

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

DATE: JANUARY 26, 2010  
6:00 p.m.

RED LION HOTEL  
802 George Washington Way  
Richland, Washington 99352

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

## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

## DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

QUESTION POSED	PAGE	LINE
Mr. Conant	3	6
FORMAL COMMENT SESSION	PAGE	LINE
Marlene Oliver	4	14
Gary Troyer	7	17
Brett Vandenheuvel	9	12
Gary Woodcock	12	20
Gerry Pollet	16	11
Carl Holder	19	17
Joe Conant	22	11
Tom Carpenter	23	19
Claude Oliver	26	13
Liz Mattson	30	1
Jen Gregor	31	1

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

(7:45 p.m.)

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Restate the question one more time so we can get that question answered, sir.

MR. CONANT: Hanford workers --

FACILITATOR PARHAM: I'm sorry, the microphone.

MR. CONANT: Hanford workers that got the cohort, why did they only go up to 1972 and not to the present?

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Okay, you got that? We'll get that answered.

(Further questions taken;  
not reported.)

FACILITATOR PARHAM: This is the comment period. Let's go ahead with the comment period. As I said, we have a series of people who would like to comment, but we originally advertised as three minutes but because we have a manageable number, we'll go five minutes. I am going to use a stop watch, just to keep me on, and I'll let you know with one minute left of the comment period.

We're taking people in the order that you signed up. We need to have you come to the microphone,

1 Patti, and make sure absolutely positive that we capture  
2 your comments. We do not miss. It's not a requirement  
3 you give your name and affiliation, by the way. That's  
4 your option, and if you want to, please do.

5 If you have written comments ancillary to your  
6 oral comments, we would love to have those. We're trying  
7 to get this right. If we don't hear something, like the  
8 question, over there, we'll ask to repeat it. Sorry, but  
9 I want to make sure this gets done and there's no stone  
10 left unturned here.

11 So the first person that we would like to have  
12 called to the microphone is Marlene Oliver.

13 Marlene.

14 MS. OLIVER: Thank you. I have a number  
15 of hats on tonight. I'm a member of the Washington State  
16 Farm Bureau. I represent ten million cancer patients in  
17 the United States of America. I'm a consumer advocate for  
18 research and related activities to the National Cancer  
19 Institute. I work on the Centers for Disease Control  
20 Project in an effort to control cancer state by state.  
21 I'm a member of the local American Nuclear Society,  
22 Eastern Washington Section Board.

23 I'm a member of a number of medical  
24 organizations, domestically and around the world, and I'm  
25 here representing the American people.

1           So from what I have seen in the statements  
2           made, and I haven't read the document yet, but from what I  
3           have seen around the room, I think the Department of  
4           Energy and the people who are writing this EIS should  
5           follow the law. There is a federal law on the books  
6           called the Federal Data Quality Act that mandates that  
7           decisions, such as those being considered tonight and in  
8           this process, be based on sound science.

9           There are any number of scientists in this  
10          room, in this community and around the world who will tell  
11          you that the decision to do anything except to restart  
12          FFTF -- and you have letters from around the world on file  
13          from organizations, such as the International Atomic  
14          Energy Agency; the French government -- by the way, the  
15          French get 80 percent of their electricity from nuclear,  
16          they're moving to 90 percent; the Secretary of Energy Chu  
17          has said he's opting for the nuclear option to decrease  
18          our reliance on foreign supplies of fossil fuels.

19          So I ask you to follow Secretary Chu's  
20          directive. We need this reactor, and some other people  
21          will address this to get there.

22          Now I'm going to address the medical issue,  
23          medicine. I'm involved with medical isotopes. Medical  
24          isotopes can be used for a variety of things. The best  
25          isotopes for therapy must be made in a fast-neutron

1 reactor. We have no other fast-neutron reactor that can  
2 make isotopes in the quantity and the quality to treat  
3 patients in America. I'll give you some examples.

4 Oh, by the way, I have not seen, in this EIS  
5 so far from what has been discussed, a cost-benefit  
6 analysis. We are all taxpayers. You're talking about our  
7 tax dollars being ruined by the destruction of FFTF, to  
8 replace it as a test reactor, to look at some of these new  
9 technologies which we need, to recycle nuclear waste,  
10 which would make Harry Reed the head of the senate very  
11 happy because that basically takes off the table Yucca  
12 Mountain, which we have wasted billions of dollars on FFTF  
13 to get rid of much of this nuclear waste.

14 But back to isotopes, the cost analysis done  
15 for Medicare and Medicaid for the very least, every doctor  
16 I've talked to has come up with the same figure. We could  
17 save, easily, 50 percent of our Medicare and Medicaid bill  
18 with the judicious use of medical isotopes. We cannot  
19 produce moly-99 to diagnose patients. Now the reactors in  
20 the world are closed. They're old.

21 We can target and kill 100 percent of cancer  
22 cells. We can do it now. We need the isotopes at FFTF to  
23 do this. We can target and eliminate arthritis for 80  
24 percent of Americans.

25 Medicare spends three times as much on

1 arthritis as it does on cancer. But what really has the  
2 doctors scared is infectious disease. We can target and  
3 kill, if we had the isotopes that the FFTF can make, 100  
4 percent of bacterium, 100 percent of fungus, and 100  
5 percent of cell's anti-viruses. That's the truth. So  
6 listen to us, scientists, listen to the secretary, your  
7 boss, listen to the American people.

8 We only want Option 4. We want options,  
9 alternatives 1, 2, and 3 removed and we want the only  
10 option to be FFTF restart. We want it in there and we  
11 want it now because the life you save may be your own or  
12 your child's. Thanks.

13 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.

14 Gary Troyer is up next, and then Brett  
15 Vandenneuvel, I believe. I may have mangled your last  
16 name. Gary and Brett.

17 MR. TROYER: Thank you. I appreciate the  
18 opportunity to come here. I know that this has been a  
19 stellar effort required to produce a document that we can  
20 take a look at and see what the future looks like for  
21 Hanford and for our society.

22 I do have some concerns. Some of it was  
23 voiced by Marlene, just ahead of me, that one of the  
24 options is not there that I really think should be  
25 considered, is restart, availability for the American

1 public to see the utilization of what they paid for.

2 I'm finding is that I've retired from Hanford  
3 and gone into private consulting and fast-reactor  
4 research, that we are going overseas to get this work done  
5 because we don't have it here in our own country. That,  
6 to me, is a travesty. It flies in the face of every  
7 working man, woman, and child in our country and needs to  
8 be seriously reconsidered.

9 We've come forward a number of years now since  
10 your decisions to fold this into this EIS, but there still  
11 is the opportunity to look at the other alternatives, that  
12 being potentially preservation for restart. There's a  
13 number of private companies that have offered plans that  
14 were denied only for political reasons. They had an  
15 economic basis. Medical isotopes was the main masthead  
16 for that operation.

17 We're now entering into this idea of what do  
18 we do with our spent used fuel. Yucca Mountain is  
19 definitely shut down because there's no money to bring it  
20 into activation. That means we've got to do something  
21 else. We have those solutions. It was called GINA, the  
22 Fast Fuel Cycle initiative, etc. We need to go forward  
23 with that, and the key cornerstone, when you look at  
24 Dr. Chu's description of what is needed to do the testing  
25 for materials and fuels and targets, the specs come out to

1 be very similar to the FFTF.

2 So to me, any logical, rational look at this  
3 bringing jobs back on shore, getting down the road in our  
4 energy crisis, requires that option being in this EIS,  
5 preservation for the potential to restart. Dr. Chu has  
6 said, regarding nuclear energy, we need to preserve our  
7 resources, "to provide options for future policymakers."

8 Now on the other hand, what does that say  
9 about our current policymakers? Thank you.

10 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Brett,  
11 and then following Brett will be Gerald Woodcock.

12 MR. VANDERHEUVEL: Thank you. I'm Brett  
13 Vandeneuvel. I'm the director of Columbia River Keeper.  
14 I'm not going to talk about FFTF right now.

15 Columbia River Keeper began working on Hanford  
16 issues in 1989 when we first got started under the name of  
17 Columbia River United. Our mission is to protect and  
18 restore water facility throughout the whole Columbia  
19 Basin, and this is a pretty exciting time when, looking at  
20 this draft EIS, when major decisions are going to be made.

21 I want to talk about a couple of things, tank  
22 closure and off-site waste. By exciting, I mean there's  
23 major decisions being made, not that we're necessarily  
24 excited about this EIS. The Department of Energy proposes  
25 not to clean up about a million gallons of waste that has

1 already leaked below the tanks. This is simply not  
2 acceptable, so we're encouraging the Department of Energy  
3 to complete the job, to not just look at the tanks  
4 themselves but to actually clean up the tanks that have  
5 leaked, clean up the material, the radioactive material  
6 that has leaked from the tanks.

7           It's not okay to ignore the ground water in  
8 the soils and to focus only on the tanks. We encourage  
9 the Department of Energy to meet the greater than 99  
10 percent waste retrieval goals. The question for the waste  
11 retrieval is, and there's some interesting charts in the  
12 EIS summary, if you haven't seen them. The question is,  
13 how much radioactive waste will we allow to reach the  
14 river? How much radioactive waste will we allow to  
15 contaminate the soils and contaminate the ground water?

16           And the chart I'm talking about asks the  
17 question, how many people will be allowed to get cancer?  
18 And there's different lines, based on different levels of  
19 waste retrieval. There's a line that shows basically one  
20 in a hundred, you know, for no action. Obviously,  
21 everyone agrees that's completely unacceptable. There's a  
22 line for one in a thousand, one in ten thousand. At what  
23 level do we think it's acceptable?

24           I certainly don't think many people would  
25 agree here that one in a thousand is acceptable or even

1 one in ten thousand. If we can do it more, if we can  
2 clean it up to 99.9 percent and not risk one in ten  
3 thousand people, then we certainly should do that. Sure,  
4 it's going to be expensive. It will continue to produce  
5 jobs in the economy and it will benefit our economy, not  
6 only now, but into the future when we're not dealing with  
7 some of these medical problems and, you know, people  
8 getting cancer from the ground water.

9 So off-site waste is the next topic. It's  
10 simply not acceptable to make Hanford the nation's  
11 offsite nuclear repository, to ship waste from Hanford,  
12 to Hanford from Tennessee, from New York, from New Mexico.  
13 The voters of Washington have already spoken on this issue  
14 by banning the importation of radioactive waste. Hanford  
15 is a bad location. It's on the banks of the Columbia  
16 River, the life blood of the Pacific Northwest.

17 There are, you know, we work with people all  
18 up and down the river, all the way down to the estuary who  
19 are affected by these decisions.

20 I just wanted to make a brief comment to the  
21 Oregon Department of Energy and to Ecology, to thank both  
22 the agencies for their work on this, in reviewing this,  
23 but also to encourage you to continue to represent the  
24 people of Washington and Oregon -- I know I saw a couple  
25 or at least one Oregon Department of Energy employee --

1 continue to represent those interests of the people who  
2 care deeply about these issues.

3 And for Ecology, you have a lot of power in  
4 this issue, and so does Oregon. Ecology has the power of  
5 their own SEPA process, the State Environmental Policy  
6 Act, and if DOE does not address your issues, if they do  
7 not address the issues you've taken stances on already,  
8 don't go quietly. You have a lot of authority, you have  
9 substantive authority under SEPA and you have the  
10 supplemental, ability to do supplemental SEPA analysis,  
11 supplemental EIS, which you're required by law to address  
12 every single issue that Ecology does not think is  
13 adequately addressed by Department of Energy.

14 So you've already brought up some of those  
15 issues, and I encourage you to not, you know, just be  
16 frustrated by DOE's actions but to actually take things  
17 into your own hands. Thank you.

18 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Gerald, and then  
19 after Gerald is Gerry Pollet.

20 MR. WOODCOCK: I'll make this easy on you.  
21 I'll hand you a copy of this when I'm done.

22 Good evening. My name is Gerald Woodcock. I  
23 worked at Hanford 30 years, beginning in June of 1974.  
24 During that time, I held a wide variety of both  
25 professional and managerial positions in both Westinghouse

1 Hanford Company and its successors, Lockheed Martin  
2 Company and Fluor Hanford.

3 I'm a member of the American Nuclear Society  
4 and chairman of the Public Information Committee, and it's  
5 in that capacity I speak to you this evening. I'm also a  
6 part-time consultant and I also teach people to fly  
7 airplanes.

8 I managed the group that accounted for FFTF  
9 during its final stages of construction. I was here when  
10 the FFTF went critical for the first time and I was here  
11 when it was shut down while it was still actively running  
12 experiments for both the U.S. and foreign countries.

13 I'm aware that DOE aggregated a contract with  
14 Japan when it shut the reactor down. I have followed and  
15 participated in the ensuing invade of FFTF's future. All  
16 of the evidence that I have seen points to a purely  
17 political decision to shut down the reactor. There is no  
18 rational basis in science, engineering, or economics for  
19 the decision to abandon this incredible machine in which  
20 the American taxpayer has invested over \$1.2 billion  
21 dollars and, remember, I'm the guy that did the accounting  
22 for it.

23 Further, the replacement cost of a similar  
24 machine to be built today would be about two-and-a-half  
25 times that amount or well over \$3 billion dollars. DOE's

1 statement that there is no economic use of FFTF is  
2 demonstrably incorrect. It was incorrect when the  
3 original shutdown decision was made. It's still  
4 incorrect today. Further, even if that were not the case,  
5 the Federal Government subsidizes many activities for the  
6 common good of the population. Wind power comes to mind,  
7 as does the recent Cash for Clunkers scheme.

8 So to say that FFTF has not paid for itself  
9 was and is patently disingenuous. Much more to the point,  
10 nuclear power, in particular, and nuclear technology, in  
11 general, is in fact surging very strongly into prominence  
12 once again. This is occurring around the world, as well as  
13 in the United States. In evidence, I would recall to your  
14 minds the headline in Sunday's Tri-City Herald, "Nuclear  
15 Renaissance." The article discusses at length the reasons  
16 for a strong resurgence of interest in the nuclear power.

17 This was followed just yesterday by another  
18 headline, "Feds Drowning in Demand for Nuclear Power  
19 Licenses." This article discusses the fact that the NRC  
20 has had to add substantial staff and office space to  
21 handle the flood of Construction and Operation Licenses,  
22 COL applications. By the end of this year, it is expected  
23 that there will be about 31 license applications for new  
24 reactors.

25 All of this activity is expected to cause a

1 huge upswing in demand for test facilities. Indeed,  
2 Secretary of Energy David Chu, in just the last 30 days,  
3 has issued a statement pointing out a requirement for a  
4 test facility in which, by sheer coincidence, must have  
5 just about the exact specifications that the FFTF is  
6 capable of.

7           This country is currently in financial crisis  
8 mode. Its national debt is several multiples of what it  
9 has been historically, and no end in sight. Why then  
10 should we taxpayers stand idly by while an extremely  
11 valuable piece of capital property is wasted when it could  
12 be restarted at a very reasonable cost and produce huge  
13 benefits to not only the United States but the entire  
14 world?

15           I mention just three areas where FFTF is quite  
16 capable of making contributions: fuels and materials  
17 research, transmutation of used nuclear fuel, and medical  
18 isotopes, and that's just the tip of the iceberg. There  
19 is no other machine on the planet with capabilities that  
20 even approach those of the FFTF. The FFTF must be  
21 preserved as much as possible, with the goal to restarting  
22 within the very near future. To do anything else is to  
23 fly in the face of the requirements Dr. Chu laid down in  
24 the recent letter to the Office of Management and Budget,  
25 and equally to the point, squander a huge resource which

1 is already paid for and which yet has great potential for  
2 the future benefit of mankind.

3 The first alternative for FFTF under Section  
4 S.4.2 on page S-52 of the Draft Tank Closure and Waste  
5 Management Environmental Impact Statement Summary needs to  
6 be put back on the table and seriously examined for the  
7 benefits that would accrue from a restart of the FFTF.

8 Thank you, very much.

9 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.

10 Gerry Pollet, followed by Carl Holder.

11 MR. POLLET: Thank you. Gerry Pollet for  
12 Heart of America Northwest. The draft EIS and tonight's  
13 hearing is the beginning of a dialogue process, we hope,  
14 and we are sure it will be. In that dialogue, the public  
15 should be asking, are there alternatives that you prefer,  
16 as opposed to what is presented? Are there alternatives  
17 that are missing that are reasonable alternatives? This  
18 is the time to have that conversation. Do you agree with  
19 the Energy Department's preferred alternatives, given the  
20 projected impacts of each of them? What are the  
21 cumulative impacts from the whole range of actions  
22 presented? Is key information missing?

23 Now for many people, it's hard to assess these  
24 questions. The Hanford Advisory Board, as Susan said, is  
25 going to be having a workshop on February 16th and 17th

1 that the public is invited to and a meeting on March 4th  
2 at the Kennewick Red Lion on March 4th. I think that's  
3 where it is, someone else can correct me if I'm wrong, and  
4 it's very important for people to get good information.  
5 We're disappointed with some of how things are presented  
6 in the summary, whereas, there is really fabulous  
7 information presented, if you read 6,000 pages of this  
8 document.

9 One of the areas I would like to praise is the  
10 use of plume maps showing cancer risk levels from ground  
11 water and the concentrations in ground water through  
12 different alternatives over time. It's essential that  
13 people look at these maps and use them. For instance, if  
14 you look at the map for carbon tetrachloride, a poison and  
15 carcinogen, we see that today, as many people knew in the  
16 central plateau, you have levels of carbon tetrachloride  
17 50 times the drinking water standard.

18 Unfortunately, under the modelling in the EIS,  
19 what we see is projected out into the future a hundred  
20 years from now that we're at 50 times the drinking water  
21 standard for carbon tetrachloride at the river's edge,  
22 where it is reasonably foreseeable, indeed more than just  
23 reasonably foreseeable, that there will be significant  
24 exposures.

25 In a thousand years, under the projection of

1 just the residues in the soil today, without adding  
2 anymore waste, in a thousand years, the EIS projects that  
3 the plutonium level in river shore will reach 300 times  
4 the drinking water standard. The drinking water standard  
5 is set so that one adult in every ten thousand who uses it  
6 will get a fatal cancer. That's 300 in 10,000, 30 in a  
7 1,000, 3 in a 100 from one contaminant. This is  
8 unacceptable.

9 Part of our core problem here is the DOE's  
10 preferred alternatives to cap and leave, instead of  
11 retrieve and treat. It is essential that the alternatives  
12 of fully retrieving wastes are presented, along with the  
13 benefits, and that the Department of Energy adopt  
14 alternatives that retrieve to the maximum extent  
15 practicable, which is what Washington State law requires.

16 There are some key alternatives missing from  
17 this Environmental Impact Statement. Both of the waste  
18 management alternatives presented include adding off-site  
19 waste to the incredible harmful ground water and cancer  
20 risks from the existing wastes. It makes no sense and it  
21 violates NEPA not to have an alternative of not adding  
22 offsite waste.

23 More importantly, perhaps because offsite  
24 waste adding to the harm is just utterly ridiculous, is  
25 the question of whether or not we should have an

1 alternative that says, if the landfill permits are not  
2 going to allow wastes to exceed ground water protection  
3 standards, where will the waste go? This EIS needs to  
4 have a set of alternatives that examine waste streams that  
5 need to be removed from the Hanford site pre-1970  
6 transuranic wastes. Chemical wastes mixed with  
7 radioactive wastes that are now proposed to go into  
8 landfills or to remain under caps need to be exhumed and  
9 removed from the Hanford site and the landfills, as Susan  
10 noted earlier on behalf of Ecology, needs to have permits  
11 that say, we will not violate the standards.

12 That is missing from the EIS. There is no  
13 discussion of that mitigation required under state law.  
14 Thank you very much.

15 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.

16 Carl Holder, followed by Joe Conant.

17 MR. HOLDER: Good evening. Benton County  
18 sued the Department of Energy in 2002 to stop liquid  
19 sodium drain and to stop the rush to destroy the FFTF.  
20 Benton County argued that the decommissioning was not  
21 allowed, and DOE argued that only deactivation was  
22 ongoing.

23 Benton County lost the case, but in Judge  
24 Shea's order, we won the knowledge that any action at FFTF  
25 must be accomplished under the rules of the National

1 Environmental Policy Act, as NEPA allows for public  
2 comment, the analysis of good alternatives and  
3 consideration of new information.

4 The previous NEPA document is the programmatic  
5 Environmental Impact Statement that was completed in  
6 January of 2001. Very significant events and new  
7 information should be evaluated by DOE, most  
8 significantly, the medical isotope supply is in crisis due  
9 to aging international reactor infrastructure, domestic  
10 production of the isotope Pu-238 did not start and  
11 production planning has failed.

12 And there was a record of decision that  
13 confirmed the need to reestablish production capability,  
14 and the DOE-IG said that continuing delays in  
15 reestablishing a domestic Pu-238 production capability  
16 could severely impact the Department's ability to meet its  
17 core national security mission, as well as those of DoD,  
18 NASA, and other government users. And the U.S. purchase  
19 of Russian Pu-238 will end and cannot be used for national  
20 security.

21 The civilian reactor research and development  
22 is constrained due to the lack of testing and  
23 certification facilities and programs, and current  
24 research and development projects and intellectual  
25 property are moving off-shore to China, South Korea,

1 India, Russia, Ukraine, France, Canada, etc., and nothing  
2 for the United States.

3 RL's VIT plant needs 40 megawatt electric,  
4 which could be supplied by the FFTF with a power block  
5 attachment and, most significantly, on December 22nd,  
6 DOE's Secretary Steven Chu wrote "The closed fuel cycle  
7 cannot be implemented without a fast neutron spectrum  
8 ...," that "... research is needed now to provide options  
9 for future policymakers," "The administration has pledged  
10 that a Blue Ribbon panel will consider all alternatives to  
11 Yucca Mountain ...," "... other nations are pursuing the  
12 technology ...," and "If the United States does not have a  
13 broad fast reactor research program, we will have no  
14 opportunity to influence design of these foreign reactors  
15 from a vital national security perspective such as  
16 proliferation resistance."

17 The FFTF is now in cold standby with sodium  
18 system piping under argon cover gas, also known as Stage  
19 II Surveillance and Maintenance. I assume that's correct.  
20 The April 2007 study accomplished by Columbia Basin  
21 Consulting Group for the Department of Energy's Global  
22 Nuclear Energy Partnership concluded that FFTF is a fully  
23 licensed nuclear reactor with a 20-year full power life.  
24 Even though the liquid sodium coolant has been drained,  
25 the FFTF could be restarted and the GNEP EIS was

1 cancelled.

2 In conclusion, with the minor yearly cost of  
3 surveillance and maintenance, I believe it is incumbent  
4 upon EM to preserve the reactor, and of the listed  
5 alternatives, the No Action alternative is the alternative  
6 that should be chosen, so as Secretary Chu's words, to  
7 provide options for future policymakers. Thank you.

8 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Joe Conant, followed  
9 by Ron Hale.

10 Joe?

11 MR. CONANT: Hello. I worked out there at  
12 Hanford for 25 years and looking at some of the friends  
13 and cohorts I've worked with, you're going to have a high  
14 dose of people with cancer. And it would be great to have  
15 FFTF running or WPPSS restarted or something to work.  
16 You're going to need the power to run the vitrification  
17 plant, but first you're going to have to look at the  
18 workers who worked out there, the ones that did like  
19 characterization of the tank farms, and have them do an  
20 epidural test to find out how many people you worked with  
21 had cancer with these chemicals and stuff.

22 Right now, Advance Med isn't, they just take  
23 each individual person, and they spent millions of dollars  
24 characterizing this waste but they didn't look at my  
25 co-workers that got sick and had cancer. And when you

1 have cancer, I ask the question, why did they have the  
2 cohort only go to '72, because most of the people I know  
3 got cancer, I worked with them in the '80s and '90s.

4 I have a friend here that got only 31 percent  
5 for his cancer reading and lost a kidney due to cancer,  
6 but he was denied on his claim. I've got a lot of people  
7 that I know that's that way.

8 Now we do need the isotopes and it would be a  
9 win/win situation if everybody worked together and admit  
10 that people are getting sick out here, which I think some  
11 of these cohorts have, admit to the downwinders what  
12 happened to them and, plus, if nuclear is the source that  
13 we have to go to, see what we can do to use it to help  
14 people. That's about all I can say. Thank you.

15 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you, sir.

16 Ron Hale followed by Tom Carpenter.

17 Ron Hale?

18 Tom Carpenter?

19 MR. CARPENTER: Hello, I'm Tom Carpenter  
20 with Hanford Challenge. And I also want to thank the  
21 state of Washington and the state of Oregon for their  
22 comments and especially the state of Oregon's Alternative  
23 No. 7 that was presented in a letter earlier this month  
24 about tank farm closure. I think that had some real  
25 possibilities.

1 I wanted to focus a little bit on some of the  
2 principles that we're looking at that we think underlie or  
3 should underlie Hanford clean-up and that we're  
4 advocating.

5 And that includes that anything that's done  
6 out here for clean-up or in remediation be done so with  
7 the long-term protectiveness of the river in mind, of  
8 human health, including, as we just heard, of workers and,  
9 of course, of the environment, with the idea that down the  
10 road other people will be utilizing this site for other  
11 purposes in several hundred years or several thousand  
12 years and maybe not remember that there ever was a Hanford  
13 site here, and yet underlying that site could be a pretty  
14 serious contamination source.

15 Any clean-up ought to be compliant with legal  
16 requirements, including the limits for ground water  
17 contamination for drinking water, for use in the future,  
18 and it appears to us that there is not an alternative that  
19 reaches that goal as was mentioned by previous speakers.

20 And we think that there ought to be  
21 alternatives that do so. We think that, as a principle,  
22 waste ought to be well characterized, that is low to the  
23 ground, especially underneath the tanks. I think there's  
24 very poor characterization data so far and, therefore, not  
25 really a basis to make a good decision about which tanks

1 to remove, how much waste you need to go for.

2 A previous speaker talked about going through  
3 BETA zone waste that's leaked out of the tank, tank waste  
4 a million gallons or so that's leaked below the tanks, how  
5 much is in there and where is it, and obviously those  
6 decisions need to be made and we support as much, getting  
7 as much of that as possible for future protection.

8 And that we need to retrieve and put into glass  
9 all the high level waste that's at the Hanford site right  
10 now and send that to a repository in the ground when we've  
11 got one.

12 We also have as a principle to not rely on any  
13 institutional controls for the future that we use as  
14 barriers and glass, where possible. And I would like to  
15 just point out as a data point here, as many people here  
16 know, the profile of this site geologically changes pretty  
17 significantly over time, and we're talking long timeframes  
18 for some of these. 12,000 years ago, this area was under  
19 several hundred feet of water because of glacial flooding,  
20 and apparently, that's happened many times geologically  
21 and we need to keep that in mind, that when we put  
22 material and leave it in the ground, that it's likely to  
23 wash out and that could be a very poor result for a lot of  
24 people down the road.

25 Finally, there's going to be a lot of money

1 spent on Hanford cleanup. It's going to cost more to  
2 clean up more. And I would like to point out that the  
3 Brookings Institution did a study a few years back that  
4 put the manufactured nuclear weapons at about \$5.5  
5 trillion dollars to the taxpayer, so we may have to spend  
6 some more money to get this waste in a stable form to  
7 protect the future, and we ought to spend that money.  
8 Thank you.

9 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.

10 Next up, Claude Oliver followed by Liz  
11 Madison.

12 Mr. Oliver.

13 MR. OLIVER: Thank you. In November, in  
14 2002, the United States Department of Energy ignored  
15 responsibility under the NEPA Policy Act with all of the  
16 political help and guidance it needed to do up the  
17 largest, small business award contract in the history of  
18 U.S. Department of Energy to expedite destruction of the  
19 Fast Flux Test Facility.

20 So what about NEPA compliance, the law  
21 governed the process. Nuclear scientists and the people  
22 of Benton County, Washington State watched as no federal  
23 elected officials came to their aid as Fluor Hanford  
24 contractors proceeded with advancing the Fast Flux Tear  
25 Down Project. So in desperation, Benton County took the

1 United States Department of Energy to Federal Court in  
2 November of 2002 with Federal Judge Edward F. Shea  
3 presiding. Washington State U.S. DOE FFTF decommissioning  
4 process, under CERCLA pretense, was a clear violation of  
5 NEPA policy law designed to leave nuclear scientists, the  
6 public, and the energy and research development needs of  
7 the United States out of consideration by U.S. DOE and  
8 other federal elected officials.

9 Federal Judge Edward F. Shea, on February  
10 28th, 2003 ruled that prior to committing any resources to  
11 any one of the options for decommissioning, the DOE must  
12 prepare an EIS NEPA 40 CFR 1502.2. This ensures the  
13 opportunity for public comment.

14 Thank you, Judge Shea, and members of the DOE  
15 that are now providing an opportunity for public comment  
16 on these areas years later. Even with Judge Shea's  
17 ruling, the people of Benton County were ignored as U.S.  
18 DOE and its elected federal officials issued CERCLA  
19 Contract B 2949102 for FFTF Tear Down, which was issued in  
20 early 2005.

21 On August 31, 2005, I asked federal regulators  
22 governing the county office and U.S. DOE Inspector General  
23 to review what contract issue authority U.S. DOE had  
24 issued the FFTF Tear Down procurement contract valued at  
25 \$260 million dollars. Result, U.S. DOE lacked authority

1 and the contract was withdrawn.

2           Should the Obama administration continue the  
3 rush to destroy the Washington State Fast Flux Test  
4 Facility and abandon Yucca Mountain without required NEPA  
5 compliance, the United States will lose the nuclear  
6 capability of the FFTF, a multi-million dollar complex,  
7 which offers -- which would preclude the very need for  
8 Yucca Mountain's 10,000 year storage. The national  
9 impacts for President Obama's political decision are in  
10 the billions, with glass vitrification from Hanford  
11 Douglas to go to Nevada being orphans.

12           Recently President Obama made this comment in  
13 New Orleans. There is no reason why technologically we  
14 can't employ nuclear energy in a safe and effective way.  
15 Japan does it and France does, and it doesn't have  
16 greenhouse gas emissions, so it would be stupid for us not  
17 to do that in a much more effective way.

18           FACILITATOR PARHAM: One minute.

19           MR. OLIVER: One minute?

20           FACILITATOR PARHAM: Yes.

21           MR. OLIVER: Thank you. So, in closing, I  
22 have some questions. And the text will be provided it, so  
23 if I don't get through them in all of this minute I will  
24 give them to you.

25           Do you know what Barack Obama means with his

1 comment that it would be stupid for us not to do  
2 employment of nuclear power in the U.S.? I think we  
3 should know this. We've got a new president. He's saying  
4 he wants to do something with this. This is the test  
5 machine that would be vital for advancing that, if the  
6 president is in fact serious with that comment.

7 Also I think it's important that U.S. DOE  
8 advise why it did not accept Federal Judge Shea's ruling  
9 and instead issued a contract which was in violation of  
10 his ruling. And also that U.S. DOE, in complying with  
11 NEPA process impact issue, should look at Yucca Mountain  
12 with consideration for FFTF as a nuclear fuels materials  
13 waste recycling demonstration that could offer major  
14 scientific mitigation, plus time and cost savings for  
15 which DOE has legal obligation to address for Washington  
16 State, for host communities and commercial utilities of  
17 the United States.

18 Options to restart of the Fast Flux Test  
19 Facility must immediately be explored in the context of  
20 major policy decisions being faced by U.S. DOE, President  
21 Obama, Washington State, Washington Congressional  
22 Delegation, Nevada, Commercial Utilities and host U.S. DOE  
23 communities. Thank you very much.

24 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.

25 Liz Mattson.

1 MS. MATTSON: My name is Liz Mattson and  
2 I'm with Hanford Challenge. I agree with the comments  
3 made by Brett and Jerry and Tom. And the reason that this  
4 EIS is important is because it is about the future of the  
5 Pacific Northwest and I care about the future of the  
6 Pacific Northwest. This is our home. I want an  
7 aggressive Hanford cleanup that is legally compliant and  
8 protective of human health and the environment to the  
9 maximum extent possible.

10 I prefer clean closure to landfill closure.  
11 The tank closure preference for 99 percent of waste  
12 removal sounds good, but the remaining one percent of the  
13 waste contains a disproportionate amount of the  
14 radioactivity and poses a threat that is not acceptable.  
15 Additionally, I do not want Hanford to import offsite  
16 waste.

17 I also care about the health and safety of  
18 Hanford workers and I want a cleanup that considers their  
19 safety and honors the hard and hazardous work they do at a  
20 compensation system that works. Thank you.

21 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. That ends  
22 our list for now. Anyone who did not sign up who would  
23 like to provide comments now? Anyone who would like to  
24 comment after what they've heard at this point?

25 No. Is there anyone, yes.

1 MS. GREGOR: Hi, I'm Jen Gregor with  
2 Hanford Challenge. I just want to say, you know, being  
3 for Hanford site is the greatest extent possible, please  
4 don't leave a mess for future generations. I love the  
5 Pacific Northwest and I don't want my children and  
6 grandchildren to have to deal with this when we can do it  
7 now.

8 The goal is for healthy and safe life and for  
9 people cleaning up the site. Let's put the resources and  
10 the money that we need to spend into this to do the best  
11 job possible. The technology and processes and expertise  
12 that we develop will help us in the future here and other  
13 places as well. Let's do, you know, let's remove the  
14 contaminated soil, do what we need to do. Thank you.

15 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone  
16 else who would like to provide comment at this time that  
17 hasn't? Anyone who would like to provide comment that  
18 hasn't at this time? If not, anyone who has provided  
19 comments previously who would like to provide additional  
20 comments?

21 If not, we would like to thank you for your  
22 patience and politeness, and thanks to DOE and Department  
23 of Ecology for their presentations. And we have several  
24 meetings coming up and plenty of information about those  
25 to provide to go on-line and look that up for additional

- 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

comments so you can do that. Thank you very much.

(9:15 p.m.)

1 STATE OF WASHINGTON )  
 )  
 2 County of Benton )

3 I, Patricia E. Bute, do hereby certify that at  
 4 the time and place heretofore mentioned in the caption of  
 5 the above-entitled matter, I was a Certified Shorthand  
 6 Reporter and Notary Public for Washington; that at said  
 7 time and place I reported in stenotype all testimony  
 8 adduced and proceedings had in the foregoing matter; that  
 9 thereafter my notes were reduced to typewriting and that  
 10 the foregoing transcript consisting of 32 typewritten  
 11 pages is a true and correct transcript of all such  
 12 testimony adduced and proceedings had and of the whole  
 13 thereof.

14 I further certify that I am herewith securely  
 15 sealing the said original deposition transcript and  
 16 promptly delivering the same to

17 Witness my hand at Kennewick, Washington, on  
 18 this 27 day of April, 2010.

19  
 20 Patricia E. Bute

21 Patricia E. Bute

22 CSR No. 2919

23 Certified Shorthand Reporter

24 Notary Public for Washington

25 My commission expires: 2-29-12



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