Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
P.O. Box 550
Richland, Washington 99352

April 29, 2010

Certified Mail

Mr. Dvija Bertish
Director of Environmental & Conservation
Rosemere Neighborhood Association
P.O. Box 61471
Vancouver, Washington 98666

Dear Mr. Bertish:

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST (FOI 2010-01319)

You requested, pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), a copy of the Court Reporter's transcript of the public hearing held in Portland Oregon on February 10, 2010, regarding the public comment on the Hanford Tank Closure Environmental Impact Statement.

Your request is granted and the document is enclosed. In addition, you also requested a waiver of fees for any information provided to you. As fees were minimal, a determination on your request for a waiver of fees was not made.

Should you have any questions regarding your request, please contact me on (509) 376-6288.

Sincerely,

-Original Signed By-

Dorothy Riehle
Freedom of Information Act Officer
Office of Communications
and External Affairs

OCE:DCR

Enclosure

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

February 10, 2010

6:00 p.m.

Doubletree Hotel

1000 N.E. Multnomah Street

Portland, Oregon

Mr. James Parham, Facilitator

PANEL MEMBERS:

Ms. Mary Beth Burandt, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection

Mr. Jeff Lyon, Washington State Department of Ecology, Hanford Project Office

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION

	Page	Line
Mary Gautreaux	5	12
Brent Foster	6	15
Jim McNaughton	10	17
Colm Brennan	12	9
Paul E. Libby	13	1
Gerry Pollet	14	20
Jan Castle	19	11
Gloria Black	22	13
Dvija Bertish	24	7
Madya Panfilio	26	7
Louisa Hamachek	27	9
Breena Satterfield	28	16
Sandy Polishuk	29	13
Sharon Loaiza	30	24
Maja Meyer	33	10
Dr. Rudi Nussbaum	35	17
Kelly Campbell	38	4
David Delk	40	22
Paige Knight	42	18

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION (Cont'd.)

	Page	Line
Lynn Ford	46	3
Thomas Layne	48	3
Melba Dlugonski	51	1
Chuck Johnson	54	1
Cherie Holenstein	55	19
Dave Bybeey	57	23
Thomas Clark	60	10
Rochelle	62	15
Brett VandenHeuvel	63	24
Lang Davison	66	18
Fred Nussbaum	67	24
Robin Klein	69	11
Chris Henry	71	8
Christine Charneski	74	12
Ross Tewksbury	77	14
Joyce Follingstad	80	3
Laura Feldman	82	19
James Brunkow	84	16
Dorothy Land	85	6
Nancy Johnson	87	6
Lisa Van Dyk	88	1
Norm Santana	88	24
Lori Meserve	89	15

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION (Cont'd.)

	Page	Line
Holly Hoffman	89	19
Tom Carpenter	90	24
Jim McNaughton	95	4
Chuck Johnson	95	11
Louisa Hamachek	98	4
Gerry Pollet	100	10
Lori Meserve	103	19

* * *

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION

MR. PARHAM: I think we're going to go ahead and move to the comments. We have a lot of people -- right now, looks about 50 -- who want to comment. And I would like to start with the elected officials.

And I know a representative from Senator Wyden's office is here. And we'd like to have you step to the microphone, please.

COMMENTS BY MARY GAUTREAUX:

Thank you. And, Mary Beth, thank you very much for coming to Portland, to Oregon.

I'm Mary Gautreaux from Senator Ron Wyden's office. And the Senator couldn't be here today, but he did want me to read a statement. As you know, Senator Wyden has spoken out many times over the years for cleanup at Hanford.

And he said: "The Department of Energy has been working on Hanford cleanup for more than 20 years, and at best they have another 20 years to go, and probably a lot more. Now, the DOE is proposing to possibly bring even more radioactive waste from other DOE cleanup sites to Hanford for

disposal, making this toxic cesspool possibly even worse. That puts Oregon at risk twice: First, when the waste is trucked through Oregon; and again when it seeps back into the Columbia River. If I have said it once, I have said it a dozen times: Hanford should not be turned into a national sacrifice zone. I am not satisfied with the progress at Hanford, and I am absolutely opposed to DOE bringing more waste to Hanford, since they have been unable and unwilling to clean up the radioactive mess that's already there."

MR. PARHAM: Next, we would like to have the Attorney General Kroger rep. Is that right?

COMMENTS BY BRENT FOSTER:

My name is Brent Foster. I'm here tonight on behalf of Attorney General John Kroger. And he was sorry that he couldn't make it. I think if we could encapsulate Mary's and Ken's talk together, I could pretty much say "ditto" and be done with it. I've been to many of these meetings. This will be the first representing a state's attorney general; so hopefully, I don't swear or do other things like that. But some of that may actually be appropriate when we're talking about Hanford.

I do want to point out that Oregon Department of Energy, whom Ken represents tonight, is the agency for the State of Oregon, that is the state's Hanford watchdog. And I just want to thank Ken and everybody that works for him for doing a great job. When the Attorney General asked me what's happening with Hanford, it's Ken and the staff that he works with that are first to get our call.

Just to provide some brief comments: There's no question that Hanford is an incredibly important place. And since I went out there for the first time and actually swam a good section of the Hanford Reach. It's something I've done every year except for last, which I couldn't do it. But next year, I will be back.

So I speak both as a representative and probably -- I don't know how many people actually jump in the Hanford Reach every year. But to me, it's something that I don't necessarily savor, but it's something that reminds me of the importance of keeping -- of keeping our focus on cleanup at Hanford.

Hanford is important not only for salmon, it's important for downstream river users. It's important for honoring tribal treaty rights. And

frankly, the future of what will become even more important: a water source in the future of global warming and water limitations.

The decisions that we make today carry with them a sense of legacy that are really unlike many other decisions that we have to make today. I make a lot of decisions, and the Attorney General and many of the agencies represented here make decisions. Very few of them have the direct effects that we can say 10,000 years from now will be significant to the people who live in the Northwest. This is one of them. And so it elevates the importance of the decision to a level I think that is very different than most of the decisionmaking that we think about today.

Ken is right that what we have in the EIS is a document that ought to be a call for a shift in timing and urgency, focus, strategy and, ultimately, how we deal with this site. You don't need to look at those maps; I don't need to sit up here and explain what they show you, that the status quo is unacceptable. The status quo is unacceptable, and shipping more waste to Hanford and adding it on top of the status quo borders somewhere between insane and maniacal.

These are the things I told my boss might come out when he decided to hire me.

The bottom line though is, I think we have a real need to rethink where we are going. The idea of adding more waste is legally, ethically, and morally unacceptable, given what is contained in this EIS.

I would just end by urging everyone at the Department of Energy who prepared formal comments on behalf of the state, I think that the alternative analysis is there. The proposal needs to be taken seriously. We do want to see them analyzed.

And we would urge the DOE to really take this EIS as an opportunity to reach that focus, engage seriously in the questioning of how the strategies have been implemented to date, what's gone wrong, and come back with a decision that would be respected by future generations and something that they will thank us for and not curse us for.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you very much. Thanks to the elected officials for being here tonight.

I would like to now turn to the whole reason we're here, to hear from the citizens. And again,

I'd ask you to limit your comments to three minutes initially because of the large number of people we need to hear, and I want to make sure we get to everyone. So we'll give you three minutes. And I'll give you a high sign, and if you can finish up.

And remember, when we get through this list, you're more than welcome to come up again and again to make sure you get your comments thoroughly into the record. Dee and I will make sure that happens. At some point, we may take just a finger break for her and I'll stop for a second. And we'll move into that now.

The first person on our list to speak is Jim McNaughton. Jim.

COMMENTS BY JIM McNAUGHTON:

My name is Jim McNaughton. I live in Fairview. I'm a member of the Alliance for Democracy.

Last night, Mary Beth, and tonight, you made a statement there will be a moratorium. Now you're saying that there is a document in this? I have never seen a document in any of your stuff, in any of your material. Is there a document, a legal

document, that will stop the transportation of all grades -- A, B, C, and C-plus -- across the highways? Is there? I'm asking you, Mary Beth.

MR. PARHAM: We'll take that as --

MR. McNAUGHTON: Can't she answer my question?

MR. PARHAM: Mary Beth, do you want to answer? I'm not sure --

MR. McNAUGHTON: Is there a document of that in your statement?

MS. BURANDT: There was a court settlement in 2006. And part of that court settlement said that there would be a moratorium against DOE receiving waste from other -- from Hanford receiving waste from other DOE sites until the Tank Closure and Waste Management EIS was final. What DOE has agreed to is extend that moratorium to the year 2022 or when the waste treatment plant is operational.

MR. McNAUGHTON: Do you have a document to back up that statement? A legal document.

MS. BURANDT: Yes. A copy is back there.

MR. PARHAM: The material is in the room.

MR. McNAUGHTON: If there is not a legal document, who can make that legal document to back up that statement?

MS. BURANDT: There was a document filed with the court. So it is a legally binding document.

MR. PARHAM: Charlotte, do we have a copy? Let's get him a copy.

MR. McNAUGHTON: Thank you very much.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Is it Colm Brennan? Is that right?

COMMENTS BY COLM BRENNAN:

My name is Colm Brennan. I'm from Beaverton, Oregon. And I'm also with Alliance for Democracy.

And my question is to Mary Beth: Why do you want people in Oregon and Washington to be exposed, to be jeopardized by nuclear waste that's going to be shipped through Oregon and Washington -- I don't believe what you say about a moratorium; we haven't seen any legal documentation -- for the profit of the nuclear industry?

And that's my comment. Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Paul Libby.

MR. LIBBY: I have somewhat of a solution --

MR. PARHAM: Paul, come up to the microphone so we make sure we get everything on the record for the court reporter. Thanks.

COMMENTS BY PAUL LIBBY:

I have some answers to the real problem that we face. And they were developed by Japan after we dropped the nuke on them. And this is spiderwort, which has a very sensitive detection of the radiation. And the Trojan Decommission Alliance spent all summer measuring around Trojan before it was destroyed. And we could pick up the radiation seven miles away from that plant. And if that is happening all over the world, where are we?

I saw the nuke submarine in -- in -- on the Sound up there. And it scared the daylights out of me. We had 1500 people there, picketers picketing it. We had seven small boats around that nuclear sub, and they had the sea guns on us.

How do we face the reality of the nukes? When I first saw them, I went almost crazy. And I began to realize it wasn't me that was crazy; it was the whole world. And this, I read in a study of Trojan. And we found that there was -- right below Trojan and in the Columbia, there was -- there was all these nukes. I've forgotten them all now. But I knew a lot about nukes.

And I don't want my kids to grow up in a nuclear world. And that's -- and we're dealing a

little bit with that. What is happening to all the world? These plants could pick up the radiation. And we took a million samples. And I don't know where it came from, but some of the scientists said that we didn't have enough. And I know that science demands a lot of -- a lot of testing.

And this was -- Tokyo University developed these plants. And there's KUY7 and KU10. I tell you, that was back in '78. And the records, I don't know whether there is -- not Oregon University, but Oregon State. And I know they're in the Oregon records. And that's about drove me crazy.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you, Paul.

MR. LIBBY: And I don't want my kids growing up in a nuclear world.

MR. PARHAM: Next up on the list is Gerry Pollet.

COMMENTS BY GERRY POLLET:

I'm Gerry Pollet with Heart of America Northwest.

Paul, who just spoke, is 88 years old. And I'm 51. So in 37 years, I hope that I won't have to be coming to these hearings. I've been coming

to them for nearly 30 years.

Unfortunately, under the Energy Department's plans that we're here to object to tonight, we will have to train an entire new generation and another generation to be coming to meetings and saying to our own government, "Clean up your mess before you dump more. It's unacceptable."

Let's roll the slides. Thanks.

We're here because of the Columbia River. As we speak tonight, radiation is also seeping into the Columbia River at 1500 times the drinking water standard. That's DOE's own annual groundwater monitoring report for the area. 1500 times the drinking water standard for radioactive strontium 90.

You've heard about the drinking water standard tonight. It's set at the level at which if you drank the water as an adult, one adult out of every thousand would die of cancer. Do that math yourself.

When we clean up over the next 30 years at Hanford, under the Energy Department's plans to not clean up the billions of gallons of discharges in the high-level waste tanks, just cover it up and install the cap, to not empty the tanks all the way

and to add more waste, we recontaminate the site and the drinking water. The groundwater which is going to be used for drinking in a hundred years, in a thousand years, it's going to be recontaminated.

If I walked into this room with a gun and closed my eyes and pulled the trigger, it would be premeditated murder. I think you should think about that and pass that on to the decisionmakers. Because without any doubt, the evidence shows if you add more waste, if you leave waste to spread from under your caps instead of cleaning up the tank leaks, if you do not remove the tanks, people will die.

Let's go on to the next slide. That's -- Our Energy Department dumped waste in unlined ditches through 2004 at Hanford. When they issued that decision, that they say they're just implementing, to use Hanford as a national radioactive waste dump, it was to use these unlined ditches. Now at least, due to public pressure, they said they're not going to use unlined ditches. But they're not willing to go in and dig them up and retrieve what's in them. That's unacceptable.

Next slide, please. The voters told

Washington State, "Clean up your waste before you add more." Now we know very clearly that the evidence shows, you cannot leave the waste that's already at Hanford without recontaminating the groundwater to wholly unacceptable levels, and you will never be able to add more waste and not contaminate the groundwater.

Next slide, please. This is carbon tetrachloride in the groundwater today. The darkest red areas are 50 times the drinking water standard.

The next slide. In 120 years, you see for yourself how much of that is starting towards the Columbia River. Again, that's one contaminant, 50 times the drinking water standard. That's just one contaminant.

Next slide. Plutonium 239, half-life 24,000 years. Their data shows seeps along the Columbia River in a thousand years will be 300 times the drinking water standard from the tank leaks, the waste that they do not clean up, and the burial grounds.

Next slide, please. Uranium 238 spreading towards the river 120 years from now, under their half cleanup plan. We'll call it a half cleanup

plan; it's probably a quarter of a cleanup plan.

Next slide. Let's skip ahead to the transportation slides. Right there. Three billion picocuries equals about 17,000 trucks of radioactive waste.

Mary Beth, it is a lie to say that the drivers of those trucks do not get a radiation dose. It is a lie. Your own document shows the radiation doses they get.

Next slide. The people stuck in traffic. You and I and our children and our grandchildren will be exposed to these trucks. The Energy Department has illegally left out of this EIS the disclosure that it wants to shift highly radioactive waste, called GTCC waste, to Hanford, which is its unspent fuel.

Their estimate for shipping spent fuel to Hanford was 816 fatal cancers along the truck route, even if there's no accident or terrorist attack, due to radiation emitted from the trucks. There's their EIS, their data. And notice it says adults. They left out the children. I care about the kids.

Next slide shows what happens if there is an accident with a reasonably foreseeable release from

a remote-handled plutonium shipment to Hanford, which is part of the GTCC proposal, at the intersection of I-84 and 205. 300 square miles of Portland have to be evacuated, a thousand fatal cancers. You cannot decontaminate 300 square miles of Portland. We have to stop them.

Thank you for being here tonight. Don't stop here. Keep coming. Thank you, all.

MR. PARHAM: Next on the list is Jan Castle.

COMMENTS BY JAN CASTLE:

Gerry, you're a tough act to follow.

My name is Jan Castle. I am a member of the Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, and the Union of Concerned Scientists.

Actually, I'm glad to get all this information. I'm with Ken. I think that this gives us some very helpful confirmation to start to find a way forward. And I appreciate that, Mary Beth, from the Department of Energy. I appreciate the efforts on the behalf of the Department of Ecology from Washington, the Department of Energy from Oregon. I'm very proud of their work.

I appreciate all the work that Heart of America Northwest has gone to to develop these

citizen guides. And just a procedural thing here: I would ask that when you start the procedure for scheduling hearings next time, that you start with Heart of America Northwest in trying to set the appropriate dates so that they have the prescribed 45 days in order to produce these guides.

This is extremely helpful information. It should come to people well in advance of the hearing so that they are prepared and can understand what they're hearing at the hearing. Mine arrived in the mail yesterday. That's not good enough.

So I know the Department of Energy has been responsive before in procedural things. I would ask that you move Gerry Pollet -- who, believe it or not, actually has a working relationship with these people -- to the top of your list so we get this information in a timely manner.

I have detailed comments that I will submit electronically. For now, very quickly, I would just say I support complete cleanup of Hanford to the greatest extent technically possible. I oppose all options for lesser remediation and, of course, making Hanford a national radioactive and mixed waste dump.

I support removal of 99.9 percent of the waste in the tank -- because I understand that last nine-tenths percent has the most hazardous waste in it -- or to the extent is technically possible. I realize that will move on a tank-by-tank basis. I support starting now for the Department of Energy to plan, fund, and build new capacity for the vitrification plant, with the goal of completing vitrification by 2040 or thereabouts. I do not support the supplemental treatment options.

I support clean closure of the tank farms, and ask the DOE to investigate and remediate the soil around and under the tanks to whatever depth of excavation that is necessary. I understand that this is a tall order. I'm sure it would be the largest such operation in the country. This is the most contaminated area in the western hemisphere. Sorry, in the northern hemisphere.

So yes, it's going to be a massive job. It's going to be difficult. And I just would urge you to keep on it until you find ways to do it safely and to utilize whatever technology you can come up with.

So I also realize that pursuing these options will be very expensive. This is the cost of

nuclear weapons production and nuclear power production. This cost needs to be factored in at the beginning of decisions, not at the end of decisions. So I would like to see us -- I'd rather see us spend money on completely cleaning this up, which is our moral obligation, than on loan guarantees for another generation of nuclear power plants.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Next on the list is Gloria Black, and she will be followed by Dvija Bertish.

COMMENTS BY GLORIA BLACK:

I have some rhetorical questions for the representative. I got a lot of generalizations in what you said. Some of the quotes: In the future, we will need more detailed modeling to evaluate site-specific conditions for making closure decisions. And I heard a lot of hard-to-get information. So my question is: Why are your conclusions different from those, say, of Heart of America Northwest regarding findings?

Regarding the Department of Energy, in talking about going through the 99 percent cleanup versus the 99.9 percent, you made reference to, "Oh, well,

we've got to balance between the short term and the long term." And the short term was, I believe, the lives of the workers who would be dealing with this. And I would just like to point out that it is because of the lack of long-term planning that we have to worry about the lives of those people. And hopefully, we can focus on long term from here on.

I wonder why the Department of Energy said, "Gee, let's wait till 2022." I don't know what's behind that. Why did they pick that year specifically? Whether people just think, "Oh, sounds good. Maybe they're really doing something in the meantime."

And my last comment is, I wonder whether there's anywhere in any of these studies, particularly concerning the shipment of nuclear waste, whether what has been taken into account is emergency services for accidents, be they intentional or not intentional, whether there is preparedness on the part of our federal government and local government all along the routes to take care of any kind of national emergency we might have from any accident.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Can you tell me your first name, please?

MR. BERTISH: Dvija.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Dvija. And after Dvija, Madya Panfilio.

COMMENTS BY DVIJA BERTISH:

I'm Dvija Bertish. I'm with the Rosmere Neighborhood Association. We're a conservation group in Vancouver. I'm also a member of Columbia Riverkeeper.

I want to state very clearly that several of the preferred alternatives proposed for the Environmental Impact Statement are unacceptable. First and foremost, as many people have already spoken, we do not want to have any radioactive waste trucked into Hanford at all. And irregardless of a moratorium for ten years, 20 years, till the year 2022, whatever year it is, it needs to be completely removed and stricken.

As far as I'm aware, the moratorium is subject to change. And they could start shipping stuff even sooner than the date they describe. So it needs to be legally binding. If that does not happen, then I think that the citizens of the

states of Oregon and Washington have no other option but to sue. And we should.

The Fast Flux reactor needs to be removed 100 percent, not just entombed. In terms of the tank closure, I agree with several of the speakers that we need to remove all of it and remove the shell casings from the ground as well, leave no residue. And that means digging up the soil and trying to remediate out of the groundwater as well.

There are several new technologies from the oil and gas industries that have not been looked at that are available to speed up the process. And I think this process is far too slow.

Get rid of all of the buildings. We need to have no residue of any nuclear reactor facility for a museum, for a public park, for camping, for sight-seeing. It all needs to be stricken. Hanford is a harbinger of what an increased nuclear program will bring to all of us, and people are going to die from it as it is right now. We owe it to the future of our entire community, our states, and our western seaport to get rid of this.

The radioactive isotopes that are being released from places like Hanford are already floating past Portland and Vancouver now. So it's

not acceptable to leave any of the residue in the ground. Those are most of my comments.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. After Madya Panfilio will be Louisa Hamachek.

COMMENTS BY MADYA PANFILIO:

My name is Madya Panfilio.

There is an epidemic of thyroid disease as it is in the Northwest. And doctors do not even really know how to not only treat it, but they don't even know how to test correctly for it. And we also have an epidemic of breast cancer. And much of this is due to Hanford.

How long is this going to take the Department of Energy to do the right thing? The right thing to do is dismantle completely the reactor and do not allow any more waste into Hanford. We simply do not want our children, ourselves, our Earth to be exposed any more than absolutely -- we just don't want it exposed anymore to radioactivity.

We need to have the landfill closures, not closed actually, because we want -- you can't have a closure. We need to have complete cleanup. We want 100 percent cleanup. Not 99.6, not 99.7. 100

percent cleanup.

The preferred alternatives seem to be just a matter of manipulation. When we don't plan well for the future, and we don't do the right thing, we have no future.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Louisa, and after that will be Breena Satterfield.

COMMENTS BY LOUISA HAMACHEK:

I'm Louisa Hamachek from Eugene, Oregon. And I'm a mother.

And I'm very concerned about transportation of nuclear waste dangerously going through Eugene on I-5. I know your maps have showed that you're not going to be using I-5, but I heard that that could be different. And I find it horrendous to think that we could be getting sick and getting cancer from just driving alongside one of the trucks, unknowingly. And you have no right to do that to any citizen or to the animals along the way.

I also am speaking for the animals that live in the Columbia River Basin. And Eugene sits on the Willamette, which isn't downstream of Hanford. But we're doing our best in Eugene to keep the river clean from what's upstream of us and then

what we release to go downstream. And all along the way, people are working very hard for that. When it hits Portland and it gets mixed in with the Columbia, it's -- continuously, it's part of our responsibility to see that it's clean.

And we demand, as part of our Willamette Valley citizenship, that Hanford stop releasing the radioactive fluids into the river, and that there be a 99.9 percent, a 100 percent cleanup of the waste. And the tanks should not be left in the ground, and all the fluid should be cleaned up and sucked out of the tanks.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Breena Satterfield, and then Sandy Polishuk.

COMMENTS BY BREENA SATTERFIELD:

My name is Breena Satterfield. I live in Portland. I live in the area that is shown on the map that if an accident should occur at the meeting place of the 205 and the 84. And most importantly, I'm a member of the human race.

I have a family; I have grandchildren. I want them to have families and grandchildren. I don't want them exposed to the 617,000 trucks. I hope I got the number right. I don't want them exposed to

the air contamination, the groundwater contamination from Hanford. I fear that all of us have been already.

And I would like to point out that none of us, as a parent, has ever asked a child to go and wash one hand. It's two hands. You ask them to "Go wash your hands." And if they're dirty, they take a shower as well. Hanford needs to be cleaned up, totally and now.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Sandy Polishuk. And after Sandy will be Sharon.

COMMENTS BY SANDY POLISHUK:

I'm Sandy Polishuk. I live here in Portland. I grew up in Washington state. I've lived in the Northwest my entire life, except for going away to college for a couple of years.

I was diagnosed with breast cancer when I was 46 years old. That's not considered so young anymore. Women are now being diagnosed in their thirties, as we contaminate this planet more and more.

One of the things I find very ironic in this city, I think in this whole state, if it's discovered that your home heating oil tank is

leaking, you are required to completely clean it up. And that means taking it out of the ground and removing all the soil under it. They don't care if it costs you $50,000. I know, $50,000 doesn't sound like much to what Hanford has paid, but we're talking about one homeowner. You can take out a third mortgage if you need to. You've got to do it; and you've got to do it right, too.

We need complete cleanup, clean closure. This capping and leaving the stuff there, leaving anything in those tanks, leaving the contaminated soil so it can further migrate into the river is absolutely unconscionable.

I want to ditto everything that Senator Wyden wrote to you and all the other things that people have been saying. We need a complete cleanup, as much as possible. And it's absolutely ridiculous to even think about bringing more waste to a site on a river.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Sharon. And after Sharon will be Maja Meyer.

COMMENTS BY SHARON LOAIZA:

I'm Sharon Loaiza. Why would we even consider

bringing in more radioactive waste when we still have not cleaned up the mess we made a long time ago? Do we really want to have trucks traveling up I-5, through populated areas, carrying high-level radioactive waste? We talk about fatal cancers to adults, to children. Well, think about when you drive down I-5 and see those red-tailed hawks. There's wildlife we're thinking about too.

My family and I are Hanford downwinders. And we were exposed to radiation through the air, water, and food we ate. We lived in Hermiston between 1950 to '56, during the time major radioactive air releases took place. Five years ago, I was diagnosed with Stage III non-Hodgkin's lymphoma; my deceased mother had leukemia; my sister has thyroid disease. We not only experience the pain and worry of the illness, but we deal with the cost of medical care.

Contamination of the river was greatest during the late 1950s and '60s. In 1956, our family moved to The Dalles, where we were exposed to radiation from the Columbia River. Our mother often took us to the Columbia to swim, and we boated and we swam with our friends. And we regularly ate salmon caught by the Native Americans. And during that

time, people had no idea; we never thought about contamination of the river.

At Hanford, the radioactive build-up within the reactor was regularly flushed loose and into the Columbia, along with the water used to cool the reactive cores. The HEDR -- Hanford Environmental Dose Reconstruction -- project has estimated the radiation doses the public may have received from Hanford from 1944 to 1992. They figure about 2 million people were exposed, either through the air or the Columbia River or both, as our family was.

We don't see this radioactive poison as it silently moves throughout our soil, our water, and our state. It knows no borders. We live on a jewel of a planet floating ever so delicately in space. We depend on this interconnected system of air, water, and soil to nurture us now and long into the future. Are we going to choose as our legacy a cleaner planet with a pristine Columbia River, or will future generations see a sign that says, "Do not swim, radiation present"? Or even worse, there will be no sign.

Today, we fight to protect our salmon and we fight to protect our bald eagles and we fight to

preserve the Columbia Gorge. Doesn't it defeat the purpose of our efforts if we allow Hanford to be a national radioactive waste dump? So let's stand up and fight to protect all of our families and the environment. And let's clean up Hanford and close it forever.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Miss Meyer, and then after that will be Dr. Rudi Nussbaum.

COMMENTS BY MAJA MEYER:

My name is Maja Meyer. I'm Sharon's sister. I'm a native Oregonian. And I would like to relay my personal story of being a downwinder to Hanford.

I was born in 1949 and lived in Hermiston until '56. I was exposed, as a baby, to the radioactive iodine that Hanford intentionally released into the air. The exposure affected me tenfold through drinking the milk from the cows, who ate the grass that was contaminated through the air from the Hanford release. Our family had a garden. And we would eat fresh fruit and vegetables, grown from the ground that was contaminated by Hanford.

My family moved to The Dalles in '56. And for the next 11 years, my family and friends swam in

and ate fish from the Columbia River. The Columbia River was contaminated because Hanford used the river to cool the reactive cores, and then the water was sucked back into the Columbia.

My mother was a fish counter at The Dalles dam. And I remember going with her one day and sitting in the fish-counting elevator with the glass window, watching the schools of fish swim by while she calculated their numbers by species. I remember seeing deformed fish, and she would make a note of it. And I asked, "Why are the fish deformed?" She didn't have an answer at the time.

But that experience flashed into my mind again as I read the documents that were finally released to the public through the Freedom of Information Act in 1986. I was stunned to read that the cancer-causing radiation doses were released from 1944 through the '80s.

In '79, during my physical, my doctor felt a lump in my neck and ordered an ultrasound. They found a nodule on my thyroid. And I remember the doctor asking, "Have you ever been exposed to radiation?" I said, "No." And then remembered this conversation again while reading the documents made public in 1986.

I now have five precancerous nodules and a goiter on my thyroid. I see an endocrinologist every year for a painful aspiration of the goiter, and I have had a lot of expense for medications. With my mother's leukemia, my sister's lymphoma, our family has experienced the pain of cancer.

How many more families in the future will suffer with cancer because Hanford continues to be contaminated? We cannot bring additional radioactive waste into Hanford because we haven't cleaned up what was dumped decades ago. We owe it to our children and future generations to clean up Hanford now.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. After Dr. Nussbaum, it will be Kelly Campbell after that.

COMMENTS BY DR. RUDI NUSSBAUM:

I do not want to repeat what other people have said, so I will fully endorse what Senator Wyden has said and what the Heart of America has put together. They did a wonderful job.

It's very easy at meetings like this -- and I have been to too many in my long life -- to get ground in lingo of the administrative kind or the technical one. I want to bring this discussion

back to a much broader vision of the problems. And I also think that for citizens, it is important to maintain a degree of outrage rather than one of giving up. And I, therefore, will not start what I have to say with friendly words about thanking everybody, and the Department of Energy in particular.

My name is Rudi Nussbaum. I'm a retired professor of physics and environmental sciences at Portland State University. And I'm a member, long-time member of Physicians for Social Responsibility.

Why does DOE need to truck nuclear waste to Hanford? Because after all these decades of promises, there is no solution for permanent and safe storage inside. There is no science that even supports at this point the possibility for such a safe, long-time burial of the waste.

So I want to point out to you that the DOE's so-called preferred alternative to abandon cleanup of Hanford is directly related to a lavishly financed effort by the entire nuclear establishment to brainwash Congress and the public and our decisionmakers to accept new government-financed nuclear power plants as safe and green energy

producers. Both of these claims are patently false.

I speak here as a scientist who has studied radiation health sciences and has worked with, investigated, and reported on Hanford downwinders' excess thyroid disease, cancers, spontaneous abortions, and others. Such radiation related to human injuries have always been cynically dismissed by the Department of Energy, its contractors and, unfortunately, many corruptible scientists.

Together with the undeniable legacy of human suffering from atmospheric nuclear tests, uranium mining, the Chernobyl and Three Mile Island disasters and so forth and so forth. And most recently, we have not heard in media or scientific journals of high standing in this country about the conclusive findings -- and I say again, conclusive findings -- of the government-sponsored study of more than double the childhood leukemia cases in the immediate proximity of all German nuclear power plants. And those reactors are of similar design as U.S. reactors. However, a comparable, powerful study has never been conducted here. You may ask why.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Kelly Campbell. And after Kelly will be David Delk. Thank you.

COMMENTS BY KELLY CAMPBELL:

Thank you. My name is Kelly Campbell, and I'm the executive director of the Oregon Chapter of Physicians for Social Responsibility. We're the local chapter of National PSR, which is the U.S. affiliate of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, which was the recipient of the 1985 Nobel Peace Prize for our work to abolish nuclear weapons and prevent nuclear war.

The Oregon chapter was founded in 1980 by a group of local physicians and scientists who advocate against nuclear weapons and for the cleanup of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation. They also helped to evaluate the health of those downwind and downstream from radioactive iodine releases from Hanford. And so the issue of Hanford cleanup continues to be an important one to our organization.

We base our recommendations on implementation of the precautionary principle. And the lay term for this is simple: It's better safe than sorry. The Hanford site is a glaring example of what

happens when policy is formed without regard to this common-sense principle at all. We're here tonight in this room, having this discussion, due to the disastrous consequences of policy without thought to the public future health -- the future public health implications or environmental implications.

The cleanup of Hanford now should embrace the precautionary principle. And in doing so, it needs to clean up the site to the highest standards possible to protect human health and the environment. We would associate our comments with those of Heart of America Northwest and virtually everyone who spoke in here tonight about the specifics.

I do want to share with you a story. I'm wearing a bracelet tonight that was given to me by a group of Hibakusha survivors of the atomic bombs in Hiroshima and also in Nagasaki. And in meeting with those survivors, they continue to suffer from the health effects of what was produced at Hanford, just as we continue to deal with the problems of how Hanford has affected our region.

And I wanted to mention this tonight just to put this hearing and my comments into a larger

context: That the public health environmental problems we face here, we don't face alone; we face with everyone in the world. And we are linked to the people who are on the other end of the plutonium that was produced here at Hanford.

The only way that we're going to remedy the situation, the only way that we can honor the lives of those lost due to this nuclear radiation -- whether in Japan, whether from testing elsewhere, or whether from people here in the Hanford region -- is to do a complete and full cleanup of Hanford, to not bring in any more nuclear radioactive waste to Hanford, and to really challenge ourselves to say how do we implement the precautionary principle in the cleanup of Hanford and in going forward with respect to nuclear policy in this country.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. David Delk is next. After David is Paige Knight.

COMMENTS BY DAVID DELK:

Hello. My name is David Delk. I am the president of the Portland chapter of the Alliance for Democracy.

I wanted to, first off, express my extreme disappointment with the position of the State of Washington on the issues. I feel like they have just totally rolled over and are not really representing and advocating for the citizens of the state of Washington. Having said that, I also want to acknowledge that Ken Niles and the State of Oregon do appear to be representing the citizens of the state of Oregon. And I want to express my great gratitude for their position.

When I read the preferred alternatives in this Environmental Impact Statement, I was frankly shocked. I was very disappointed almost to the point of not believing what I was reading was actually accurate.

Landfill closure is not adequate. Capping over existing radiation is not adequate. It needs to be cleaned up. We want to have the tanks cleaned to 99.9, virtually 100 percent. Leaving that potent radiation in the tanks is just unacceptable. The Fast Flux facility needs to be removed, not just entombed. The radiation just needs to be cleaned up.

The other thing is that I'm disappointed that the Environmental Impact Statement does not include

the Greater-Than-Class-C waste, which has evidently been shunted off into another Environmental Impact Statement to come later on. Those things really cannot be separated, and they should have been considered at the same time.

And the last thing is that we cannot add more waste to that site. The cleanup must be completed, not just saying that we're going to postpone -- that we're not going to bring more waste till 2022, when the vitrification process can actually start. We need to have that process well, well underway -- in fact, completed -- before more waste goes to that site.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. After Paige Knight will be Lynn Ford.

COMMENTS BY PAIGE KNIGHT:

My name is Paige Knight, and I'm the president of Hanford Watch here in Portland, Oregon.

The decisions of this Environmental Impact Statement will affect the lives of this region, of all of us, for generations to come. What we want is the protection of human health and the environment for decades -- for the decades and

centuries ahead of us. That means long-term protection of the Columbia River, our lifeblood.

We do not want contaminants flowing into the groundwater at Hanford and into the Columbia River, its basin, its farmland, our fishing grounds, and our recreational areas. We want the cleanup to occur now, not to be delayed into the proverbial future of politics that puts these decisions off until the next Congress, the next catastrophe, the next generation.

We want to protect our natural resources for now and for the future. We want the Department of Energy to fully comply with legal obligations from now to the final state of the site. We want the legal obligations to be more stringent. We want tank waste stored safely in tanks -- new, if needed -- for radioactive waste retrieval in the vitrification facility that is being built and, hopefully, will operate successfully over time.

We want tank waste removed from the existing 177 tanks to the greatest degree possible. We want the tank waste treatment plant to operate as it was planned, with two high-level waste melters and two low-activity waste melters. We have wasted enough time and money on alternatives that are proving to

be fatally flawed. We want high-level waste in canisters stored on site until and if a national burial ground is decided on.

We want the tank farms ultimately closed. This means characterizing contaminated soils and cleaning them up as deeply as possible. We want the waste from the tanks and the piping between the tanks filled with material that will immobilize the waste that remains and that will keep intruders out of the site. We want the waste that is disposed of on site monitored for as long as the wastes are lethal to humans and the ecosystems that we rely on. This will be for hundreds of thousands of years.

We want tank farm waste in cribs and trenches to be dealt with in the remove-treat-dispose manner, rather than by using short-lived caps to cover the material, which will eventually harm us. We want all cleanup to be fully protective of the environment, maintaining the standard for long-term protection of the Columbia River, the air shed, the farmland, and the health of the people of this entire region.

Many of the contaminants at Hanford will be lethal. Some will ebb and peak again over the next

hundreds and thousands of years. Much of the waste we are dealing with will have to stay at Hanford with no imminent repository. Many of the alternatives of cleanup in this EIS underestimate the amount of contamination that we are facing and which will feed the groundwater leading to the surrounding areas and the Columbia River for thousands of years.

We need to demand an aggressive cleanup and cleanup dollars now. Time is wasting. Progress has occurred, but not at the pace needed to protect our future. This is our decision, should we choose to demand it and see it through.

Given the centuries of radiological and chemical threats to the agriculture -- agriculturally productive region of the Columbia River and the Columbia River Basin, we refuse to accept the additional burden of adding more waste from other sites to Hanford. Accommodating other national wastes from the weapons complex will take untold time, money, and focus off cleanup, denying us our right to a healthy and safe environment for the rest of time as we know it.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Lynn Ford. And then

after Lynn will be Thomas Layne.

COMMENTS BY LYNN FORD:

Hello. My name is Lynn Ford. I live in North Portland. And boy, it seems like I've been coming to these things for a long time.

I just want to add that I endorse Hanford Watch's recommendations. And also, once again, when I come here, I hear the Oregon Department of Energy. And I say, "Well, all my tax moneys don't go to waste."

One thing is that, something I remember hearing at some previous meeting -- They all blur by now, I'm sorry. But people started questioning whether the DOE can even do this. The real duty, the real purpose of the Department of Energy is to promote nuclear weapons. That's what it's about. That's why we have the empire, and that's why we do what we want in the world. When I say "we," I mean the United States government. And cleanup is just not the same kind of job.

On the other hand, you've just seen, what, eight years of, you know, how bad the EPA can be also, which I used to think had some kind of -- So I don't know. I think we need to relook at this.

This is a rerun, in a way. Although I will say that I know from Paige Knight and other people on the Hanford Advisory Board are endeavoring to work out solutions. It has improved; it's really not as bad as it was when we started. But it's just not near fast enough.

And I have to say, 2022 for the end of the moratorium. Some would look at actuarial studies and say, "Well, most of those people will be dead by then, so we don't have to worry about it." And I do want to say I have compassion for the folks who are downwinders and so on, who actually know how much they have suffered. The rest of us are here, waiting to find out.

I just -- It's completely amazing to me that the Department of Energy folks, who have been dealing with this, and I think they're very hard workers. You know, there's some good, honest engineers. But how they can stay dedicated to their mission. I mean, when they get done, maybe they can name the whole thing after President Ahmadinejad of Iran, because he's the only person in the world that is dedicated to things.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. After Thomas Layne

will be Melba.

COMMENTS BY THOMAS LAYNE:

My name is Thomas Layne. I'm here as a citizen. And I live in Brightwood, Oregon. I also lived for several years in Washington before moving to Oregon.

I have a stepdaughter who worked at the Hanford plant in the late '60s. In the early '70s, she assured me that the Hanford plant was clean and was of no danger to health. "Hey, Tom, it's okay." But now, of course, we know very well that it is not clean, it is not healthy, and certainly it isn't okay.

And the Hanford Nuclear Reservation is said to be the most polluted piece of land on the planet. It's a deadly risk to the lives of men, women, children, animals, and fish that live in the area at the same time nuclear waste is leaching into the environment.

So it astounds me that this hearing is even being held, this whole series. Whatever the justification for Hanford's existence as far as the World War II war effort, including the dumping and burying of nuclear waste that continues to poison

the air, ground and water, the government you represent created this pestilence in our midst. And your job is to fix it. You don't need a hearing to establish that fact.

I read in this morning's newspaper that this life-threatening pollution will be a risk for the next, what, several thousand years. And you're concerned about the cleanup expense perhaps rising to a hundred billion dollars. Well, in this era of the multitrillion dollar budgets, it should not be so difficult to earmark an annual amount to continue the cleanup of Hanford. Even if it takes several thousand years.

There's a serious discussion today about doing a bit more D and C -- that's dusting and cleaning -- of the site. And that is simply, what, capping it all and walking away, knowing that this is not going to end the risk of deadly radiation to the local environment and its citizens.

When I was a child, I was taught to clean up after myself. Be that as it may, my bike and wagon on the front lawn, the chaos in my bedroom, the milk that I spilled on the kitchen floor. I was not allowed simply to walk away with a job half done or not tended to at all.

You guys made this mess, your predecessors did, the government that you work for. You as current members of that government have inherited this mess as well as the high moral imperative to clean up your mess that is still festering in our backyard.

I lived in Germany for several years. And not far from where I lived was a nuclear plant that had been deactivated at the request of the local citizenry. I was astonished to see what they did to it. They made a theme park. The tower was a climbing wall. It's astonishing what you can do.

I want to finish with a question: Do any of you live in the Hanford Nuclear Reservation neighborhood? Do you have or do you know any children that live there? Friends or family? Well, if not, I'm not surprised. But if you do, and you follow through with this kind of a plan, then your hearts are bolder than I could ever imagine.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. After Melba will be Chuck Johnson.

COMMENTS BY MELBA DLUGONSKI:

My name is Melba Dlugonski, and I live in Portland.

The first hearing that I attended regarding Hanford was 22 years ago. My son was five years old. At the time we were given a lot of promises. We weren't going to have any open dumping anymore and all that sort of thing. And I consider that the fact that they keep on having these hearings, year after year, maybe a little bit of this gets changed, a little bit of that gets changed. But basically, it's all the same thing.

They're pretending to listen to us. And I'm really not sure why they spend the thousands or hundreds of thousands of dollars it takes to print all that stuff and to bring people here and rent these rooms and that sort of thing, when they really have no intention of listening to us or they would have 22 years ago, because we were talking about it then and we were all saying the same kinds of things that we're saying now.

ATTENDEE: Because it's the law, they have to.

MS. DLUGONSKI: It's the law, they have to.

I think the Department of Energy has made an enormous number of mistakes through the main

deputies. I'm sure some of the people who are responsible for some of those decisions are very, very sorry. I'd like to hear the Department of Energy say, "We're very sorry. And we're going to be willing to do what it takes to make up for the mistakes that we have admitted that we're making, and not turn around and bring some more stuff here, even if -- whether or not what we already have here gets cleaned up."

I know that most of the things that I might want to say were said over and over again, and we're all repeating one another. And I will just echo the things that Miss Castle said and the Heart of America people, et cetera, all things I agree with.

The only thing I can think of that hasn't been mentioned is what kind of surveillance and militarization we might have to have if we're going to have that many thousands of trucks carrying terrorist harvest through our neighborhoods that can light out forever 300 square miles. They're supposed to be little logos on them, so they are targets. I mean, they have target signs painted on them.

So what responsible thing would our government

try to do to protect us from terrorist activity in this kind of situation? I'm not sure. I don't think any -- And I think that it's time for us all to get out in the street, block the freeway, whatever the hell it takes to stop these people from doing these things.

I've been coming here for 22 years. I'm tired of coming to it. I'm tired of being ignored. And I'm tired of the fact that not only do we as people not matter, that the other animals and plants and whatever do not matter. There is no consideration for what the cost of new power plants, new weapons that are going to produce more and more of this crap. And nobody knows where to put it. And no one is standing up and saying that these parts belong together.

At this hearing, I'm not supposed to be talking about those things because that isn't in the Environmental Impact Statement. You see, nobody is allowed to bring the parts together. But we have to, as human beings, stop it.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Chuck Johnson. And after Chuck will be Cherie Holenstein.

COMMENTS BY CHUCK JOHNSON:

I'm Chuck Johnson. I'm a board member of the Columbia Riverkeeper. I live here in Portland, Oregon. And I'm a lifelong Oregonian.

I see this Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management EIS as a major step backwards in DOE's approach to clean up the Hanford site, at a time when such good progress has been made in the river bank cleanup. And it is just really extremely disappointing to see a decision like this -- or a recommendation come out like this.

And the thing that just mystifies me the most, I have to say, just seeing the U.S. DOE do this. Yeah, it's disappointing. But we have a long series of disappointments in dealing with U.S. DOE. So it's not as surprising as the reaction of the State of Washington to this proposal. I have to say, I am mystified.

ATTENDEE: Jobs.

MR. JOHNSON: No, it's not jobs. That's the point. There's a lot of jobs right now, $2 million stimulus, clean up all the river banks. So I am absolutely mystified by your governor and by your agency, sir, in kowtowing to this -- this cover-up instead of insisting on a cleanup. I find it

disgusting. And it's a traitorous act to your neighbors and to your own people to leave this legacy, this toxic legacy in the ground, and paper it over and prepare for, what, another round of nuclear power plants or something at Hanford.

The next shoe that will drop will be "Let's revive WPPSS." No, don't laugh. That is what I think is going to be happening next. And, you know, I'm proud of our Oregon Department of Energy for looking at this EIS and finding the flaws in it. But I'm mystified that the State of Washington would ignore the obvious flaws in this proposed EIS. It's just sickening. And your governor should be ashamed of herself and you should be ashamed of yourself.

MR. PARHAM: Cherie Holenstein. And after that, Susan Nash.

COMMENTS BY CHERIE HOLENSTEIN:

I'm Cherie Holenstein of Portland. I'd like to, first of all, ask for a moment of silence for Paul McAdam. You'll recognize and note one of our videotapers is missing here tonight. He recently died. He spent his own money buying tapes. And he died about a month ago. So may we have a moment of

silence, please.

Thanks very much.

And thank all of you folks for coming. And I do want to say that I'm so encouraged by your outrage. I've been coming to these things for almost 25 years, I don't know. And people have been pleasant and polite and outraged when it's needed. Thank you very much.

This problem is brought to us by the lords of greed and corruption, the lords of arrogance, the lords of moral cowardice and audacity and, of course, the lords of war; otherwise known as the military, industrial, corporate, and congressional complex. One of the "Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse" dropped dead. Now this is transported not on horses, but carried throughout our country by trucks.

The trucks deliver death along the route with their merchandise. The tragedy occurring in Haiti is connected to what is being discussed here tonight. The 20,000 U.S. troops stationed in Haiti are furthering the damage and disinheritance of the Haitian people. And it's all connected to the problem again that's happened here tonight.

So what to do. We've been advised by the

dedicated folks of Heart of America Northwest, Hanford Watch, Columbia Riverkeeper -- I know his last name, but I forgot his first -- and the Oregon agency, Cam and Brett, as to the best solutions. Thank you all for all the work you've done for that. To save time, I'll just say ditto what Brett said he was going to do and did. So ditto, ditto, ditto.

The famous journalist H.L. Mencken said: "For every problem, there is a solution that is simple, direct, and wrong." I don't need to make it clear. Perhaps the folks at the United States Department of Energy have been reading too much Tom Clancy and not enough H.L. Mencken, "The Little Prince," and "Howard's End."

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Susan Nash.

MS. NASH: I'll save my time and send it in writing.

MR. PARHAM: Okay. Dave Bybeey. Followed by Dave will be Thomas Clark.

COMMENTS BY DAVE BYBEEY:

Dave Bybeey here. I live a couple miles north of the Columbia. I've been a life member of the

Sierra Club for over 35 years, half my life. But I speak here just on my own.

I want to speak to the audience as well as the DOE. I hear the word "cleanup." I don't really know what that means. I hear a fear of them running down the roads, probably legitimate.

But we've got over a hundred nuclear power plants running at this instance in the United States, generating nuclear waste. I've not heard anyone speak tonight about recycling, like we talk about recycling a lot of the rest of our waste. All the nuclear plants we have in the United States are horse-and-buggy instruments. They were all designed before the space shuttle was designed, which we're going to retire later this year.

There are designs on the drawing board, things like moving-phase nuclear reactors, special Generation IV nuclear reactors. Generation IV has a theoretical potential to recycle over 90 percent of the waste that we have. I want to recognize the fear that I've seen in the auditorium tonight. I share that fear, because my scientific background, the nuclear waste that we're generating is far more treacherous than I think you've seen in the press.

We need to figure out a way to recycle it. And I ask you to not just be afraid of nuclear. We're not going to purge our planet of nuclear. It's going to continue to grow. China has announced they're going to start building ten new nuclear reactors a year. They're all going to produce dirty waste.

So when you hear someone talk about the ability to recycle, it's theoretically out there; it needs to be proven. And if we can truly recycle the bulk of the nuclear waste, it will be gone. There will be some residue. And I think we need to have the creative thinking to really think about what we're going to do with what's left.

One of the things I've heard, that I think is very creative and needs to be proven, but we're living in a world of ever-growing robotics. Right now, we have two little rovers roving around on Mars that were designed in 30 days with an operation of four to five years.

One of the creative ideas I've heard is to go out in the Pacific Ocean. You have the Pacific plate, tectonic plate of the planet, sliding underneath the North American plate. Use robotics to take what is left after recycling and

robotically bury it down into the crust of the Earth, so over the millennia, the stuff will continue to exist. It will slide back into the isotopic core of the Earth, from where it first began.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Thomas Clark, followed by Barbara Pereira.

COMMENTS BY THOMAS CLARK:

Between 1955 and 1958, I served in the U.S. Marines in Twentynine Palms, California. Okay. In that position, I witnessed aboveground nuclear testing in Nevada. I was in a support capacity. 2500 troops from my base were put into trenches in Nevada and subjected to a tactical nuclear weapon exposure. All 2500 were dosed with radiation, very close. The only solution they had was a water truck brought on site, where they hosed down all the troops. Now, that gives you a little sense of my bias. Okay.

Since that time, I have become a cold system engineer. I've worked at Argonne National Laboratory on high-energy physics. I've been at a further enterprise level of control systems,

medical informatics. I know the Department of Energy has read the same accident reports about nuclear effects that I have. We also know that there is very little medically that can be done for anybody in that position. Okay.

What's also irritating to me is in this particular area, I see no environmental sensors, no network of sensors; no training, no facilities for the medical personnel throughout Washington and Oregon, and very little response team efforts. They don't exist. If I go to Germany, France, the UK, I see that. Okay. Why don't we have this?

This is a situation that will not go away. You know as well as I do that what you're dealing with will be here for six-digit time periods. There is nothing that you can do with it. You can't scrub it; you can't destroy it. We don't have the tools. We don't have the procedures. Cleanup is cleanup. It is also encapsulation, package it, get rid of it. Okay.

I'm not suggesting anybody waltz in there and try this, because you'll be dead quickly. But I'm also in systems theory. And complexity is something you must remove from any situation if you want a solution to any particular problem. Okay.

If you're building a system, you do not make it complex; you make it simple. Okay. The previous suggestion of taking this waste and burying it offshore so that the Earth eats it isn't so bad.

Well, I would like to say that you can Google everything that I've said. What I don't see is any documentation on the exposure for nuclear radiation across this country. I have seen from the NIH maps an incidence of cancer. It's a good place to start looking. But come up with a simple solution.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Barbara? After Barbara will be Rochelle.

Rochelle.

COMMENTS BY ROCHELLE:

So the woman earlier who spoke about the contaminated heating tanks. I'm a Realtor. And I saw a lot of people have to clean up their heating tanks, and it costs a lot of money. And DEQ has their own tolerance for that. And I expect a zero tolerance from my state and my federal government regarding Hanford. I want to see 100 percent cleanup. I want to see no more waste come to Hanford.

In fact, I like to dream. I imagine that a

world in which we can create waste that we cannot remediate, that we cannot recycle, is not a world that we should tolerate. I believe that people who create waste that cannot be recycled and remediated must be responsible for that waste. In a just world, the world I dream of, people who are responsible for that, who made the choice to create without the ability to do that, should have to come and clean it up. And in a just world, our voices speaking for justice will be heard.

I am inspired by "Howard's End." I'm inspired by the models of direct action. I do believe that direct action has made an impact on the nuclear industry for a lot of years. It will continue to do so. But we do have to be organized. I've lived in the Northwest now 20 years this year. If I live here another 20 and it is the same way, I won't be surprised, because the world isn't very just. But I like to dream.

And I thank you all for raising your voices. And here's to justice.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Brett VandenHeuvel.

COMMENTS BY BRETT VANDENHEUVEL:

I'm Brett VandenHeuvel. I'm the director of

Columbia Riverkeeper.

I've been keeping a little tally tonight, and I've concluded that people don't want more nuclear waste to be sent to Hanford. So if everyone else agrees with me, it looks like the discussion is finished and we can take this back to Richland, Washington, and we win.

The context of Hanford is important. Hanford sits on the banks of the Columbia River. The Columbia River is the lifeblood of the Pacific Northwest. It's critical for our drinking water, for agriculture irrigation, for the communities that live along the river, for the salmon, that our economy depends on.

And this critical nature of the Columbia River is not going to change. It's going to be there for generations and generations and generations. And all of these economic values, all of these spiritual values, all of these values for our communities depend on a clean Columbia River. And how are we treating this critical resource? How are we treating this national treasure? We're proposing to import more waste to the banks of the Columbia.

This document, this process, this

Environmental Impact Statement is offensive, and it's completely unacceptable. I don't want to ascribe motives to anybody. I don't want to suggest this was done purposefully. But if I wanted to produce a document that jammed in a bunch of confusing, unrelated topics and hid the valuable and important topics, it would look a lot like this document right here, this summary of the 6,000-page document.

These are simple things: Clean up the tanks to 99.999 percent, whatever is technically feasible. It is very clear, the cancer rate is increased by multiple orders of magnitude if we don't do that. That should be a given. That shouldn't even be part of the discussion tonight.

What I think is a key part of the discussion, what we keep hearing over and over and over, is no new waste to Hanford. No new waste to Hanford. The alternative -- It's offensive to me to have to comment or be asked to comment on whether we want to bring off-site waste and put it in the east or the west landfill. That's a false choice. I refuse to even acknowledge that choice. And the only acceptable alternative is no new waste to Hanford.

The data show, as Ken Niles mentioned, now we have data to show that there will be environmental consequences. And bringing any new waste to Hanford is an intentional release. We know what is going to happen, and that will be intentionally releasing that waste.

And I'll finish up by saying that Columbia Riverkeeper and others will submit detailed legal comments on this Environmental Impact Statement. But frankly -- I'm going to show my cards here -- if you produce enough drafts and enough words, you can meet the legal standard. But the real standard here, the real test is: Does it meet our moral test? And the answer to that is "No."

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Next is Lang Davison. And after Lang will be Fred Nussbaum.

COMMENTS BY LANG DAVISON:

My name is Lang Davison. I live in Portland. I'm here as a citizen and as a father of two small children.

Frankly, I'm stunned by what the U.S. Department of Energy is proposing in this EIS. This amounts to what is, at best, a half cleanup of Hanford followed by a proposed recontamination.

This is shameful.

I really don't know what employees and officials of the Department of Energy in the U.S. say to themselves to be able to sleep at night when they propose something like this. And the same goes for the Washington Department of Ecology when it makes a bunch of slippery, mealy-mouthed comments about this plan and this proposal.

On behalf of my fellow citizens here in Portland and Oregon, we demand the following three things: immediate cleanup of the tank farm to include 100 percent of the 53 million gallons of waste that are there; clean up what is already leaking into the groundwater; and bring no nuclear waste into Hanford whatsoever, drop the proposal to do so. Adding more waste and/or failing to clean up what's already there, as has been said, is legally, morally, and ethically unacceptable and reprehensible.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Fred Nussbaum, and then Robin Klein.

COMMENTS BY FRED NUSSBAUM:

Good evening. My name is Fred Nussbaum. I'm

a resident of Portland, lived here for over 50 years. And I'm also a part-time resident of the state of Washington. I have a vacation home up in Port Townsend.

So the comments from the Washington Department of Ecology, I found very disappointing. And I'm proud of the Oregon Department of Energy's comments.

My background is in transportation. And so the idea of more nuclear waste in trucks or even on rail through Oregon and Washington, through the rest of the country, is just mind boggling; especially to an area, a facility that has been proven to not be able to contain its own waste as it is.

And we're looking at a huge undertaking to do a full cleanup, which of course I'm in agreement, too. So everything that the other groups have said -- Heart of America, Hanford group, so on, so forth -- I agree with.

And I think one of the major failings of this DEIS and most DEISs is that we don't involve the citizens in working out what the criteria are going to be and what models are going to be and the assumptions that are going to go in there and all

this stuff. Because as we've heard from people, the environmental consequences in terms of what the impact is on our natural environment, on the people downstream and so on, have not been adequately addressed in this document. And this whole thing is unconscionable.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Robin Klein, and then Chris Henry.

COMMENTS BY ROBIN KLEIN:

Hi. I'm Robin Klein. I'm speaking for myself tonight. Also, I am on the board of Heart of America and Columbia Riverkeeper, and a former director of Hanford Action of Oregon.

First, while it is understood that every potential option could not practically be explored in this EIS, at least you would think that 15 years or more of public hearing and outcry and threats by the state, that today's EIS might include options universally popular here in the Northwest -- especially here in Portland, the largest population center downriver from Hanford -- options popular with all of us outside the Department of Energy, options such as "We'll clean up before ever even

considering an option that involves bringing in off-site waste."

After the ecological assault that has been done to the Northwest and massive threats to the future health of our children, to suggest the Department of Energy and Hanford can handle more waste is without foundation. This EIS was drafted -- it is crafted in such a way as to manipulate or control the outcome by presenting alternatives palatable to the Department of Energy, to enable the Department of Energy to proceed with what it wants to do. I will suggest that that is to bring in new waste, not what the public wants.

And the preferred alternatives are clearly the Department's preference, not the public's: limited cleanup of the tanks and the earth; entombing the FFTF rather than fully dismantling it; and analysis to enable importation of more dangerous waste to a site by an agency that has already demonstrated its utter inability to manage, let alone clean up, the waste there.

In conclusion, the goal should be set at 100 percent cleanup. Do not sell the cleanup short by reducing the goals at the outset. And we are still at the outset. Time and the will to make it

happen, investment in developing technologies will likely get us there sooner than later in time. And one thing is for sure: This vast, hot radioactive cesspool is with us a ghastly long time.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Chris Henry. And after Chris is Christine Charneski.

COMMENTS BY CHRIS HENRY:

Hi. My name is Chris Henry. I'm here representing the Pacific Green Party of Oregon tonight. And I'm the candidate for the First Congressional District that's currently being held by David Wu. I ran in '08, and I'm running again in 2010.

I'm a teamster, and I'm on layoff right now from Yellow Freight. I have a hazardous materials endorsement. I drive truck. My father drove a truck; my grandfather drove a truck; ergo, I drive.

I'm going to deputize all of you as truck drivers. Here's the reality: Regardless of what the shipment is, no matter what you're hauling, you're going to be sitting in that chair, like you've been, for two hours at least before you get a break. And if you're a driver driving through the night or any other time, you drive a lot. So

you're going to drink a lot of coffee. Okay.

And with that coffee, you're going to have to take a bathroom break. Where are you going to do that when you have a radioactive load, a hazardous load? You're going to have to think about that long and hard. What if there's inclement weather? What if you run into snow? What if you run into ice? You're going to have to pull over and chain up.

There are other drivers. There are other people out on the public highway. The company doesn't own the highway; the DOE does not own the highway. You own the highway. When I'm out there driving, I'm cognizant that that is not my company's highway. That's the people's highway. And you have to be very careful when you are driving, because everyone else is at risk. So you have to wonder about when you take detours, what if you blow a tire? There are lots of things that can happen on the highway.

When they bid on a contract, it's not going to be a Teamster organization likely that is going to be hauling these shipments. These are going to be the lowest bidders. They're going to be drivers who haven't been checked as well as teamsters. It

took me years to get into the Teamsters. And I've worked through a lot, an awful lot of organizations. In 15 years, I've held over 20 jobs driving trucks because it's seasonal or they close the plant or whatnot.

So in order to find good drivers, good seasoned drivers who know what they're doing, especially with radioactive shipments. And you've got to know your stuff. You know, they can't tell you, they seriously can't tell you that you are not going to be exposed. You are always at risk, no matter what it is.

So what we're doing is we have this energy that we're shooting for nuclear energy, but it's a short-term solution. And it gives us nukes. So that's what they want. They're worried about worker exposure to clean it up, but they haven't worried about the workers who are mining it, the uranium, who are processing it into usable, fissionable material. They're not worried about the workers who are operating the plants. They're not worried about the workers who process it into weapons, who enrich it.

So there's a deep concern, they say, about cleaning it up. We have to be in this for the long

term in order to clean it up. And it should be done mostly on site. It shouldn't be shipped across the highways. So it's not a carbon neutral -- Nuclear isn't carbon neutral; it's carbon intensive. And we're seeing it here. So anyway, we oppose any proposition to ship it over the highways.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Christine. And following Christine will be Jeff Weih.

COMMENTS BY CHRISTINE CHARNESKI:

My name is Christine Charneski. I was born in Portland, at the confluence of the Willamette and Columbia Rivers. I've lived here all of my life. And I think Paul just left. I was with Paul in the Trojan Decommission Alliance a long time ago. He was an esteemed leader of our group, and I just wanted to give him a shout out for that.

My mom was a federal employee. She was an administrative person. And I grew up just steeped with the understanding of how difficult it was for government employees, people who were smart, educated, knowledgeable -- scientists especially, my mom worked with a group of scientists -- who

tried to look out for resources, tried to look out for taking care of the planet and the public good.

And how difficult it was to do their jobs sometimes, how undermined they were by the whims of political appointees who would come in as the different administrations came and went. And how -- how horrible it was sometimes for the position that scientists were put in, having to take on policies and deal with issues that they didn't actually support. They had to make career decisions.

My mother came home in tears sometimes. I mean, I was a little kid, watching my mother, who was a secretary, cry over the positions that she saw really dedicated men put in making career decisions, struggling to try to do the best job that they can.

So I'm really sympathetic to what happens when you're working in an agency, and you're trying to put forward some policy the best way you can. And I kind of feel for what it must be like to take a lot of heat for presenting such a miserable, pathetic kind of policy that's being presented tonight.

So I guess really what I want to say, I mean,

clearly, I support everything that has been said tonight. And I think I've been to these hearings, not as much as everybody but for about as long as everybody. I was really heartbroken. I got the last mailing. I said, Really? We're going to do this again? We're going to talk about trucking waste across our country? I mean, really?

I also was one of those people who thought that maybe now we're going to have a shot. You know, we've had a year. We've got a smart guy in charge again. We've got a really bright guy in charge of DOE. And maybe in this era of being a little more open, a little more reviewing things based on real science and real fact, we've got a shot at going in a new direction.

So I guess the message that I'm thinking maybe you might want to consider as you're looking at this room of people, some of us have been coming here for a long time. We're real tenacious. We're just going to keep coming. But I'm pretty sure that if this really keeps going in the direction that it's looking like, people are going to keep coming. People are not going to go away.

I think you can really take a message to the political directors that you answer to and tell

them, "Look, we'll cover you. It's okay to shift gears. It's okay to go in new directions. It's okay to start really looking at the real alternatives, the really smart, moral -- It's really essential things."

The people out here will cover that. We will back that. We will back whatever kind of tough decisions that you all have to go back with. We'll support you.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Jeff? Is Jeff here? Ross Tewksbury.

COMMENTS BY ROSS TEWKSBURY:

I am Ross Tewksbury from Portland.

And I'm kind of struggling. There's not much left to say, except that I just want to reiterate that they don't need to import any more radioactive waste to Hanford, because they obviously can't handle what they've already got now.

And with the trucking situation as was just eloquently explained, I really doubt that the Department of Energy officials that are so hot on this trucking and transporting stuff would be volunteering to live alongside the roads where the

trucks go by every month. I think they kind of figure somebody else will be living there, no problem.

And I'm also against this whole idea of, you know, sort of like landfilling it and capping it and then saying, "Wow, we're done. Let's go away now." I mean, that was the impression I got from listening to it. So they need to fully remove the tanks and do the clean closure 99.9 or 100 percent, as much as they possibly can. They need to dismantle the FFTF plant entirely.

So far, the way things have been working, it's just like playing a shell game with this waste. Let's move it over here, move it over there, take that out and move it over there. And I mean, to people back in the '40s and '50s, you know, we're like the future generations dealing with this production that happened back then.

And now there's going to be more future generations, off to our great grandchildren and off into the indefinite future. If we continue to screw it up, they're going to have to deal with it a hundred years from now, 200 years from now. So there's no way to do the shortcut-type of thinking here.

And the one word I found actually kind of offensive, you keep talking about closure. But there is no closure. Certainly from the graphs we've seen, going off of the charts here, the groundwater is still going to be -- whatever we do, it's going to be bad. It's just a matter of whether we can kind of do the defensive measures to slow it down and mitigate it as much as we possibly can.

But there is no closure to this. It's never going to be over. It's always going to be going for thousands and thousands of years, way down into anything we can even imagine here. And so we need to do the maximum we can do with the technology that we've got today, the maximum cleanup we can possibly do.

And some of the stuff, we have to wait for future technology to catch up on so we can do even more, better things. And so it's just -- there's just -- It's going to be going on for thousands and thousands of years. It's not something that's going to be cleaned up and gone over, you know, like that.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Joyce Follingstad.

After Joyce will be Laura Feldman.

COMMENTS BY JOYCE FOLLINGSTAD:

Good evening. I'm Joyce Follingstad. I'm a psychologist and a nurse in Portland, Oregon.

And over Christmas this year, one of my dear friends just was informed one day that she had Stage IV thyroid cancer, and had to have it removed immediately. And now I watch her suffer with trying to deal with the levels of hormone that can make her feel somewhat normal again.

As we know, we now have a statistic in the United States that one of every two men will get cancer, and one of every three women will get cancer. How much more can we bear? I say it is time now to clean completely every bit of Hanford. Let's not just clean up the tanks. I believe every bit of the tanks and the soil and the water underneath should be cleaned, but also those trenches need to be cleaned out completely.

And it's just a joke that now we have lined trenches that delay the leaching of those materials into the ground and into the water for maybe ten, 15, 20 years. So I say drop all these considerations of the preferred alternatives. We

need 100 percent of cleanup. We need cleanup of the soil, the water.

Any new waste brought to Hanford is completely unconscionable. We now have -- thank you for your graphs and your information in the EIS -- the proof that it will impact the environment and cause harm. It will kill truck drivers with a single accident; it will render hundreds of square miles uninhabitable and will kill thousands of individuals.

And as we know from having done the experiment of dropping bombs in Japan, those of us that do manage to live through the catastrophe and look for a place to go and get help, well, those people were very shunned by the population of Japan. And our neighbors and our relatives aren't going to be offering a place for us to live.

And remember, too, that none of us can ensure our homes or our health from radioactivity. So also, completely remove the FFTF, every bit of it. So I would say "No" to the trucks on the roads. I say clean it all up.

And also, we need to have the DOE to have a plan to clean up Kuwait and Iraq and Afghanistan, where now we know that, two decades now after the

war, the first war there, cancers are up 400 percent, birth defects are up 400 percent. And our servicemen and women are bringing home radioactive contamination and giving their children birth defects. So I say "No" to any new nukes.

And I say "No" to any more waste at Hanford. Because also, it's a political decision. And when we accept waste from other states, they can stay living in denial that their wastes somehow don't matter because it's all shunted off to our states that live with the waste.

And so I say, let us clean up now, completely. Let's take as long as it takes to do it right. Because we have children and grandchildren; we have wildlife. We owe it to them to do it right.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Laura Feldman, and then Marian Grebanier.

COMMENTS BY LAURA FELDMAN:

Hi. I want to thank you for coming tonight. It makes me feel less crazy. There's a lot of strength and perseverance and courage and intelligence in this room. And this is a nightmarish thing. This is a nightmare. It's a natural holocaust.

And I honestly think, at this hearing, I think I realize the latest development is that the gauntlet has been thrown down. DOE isn't going to do the right thing. The movement, the trucking of this waste through our communities is pretty much aligned, for me. And I think that rather than continuing to show patience for this boondoggling and corruption and, you know, greed that drives this whole supposed Hanford cleanup, I think we need to, as others have said, take direct action and make sure this doesn't happen.

I think our politicians aren't going to do this for us. DOE certainly is not. And it's just very real, now that they're going to be on the freeway next to you or me or someone you care about. That's one part. I think the buck stops here. We need to put our foot down.

Secondly, I need personally to go towards something positive. I think there are solutions to this cleanup. I've heard snatches of it here, which is another reason I love to come to these hearings. Because what I don't get from them, what I get from you, are possible solutions and unique ways of thinking about this problem. So if we can create the most wasteful toxic form of energy, we

ought to be able -- I know we have the creativity and the intelligence to solve this problem.

So as Melba said, as Paul Libby earlier said, it makes me crazy. But I want to do something and I want to do something really tangible. And I don't feel like I'm going to let them truck this waste through Portland. That much I want to say. And I don't know what that means. I don't know exactly what that means, you know. But I think we need to take direct action: suing them, protesting, and working towards actual solutions.

Thanks.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Marian, and then James Brunkow. Marian? James Brunkow.

COMMENTS BY JAMES BRUNKOW:

My name is James Brunkow. I'm a resident of Portland.

It just seems to me that anything less than cleanup is pretty much nothing to actually sacrifice. So I don't like the idea much. I don't think the future generations like it too much, either. I guess that would be tank closure 100 percent.

And I don't know, I get real nervous. I don't

think I can speak any longer.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Joanne Keefe? Joanne? Roger Cole? Dorothy Land? Is that right, Dorothy? Thank you.

COMMENTS BY DOROTHY LAND:

I am a downwinder. I'm from what we call the thyroid belt.

I've taken thyroid medicine my whole life. I'm always freezing cold when other people are taking off -- they're sleeveless and in shorts, and I'm in like three layers. I'm tired a lot. My adrenals have now gone bad as a result, because they try to take over for your thyroid and then they go. And on it goes. My sister had her thyroid and her parathyroid removed. She's not the only one.

We were downwinders. I do not want to be a downstreamer. I don't think I want to live through it all. I've lived along the Columbia River my whole life, pretty much. I'm thinking of moving away if this happens. I don't want to see this. I don't want to suffer anymore. And I don't want to watch other people suffering.

They're sacrificing us. I've heard that

several times tonight: We're being sacrificed. Outraged, I've heard that a lot, too. I think we should stop making it. I don't know what Obama is thinking about, that we need more nuclear. It's crazy. And the clean coal, that doesn't make sense either.

There are many kinds of energy that haven't even been looked into. There's all kinds of new energy inventions and stuff. We do not need nuclear. And let's not make any bombs anymore. Let's not fight anymore. Okay, you guys?

Also, with the money that has gone to Hanford, my understanding is that we're not doing that kind of priority stuff. Let's spend the money wisely. Clean it up, don't bring any more. Everything everyone's been saying. Let's straighten up and take some moral responsibility.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Miriam German? Miriam?

ATTENDEE: She left.

MR. PARHAM: Okay. Brooke Jacobson? Brooke? Dru Jones? Dru?

Anyone else have a comment that would like to comment at this time? Okay. Let me just ask this question, if there's anyone who hasn't commented

yet? Let the people go who haven't commented yet, and then we'll get right to you.

Ma'am, did you want to comment?

COMMENTS BY NANCY JOHNSON:

I do want to comment. Thank you for everyone who has spoken out. And thank you for being here.

I am a third-grade teacher in Portland, Oregon. And what I'm hearing is just making me sick. And I don't know what other solution there could be than to do a 100 percent cleanup.

I don't know what you're thinking, and I don't know where it comes from. And I definitely don't know how you sleep at night. And I don't want to sleep at night. And I want -- I will do whatever I can do to stop you from doing whatever you're doing.

And that's all I have to say.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: I'm Nancy Johnson.

MR. PARHAM: I believe we've got another person that would like to comment. Yes, ma'am.

COMMENTS BY LISA VAN DYK:

I'm Lisa Van Dyk with Heart of America Northwest. And I'd just like to thank everyone that it still here, and acknowledge the fact that most of the people are not here anymore.

So I would like to clarify something that I also clarified last night about the legality of the moratorium. I think it was a little confusing because there was subtle agreement a while ago that it's a legal, binding document, that the Department of Energy will not bring waste to Hanford until this final EIS is released.

This is the draft. The final will probably come out in about a year. But the extension to the moratorium, which was through 2022 or when the waste treatment is operational, is not legally binding. It is in the cover letter to a legally binding document.

So that is all I wanted to clarify. And thank you to everybody who is still here.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else who would like to comment?

COMMENTS BY NORM SANTANA:

Hi. My name is Norm Santana. I live in

Portland.

You know, I can understand why, you know, you might want to just throw up your hands and say, "Oh, 100 percent cleanup is just too big of a job. It's just going to be too expensive." But I -- I think I couldn't support anything less than a complete, 100 percent cleanup. I know that's a big job and everything. But, you know, it's jobs. What the heck. And it's the right thing to do.

I also want to thank you for showing up. Really, thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else that would like to comment that hasn't? Yes.

COMMENTS BY LORI MESERVE:

My name is Lori Meserve. I just want to say: Bank bail-out. Thank you.

COMMENTS BY HOLLY HOFFMAN:

Holly Hoffman, Portland, Oregon.

The last time I was at one of these meetings, it appeared that we were going back and looking at getting a hard look at what the proper thing to do was to clean up, essentially in order to enable to continue dumping. And then as long as the cleanup

hadn't started yet, they would be permitted to dump and continue to dump.

So I appreciate Ecology for bringing suit and bringing the moratorium. And it just seems a little -- I don't know how to characterize it. But it seems like the choice of year when the moratorium will end also coincides with the time that there will be an up-and-running facility. So we'll just be the cleanup -- designated cleanup site for the country, since Yucca Mountain is now off the table.

And I just don't understand the accuracy of the choice of site, when there's so much water going through the site and it's so active. And if we had started cleanup, actually addressing it at the time that we were delaying it, we wouldn't be now facing strontium reaching the river. So I'm very concerned about how long it's taking and the direction that it seems to be going.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else who would like to comment that hasn't yet? Yes, sir.

COMMENTS BY TOM CARPENTER:

My Tom is Tom Carpenter. And I'm from

Seattle, Washington. And I'm the executive director of Hanford Challenge. And I've also worked in a role as an attorney for the government accountability project, representing nuclear whistle-blowers, especially at the Hanford site since the late 1980s.

And one thing that whistle-blowers have told us is that we have been misled and there have been credibility gaps from government agencies at the Hanford site for some time, starting with the fact that waste that has leaked out of nuclear waste tanks at the Hanford site somehow wasn't migrating through the groundwater. And there was a lot of fighting going on about whether or not that in fact is happening.

So 15, 16 years ago, there was a fairly adamant fight going on between scientists at the site who insisted that there was good evidence that groundwater was contaminated by tank waste. And in fact, that turned out to be true, just like many decades of denial by the Department of Energy.

And we then found out some other painful truths, including that far more waste has leaked from those tanks than was thought. So in 1966, for instance, we know that there was a tank explosion

from Tank 105A. And over a million gallons of cooling water was put into the tank, because of the heat of the waste, that had leaked out of the tank into the soil beneath the tank. That's not counted in the million gallons that you all have heard about.

And then a Los Alamos scientist issued a draft report saying the tank waste that had leaked from the tanks was probably more on the order of 6 million gallons to as much as 10 million gallons. That report was not officially released; just a draft went out, appeared to be a draft.

I bring all this up because this Environmental Impact Statement has a lot of claims about data. It's got models in it. And I -- I've looked at it. We have scientists who are looking at this. And what we know is that we actually don't know a whole lot about what is in the ground, what is below the tanks. And that worries a lot of us very, very much.

We are talking about waste that is dangerous, in the trillions of curie; seven, eight trillions of curie of strontium 90 in a liter of water. And yet we've got hundreds of millions of curies of this material out there. It lasts a long time.

People were talking about iodine 129 that has a half-life of 15 million years. It's around for 150 million years. These are scales that it's just hard to get our minds around. And you can't.

You know, there haven't been institutions capable of living out that long to be able to protect the site probably for, you know, the next thousand years. I don't know, 500 years, 250 years. So when we talk about forever guarding these sites from intrusion, it's just not going to happen.

So I agree with the comments that I've heard tonight about needing to do as robust and effective of a remediation. And I've heard this word "cleanup" a lot. Ain't no cleanup is going to be happening. We're going to be stabilizing; we're going to be hopefully setting this waste aside. But we're not going to be able to treat this stuff.

It has to go away at some natural rate, because we don't know how to neutralize it or whatever. You can secure it in glass, but we know glass will fail. I mean, these are real long time frames. And the volumes are just so large. So it's a very big problem. And we do know that it's an institutional issue.

I also will point out, just for the benefit of this crowd and maybe the Department of Energy, that in 1996, the Brookings Institution released a report that calculated costs of making nuclear weapons at $5.5 trillion. That's what the taxpayers paid to make this mess.

And Hanford isn't the only one; there's other big messes out there. And of course, the United States isn't the only place. Russia, China, France, England, et cetera, they all have large contaminated sites, too. And these are sites that are going to keep on giving unless we do something about it.

And we have to do something about it. We have to spend the money. We have to develop the technologies. We have to think differently and act differently than we have been. And we cannot just give up and walk away on this cleanup. And if that is what this Environmental Impact Statement says we need to do, I disagree. I think this room disagrees. So it's going to be up to us to make that happen.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone who has not had a chance to comment who wants to? If not, then

is there anyone who wants to comment who has already? I'll start here.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY JIM McNAUGHTON:

I just want to back up and make the statement: There is no legal document that will back up your statement there is a moratorium. I just want to make that a fact.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Yes, sir.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY CHUCK JOHNSON:

Chuck Johnson from Columbia Riverkeeper again. Just to be -- You know, generally at these hearings, I've been more positive than I was when I gave my first statement.

And generally, that's been because I felt that, as a region, we made a decision, you know, early '90s that Hanford was a waste site and a site that needed to be cleaned up; and that there was more or less a consensus in the Northwest that we weren't going to be adding waste to that site, and that we were going to be striving to, as best we could -- I think Tom probably said it better. He's right. It isn't cleanup; it isn't remediation. It's trying to make the best of a very bad

situation, but not add to it and do everything we can to make it better.

And I hope that we can get back to that, because this plan does not do that. It doesn't do that at all. It's a step way in the wrong direction. Because I think if we have accommodation in the Northwest, and we have Oregon and Washington working together, with our Congressional delegations, we can find the money to get the job done here.

And it will produce a lot of good, quality jobs, just like it's doing right now with the remediation work that's being done along the river. It's very important work. And we need to do that for the whole site. I see no reason why we should leave waste in the ground and allow it to contaminate the areas we're cleaning up right now. That's ridiculous.

So, you know, I really hope you go back to the drawing board. Don't try to sweep this under the rug. Don't let this become a national sacrifice. I thought we were stepping away from that idea. And I hope that we can get back to the regional consensus that we have: This is a society that we want to clean up; we want to restore; we want to

use the Hanford Reach as a resource, a recreational resource.

You've got Battelle Labs there that could be researching energy issues of all sorts. And Tri-Cities already is a research capital; it can continue to be so. You know, even this idea of a -- a reactor museum. I think the reactor itself might be contaminated and not necessarily safe to go into, but you can build a replica. It is a part of our heritage. And I think it ought to be honored in that way or at least known as part of our history.

And we ought to be working together. But this is a step of working away. This is, once again, ignoring the wishes of really what I think is the majority of people in the Northwest. And look at The Oregonian editorial today. That's a mainstream paper. And they were very clear about what vision they expect for the cleanup work at Hanford. And I think we all are, here in Oregon especially.

So we call on our brothers and sisters in Washington to work with us. Don't fight us. Don't go back. Don't go back on the road that didn't work.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else that would like to provide additional comment? Ma'am?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY LOUISA HAMACHEK:

I'm Louisa Hamachek. I spoke a little earlier. I'm from Eugene, Oregon. And I feel myself to be part of the entire Columbia River Basin and a connected responsibility.

And I forgot to inquire whether the Department of Energy has seen -- looked to what's the effect of the radiation on the other toxic chemicals that are the pesticides that are coming down the Columbia River, and the blending and the new chemicals that are being made. And what's the effect on the fish and the animals from that?

I also wanted to point out that the Columbia Generating Station is generating waste at the Hanford site now. It is creating electricity for the rest of the area, for the Northwest. And I would like to ask that that station be shut down, that we shouldn't just quietly allow this nuclear power to continue and accept that electricity, and that the research facility should go towards more renewable energy that's actually safe. And so that's nuclear waste right there being generated on

the site.

Also, if the radiation is in the salmon, and the salmon are unsafe in the river, I would like that the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Department of Health, or if that's Ecology, would prevent people from fishing the fish of the -- of the Columbia, and that that honestly be declared to people that that fish is unsafe. And then more of the public would get the point that the river is polluted.

And one last connection. The -- I was reminded about the woman commenting on Kuwait and Iraq, that the depleted uranium is a weapon that's being used now in Iraq and Afghanistan, and it was in the Balkans. And the increase of the radiation and the cancers and the birth deformities in the areas where we have been using that has been -- there has been this enormous jump.

And I would like to know whether Hanford has any part in the creation of the depleted uranium. And I would ask that we don't participate in that, and that there would be a ban on depleted uranium. And that our Department of Energy does not use the creation of depleted uranium weapons as a way to get rid of the waste.

If you're hard up for where to put it, please don't throw it in other countries, as that dust will travel all around the entire world. And it's absolutely horrible that we are using that as a way to get rid of it, that harms the people and the animals of these other countries that we are -- claim to be at war with.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY GERRY POLLET:

Gerry Pollet.

There have been several controversies over the statements made this evening from the front of the room. And I'd like to know if the question-and-answer period and the presentations were on the record and reported by the court reporter.

MR. PARHAM: The question-and-answer period was not on the record, and the formal comment period was on the record. Do you want to add that?

MR. POLLET: I'd like to formally request that from now on, that the question-and-answer period be recorded and transcribed and available.

People are testifying on the basis of what they have been told in the room from the presenters. And the presenters have made

conflicting statements between hearings, and statements that are inaccurate. And then people are sitting here and going, "Well, maybe I shouldn't comment. I don't have comments about waste coming to Hanford because I'm not concerned, if it won't come for ten years." That's a legally forceful commitment, a moratorium, they heard.

And I'm floored. And I'm embarrassed that none of the officials in the front of the room, including Jeff from the State of Washington. I know you talked to someone else in our organization earlier tonight that the state knows full well that it's not a legally, enforceable moratorium after the final EIS is issued, and that the Energy Department is free to change its mind whenever it wants to and start transporting waste. Right?

So I need some comment from someone at the State to correct the Energy Department that they made the wrong impression.

And, Mary Beth, I think you know this.

And I think there are other issues that the public needs to be able to see and look at and go, "Wait a minute." The presentations had serious inaccuracies; our question-and-answer period had serious inaccuracies.

And one of the bottom lines here is, the Energy Department and the State of Washington are here holding public meetings because you'd like to increase trust in government overall. This is a democracy. Openness is vital. And to do that, we have to be honest. You can't have people walking away tonight thinking that they were misled by public official and still have faith in your agency.

I'd like to thank you for being here. I'd like to thank you for holding these hearings. But I think that we need to make sure that when you speak, you're accurate and people are getting an accurate representation. And if you hear a misstatement and you're in the front of the room, I think you need to say that the other agency is mistaken, that State of Washington has a different view than the Energy Department.

And it's very important that we have that record. And I'd like to make sure that the comments are recorded, the questions and answers are recorded at the next meeting, and that we get to see them.

Thank you all for coming and sitting here through the night. Make sure you send a letter to

your members of Congress and governors. And unfortunately, we're going to have to be back here, because they've illegally and improperly piecemealed these decisions and left the Greater-Than-Class-C waste out of this one.

Again, that's something that is just utterly unacceptable in terms of open government to say "Yes, we have another pending proposal. And we didn't disclose it in this proposal. And you have to come to another meeting if you want to testify on the impacts of adding that waste to Hanford." It's wrong, and it violates NEPA, and it needs to be put into this EIS.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anybody else? We're at 20 after the hour. Anyone else like to make additional comments?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY LORI MESERVE:

I've got one more word: Transparency.

MR. PARHAM: Okay. If there are no additional comments at this time, I want to thank you for being so patient you stayed to this hour. And thanks to the DOE and the two departments from the

states, and all of you who were very collegial and very polite. Thank you.

(COMMENTS SESSION CONCLUDED AT 10:22 PM)

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

CERTIFICATE

I, Deelana Johnson, Registered Professional Reporter and Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify that I reported in stenotype the Formal Comment Session of the Public Hearing captioned herein.

I further certify that my stenotype notes were reduced to transcript form by computer-aided transcription under my direction.

And I further certify that pages 1 through 104 contain a full, true, and accurate record of my stenotype notes, to the best of my ability.

Witness my hand at Portland, Oregon, this 117th day of February, 2010.

s/ Deelana Johnson

Deelana Johnson, CSR, RPR

CSR No. 90-0104

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com