  
16 | 16 |           Okay. Why can a 30 year liner be  
17 | 17 | considered adequate at all? I don't know. I  
18 | 18 | cannot express my anger.  
19 | 19 |           Let's see. What else. Oh. The  
20 | 20 | transportation of hazardous waste. I am  
21 | 21 | currently working on becoming a volunteer  
3 | 22 | firefighter. So I have gone through a HAZ-MAT  
23 | 23 | class, and I have listened to lots of stuff.  
24 | 24 |           The way this toxic waste sounds, it  
25 | 25 | sounds like it could be really bad, and really

## TSP-0012 (contd), TSP-0013

3

1 interesting to try to take care of, and  
 2 firefighters will get contaminated, hospitals  
 3 will get contaminated, it will be really bad.  
 4 I mean, there is already a meth problem here  
 5 that's bad as it is. We don't need to add  
 6 hazardous waste to it.

7 Geez. What else? Yeah. I guess  
 8 that's really about it. I appreciate everybody  
 9 making comments, and let's stand up and kick  
 10 some butt, because they need to realize what's  
 11 going on.

12 MR. DEE WILLIS: Judy Cohen.

13 **TSP-0013** MS. JUDY COHEN: I feel really  
 14 outraged by what the DOE is proposing, but  
 15 mostly what I want to talk about is the  
 16 process.

17 I find that to me trust is doing  
 18 what you say you are going to do when you say  
 19 you are going to do it.

20 I would actually appreciate your  
 21 paying attention, because I am directing my  
 22 remarks more to the DOE than anyone else.

1

23 And to me, as a citizen, reading the  
 24 newspaper, you have no trust with me. There  
 25 has been no credibility in what the DOE has

53

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

TSP-0013 (contd)

1

1 said. It's changing its mind all the time.  
2 It's revising its figures all the time. It's  
3 renegeing on promises all the time.

4 There has been no good faith at all  
5 that you have shown, either in that history or  
6 in these sort of pathetic, impotent energy  
7 proposals.

8 It would seem to me as a citizen  
9 that the mission of the Department of Energy  
10 would be basically to keep the citizens safe  
11 from those -- from the tasks that the  
12 Department of Energy accomplishes, that their  
13 underlining mission would be to keep the  
14 citizens safe in the same way that all  
15 government -- mean, why do we need  
16 government? We only need government to protect  
17 citizens from outside danger basically. And in  
18 this role I find the DOE performing abysmally.  
19 In fact, really, more than anything else, it is  
20 a threat the American people have about energy.

2

21 The process of this meeting bothers  
22 me a lot. I thought your presentation was very  
23 terse, brief, evasive, with very little data  
24 really given to people, very little background  
25 information given to people, very little facts

TSP-0013 (contd), TSP-0014

2

1 given to people.

2           Allowing only one question of people  
3 who spontaneously ask questions. I don't know  
4 why there was that control. Getting ready to  
5 grasp the microphone, to rush people in the  
6 process. All this really bothered me.

7           I found the answers shallow, glib.  
8 Not knowing the half-life of substances when  
9 you should have come armed with facts and  
10 knowledge, and been able to elucidate people,  
11 rather than the opposite.

12           I might have misunderstood, but in  
13 the card that was flashed up here, I thought it  
14 said that there would be a Final Environmental  
15 Impact Statement after the public hearings. Is  
16 that right?

17           MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: Yes.

18           **TSP-0014** MS. JUDY COHEN: Now, explain  
19 to me why there isn't a Final EIS, and then  
20 public hearings to discuss the Final EIS?

1

21           To me, that totally says that this  
22 meeting has no purpose whatsoever, because what  
23 we are saying might very well be inaccurate,  
24 and there is no way we can know.

25           The point of this meeting should be

TSP-0014 (contd)

1

1 to bring facts to the public so people can be  
2 informed and be able to give you the best  
3 information they have in response to that.

4 In Alabama there were those  
5 experiments on black men with syphilis, that  
6 Tuskegee experiment. Do you remember that?  
7 And when you read about that in the newspaper,  
8 you say, oh, my God, how could the government  
9 have done what they are doing, and never again  
10 should this happen. And never should our  
11 government resort to that type of deceitful  
12 behavior with its citizens, and never should  
13 the citizens be such pawns and be diluted into  
14 trusting some institution that's going to take  
15 care of them when in fact what they are doing  
16 is doing something terribly destructive to  
17 them.

18 You guys are the ones that have to  
19 wake up and look at your face in the mirror in  
20 the morning, and you in your role as an  
21 employee of the DOE can either be somebody who  
22 says, gee, we've got this terrible material,  
23 this highly dangerous, and we never, ever  
24 adequately thought of a way to make provision  
25 for storing it, and, okay, there was a second

56

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

## TSP-0014 (contd)

1 world war, there was a bomb being dropped,  
2 there was an emergency situation, if you want  
3 to call it that.

4 Well, we have had 50 years to work  
5 out the emergency situation and figure out what  
6 we are going to do with this radioactive  
7 material. And instead all we do is generate  
8 more of it. And don't solve the problem at  
9 all.

10 You guys could change that. You  
11 could put pressure on your own agency to do  
12 what is socially responsible and conscionable.

13 I think the rest of what I want to  
14 say has been said already. I just want to say  
15 in your Environmental Impact Statement, are you  
16 also actually going to do a study on the high  
17 level of accidents on I-90? It is tremendously  
18 increased in the last five years, where there  
19 are fatal accidents, there are cars following  
20 each other at 65 miles per hour at one and a  
21 half or two-car lengths separate from each  
22 other.

23 I can drive on I-90 and I personally  
24 have to worry about having an accident because  
25 there are so many people who have obvious road

57

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

TSP-0014 (contd), TSP-0015

1       rage, and I have pretty much become one myself,  
2       that you are just lucky to be able to go one  
3       direction or another and survive it. So I hope  
4       you take a look at that, too.

5                       MR. DEE WILLIS:    Thank you.

6                       Gerry Pollet.

7                       MR. GERRY POLLET:    I think I  
8       will pass.

9                       MR. DEE WILLIS:    Okay. Is  
10       there anybody who hasn't signed up to give  
11       comment who would like to do that now?

12                      Yes, Ma'am. Would you give us your  
13       name.

14       **TSP-0015**    MS. DEBORAH GREENHALGH:  Sure.  
15       My name is Deborah Greenhalgh. And actually my  
16       father was a plutonium chemist. He worked at  
17       Hanford. And he did die young.

18                      One year before he retired he was  
19       terrified of retiring, because he thought that  
20       would mean death. And it eventually did.

21                      Ironically, my brother is also a  
22       chemist there, too.

23                      Having said that, I have a broad  
24       spectrum of knowledge on seeing the point of  
25       view from living through the Hanford Area as a

## TSP-0015 (contd)

1 means of support, financial support, as well as  
2 seeing the reports of being a downwinder.

**1**

3 And so some of the things that I  
4 think we really need to look at is how we can  
5 be proactive in the future, and having these  
6 meetings like this, I must thank you for this  
7 opportunity.

8 It is very important that we all get  
9 together and share our knowledge, because each  
10 one of us has something that somebody else  
11 doesn't know.

**2**

12 The vitrification plant. I was so  
13 ecstatic to see that come up and to be built.  
14 And I do encourage you to do all you can to get  
15 that going again.

**3**

16 Another thing is that to look into  
17 the microbes, the bugs that actually eat  
18 plutonium waste, medical waste, mixed waste.  
19 They started out eating chemical waste, and now  
20 they have been evolved by the government to  
21 actually eat radioactive waste. And this could  
22 clear up a lot of mess if we could get that  
23 going.

24 Another thing, with the fires,  
25 through the Area 51 and the Nevada test site,

59

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

TSP-0015 (contd)

1 there were a lot of mixed waste and  
2 radioactivity wastes that were set on fire,  
3 because from President Clinton there are  
4 certain areas, well, the Area 51 does not have  
5 to deal with certain EPA requirements. And  
6 because of that there are a lot of harms  
7 that some of the employees have had to deal  
8 with.

9 . And Robert Frost was the first to  
10 die from dealing with these fires, the  
11 pollution, the contamination. And basically it  
12 ate him alive. And the doctors cannot, they  
13 cannot treat these employees because they are  
14 not allowed to know what they were exposed to.

4 | 15 And so when you are putting together  
16 this Final EIS, I encourage you to look at  
17 these medical cases and see if there is  
18 anything you can do to prevent future fires at  
19 Hanford from affecting other people, the  
20 surrounding populations, you know, from dealing  
21 with what Robert Frost and other co-employees  
22 have to deal with.

5 | 23 And then finally is the mercury and  
24 other elements that might be leaking into the  
25 soil. Those need to be included. Their

## TSP-0015 (contd), TSP-0016

5

1 assessments need to be included in the EIS,  
2 because not too many people are aware of this,  
3 but Spokane has the second highest M.S.  
4 caseload in the entire world, and they don't  
5 know why, but mercury just happens to have the  
6 exact same symptoms, mercury poisoning, as M.S.  
7 So that's something else for you to look at.

8 And I know there are other issues  
9 besides what might be leaking from those drums.  
10 But we have, you know, the industry, the mills  
11 and all the other things that contribute to  
12 that as well. But it's still something that we  
13 can take apart, we can be proactive from the  
14 Hanford Site. Okay?

15 Thank you.

16 MR. DEE WILLIS: I didn't get  
17 your last name. Would you spell it.

18 MS. DEBORAH GREENHALGH:  
19 Greenhalgh. G-r-e-e-n-h-a-l-g-h.

20 MR. DEE WILLIS: Anybody else  
21 like to give comment, public comment? Yes,  
22 come on up.

23 **TSP-0016** MS. AMBER WALDREF: Thanks.  
24 My name is Amber Waldref, and I am here with  
25 Heart of America Northwest, the Hanford watch

61

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

TSP-0016 (contd)

1 dog group. And I am from Spokane. I grew up  
2 here. My parents still live here. So I'm very  
3 concerned, now that I live over in Seattle, I  
4 am working on the Hanford issue, because it is  
5 close to home, which is where I am from here in  
6 Spokane. It is still home to me.

7 I want to just reiterate a few more  
8 concerns I have with the EIS in terms of  
9 transportation. Someone just was talking about  
10 the increased number of accidents on I-90 was  
11 because of the increased use of the freeway,  
12 with more population going up along the I-90  
13 corridor. And that's similar to I-5 and I-84  
14 as well.

15 And I just want to comment that the  
16 census data that's used for transportation risk  
17 for this EIS is based on 1990 census data. So  
18 I think that it should be updated. I think  
19 that the EIS should be redone and revised and  
20 updated with 2000 census data so that we can  
21 really adequately analyze the risks along all  
22 the different corridors.

23 And also the issue of the bridges in  
24 Oregon. I want to reiterate my concern that  
25 although the Oregon routes of I-84 and I-5 are

## TSP-0016 (contd)

1 preferred for the transportation of this waste  
2 to Hanford, because of the large number of  
3 bridge closures due to over-exceeding the  
4 weight, that it seems like there's a pretty  
5 good chance a lot of this stuff will be coming  
6 through Spokane. So I really have to think  
7 that the health and environmental risks to the  
8 Spokane community need to be analyzed and  
9 included in the EIS.

10 And finally, I have been thinking, I  
11 am in the midst of an environment justice  
12 class, because I am finishing up my Master's in  
13 environment and community, and thinking about,  
14 you know, what are just and equitable ways to  
15 deal with this type of problem.

16 I mean, there is radioactive waste  
17 in sites all over the country. And, you know,  
18 no community wants to have this stuff coming  
19 through their streets, and their freeways and  
20 highways.

21 But I would just like the Department  
22 of Energy to think about cumulative risk and  
23 think about that Hanford is the most  
24 contaminated site, and I think we have taken  
25 our just and more than equitable share of the

TSP-0016 (contd), TSP-0017

2

1 waste, and there's going to be huge impacts to  
2 my children and grandchildren, and I think that  
3 the DOE needs to take that into consideration  
4 and leave the waste that it wants to bring here  
5 in other places, safe and contained, but not  
6 risk more communities along the way by  
7 transporting it to Hanford.

8 Thanks.

9 MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you.

10 Anybody else like to give public  
11 comment?

12 DR. WILLIAM GREENE: The last  
13 shall be first.

14 I wanted to speak for maybe all of  
15 you or maybe some of you. But I would like to  
16 thank the DOE engineer who is here, believing  
17 in the process that is going on, and the  
18 benefits of it, and thanking you for being  
19 here.

20 MR. DEE WILLIS: Anyone else  
21 on the record? Okay.

22 Yes, Ma'am? I am sorry.

1

23 **TSP-0017** MS. LOUISE CHADEZ: My name is  
24 Louise Chadez, and I just want to say that I  
25 think this is a perfect time that we can all

TSP-0017 (contd), TSP-0018; Panel Discussion

1 | 1

say not in my backyard. Thank you.

2

MR. DEE WILLIS: Anyone else,

3

public comment? Oh. I am sorry.

4

**TSP-0018**

MS. JEANINE WADE: I think we

1 | 5

should ship -- Jeanine Wade. I think we should

6

ship 70,000 truck loads to Crawford, Texas.

7

MR. DEE WILLIS: Anyone else

8

wish to give comment?

9

So this is what I would like to do

10

for the rest of the evening.

11

The initial question period was kind

12

of chaotic because a question was asked and the

13

DOE person wanted to respond and then Gerry

14

Pollet wanted to respond. On occasion the EPA

15

representative wanted to respond.

16

I have not cleared this with any of

17

the three, but I want to propose that you three

18

come up, form a little panel, just bring your

19

chairs up. Is that okay?

20

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: Sure.

21

MR. DEE WILLIS: And this is

22

the format I want to propose. Will you do

23

that, Dennis? Is that okay with you?

24

MR. DENNIS FAULK: Sure.

25

MR. DEE WILLIS: Okay. You

65

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

Panel Discussion (contd)

1 are going to sit here. I am going to go to  
2 people who have not asked questions, who did  
3 not ask questions in the first period first.  
4 You ask your question, direct a question to one  
5 of the three people on this informal panel.

6 After they receive the question, I  
7 want you to allow them to discuss the answer  
8 among themselves for a reasonable period of  
9 time.

10 We will finish that. And then go to  
11 the next question. Is that clear? They are  
12 going to talk among themselves after you ask a  
13 question.

14 MR. GERRY POLLET: That's like  
15 that old Saturday night live skit?

16 MR. DEE WILLIS: Yeah. It is.  
17 It is.

18 So who has the first question?

19 MR. DENNIS FAULK: I actually  
20 do. If I could, Dee. The gentleman that made  
21 the comment that he thought the groundwater, or  
22 the river was getting worse.

23 It really isn't getting worse. The  
24 Hanford contaminants into the river are getting  
25 better. The worst of it has happened.

Panel Discussion (contd)

1                   As you know, it was directly  
2 discharged into the river. That has ceased.  
3 They used to directly discharge liquids into  
4 the soils. That has ceased. So those are good  
5 things.

6                   There are still contaminants going  
7 into the river. We are doing the best that we  
8 can to stop that. But my opinion and EPA's  
9 opinion is, in essence the river is safe, and  
10 we need to do our job to make sure that those,  
11 particularly tank wastes, don't get into the  
12 river in the long term.

13                   So, again, I just want to put that  
14 out.

15                   Now, if you read the EIS, again, if  
16 things aren't done to mitigate, there could be  
17 problems in the long term from these wastes.

18                   MR. GERRY POLLET: Well, then  
19 explain this, then. Okay? This is the site  
20 assessment capability. It is their rough  
21 model. It is a rough model.

22                   EPA staff had the other, older  
23 document that is similar to this at the meeting  
24 this morning.

25                   This red area is 100 times the