

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

March 1, 2010

6:00 P.M.

The Hilton Hotel
66 East Sixth Avenue
Eugene, Oregon

James Parham, Facilitator

PANEL MEMBERS:

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

Ms. Suzanne Dahl, Washington State Department of
Ecology, Hanford Project Office

	FORMAL COMMENT INDEX		
	SPEAKER	PAGE	LINE
1			
2			
3			
4	Gerry Pollet	4	19
5	Marilyn Cohen	10	15
6	Loretta Huston	12	21
7	Timothy Shinabarger	14	13
8	Lynn Porter	16	23
9	Kathy Ging	18	12
10	Moshe Immerman	21	16
11	Michael Gannon	26	2
12	Louisa Hamachek	29	24
13	Larry Deckman	31	22
14	Jack Dresser	33	14
15	Max Smoot	37	21
16	Cat Koehn	42	13
17	James Kane	45	6
18	Alex Bark	45	21
19	Unidentified speaker	48	2
20	Janna Thrift	50	20
21	Lucas	55	8
22	Unidentified speaker	56	3
23	Patrick Delshaw	56	8
24	Erica Elliott	57	24
25	David Walla	61	21

	FORMAL COMMENT INDEX (CONT.)		
	SPEAKER	PAGE	LINE
1			
2			
3			
4	Gerry Pollet	63	8
5	Loretta Huston	64	24
6	Moshe Immerman	65	13
7	Jeshua Hubbard	71	13
8	Kathy Ging	72	16
9	Louisa Hamachek	74	11
10	Michael Gannon	75	22
11	Moshe Immerman	79	19
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1 JAMES PARHAM: Marilyn is here with me
2 and she is the court reporter, and at this
3 point we move to this formal stage where DOE
4 and Washington and others listen, you talk, and
5 we record.

6 If you want to give your name, that's
7 great; if you don't, fine. If you want to
8 state your affiliation with an organization, if
9 you're representing that organization, that's
10 good for us to know, so we know that you're
11 doing such in that capacity or you're just
12 representing yourself.

13 With that said, we would go ahead and get
14 started and ask you to come to this microphone
15 here. And the first person on our list is
16 Gerry Pollet from Heart of America. After
17 Gerry will be Marilyn Cohen of the Global
18 Resources Institute. And Marilyn after Gerry.

19 GERRY POLLET: So I'm going to be showing
20 some slides. I'm Gerry Pollet with the citizen
21 Hanford cleanup watchdog group Heart of America
22 Northwest. I want to thank you all for coming
23 out tonight. There's never been a hearing in
24 Eugene on Hanford before, and a lot of people
25 were saying, "Oh, don't think people care."

1 Well, thank you for coming out and showing that
2 people do care.

3 We're here tonight because we all do care
4 about being responsible and not putting off
5 decisions that will cause cancer in future
6 generations, making -- foisting our mistakes
7 off into the future over and over again.
8 That's what the last generation did with the
9 waste that's sitting in Hanford's leaky
10 high-level nuclear waste tanks, and it's up to
11 use to make sure it doesn't happen again.

12 So I'm going to show a few slides, and
13 let's jump ahead here. Next. We're here of
14 course because we're concerned about the
15 Columbia River. It flows past Hanford for over
16 50 miles, past nine full-scale nuclear
17 reactors, hundreds of landfill sites and liquid
18 waste discharge sites. And while we're here
19 tonight, radioactive strontium 90 is seeping
20 into the Columbia River at 1500 times the
21 drinking water standard.

22 The drinking water standard is set at a
23 level at which one adult out of every 10,000
24 who drank 2 liters a day would die of cancer.
25 So just from that one contaminant, if you were

1 drinking the water, we'd expect 15 percent of
2 the adults to get cancer over their lifetime.
3 That's one contaminant. There are dozens of
4 contaminants that the Energy Department's own
5 analysis reveals under its preferred
6 alternatives will grow horribly worse over the
7 next hundred, hundreds, and thousands of years.

8 Let's keep going. There are 40 miles of
9 unlined ditches at Hanford, like this one, that
10 the Energy Department has dumped radioactive
11 waste into. Forty miles. The Energy
12 Department's proposal is to simply cap them
13 rather than clean them up.

14 Now, it's against the law for your
15 municipal government to operate an unlined
16 landfill, but your federal government thought
17 it was okay to do this right up until 2004.
18 Your municipal government, if it has a leaking
19 landfill, it has to meet the environmental laws
20 that say dig it up, clean it up, treat it,
21 redispense of it. The Energy Department thinks
22 it's above the law, apparently. It just wants
23 to cap it.

24 The Energy Department's proposals for
25 high-level nuclear waste tanks, where billions,

1 with a B, of gallons of high-level nuclear
2 waste liquids were dumped out of the tanks and
3 into the soil, over a million gallons has
4 leaked from the tanks, and the Energy
5 Department's proposal is, as you heard tonight,
6 to cap it, cover it up. It's a cover-up, not a
7 cleanup; and it's unacceptable for the future.

8 Next. Let's keep coming. You've seen
9 some slides of the groundwater contamination
10 flowing into the Columbia River. Here this one
11 is for carbon tetrachloride. The Department of
12 Energy has failed to reveal in the EIS numerous
13 volatile organic chemicals which we know are
14 disposed in landfills. There are a score of
15 volatile organic chemicals that are seeping out
16 of U.S. ecology landfill documented at levels
17 immediately dangerous to human health and the
18 environment in the soil gases, and there isn't
19 even a mention of them in the environmental
20 impact statement in the inventory. Uranium is
21 not treated in the inventory as a chemical
22 concern, although its toxicity is very high.

23 Keep going. And the -- Let's keep going.
24 Let's keep going. Let's jump ahead to -- I'll
25 keep you going. Here we go.

1 The Energy Department proposes to ship
2 3 million cubic feet of radioactive waste to
3 Hanford to be buried. It is not okay for the
4 state of Washington or the Energy Department to
5 try to pretend that, if we just put it in the
6 east landfill instead of the west landfill, the
7 alternative is okay.

8 The east landfill, even without the
9 off-site waste, will cause contamination of
10 Hanford's groundwater flowing into the Columbia
11 River at many, many times the state's cancer
12 risk cleanup standards. The addition of the
13 off-site waste increases that to 100 times our
14 Washington state cancer risk cleanup standard.
15 It is grossly unacceptable.

16 But, wait, what's left out? The Energy
17 Department decided not to disclose in this
18 environmental impact statement that it is also
19 considering shipping to Hanford extremely
20 radioactive waste as hot as spent nuclear fuel.

21 Next slide. These are called greater than
22 class C GTC wastes. They would come up from
23 California on I-5 as well. The Energy
24 Department did an environmental impact
25 statement in 2008, considering what would be

1 the risk of shipping high-level nuclear waste
2 to Hanford from commercial reactors for
3 reprocessing. It estimated that 816 fatal
4 cancers would occur in the adults along the
5 truck route to Hanford just from radiation
6 exposure when you're stuck in traffic or you're
7 -- the trucks go by your schools. That's in
8 adults. They left out the analysis for cancer
9 in our children, who are three to ten times
10 more susceptible to get cancer from the same as
11 does an adult.

12 JAMES PARHAM: Five minutes, sir.

13 GERRY POLLET: It is outrageous that the
14 Energy Department decided to try to hide the
15 ball and not show the greater than class C
16 wastes also coming to Hanford.

17 Our National Environment Policy Act says
18 all related proposals have to be disclosed to
19 you for comment in an environmental impact
20 statement. These wastes add a tremendous risk
21 to the 3 million cubic feet of waste the Energy
22 Department proposes to ship to Hanford, some of
23 which are also as hot as spent nuclear fuel.

24 I urge you to get up here tonight, speak
25 from the heart, tell them that you want a full

1 cleanup. You don't want wastes capped, you
2 want them retrieved. After all, if you have a
3 leaky oil tank, or any oil tank, when you sell
4 your home, and it's no longer in use, what does
5 the law require? It has to be pulled. You
6 might have to take out a mortgage to do it.
7 Why doesn't the Energy Department have to pull
8 its tanks and fully empty them?

9 JAMES PARHAM: Okay.

10 GERRY POLLET: Thank you very much for
11 being here tonight.

12 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Next to the
13 microphone, Marilyn Cohen; and after Marilyn
14 will be Loretta Huston. Yes, ma'am.

15 MARILYN COHEN: I'd really like to urge
16 you to put all your efforts into cleaning up
17 completely -- not just capping, not just sort
18 of, as someone said, covering over.

19 I understand that Hanford's the most
20 contaminated site in the western hemisphere,
21 and it's time to just clean it up. To add more
22 fuel is just absolutely appalling. I mean,
23 just -- if you can't clean up what you've got,
24 and it's going to be leeching into the water
25 for the next 10,000, 20,000 years, what are we

1 talking about, as Americans, about putting more
2 into the soil?

3 And then the question of trucking more.
4 You're talking about going up the entire
5 population coast of Oregon. You're going
6 through Roseburg, Eugene, Portland. I don't
7 know if you hit as far as Seattle.

8 I learned tonight that the trucks going
9 through actually leak radiation as they go. If
10 a driver stops in a place to eat, the truck is
11 leaking out of those containers, as far as I
12 understand. The driver decides what the
13 weather will be like, whether he'll continue.

14 I don't know if you've ever driven the I-5
15 corridor behind a triple trailer in rainy
16 weather and thought you were safe. I don't
17 know if you've driven in Portland conditions --
18 weather -- traffic conditions in rainy weather
19 and thought you were safe. That would be from
20 an accident. But just if you were stopped in
21 traffic next to one of these leaking radiation
22 trucks, you'd be exposed to it. That's one of
23 the craziest things I've heard coming from our
24 U.S. government.

25 I have a niece who is suffering from

1 multiple sclerosis. Her dad was a waste
2 management scientist at Hanford. I just
3 learned tonight that epidemiology studies link
4 multiple sclerosis with nuclear waste. I never
5 knew that before.

6 My husband has cancer. There are other
7 people who have cancer. This is a human issue
8 that we're talking about. It's not just some
9 scientific, "Can we come up with the greatest
10 world answer and spend \$500 billion here and
11 another \$500 billion there." These are real
12 people we're talking about, and the real harm,
13 and so I urge you to please do all you can,
14 spend all the money you can, and put all the
15 effort you can to clean this up and stop it.

16 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

17 (Applause.)

18 JAMES PARHAM: Loretta Huston, and after
19 Loretta will be Timothy Shinabarger. Yes,
20 ma'am.

21 LORETTA HUSTON: Just a moment to pause.

22 It's extremely, extremely complex, the
23 problems that we're facing with in today's
24 modern world. We had a little glimmer of hope
25 when we voted our President that said he was

1 willing to listen to us, the people. And he
2 was running on the campaign of the urgency of
3 now.

4 We're running out of time. We're running
5 out of money. We're running out of solutions.
6 It doesn't take layers and layers and layers
7 and layers of details to understand what's
8 going on. Our world is toxic, and we have
9 choices to remove ourselves from this very
10 dangerous lethal direction.

11 I can't be more uproared with hearing our
12 President during the state of the union speech,
13 being so inspired by a clean renewable future,
14 to then just flip it around and allocate
15 billions of dollars in a direction where we all
16 know the consequences of where this goes. We
17 can't even deal with the problems that we
18 already have with 40 miles of contaminated
19 waste that's leeching into our water, and
20 children that are playing along the riverbanks
21 and there's not even a sign that says these
22 waters are contaminated. Just simple basic
23 things; it's common sense.

24 And it's time to -- I'm just wondering,
25 how can we more directly get our message

1 across? Can we bring the administration to the
2 Hanford nuclear site and educate them and show
3 them exactly what's going on and the
4 complexities of what we're facing with --
5 facing in today's world?

6 It's time. It's time to direct action.
7 It's time -- We have more than enough
8 information to deal with.

9 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11 JAMES PARHAM: Timothy Shinabarger, and
12 then after Timothy will be Lynn Porter.

13 TIMOTHY SHINABARGER: Good evening. Tim
14 Shenenbarger.

15 My comments address the Department of
16 Energy's preferred alternative regarding waste
17 management, which calls for the disposal at
18 Hanford of radioactive waste from off-site DOE
19 facilities. Obviously, disposal at Hanford of
20 off-site waste includes shipment of such waste,
21 so I'll also address shipment.

22 The EIS makes clear that Department of
23 Energy is looking for someplace to store waste,
24 not just from Hanford, but from all of its
25 facilities nationwide. According to the EIS

1 summary page S57, I'm quoting, "There is a
2 substantial uncertainty associated with the
3 sources, volumes, and potential long-term
4 performance of radiological and chemical
5 off-site waste inventories forecast for
6 disposal at Hanford," unquote.

7 Although the map Ms. Burandt showed,
8 displayed, does not show Interstate 5, I-5 is
9 the logical shipment route for DOE facilities
10 in California. Interstate 5 passes through the
11 Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area and
12 bisects Lane County. The EIS does not even
13 analyze impacts of using Interstate 5 as a
14 shipping corridor for nuclear waste from other
15 DOE facilities.

16 What are the dangers posed by DOE
17 radiological and chemical wastes being
18 transported to Hanford through the
19 Eugene-Springfield Metro Area and Lane County?

20 My daughter volunteers with a local fire
21 district. I need to know whether local
22 emergency responders can safely respond to
23 accidental release of radioactive or chemical
24 material shipped for the DOE.

25 I request the DOE expand this

1 environmental impact statement to do two
2 things: First, analyze the impacts of using
3 Interstate 5 to transport radioactive waste to
4 Hanford, and specifically to analyze the
5 impacts specific to this portion of I-5 that
6 passes through Lane County and the
7 Eugene-Springfield Metro Area. And, second,
8 analyze what materials and training the local
9 emergency responders will need, and who is
10 going to pay for those material and training,
11 so local responders can safely handle
12 radioactive releases from materials shipped for
13 the DOE.

14 Lacking such analysis, the EIS cannot
15 justify it's preferred alternative and cannot
16 justify any other waste management alternative,
17 except the no-action alternative one.

18 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

19 (Applause.)

20 JAMES PARHAM: Lynn Porter, and after Lynn
21 would be Kathy -- and I think the last name is
22 Gui, G-U-I, after that.

23 LYNN PORTER: Okay. I'm Lynn Porter with
24 Hanford Watch. We're a Portland
25 environmentalist group. We've been following

1 Hanford for -- since 1992. Our Web site is
2 hanfordwatch.org and we have an e-mail list on
3 our Web site that you can sign up for.

4 Our president, Paige Knight's, comments on
5 the EIS are on our Web site, and I'm sure she's
6 also sent them to DOE. If anyone would like to
7 read them, please go to our Web site.

8 I'm just going to make a few brief
9 personal comments.

10 We don't want any more waste imported to
11 Hanford. This is a no-brainer. You don't add
12 any more waste to the largest nuclear waste
13 dump in the western hemisphere. Okay? You
14 just don't do it. And that also eliminates all
15 the concerns about shipping. The moratorium
16 should be extended indefinitely, past 2022.

17 There also should be no more waste
18 generated at Hanford from things like
19 reprocessing nuclear fuel rods from civilian
20 power plants. And we can forget that idea too.

21 We would like you to somehow keep the
22 waste treatment plant on schedule and on
23 budget, because they -- the things that have
24 happened with this over the years have just
25 been mind-boggling. The increases in the

1 schedule far into the future and the billions
2 of dollars keep going up.

3 We would also like you to clean up the
4 cribs, the trenches, and the groundwater which
5 eventually flows into the river. And please
6 try to tell the public more about the impact of
7 radioactive releases from Hanford on the fish
8 in the river and the public who use the river.
9 Thank you.

10 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Kathy, and
11 after Kathy will be Moshe Immerman.

12 KATHY GING: Kathy Ging. I was director
13 of the Lane County --

14 JAMES PARHAM: We're going to have to have
15 you slow down a little bit.

16 KATHY GING: Kathy Ging. I was the
17 director of the recent Lane County energy
18 roundups and the Oregon energy roundups at the
19 state fair, and I'm a real estate agent. I
20 helped initiate the tax credit in the
21 legislature in the late '80s, and it's still in
22 effect.

23 My recommendations on -- First of all, I
24 wanted you to consider the fact that the
25 devalued real property base in Washington state

1 and possibly northern Oregon could mean that
2 there would be less government revenues in the
3 future if you don't do a more thorough cleanup.
4 And my recommendations follow those of Heart of
5 America, including dropping all consideration
6 of using Hanford as a national radioactive
7 waste dump, and thank God we got
8 (indiscernible) at least temporarily.

9 We should -- You should also adopt the
10 incremental 0.9 percent of the waste cleanup,
11 not just the 99 percent cleanup scenario.
12 Significant contamination is found in that one
13 percent, but it seems that you would rather
14 ignore that part of the cleanup.

15 Next I would like to say that you should
16 not try to save dollars, our dollars, by
17 marginal cleanup, because it is a certainty,
18 according to government protections, that
19 cleanup costs will rise exponentially over the
20 years, resulting in more deaths from cancer.
21 The enormous sums that have already been spent
22 will already be wasted, and mediation now must
23 involve not just capping but clean closure,
24 removing waste from tanks, cleaning all the
25 links leaks and discharges. This is not your

1 garden variety of leachate from the dump that
2 contains about 150 pollutants; this is much
3 more dangerous, and some of it could last for
4 hundreds of thousands of years, not just 10,000
5 like we've been told tonight.

6 I want to mention again about the Roy --
7 the Roy process, and I will be sending you
8 information about that.

9 And, also, I'd like to ask you: What is
10 your plan for the time when the tanks are all
11 full and no more waste can be sent to the
12 pre-treatment plant?

13 Also, do you have a backup plan for when
14 the waste treatment plant has a failure?

15 To quote an old English saying: "The best
16 made plans of mice and men gang aft agley."
17 There is an earthquake hazard at Hanford, and
18 the vit plant did not have to meet the seismic
19 standards. As you remember, Trojan was shut
20 down partly because of the earthquake hazards.

21 Misguided government policy made nuclear
22 power plants even feasible, remember. It was
23 the Price Anderson Act passed by Congress that
24 enabled the building and operation of over 70
25 nuclear power plants because of limited

1 insurance company liability. We all need to
2 urge the Obama administration not to finance
3 any new nukes. This is setting a bad example
4 for nations worldwide.

5 When Dennis Hayes, who was the director of
6 the Solar Energy Research Institute, was here
7 last week, he said the photovoltaics will be in
8 the next generation covering most of our energy
9 needs; and that we, the United States, started
10 the ball in PV and dropped it, and that Japan
11 and Germany and the other countries do it. So
12 we need to restart our solar future. Thank
13 you.

14 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. After Moshe
15 Immerman will be Michael Gannon.

16 MOSHE IMMERMEN: Thank you, friends, and
17 good evening. And thanks to everyone for
18 coming here and bringing your heart and your
19 soul, and you're willing just to learn and
20 cooperate and hopefully break through levels.

21 I'm the founder, convenor, and chair of
22 Citizens for Public Accountability. We've done
23 some good things in this county. And I did the
24 second acid rain study on planet Earth at
25 Williams College, at our 2500 acre research

1 forest. I also operated an anatomic absorption
2 spectra photometer at Williams College, which
3 measures, you know, metals and other things
4 down to parts per billion.

5 We face an opportunity here, and of course
6 an on going crisis. The opportunity has to do
7 with rethinking what radiation radionuclides
8 really is. We can't see it, we can't feel it,
9 we can't taste it. We genuinely don't think
10 about it. We weren't evolved in our biology to
11 sense it, and so it's usually off our personal
12 radar unless you are into science or something
13 like that.

14 I'm asking us to please consider a few
15 basic realities -- I believe, realities --
16 about being human on planet Earth.

17 Life is sacred, which means our body is
18 sacred. I'm not Christian -- I'm a Buddhist
19 priest and I'm a biologist and Jewish -- but
20 Christ said, "For your body is the temple of
21 the living God." He did not say, "So impair
22 your genetic endowment for the next several
23 tens of thousands of years with radiation
24 because your body is sacred."

25 The body in Tibetan is called "trulkhor,"

1 T-R-U-L-K-H-O-R, transliterated. It means
2 magic wheel. This body has amazing capacities,
3 unless you waste it trying to deal with cancer
4 and impaired immune systems.

5 And then of course there's over 10 million
6 species on the planet, and we're supposed to be
7 their safekeepers, their guardians, their
8 protectors. We're self species now. I think
9 the biggest mistake humanity every made was
10 nuclear power and nuclear weapons, and we have
11 to look at it more deeply; and that means
12 probably all of us need to go home and cry --
13 cry because we've inherited the insanity of
14 World War II and so-called "peaceful atom."

15 One of my huge concerns is the fact that
16 we are in one of the world's most dangerous
17 subduction zone. Earthquakes, 8.8 in Chile --
18 here is bad. Go look at the Nature magazine
19 article of a few years back. What they found
20 from six sites along a 600 kilometer zone from
21 northern California from British Columbia is
22 that we had on January 26, 1700, a Richter 9.0
23 or better earthquake that dropped those six
24 sites one to two meters instantaneously. And
25 they know that from the cedar trees that

1 dropped. Take the 7,000 years ago that our
2 Oregon environment people pointed out. That
3 means 24 of those events over 7,000 years -- if
4 they happen every 300 years, which is what they
5 said -- 24 of those. What happens to Hanford
6 in one of them, let alone 24. But it's not
7 7,000 years: Because what's the half-life of
8 plutonium? It's a little over three times
9 7,000 years. So we're talking about 75 events
10 that we're going to bless our descendants with.
11 And who's going to deal with it?

12 Now, as I mentioned in my question, we
13 need to understand better the biology of
14 radionuclides, how they migrate through the
15 food web, the food chain; how they migrate up
16 the trophic levels seven to 12 times, so about
17 ten times concentration of each level; where
18 they go in our organ system -- cesium going
19 into our muscles, iodine going into our
20 thyroid. Most people don't know that. Again,
21 we need to look at the full spectrum of what
22 these nuclides are doing.

23 Just a few seconds. Thank you.

24 So please think about the long-term
25 future. If the Iroquois, the Hodona Soni, say

1 seven generations, that's 210 years. We need
2 to be talking about a hundred times that,
3 21,000 years.

4 And the last thing is the terrorism risk.
5 I was on a government committee here concerned
6 with continuity of government. I was asked to
7 prepare a civil unrest preparedness plan for
8 the whole county, by the county administrator.
9 This thing is an ideal terrorist target. You
10 don't want it on the road. If it's unescorted,
11 then you're in trouble if it gets attacked. If
12 it is escorted, you're advertising what's in
13 there. So please think about the terrorism
14 attack.

15 And the last thing I'll say is: Please,
16 it is not time for more commercial nukes. And
17 if we give this thing permission to be the
18 storage ground for our national, we're saying
19 to Georgia, to South Carolina: You build more,
20 and the waste will come here to the most
21 ecologically attuned part of the country, and
22 you're the least. We're saying: No. If you
23 can't handle it at home, don't do it, because
24 we don't want it here. Thank you very much.

25 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Michael Gannon,

1 and after Michael will be Louisa Hamachek.

2 MICHAEL GANNON: Hi. Thanks for having
3 this here in Eugene.

4 I wanted to first of all point out that
5 Eugene is a nuclear free zone, the result of a
6 very hard-fought political matter in Eugene
7 over about a 15-year period.

8 JAMES PARHAM: Could you move closer to
9 the microphone just a bit, please.

10 MICHAEL GANNON: Sure. I want to make --
11 try to make some comments, that may seem a
12 little bit off the wall, but I think if you can
13 stay with me and I can squeeze them into the
14 three and a half minutes, it might be
15 understandable.

16 The hearings that you're having are, to
17 me, a step in the right direction; but it's
18 like one of many tiny little steps, because
19 you've had many hearings. And you're having
20 them to analyze an ongoing analysis that, as
21 other people have pointed out, is increasing in
22 costs and keeps being set further back in time.
23 So I want to say that I do sympathize with all
24 of you for tackling one of the most difficult
25 problems in our western civilization.

1 And also I want to try to, because of who
2 I am -- and the older you get, the more you
3 want to have some impact on the total craziness
4 that we see in our society and maybe tame some
5 of it somewhere. So I would say that I'm
6 roughly -- my age is about the same as this
7 site. And I remember really well when I was in
8 high school and the Sputnik phenomenon hit.
9 And my Latin teacher, who I prized very much,
10 was taken from Medford and put into an
11 intensive Russian language program at Reed
12 College, and then I started taking Russian in
13 high school.

14 I'd like to suggest that the contamination
15 of the Columbia River on the Hanford side is
16 our Sputnik of today. It actually appeared a
17 while ago, and I'm not sure when the scientific
18 study showed the contamination was actually
19 reaching the Columbia River. But I did grow up
20 studying Oregon history in the sixth grade, way
21 down in southern Oregon in the Rogue River
22 Valley; and the Columbia River was this
23 enormous icon, and the other one is the salmon,
24 which I knew.

25 So I wanted to suggest that perhaps you're

1 still asking us to put our fingers in the dike
2 of this contamination, this contamination that
3 is bewilderingly complex to all of us. And the
4 proposal you're presenting and you want us to
5 comment on is inadequate to deal with the
6 impact of this site on our civilization and
7 perhaps the perishability of humans on the
8 planet.

9 So I want to jump back quickly to where we
10 are today having this hearing and saying, "Yes,
11 this is right on. Have these hearings." But
12 we have to have a lot of them, because you
13 can't go to the -- for example, the
14 down-winders in La Grande and Walla Walla,
15 after they started to have cancer treatments,
16 and get them to help you solve this problem.

17 So, really, folks, we're the solution to
18 this problem. We're stepping forward, learning
19 the complexities, and going forward, and at the
20 same time asking you to stop. So no new wastes
21 created at Hanford, brought to Hanford.

22 I wanted to jump into --

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No nukes.

24 JAMES PARHAM: Okay. Let's go. Thirty
25 seconds left. Go ahead.

1 MICHAEL GANNON: Thirty seconds.

2 Jeremy FiveCrows of the Nez Perce Nation
3 presented at the Eugene library last fall a
4 really dynamic example of the Nez Perce Nation
5 growing hatchling salmon in a wavy fish tank
6 lined with stones, that they paid for
7 themselves; and it was dramatically in contrast
8 to the square long trenches of salmon
9 hatchlings, and their results were much better.
10 And I doubt if the Roosevelt administration
11 asked the Nez Perce for help in growing salmon
12 to make up for those that didn't come up the
13 fish ladder.

14 So when Ken Niles, whom I respect from the
15 Oregon Department of Energy, suggests that
16 we're going to ask the Department of Energy to
17 study these issues more, I think that's
18 misdirected. We need to have the people of
19 Oregon and Washington and the western
20 hemisphere study it more. Thank you.

21 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Louisa
22 Hamachek, please, and then Larry Deckman.
23 Thank you.

24 LOUISA HAMACHEK: I'm Louisa Hamachek from
25 Eugene, and I've been concerned about the

1 mistreatment and neglect of the down-winders,
2 who are about my age now, who suffered from,
3 when they were children, the intentional
4 neglectful release of radioactive iodine gas
5 during the production era time at Hanford;
6 that, knowingly, releases of radioactive
7 material went out into the land and blew to the
8 surrounding areas that the former speaker was
9 referring to, Walla Walla and Spokane and that
10 area.

11 Many of these people have not been taken
12 care of medically, financially. And they have
13 been broken. They've had the working father or
14 mother of their family -- so many of the
15 down-winders have -- all their sisters, their
16 cousins, everybody's gotten cancer and been
17 taken out. And they have not been paid for.

18 So in our town, if there's an accident of
19 one of the nuclear trucks in our town, how
20 would the people in our town be taken care of
21 for their medical needs when -- And how much
22 has the EIS studied the entire route system of
23 nuclear waste coming to Hanford and each of the
24 communities? And how much will that cost the
25 Department of Energy?

1 And so I think it's irresponsible
2 financially of our federal tax dollars to
3 embark on this program, because there would be
4 a huge medical expense that really is the
5 responsibility of the Department of Energy.
6 That was my first comment.

7 And my second one goes along with what
8 many of the people have said: That this is not
9 the time to look to nuclear power for our means
10 of making electricity, and the Department of
11 Energy is in charge of that and our program
12 with our country. And so I'm not quite sure
13 why you are taking care of the military waste
14 and having to deal with that. It seems like it
15 should be the Department of Defense and you
16 should put the money that you're spending on
17 this into solar panels and wind development and
18 renewable resources, and I'd like to see an
19 appropriate department take care of this.

20 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Larry Deckman.
21 And after Larry Deckman will be Jack Dresser.

22 LARRY DECKMAN: Having listened to various
23 speakers tonight and their presentations, I get
24 two basic impressions. One is that the strong
25 message from the community is: Clean up

1 Hanford. Just clean it up. The techniques,
2 how you're going to do it -- people of
3 goodwill, high intelligence -- focus that
4 effort and clean it up.

5 But the second message is: Definitely
6 transport nothing new to the site. And in
7 reference to that -- and the question I asked
8 earlier about seven exceptions, moratorium, it
9 sounds like maybe some waste will be brought,
10 even during the moratorium period, to Hanford.

11 You know, for the last nine years,
12 terrorism has been in the forefront of our
13 consciousness. And I think about going to the
14 airport and having to take my shoes off, and
15 that's kind of troubling -- terrorism. And I
16 read -- or watch the news, and I think about
17 the Middle East and Iran getting a nuke.
18 Terrorism, it's a theme it plays over and over.
19 But if you're transporting trucks to Hanford --
20 if you'd go with me on just a simple scenario
21 -- how difficult would it be for somebody to
22 hijack one of those trucks? It wouldn't be
23 difficult to pull a car -- If they were so
24 intentioned, and I guess there are people like
25 this, or so I've been told the past nine years:

1 Somebody stops in front of that truck, has the
2 driver get out, and then says, "We hold the
3 truck hostage and I have a bomb." What would
4 the government do? What could they do in that
5 circumstance?

6 So that's a chilling prospect, and it's
7 one that is raised by transporting this type of
8 waste to the site. So, again, I would repeat:
9 Cleanup the site, number one; but for goodness'
10 sake, don't transport anything more to it. So
11 thank you.

12 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Jack Dresser,
13 and after Jack will be Max Smoot.

14 JACK DRESSER: Yeah, I'm Jack Dresser.
15 I'm a member of Veterans for Peace. So what I
16 wanted to do is expand the horizon of thinking
17 beyond Oregon and Washington, to the
18 international level, and to talk about these
19 pathological symbioses between the DOE and the
20 DOD.

21 Almost all of the waste, so-called nuclear
22 waste, U-238, that everybody's trying to get
23 rid of here and everyone wants to give it to
24 somebody else and nobody wants it, much of it
25 is given to the arms industry because depleted

1 uranium, so-called, U-238, is harder than
2 steel. It penetrates armor and it's given
3 virtually free or extremely low cost to weapons
4 manufacturers, so they love it. And then the
5 Pentagon loves it because it penetrates enemy
6 armor. And most of our -- most of our
7 projectiles, from missiles to bullets, are
8 tipped with depleted uranium. It cuts through
9 steel like butter. It heats up to an
10 extraordinary high temperature. About 40
11 percent of it atomizes, blows all over the
12 place. It's in the air, it's in the soil, it's
13 in the water, and it has -- Moshe, what is the
14 half-life of depleted uranium?

15 MOSHE IMMERMANN: I don't know.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think it's four
17 and a half billion years.

18 JACK DRESSER: Four and a half billion is
19 the figure I've heard. It's all over Iraq.

20 During the first Gulf War, we dumped 350
21 tons of this stuff in Iraq. Between -- at the
22 Bosra hospital, the cancer rates -- between
23 from 1989, before we did this, to 1999 -- '99,
24 right, which was eight years after the
25 so-called Gulf War, the cancer rates increased

1 over tenfold, cancer deaths, from something
2 like three dozen in 1989, to over 400 in the
3 1999.

4 It also -- This stuff is breathed in,
5 ingested, or it comes in through the food
6 supply because it's in the soil. It can
7 deposit itself in any organ of the body,
8 including the semen. It can be transmitted to
9 the children. It is producing enormously
10 increased rates of the most grotesque birth
11 defects you've ever seen. And when I go and do
12 lectures of this, I show slides of it. They're
13 hideous. Babies born with eyes in the middle
14 -- Cyclopedian eyes, babies born with arms
15 sticking out all over the place. It's
16 absolutely bizarre. This is what we're doing
17 to human beings in an other part of the world
18 that we like to call terrorists.

19 Now, this will probably go down as the
20 greatest war crime in the history of mankind
21 due that half-life. And the Department of
22 Energy is complicit with the DOD in those war
23 crimes. Depleted uranium was declared an
24 illegal weapon by the United Nations in 1996.

25 Now, we need to think about this. I

1 wanted to add this to all the other things
2 everybody else has said: Because this data and
3 Jerry's data, Heart of America Northwest data,
4 this should be spread all over the country --
5 because this doesn't need more study; it needs
6 to be stopped.

7 (Applause.)

8 JACK DRESSER: And Obama's -- Obama's plan
9 to expand nuclear energy plants needs to be
10 stopped in its tracks. And we can't depend on
11 Obama; and, hopefully, all of you have figured
12 that out by now. We can't depend on Obama for
13 anything; it has to come from below. And if
14 the people of Oregon and Washington know the
15 most about this because of Hanford, if this
16 data gets spread all over the country, and
17 people in all 50 states stand up and say, "We
18 don't want this stuff" -- There's plenty of
19 other sources of energy. We've got sunshine
20 every day all over the world. About, what, 80
21 to 90 percent of the water, which is moving.
22 There's an enormous energy source with tidal
23 energy. There's an enormous energy source from
24 geothermal. We're sitting on a hot planet.
25 It's hot under there, all over the world, in

1 addition to sun -- to solar and wind and so
2 forth. There's plenty of energy sources other
3 than nuclear, that are clean, renewable, and
4 sensible, and moral, and do not contribute to
5 the death and devastation of other human beings
6 around the world.

7 JAMES PARHAM: Five minutes.

8 JACK DRESSER: So I just want to remind
9 the Department of Energy that you are not the
10 "Department of Nuclear Energy," so get with
11 these other programs and pour your money into
12 that, and forget these absolutely insane and
13 unpredictable risks and costs of nuclear
14 energy. Look at what it's cost just to try to
15 clean this stuff up afterward. I mean, it's
16 absolutely bizarre.

17 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 JAMES PARHAM: Max Smoot. And after Max
20 will be Cat Koehn.

21 MAX SMOOT: Hello. This is really
22 interesting, how you get all nervous when you
23 come up in front of the microphone and forget
24 everything you were going to say.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Talk louder.

1 MAX SMOOT: I was going to say -- Thanks.
2 The first thing I wanted to say is it's silly
3 to have all these panels up here with these
4 little words on them about all these different
5 -- different ideas of how we can deal with
6 this, when it's so obvious. And when I talk to
7 people about this, they usually go, "Oh, well,
8 they use big containers that they test and they
9 drop from thousands of feet in the air or
10 something and make sure they're not going to
11 break and all that." And so the public is
12 obviously really misled about this, if what we
13 saw tonight is actually true.

14 And so I wanted to -- I'm really glad that
15 there isn't a nuclear waste place here in
16 Eugene, and I'm glad to see that we can do
17 without these things and we're demonstrating
18 the grassroots -- the only real way to stop
19 things like this. And I heard somebody say
20 something about direct action, and that seems
21 to be the only real front against these kind of
22 things.

23 Because it's all based on money. Right?
24 The gross domestic product. And if one of
25 those things does blow up, it will make our

1 gross domestic product go up, and that's like
2 what they're all about. Right? The Department
3 of Energy seems to be interested in making that
4 kind of thing happen, like the gross domestic
5 product. And that's that whole problem with
6 escalating progressing society or something.

7 I was going to come in here dressed up as
8 a robot and try to say: This is against the
9 eternal logic of reality. It's not going to
10 work. Trust the robots that you trust every
11 day about all these mathematical eternal logic
12 -- or universal logic that people kind of
13 construct. But that was a bad idea, so I
14 didn't do it. Yeah, I just wanted to come up
15 with some kind of thing to be humorous and
16 ridicule this idea, because I think that's one
17 of the only ways of direct action that we can
18 do, at least on the intellectual front.

19 And I know a lot of people that are really
20 not interested in coming up and speaking to
21 some impersonal people like robots that want to
22 make more nuclear energy and stuff. And I
23 represent those people. There's a lot of them.
24 And they would rather ridicule it. And I think
25 that's the only -- I don't know. It's just so

1 divisive, you know.

2 And one more thing I wanted to do was kind
3 of represent my interpretation of the
4 progression, this kind of escalating gross
5 domestic product that capitalism is based on
6 that we're doing and the radioactive
7 decomposition. And it kind of -- I mean, it's
8 kind of inspired by this sound I heard on a
9 sound synthesizer that my friend bought
10 recently; and it's kind of an abrasive noise,
11 so I encourage you all to cover your ears if
12 you want to protect yourself from this. It
13 goes like this. (Indicating.) Sorry, that was
14 a really bad representation of it. But,
15 anyway, it goes on and on; and as long as you
16 keep holding the button down, it keeps
17 progressing and it's (indicating) and it just
18 keeps changing and mutating and getting crazier
19 and crazier. And I thought that would be a
20 good representation of at least --

21 JAMES PARHAM: We may have a hard time
22 getting that on the record, but we're going to
23 try.

24 MAX SMOOT: Silly. Yeah. I should have
25 brought the synthesizer in; maybe that would

1 have worked.

2 JAMES PARHAM: Send us a digital copy and
3 we can do it.

4 MAX SMOOT: Yeah. Anyway, thanks for
5 hearing us, I guess.

6 For what it's worth, I think there will be
7 direct action. I don't know why they would
8 think that there wouldn't -- or why anybody
9 would think that people aren't going to try to
10 stop this. And of course those people will be
11 labeled terrorists, I'm sure.

12 But, yeah, I work with kids, and I really
13 like working with kids, and I have to tell
14 them, "No, that's not appropriate for school,"
15 or, "That's not appropriate. We need to stop
16 this. You're not supposed to hit each other,"
17 or whatever. And this is the kind of thing
18 that our people that are operating nuclear
19 power plants don't want to hear, and so we have
20 to do something.

21 JAMES PARHAM: Last five minutes.

22 MAX SMOOT: And the direct action
23 grassroots stuff seems to be the only way, and
24 I'm glad people are actually hear to listen and
25 talk about this and not just say, "Oh, well,

1 they have these big tanks, right, they put them
2 in and it really contains it from the water and
3 everything," when they're totally not even
4 getting the information because it's not being
5 expressed.

6 JAMES PARHAM: You're done, five minutes.

7 MAX SMOOT: Oh, I'm done?

8 JAMES PARHAM: Yeah.

9 MAX SMOOT: Okay.

10 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

11 MAX SMOOT: Thank you.

12 JAMES PARHAM: Cat Koehn.

13 CAT KOEHN: Good evening. And for the
14 record, my name is pronounced Cat Koehn, even
15 though I agree it does look like Kohen.

16 JAMES PARHAM: Okay. Thank you.

17 CAT KOEHN: I'm the director of a
18 nonprofit called Artists 4 Action, and we're a
19 group that encourages the public to get
20 involved about environmental problems. And we
21 have a "save the salmon" project right now, and
22 so that's why I'm very glad that you are
23 allowing us to come and speak before you,
24 because what I want to tell you is that we're
25 mad. We're mad about the leaks that have

1 happened, the millions of gallons. We're mad
2 about the money, billions of dollars that have
3 been wasted, just poured down a hole, and we
4 don't seem to be too much further than we were
5 the last decades. We're mad about the risks
6 that you're asking us to assume, and our
7 children to assume, with thousands of trucks
8 rolling down major highways. We're mad about
9 the down-winders that have had to live with
10 this all of their life. And the Native
11 Americans of that area of the Columbia River --
12 you don't even want to get me started about
13 them.

14 But mostly the salmon: The salmon are an
15 icon in the Northwest, and you can't -- Their
16 position shows us that this is a human health
17 risk. The fact that it's in the salmon gets
18 into the Native Americans, because they eat the
19 whole fish, and they're having a lot of
20 problems, including cancers.

21 And one of the things that we want to tell
22 you is we do not want any more waste. We want
23 you to clean it up, all of it. And I was very
24 entrenched with this man's idea about the
25 pathological symbiosis of DOD and DOE as being

1 a rather sort of hot potato game -- and what I
2 wrote in my notes is "shell game" -- because we
3 think this is a cover-up, not a clean-up. And
4 the public is appalled if you don't clean it
5 up.

6 Obama and his idea, he's just bringing up
7 another unproven techno fix. I only wish that
8 it were true, making a little smiley face on
9 it. But you're going to have to convince me.
10 It's more of the same type of thing that you've
11 been telling us from this site for decades.
12 And on the news tonight, of all things, some
13 waste -- professional waste person was granted
14 a court judgment because they were not allowed
15 to put their transuranic nuclear waste into
16 Yucca Mountain. But that's because Yucca
17 Mountain sits in the middle of a detachment
18 fault and is one of the worst places in the
19 world to put nuclear waste.

20 And so it just brings up the point that
21 the fundamental truth that you can't get away
22 from that no government agency is above the
23 law, especially not above the endangered
24 species law; and the nuclear power industry
25 just cannot hide anymore that there is no good

1 place for nuclear waste. Clean up Hanford and
2 clean it up now. Thank you.

3 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

4 (Applause.)

5 JAMES PARHAM: James Kane. James.

6 JAMES KANE: Good evening, folks. My name
7 is Jimmy Kane. I'm a farmer and I was a
8 teacher of young children. You've got a nice
9 joint here. It cost a lot, didn't it? Why
10 don't we do this all day long, bring the kids
11 to the show at the county fairgrounds. Okay?
12 They got to live with this crap. We're sick of
13 it, we're tired of it, we don't want to pay for
14 it. Stop shitting in our water, stop shitting
15 in our air, stop shitting on our earth.

16 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. That's the end
17 of our people that have signed up. Now we'd
18 like to turn to anyone who would like to
19 comment, who hasn't had the chance yet. Yes,
20 sir come on up.

21 ALEX BARK: Hello there. I'm Alex Bark.
22 I'm a University of Oregon student.

23 I just wanted to go over into some of
24 these management strategies that have been
25 talked about, some of these alternatives.

1 I'd like to encourage that all
2 alternatives considered include clean closure
3 as part of their management strategy. I think,
4 since NEPA was designed to protect the quality
5 of the human environment -- which is ecology,
6 human health, and the physical environment --
7 you have to invest all of your allocable
8 resources today with this, the most
9 contaminated site in the western hemisphere. I
10 think failure to do so increases probabilities
11 of increased cumulative impacts. And I know
12 it's really, really important that we prevent
13 these cumulative impacts, especially in
14 reference to the salmonid species in the
15 Columbia Basin.

16 Any alternatives that do not -- that do
17 not include a full, clean closure of
18 underground storage tanks should include the
19 costs to long-term decline in fishery
20 production in the Columbia Basin. I mean, if
21 we don't take care of it now, you're -- and the
22 time lines we're looking at, 5,000 to 10,000
23 years, what does that impact the salmonid
24 species? Take the cost of that and include it
25 into the alternative. I think that's a fair

1 assessment as well.

2 In addition, I think that the cultural
3 resources need to be investigated further. I
4 didn't -- Even in the synopsis in this manual,
5 obviously I haven't read 6,000 pages of -- I'm
6 sure it's not 6,000 pages -- of cultural
7 impacts, but I think that it would be really
8 important to include the synopsis impacts to
9 native -- native tribes in the region that
10 consume these salmonid species on a regular
11 basis. That's part of their heritage. And to
12 not include that in this is a really -- is a
13 failure on the DOE's part.

14 I think that's basically it. In summary,
15 please invest all resources -- please more than
16 \$2 billion that Obama has included. If he's
17 investing \$54 billion into future nuclear
18 policy, he can invest more than \$2 billion into
19 cleaning up this super contaminated site. I
20 live downstream from the contamination; I'd
21 really appreciate if more money were involved
22 in it. Thank you.

23 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

24 (Applause.)

25 JAMES PARHAM: Anyone else who hasn't come

1 and who would like to? Yes, ma'am. Go ahead.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm having, I
3 guess, conference shock, because I just came
4 from the ELOA conference and I attended the
5 session on public trust doctrine, where the
6 government -- and this is an old law -- has a
7 duty and an obligation to give us clean air,
8 water, and land.

9 And I understand all the difficulties that
10 you're having for cleaning up something that
11 basically none of us really know how to clean
12 up. And my culture shock is simple: I'm
13 looking at the whole issue of climate change
14 and haven't factored in how climate change and
15 your EIS relate to each other. And I'm seeing
16 that, if we don't do the climate change right
17 really soon, I think your whole plan becomes
18 moot in a sense. Because, if I understand
19 climate change correctly, Oregon -- every place
20 is going to get way warmer, which means way
21 less water because it evaporates, so maybe the
22 Columbia River itself would evaporate and you
23 can only live in Greenland.

24 And I think we can reconceptualize a whole
25 lot of things if we figure out how to do the

1 pieces, the priority that we have to do first
2 in order to stabilize our planet, and then
3 figure out -- I know it may be a good idea to
4 build a plant, but I'm worried. Because I went
5 up to Sanford -- Hanford when we were trying to
6 persuade them; and I don't think we really
7 persuaded them, if you're going to build this
8 plant.

9 But what we were worried about was that we
10 were going to ship out a waste to third world
11 countries so they could build nuclear plants,
12 and we were trying to stop that. One person in
13 the audience can back me, because he was there
14 too.

15 So what I hear is that when you design
16 your environmental impact statement, you don't
17 keep all the factors in -- that's what
18 everybody else has been saying -- you really
19 don't see the picture whole. And I don't know
20 how many stakeholders would have to be present
21 to see the picture whole, because I don't know
22 that little groups like this, who you go from
23 town to town and listen to them -- I don't know
24 that that gives us seeing the picture whole.
25 But we have to have a new democratic device so

1 we begin to have solutions that are
2 commensurate to the problem. Thank you.

3 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

4 (Applause.)

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just want to say:
6 We're paying the price for the people's life
7 style back East and their damn overbreeding
8 habits, their religions, their nuclear power
9 plants to keep up their life style.

10 There's only a hundred nuclear power
11 plants. How many commercial airplanes do we
12 need to put into them? You know, the biggest
13 statement would be to put a commercial airplane
14 into a Georgia nuclear power plant. Let's keep
15 the waste there. That's what I think. And
16 these fuckers deserve to die for shipping it
17 here.

18 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else
19 with additional comment? Yes.

20 JANNA THRIFT: Hello. My name is Janna
21 Thrift. And I live in Eugene now. I have six
22 kids, and I raised them mostly in Alaska; and
23 then when I came here, I was pretty overwhelmed
24 by pollution and the reality of things like
25 nuclear waste and smokes pouring into the air

1 out of smokestacks all over the place, and
2 things I'd never really seen before. So I
3 think that, to a certain degree, maybe we --
4 you know, maybe you guys, working with this
5 stuff, get a little desensitized to what is
6 really going on. Like, you know, when you work
7 with poison and the idea of cleaning up poison
8 for so long, maybe it doesn't seem like such a
9 big deal after a while; or maybe, you know, you
10 can put the date out a little bit, spend a
11 little bit more money on it, and come up with a
12 new plan.

13 But I think that the biggest, most
14 important part is what everybody seems to be
15 saying here, which is we all know that it's a
16 disaster and it's really bad, and it's time
17 that it just gets cleaned up. And I think that
18 any mother knows that when you're telling your
19 kid to clean up the mess, you are also
20 encouraging them not to make a new one while
21 they're cleaning it up.

22 So it doesn't make a lot of sense to me.
23 Because, like a lot of people have said, it's
24 very elementary. Like we've got all these
25 scientists on the job and everybody thinking

1 about it, but the bottom line is it's really
2 simple: If it's the largest nuclear waste area
3 in the western hemisphere, then our energy and
4 our money needs to go to cleaning that up; and
5 if we're allocating billions of dollars into
6 making new nuclear waste, there's a very big
7 missing part to that puzzle.

8 So I'm thinking about a couple of things.
9 When I think about the impact on the salmon and
10 our rivers, I think there's nothing that could
11 possibly make this idea cost efficient, there's
12 absolutely nothing. Because if you're counting
13 in those things, then there is nothing that
14 will pay that back for us. We're not going to
15 be able to fix the water or replace the salmon
16 when they die, because we just continue to make
17 choices to poison them.

18 And I have been studying about energy. I
19 went to school. I'm really into alternative
20 transportation ideas, which is all about
21 energy. And when I think about all these
22 amazing choices that there are out there, that
23 I've been learning about over the last half a
24 dozen years, I think there's so many choices.
25 Is this poisonous, dangerous substance the best

1 idea we can come up with to meet our energy
2 needs? I mean, we have millions of scientists
3 going on with amazing thought processes and
4 very smart people, and it seems to me like
5 we've got to be able to come up with a better
6 idea than this.

7 So one thing that I really want to be sure
8 to say to the Department of Energy is that we
9 have made a little grassroots effort trying to
10 get people to know about this hearing tonight.
11 It seemed really futile. We were like, "Don't
12 really know a lot about it ourselves. We're
13 just doing our best to get the word out there."
14 But I think the Department of Energy should be
15 spending some money letting people know what's
16 going on; because when I talked to people about
17 Hanford, nobody knows a thing. Like why is it
18 that the entire general public is completely
19 ignorant of this situation? I mean, we live
20 just barely over the border; but yet if you ask
21 people in Eugene, almost nobody has a clue
22 about this process, about you guys cleaning
23 things up, about where it is, about the idea of
24 opening it up again to bring in more
25 radioactive waste. And when I listened to your

1 guys's presentation, I hardly was sure I was in
2 the right room until people started commenting.
3 Like, I thought, "They're talking about the old
4 cleanup, but they're" -- "are we forgetting
5 about what this" -- I mean, a big part of what
6 this is about is the idea there is a
7 proposition that we create -- recreate Hanford
8 as the national radioactive waste dump and we
9 start moving waste there, as well as creating
10 more fuel there, I guess. I would imagine,
11 hopefully you're going to create it there
12 rather than move the waste somewhere else to
13 create it.

14 So, I mean, it's really, really important
15 that you let people know what's going on and
16 that some resources go that direction; because
17 it almost seems like it's meant to be a secret
18 -- especially this global nuclear energy
19 program and the idea that we would bring it
20 from all over the world. I mean, this is big
21 stuff. Why doesn't everybody know this? And
22 why, if the Department of Energy wants to have
23 a real hearing where everybody's real opinions
24 are heard, why don't we publicize things so
25 people really know this is going on?

1 And I guess that's pretty well all I have
2 to say. I just want to add my voice to a lot
3 of voices out there that say that we really
4 need to clean up the mess before we even think
5 about doing anything else.

6 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

7 (Applause.)

8 LUCAS: Greetings. My name is Lucas. I
9 have lived here in Eugene 25 years, more or
10 less. And if I could make things more clear:
11 This was all part of a vast conspiracy -- vast,
12 vast, vast. We're talking many millions of
13 years for the depleted uranium. That's a
14 pretty insignificant number. All these genetic
15 experiments and on animals and nanotechnology
16 and creating new trees and all that kind of
17 stuff.

18 Well, does anybody know the word "faux
19 pas"? Well, there are many faux pas, on grand
20 levels, for sure, definitely. So this is a
21 chapter in the book where we are unraveling or
22 unveiling deceptions and revealing -- wait,
23 what's the word -- fulfilling -- fulfilling,
24 yes, fulfilling "my cup is half full, half
25 empty" prophecies. That's all I have to say.

1 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else
2 with additional comments? Yes, sir.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The experiments
4 were for the purpose of creating -- super
5 soldiers, you know, all that kind of stuff. We
6 all remember World War II.

7 JAMES PARHAM: Okay. Thanks. Yes, sir.

8 PATRICK DELASHAW: Yeah, I'm Patrick
9 Delashaw, a student at the University of
10 Oregon. And, as a student, I have gone on many
11 road trips, including all the way down on I-5
12 to southern California, to Colorado, Minnesota.
13 And even though I'm 22 years old, my mother
14 still makes me call at every rest stop to make
15 sure I'm safe.

16 The idea that you can transport this
17 nuclear waste across these roads and not have
18 an accident -- Forget about the terrorists; I'm
19 not afraid of terrorists. I've seen so many
20 accidents, close to accidents, been even a part
21 of accidents, on those roads, that it is
22 infuriating that people think that you can
23 safely transport this stuff on a truck that is
24 top-heavy and go all the way across the United
25 States with it. Not only do you contaminate

1 just by driving by people, but there is going
2 to be a crash. In the pamphlet it says two
3 trucks a day for 20 years. I just can't even
4 fathom how those trucks are going to all make
5 it across.

6 And if you want to talk about the
7 terrorist thing, I mean, I've been making bombs
8 since I was 12 years old, just to blow up stuff
9 for fun. And that's fine and all right. But
10 it is really fricken easy to make a bomb. It
11 doesn't take any brains to set up a big mass
12 terrorist attack. All it takes is the
13 willingness to die. And there are people out
14 there that would love to see the world end,
15 they'd love to see it go down in flames. So
16 I'm just appalled that anybody thinks that it's
17 even remotely a good idea to transport these
18 containers on a truck. It's just -- It's
19 sickening. That's all I have to say.

20 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

21 (Applause.)

22 JAMES PARHAM: Anyone else who would like
23 to comment? Yes, ma'am.

24 ERICA ELLIOTT: You'll to have excuse me
25 for sort of reading here. My name is Erica

1 Elliott. I'm a Ph.D. student in environmental
2 studies at the University of Oregon. And I
3 went to a meeting like this in Hood River last
4 year -- it was about the Hanford site and the
5 global nuclear energy partnerships -- and I was
6 really struck by the fact that no academics, at
7 least in the liberal arts tradition, spoke at
8 the meeting and didn't -- I didn't really meet
9 any in attendance there. So I thought I could
10 speak from my experience what I know about
11 Hanford and interacting with students talking
12 about Hanford.

13 So in the spring of last year, I taught a
14 course to seniors at UO called The Hanford
15 Nuclear Site: Environmental Disaster in the
16 American West. It focused on the
17 environmental, social, and historical issues at
18 Hanford, as well as current cleanup efforts, as
19 well as broader concerns about how the U.S.
20 Government and its citizens -- well, at least
21 some of them, who've profited from war and
22 environmental destruction -- have turned the
23 atomic West into a national sacrifice area.

24 Hanford is an excellent case study for
25 environmental study students because of the

1 convergence of so many social and environmental
2 issues, including risks to public health and
3 wildlife, indigenous rights, and contamination
4 that challenges us intellectually and
5 emotionally with its permanence -- let's just
6 be honest -- permanence on a time scale that we
7 can understand.

8 It's very intellectually interesting to
9 look at how discourses of national security,
10 Western science, and environmentalism have
11 shaped the current landscape at places like
12 Hanford; but, ultimately, my students left
13 feeling defeated, not knowing what kind of
14 meaningful action they could take about issues
15 like Hanford. And that was my failure, but I
16 think it was also yours and, you could even
17 say, the President's.

18 So during my class, we looked up Hanford
19 on YouTube, just a quick basic search, and
20 there was a video of -- the first video that
21 came up. It was a video of Obama at a stump
22 speech. Someone asked him about the Hanford
23 cleanup, and he said, "Actually, I don't know
24 what Hanford is, but you'd better believe that
25 I'll know by the time I get back on the bus."

1 Great answer from a politician. So could you
2 please tell him what Hanford is. Maybe you
3 have more of an influence on his awareness of
4 these issues than I do.

5 I also wanted to just say I'm writing on
6 the vast cover-up of environmental destruction
7 and treaty violations that's represented by
8 turning former nuclear sites in their buffer
9 zones into wildlife refuges. And let's not
10 even get into our treatment of animals and
11 violations of the Endangered Species Act, which
12 fails even when it's supposedly working.

13 Just know that we in academia, in this
14 community, and in the Northwest, are watching
15 you, and we care. The failure to clean up the
16 waste at Hanford, and the storage of more
17 waste, absolutely encourage, support, and
18 condone the creation of even more waste in this
19 country and in other parts of the world, if
20 initiative like the GNEP go through -- although
21 I know that's sort of been tabled at this
22 point.

23 Also, this would seem impractical, but
24 putting scientists, engineers, and managers to
25 work on these issues is not enough. We need

1 ethicists, historians, and other so-called
2 humanists working for the DOE, as well as more
3 opportunities for input from citizens who will,
4 in every city where jobs aren't directly
5 dependent on waste production and cleanup,
6 deliver heartfelt speeches against actions like
7 those taken at Hanford, based on their
8 experience, religious, ethical, and moral
9 traditions, as well as their feelings and
10 intuitions -- all of which matter.

11 Please engage in more initiatives to
12 educate the citizens you serve about what's
13 going on at Hanford. Please choose
14 alternatives that promote the health of people
15 and ecosystems as well as peace. Thank you.

16 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

17 (Applause.)

18 JAMES PARHAM: Anyone who hasn't spoken,
19 that would like to speak at this time? Yes,
20 sir.

21 DAVID WALLA: Hi. I just wanted to thank
22 everyone for being here. It's nice to see at
23 least some people concerned about the future
24 state of things.

25 My name is David Walla. I'm a University

1 of Oregon Ph.D. student in chemistry, new to
2 Oregon. I actually rode my bike out here in
3 the summer, because I was just wowed by the
4 beauty of the Pacific Northwest.

5 And I was staring at the periodic table
6 one day and looking at the element plutonium
7 and realized that it's not naturally found on
8 Earth. And so I started doing some searching
9 and research and started -- came across the
10 Hanover site and I was -- I mean, coming from
11 out East, was completely unaware of what was
12 going on and just felt like this information
13 was not up front. I wasn't -- you know, I
14 wasn't aware of intentional test releases; I
15 was not aware of all the problems that happened
16 back in the '50s, that we're still cleaning up
17 with now, let alone putting more there.

18 But I just -- I don't know. I just want
19 to reiterate what everybody else has said
20 tonight, that capping is not enough, that these
21 recommendations aren't sufficient to deal with
22 the severity of the problem that exists right
23 now. I mean, I've just been sitting here on
24 the edge of tears, I guess, because I don't
25 think that this is adequate enough. This is

1 just going to -- This is saying we're content
2 with letting the shit hit the fan, and I don't
3 think that's okay. That's all I've got to say.

4 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else who
5 hasn't commented, who would like to? If not,
6 is there's anyone who's commented, who wants to
7 comment again? Yes, sir.

8 GERRY POLLET: The comments tonight have
9 been absolutely fabulous. And you can't stop
10 here, folks. We've got a lot of work to do.

11 So please, A, go home and commit to put on
12 your Facebook the link. You can use the link
13 from the hoanw.org, Heart of America Northwest,
14 and how to comment, and suggest to your friends
15 comments and give them some resources. Copy
16 your comments to the governor and to your
17 congressional delegation. Send a letter to the
18 editor.

19 We will do a follow-up e-mail to people
20 who are not on our list, to organize a meeting.
21 It was just suggested. And we'll do that with
22 people and we'll ask for the city council
23 members to join in commenting.

24 So let's not go home tonight and think
25 that we did it. Because I've been coming to

1 meetings since 1987, trying to get Hanford
2 cleaned up. We stopped Hanford from dumping
3 nuclear waste in unlined ditches. It took all
4 the way into 2004 and a lot of meetings.

5 The Energy Department has been seeking to
6 use Hanford as a national radioactive waste
7 dump since before 2000, and I think we've got
8 them where they understand that their
9 credibility is shot if they don't rescind their
10 decision to use Hanford as a national waste
11 dump, based on the evidence and the fact that
12 everyone, everyone, just sees right through
13 this claim that we have -- "Oh, trust us, we
14 have a moratorium. We promise not to ship
15 waste to Hanford till the vitrification plant
16 operates. Trust us" -- as if you should trust
17 the number one environmental law violator on
18 EPA's environmental (indiscernible) list for
19 the entire United States.

20 Okay. So go home, we'll do more meetings,
21 and please get the word out. Thank you for
22 being here.

23 JAMES PARHAM: Okay. Thank you.

24 LORETTA HUSTON: Just as a summary to
25 everything that we've all commented about: I

1 would like to invite our politicians on a field
2 trip, just -- not just to Hanford, but there's
3 mountaintop removal. Take them to the sites,
4 show them what is going on on this planet.
5 It's not just -- We're a checkerboard,
6 everything is piecemealed, it's all the same
7 story. The earth, life, is under attack, and
8 we need to bring our politicians here on planet
9 Earth and show them what is happening right
10 now. Because all these meetings and comments
11 just don't seem to reach them.

12 JAMES PARHAM: Okay. Thank you.

13 MOSHE IMMERMAN: Thank you for the very
14 loving and respectful way you've conducted this
15 night. You guys are awesome. So thank you for
16 being really human and caring. You're
17 obviously deep, genuine listeners, and this is
18 one of the best I've ever been to.

19 I'm a very practical person, and there's
20 lots of practical people, but it's being bred
21 out of our species as we move into virtual
22 reality, sometimes. The sister just mentioned
23 the idea of going on a field trip, to make the
24 field trip very useful. How many people here
25 have ever been to Hanford or talked to anybody

1 who works there? Show of hands. A tiny bit of
2 you.

3 I was up in Yakima. Somebody said go to
4 breakfast at a particular place. And there was
5 a man there who looked very strong, very
6 intelligent, on the verge of cancer; and he ran
7 one of the highest waste processing facilities
8 there. He told me some interesting stories.

9 What I encourage you to do is be ready for
10 field trips and take them often up to Hanford
11 to find out what's going. Pool your money,
12 hold a party, and buy a Geiger counter, buy a
13 really good Geiger counter. The Geiger
14 counters that are normally bought by chem
15 stores, the physics department, the
16 environmental researchers at the University of
17 Oregon are from Ludlum Measurements --
18 L-U-D-L-U-M, measurements. There's more
19 expensive ones, that they say are not any
20 better, from Everline. These are considered
21 really reliable. The number for Ludlum
22 Measurements is 325-235-5494 -- again,
23 325-235-5494. They're in Sweetwater, Texas.
24 Nice people. The Nuclear Trigger is made in
25 Texas and a lot of other things like that are

1 made in Texas.

2 If you get a Geiger counter, you can see
3 for yourself experientially what is going on as
4 you drive around the broader perimeter, you
5 know, and along the Columbia River. You might
6 be surprised. And do this just to document,
7 you know, doc it there in your PDA or your pad
8 what is going on. Okay. That's useful.

9 Number one.

10 Number two, I was given \$100,000 worth of
11 a set of enzymes, a ton of them, to give to the
12 people of Chernobyl. I went to Jim Fahy, the
13 president of Biotec, in Hawaii, that used to
14 exist. And he gave me a paper that's never
15 been published, that he paid to have done in
16 Florida. And none of the people in this room
17 probably know about this -- I'm not boasting.

18 But his enzymes were given to GSA, DOD, so
19 forth, and they went into the most high-level
20 nuclear shelters for our highest government
21 officials. You can buy these in the store.
22 It's called Biotec, B-I-O-T-E-C, Cell Guard.
23 It may extend your life. They contain -- I
24 don't want to be technical, but it's relevant
25 -- methionine reductase, glutathione

1 peroxidase, superoxide dismutase and catalases.
2 They'll protect your joints, your liver, things
3 like that, but also they'll help reduce our
4 risk for what we're exposed to.

5 Foodwise, one of the best things you can
6 do is go to Friendly Street Market, get organic
7 petite peas. Don't cook them; thaw them.
8 They're loaded with superoxide dismutase. Have
9 it around.

10 Practical level: America is very
11 regional. And this region, this bioregion,
12 Cascadia, is a little bit different, a little
13 bit ahead of the curve. And I think that we
14 make a commitment now: We don't like nuclear.
15 Our fantastic congressperson, Peter DiFazio, he
16 was involved with his prior congressman, Jim
17 Weaver, stopping the five WPS plants. Now
18 there's only one commercial nuke here. We've
19 made our choice: We don't like that future.
20 Vermont, just a couple days ago, made their
21 choice. Their one commercial nuke, their
22 Senate just a few days ago said, 24 to 3:
23 "We're not relicensing it. You're done in
24 2012." Vermont, Oregon, and Washington are
25 leading the way. The South and Southeast are

1 more conservative and, like I shared, for the
2 most part, are less ecologically attuned.
3 Again, I say, if they want to vote for, partly
4 pay for, get federal money to pay for, a new
5 commercial nuke future and all the insanity and
6 danger that's in that, say: Charity begins at
7 home. You take responsibility for it there.
8 You take care of your waste in Georgia or
9 wherever it is down there. Okay? We've made a
10 different choice, and I think we should
11 accentuate our regionalism. We have a terrific
12 person here from our state energy department,
13 and other great people here.

14 Another thing. I want to thank you very
15 much for being so warm and intelligent and
16 humane in the way you presented what the DOE
17 does. I also know that there's different kinds
18 of people at the DOE, and I don't think you're
19 here to greenwash, but there are other people
20 there that might not care about us as much as
21 you do, and there's a slight of hand sometimes
22 that goes on. So I'm not saying anything
23 negative about you, but I'm saying there's all
24 kinds of people there. I've been a park ranger
25 in four national parks, as a biologist and

1 incident commander of interagency federal
2 investigation teams protecting national parks.
3 There's lots of different kinds of people.

4 The other thing is: For heaven's sake, do
5 everything you can to get online, go to the
6 science laboratory at the University of Oregon
7 or OSU, and read everything you can about human
8 biology related to radiation. There's so much
9 there. There's really so much there, and most
10 of us, including me, know very little about it.
11 I used to study the biology of nuclear war at
12 Williams College, using federal documents, and
13 what I saw there was like just this vast
14 reality -- or unreality. But we don't think
15 about it enough. But we need to have powwows,
16 we need to have teach-ins where we teach each
17 other about the real effects of radiation; and
18 once you do that, you realize the only thing to
19 do is 99.999 percent of what's already there at
20 Hanford, and not to add anything more. And the
21 one big reason why I say "add nothing more" is
22 we're in this crucial thing now where they want
23 to build, what, 34 or 40 some odd new
24 commercial nukes in the country, and if we say
25 moratorium on any new waste for the next 20

1 years, we'll force everyone to take
2 responsibility where they are, force our
3 brother Barack Obama, who's mostly a good man,
4 to take responsibility, and say, "Hi, we're not
5 just shoving it off to the desert where they
6 get these Richter 9.5 earthquakes." We're
7 saying, "Take care of it at home. You're not
8 sending it here, because we want a minimum two
9 decade moratorium on anything new."

10 Thanks for your patience and your love.

11 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Okay. Anyone
12 else who wants to comment?

13 JESHUA HUBBARD: Hello. I'm another
14 University of Oregon student. My name is
15 Jeshua Hubbard, and I just want to say that
16 this whole issue is definitely a matter of
17 education. And we call this the information
18 age, but I feel like we have a very problematic
19 situation of not having people know the
20 information, what's actually going on here.

21 And I think anyone in their right mind,
22 that actually knew what was going on, the
23 effects of nuclear waste on all life on the
24 entire planet, everyone would want to be
25 cleaned up completely, everyone would want to

1 eliminate nuclear waste completely, and not
2 have any of it continue at all.

3 And so I just want to say that this can't
4 end here, and every single person needs to know
5 what's going on before anyone makes any
6 decision to the best of our ability to be able
7 to make that kind of thing happen. If it means
8 making Saturday morning cartoons about it, you
9 know, to teach our children about it, we need
10 to do everything we can to get it out there;
11 otherwise, no one can really make an informed
12 decision about what to do about it. That's all
13 I have to say.

14 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

15 JESHUA HUBBARD: And thank you.

16 KATHY GING: I would like to add two more
17 comments: One, for those of us who were in the
18 anti-nuclear power business and nonprofit
19 community and activist community 30 years ago,
20 it was found out that if they built the other
21 70 nuclear power plants they wanted to build in
22 this country, it would have used all the
23 available fresh water in the country, without
24 any fresh water being available for
25 agricultural use.

1 And I have to agree with the people that
2 criticized your plan for the lack of attention
3 to climate. Even the Washington state studies
4 that showed that the snow pack would be
5 declining -- and I think we're down 12 inches
6 just in Eugene for the rain year that ended
7 this past October, and wells are already going
8 down. So I think we have to look at the water
9 use for nuclear plants and the cooling rods and
10 all --

11 And, second, I want to refer to you a book
12 called "Small is Profitable," by Rocky Mountain
13 Institute. And smallisprofitable.org is the
14 Web site. In there, you will find 207 reasons
15 why distributed utilities and distributed
16 energy is the modus operandi of how to get
17 energy out to the people. And Rocky Mountain
18 Institute of course was hired by the Department
19 of Defense to try to figure out how to make the
20 DOD energy independent regarding fossil fuels
21 and all that by the year 2050.

22 But there, again, smallisprofitable.org.
23 There's a \$30 PDF or a \$70 paperback, and all
24 207 reasons are printed in the frontispiece of
25 the back cover of the book, so you don't even

1 have to read the whole book to get the 207
2 reasons. The point is that we, back in the
3 '70s, doing energy activism, knew that
4 decentral power was the way to go, and the
5 petro-geographic agenda prevented that from
6 happening. We've got to wake up and see that
7 this is the time to start this again, the
8 nuclear -- I mean, the anti-nuclear and more of
9 solar energy. Thank you.

10 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

11 LOUISA HAMACHEK: I'm Louisa Hamachek
12 returning up here. I wanted to -- While I'm in
13 my home watershed, I wanted to reiterate the
14 sense of stewardship that I have as a Eugenician
15 for the Columbia River, as we're on the
16 Willamette, that's a tributary of the Columbia.
17 And we're doing all that we can here to keep it
18 clean and safe, and it's insulting, and we feel
19 -- we feel responsible for it all the way to
20 the sea and then out from Astoria out to the
21 ocean. That it has to join up with the
22 Columbia River nuclear waste in the river is
23 exhausting for the work that we're doing.

24 My concern is also about the pesticides
25 that are used, in the agricultural world, of

1 our valley and how they will be affected when
2 blended with the radioactive waste, and I'd
3 like to hear what the chemical reaction is.

4 Likewise, what's up-river of Hanford -- in
5 a sense up-river, but not really -- up the
6 Snake River in Idaho is the INEL, the Idaho
7 Nuclear --

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The Idaho National
9 Engineering Laboratory.

10 LOUISA HAMACHEK: -- the Idaho National
11 Engineering Laboratory. It's changed its name
12 over the years.

13 But, anyway, I was wondering if, in your
14 studies, you are taking note of the radioactive
15 pollution that's gone into the Snake River from
16 INEL navy projects and what the combined effect
17 of that is into the Columbia from the Hanford
18 waste. And if that can be disclosed to the
19 public, I would appreciate that.

20 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Sir, are you
21 wanting to make a comment?

22 MICHAEL GANNON: Yes. Thank you. For
23 letting us add.

24 I realized that my little example of
25 Sputnik was not very clear, and I wanted to

1 make sure that you understood and the people
2 here understood that Sputnik -- when I compare
3 Sputnik to the leakage of contamination and
4 radioactive contamination into the Columbia,
5 that's our Sputnik today, here. Because
6 Sputnik, when I was in high school, scared the
7 nation and resulted in a massive investment by
8 the federal government and educating people and
9 developing the space program, which, under
10 President Kennedy, went to the moon. So people
11 thought it was impossible and Kennedy was
12 crazy. So it's very easy for many of us to be
13 thought of in the same way.

14 And what we're really saying, I think, and
15 I'm trying also now to coalesce or reaffirm
16 some of the other comments, is that this
17 incredibly bewildering, complex problem can be
18 solved, but we're not satisfied that you're
19 trying to solve it. We want way higher
20 priority made for the solution of this problem.
21 And I also suggested that the solution was to
22 talk to the rest of the state, like everybody
23 here, and get -- and in a sense educate the
24 state, the nation, the world, to what's going
25 on, so that we have an understanding, a much

1 more complex understanding, of how nuclear
2 elements work.

3 So I wanted to also say that I -- that I
4 think that the percent of waste that you're
5 proposing to clean up is confusing. And I
6 think that maybe the standard, not the percent
7 of waste that you clean up, but the percent of
8 radiation creating -- or radioactive wastes
9 that you clean up, so that the volume is not
10 confused with the radioactivity, and that way,
11 I think -- well, I guess that's pretty clear.

12 The other thing I wanted to point out is
13 that the attitude and approach to nuclear power
14 in this country, nuclear activity, has not been
15 labor intensive. And so what I'm suggesting by
16 an educational program similar to what the
17 nation did after Sputnik is labor intensive;
18 and at this particular moment in our history,
19 we're looking for things people could do.

20 So I think that the actual conduct of the
21 hearing is like a tiny step in that direction,
22 and so we need to ask ourselves: Why aren't
23 you having this in Roseburg High School? And
24 why aren't you having it in Florence High
25 School? That's why I mentioned a little bit of

1 my history about growing up in the Rogue River.
2 So I don't want to hear about trucks crossing
3 the Rogue River and falling off into the Rogue
4 River so that the contamination there is
5 similar to the Columbia River or the Umpqua
6 River or the Siuslaw River or the John Day
7 River, and on and on. And that isn't in the
8 impact statement, and it isn't in the analysis.

9 And so I would -- at a minimum, I would
10 ask you and staff people for the agencies
11 working on this to go back and ask that all of
12 these posters be reproduced and sent down to
13 Eugene and Salem. Let the Oregon Department of
14 Energy have duplicate copies of them so we can
15 circulate them throughout the state of Oregon.
16 And I suggest that, really, we need to do that
17 across the nation, because it is --

18 Well, maybe one of the other things I
19 don't think we really addressed sufficiently
20 here tonight was that this was where the
21 plutonium was created to destroy the Japanese
22 military machine, and, in the process, an
23 extraordinary number of citizens died. So the
24 legacy of Hanford is pretty gloomy, and it is
25 -- I think it's absolutely necessary for us to

1 come out from under that cloud of darkness, and
2 the only way to do it is to clean up the plant,
3 clean it up entirely.

4 The other thing that's happening there,
5 not only is the negative history of it, but the
6 continuation of the hearings -- and some people
7 have brought this up, but I just want to
8 emphasize it again -- the continuation of the
9 hearings, the continuation of the expenditures,
10 to analyze how to clean it up, proceeds while
11 the rest of the -- many parts of the rest of
12 the nation think it's possible to have safe
13 nuclear energy. And so if there's no action
14 deadline to clean it up, then it permits that
15 other discussion that we can nuclear energy to
16 continue. That's unacceptable.

17 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

18 (Appause.)

19 MOSHE IMMERMANN: I have an extremely brief
20 comment, if you don't mind.

21 If we look at the unlined trenches and
22 pits and assume that there's stable terrain
23 there, stable geomorphology there, that's an
24 incorrect assumption. And so if they're capped
25 but unlined, what happens if there is a large

1 seismic event? What happens if the cap is
2 breached and then you have water coming down
3 through it?

4 So, please, in your analyses, in the -- I
5 guess it's called in the corporate and
6 informally in the military world, in your
7 scenario planning, look at what kind of seismic
8 events have occurred over the last several
9 thousand years in that Hanford area, and what
10 would it do to the pits that are not in optimal
11 care. Thanks for your patience.

12 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Thank you for
13 coming out this evening, and I think that
14 concludes the hearing. So thank you very much.
15 Thanks to everyone that came out tonight and
16 spent their evening here with us. Thank you.

17 (HEARING CONCLUDED AT 9:44 P.M.)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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

CERTIFICATE

I, MARILYNN T. HOOVER, a Registered Professional Reporter and an Oregon Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing hearing before the moderator was reported by me in shorthand and thereafter transcribed by means of computer-aided transcription.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in the said hearing, nor am in any way interested in the outcome of said hearing.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 8th day of March 2010

Marilynn T Hoover

MARILYNN T. HOOVER, RPR
OR CSR LICENSE NO. 04-0387

