

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

DATE: FEBRUARY 23, 2010

6:00 p.m.

RED LION INN AT THE PARK
303 WEST NORTH RIVER DRIVE
SPOKANE, WA 99206

James Parham, Facilitator

PANEL MEMBERS:

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

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



DEPONENT

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

			2
1	FORMAL COMMENT SESSION	PAGE	LINE
2	Bob Apple	3	19
3	Jeanine Wade	8	2
4	Walt Kloefkorn	8	12
5	Linda Greene	10	8
6	Charles Fisk	11	14
7		54	15
8	Rosemarie Bisiar	13	3
9		48	25
10	Harvey L. Brown	16	4
11	Bill Johns	18	11
12	Gerry Pollet	19	5
13		49	25
14	Amber Waldref	25	1
15	Buell Hollister	28	8
16	Bill Houff	29	14
17	Steve Corker	29	20
18	Jamison Shamara	31	18
19	Bart Haggin	33	21
20		54	7
21	Lindell Haggin	25	24
22	Kate Johnston	36	20
23	Lauri Costello	39	6
24	Bob Batty	41	8
25	Angela Mageras	42	22
	Mike Nuess	43	23
	Unknown Speaker	47	14



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

(8:04 p.m.)

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Let's turn to our comment period. And I'd like you to keep it, if possible, to three to five minutes. We have a large number of people who want to speak, about half of you, it looks like. That's a great thing.

And Amy, you're ready to get started here?

If you'd like to give your name, great. I'm going to maim some of these pronunciations pretty badly, so if we ask you to spell your name, if we can't read it here or I can't seem to pronounce it.

But the first person we call generally is elected officials, and I have a Bob Apple, who is a Spokane City Council Member.

Bob, would you please step to the mic. And after Bob is Jeanine Wade.

MR. APPLE: Hello. My name is Bob Apple, but most of you know me. I'm on the Spokane City Council.

Also here tonight is Amber Waldref and Steve Corker. We constitute just under a quorum, so there can only be three of us. One more would be too many. So you have garnered our attention.



DEPONET

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

1 I am also known on the council for criticizing
2 staff, and tonight I want to criticize staff.

3 Excuse me. In my past life I was a Teamster member
4 with Local 690 here in Spokane, and I know a lot of truck
5 drivers still. It's been over 15 years since I have been
6 a member of the Local.

7 But I want you to know that the easiest route to
8 Hanford is the I-90 corridor, and for rail transport, the
9 easiest route, also, is through Spokane, and to ignore
10 that fact is ridiculous, to say the least.

11 And to say that the drivers won't have some say in
12 the route that they choose, I know is also ridiculous.
13 They will choose the route.

14 And the important part here that I want you to know
15 is that truck drivers, history is if they were to be in an
16 accident, it's due to stress, so a lot of latitude is
17 given to them to how to drive, where to drive, and get to
18 where they need to go at their choice and discretion.

19 And when you're dealing with hazardous waste, that
20 probably is more important for them to be able to decide
21 that. Unfortunately, giving them that option here where
22 we live in Spokane and where this area is, it is very
23 difficult. In fact, very dangerous.

24 From Coeur d'Alene to the West Plains, which
25 includes Spokane, the City of Spokane Valley, Airway



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

1 Heights, Medical Lake, is a very metropolitan area. We
2 have the freeway corridor of I-90. We also have the rail
3 line, and it is through the City of Spokane and most of
4 the Valley in the lowest area of a larger area, the lowest
5 elevation.

6 And the difficulty we have is that we're on top of
7 an aquifer, a sole source aquifer that flows through this
8 region, and through the Spokane area in particular we have
9 a raised freeway. I-90 is raised. It is not ground
10 level.

11 So if an accident were to occur, maybe stress from a
12 driver, whatever, and say we had an accident here, the
13 difficulty I have is that where would this waste, if it
14 were to break loose from its confinement, go?

15 If for any reason or in anyway it were to escape the
16 tanks and/or somehow with the rain or in its own form get
17 into our wastewater system, we have one sewage treatment
18 plant, and the water that runs off of our highway, our
19 raised freeway, goes directly into that system.

20 There is no way to restrict it. And if that were to
21 happen, I don't think it would take more than a half hour
22 for that waste to reach our sewage treatment plant and
23 make it totally inoperable, depending upon the amount of
24 radiation that would be there.

25 I don't know how we would recover from that and, for



1 your information, we have just put in roughly a half a
2 billion dollars into improvements there to fit the needs
3 of this region and our city.

4 So that becomes a real major problem. I can top
5 that off with the fact that I know very well as a Spokane
6 City Councilman our police, our fire, our public works,
7 I've talked with them about our emergency preparedness.
8 And our County runs an emergency preparedness operation,
9 of which they have said "We are not capable of dealing
10 with radioactive waste in a spill or in any other
11 fashion."

12 So we are not capable of dealing with it. And if
13 the federal government wants to make us capable of dealing
14 with it, that would be fine; I just don't think that's
15 going to happen. It would be extremely costly, and I just
16 don't see it. My people are telling me that all the time.

17 Right now I think our fire department would be able
18 to determine if there were radioactive waste in a spill,
19 and the only thing we could really do is try to restrict
20 the area, but of course if it happens in the central area,
21 depending upon what the material is, it's just a matter of
22 evacuating people in our major transport areas.

23 So I want to point out how hazardous this is and
24 what a real devastating effect you could have on this
25 entire metropolitan area because this is not very well



DEPONET

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

1 thought out.

2 And secondly and lastly, I want to make sure you
3 understand that I've grown up in Spokane. I've testified
4 at these hearings since the '70s. I've listened to
5 legislators talk to my family members since the '60s.

6 Quite frankly, they're gone. The problem has never
7 been resolved, and it doesn't look like it will be. Even
8 these most recent solutions of the glassification plant --
9 and it's not the first time we've had the talk of a
10 glassification plant. It just simply hasn't occurred.
11 It's now been put off to 2024, and who knows how many more
12 delays will occur.

13 I don't want any more waste at Hanford than is there
14 now. I want all waste stopped. And I think the citizens
15 of the State of Washington voted in a toxic waste
16 initiative just a few years ago to say the same thing.

17 So I want you to understand we need to stop waste
18 dumping at Hanford, nuclear waste dumping, and we need to
19 stop it cold until the problem is corrected.

20 Presently, it is the most toxic waste site in the
21 Northern Hemisphere. The radioactive waste has leached in
22 the air, it has leached into the aquifer and the water and
23 into the Columbia River. It is not being contained. All
24 the talk, they say it is. The evidence proves otherwise.

25 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.



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

1 Jeanine, and after Jeanine would be Walt.

2 MS. WADE: Thank you. My name is
3 Jeanine Wade. I live in Millwood, not far from the
4 freeway, and I would like to echo what Mr. Apple just
5 said.

6 I am adamantly opposed to the importation of
7 additional waste into Hanford, and I am even more
8 adamantly opposed to trucking this garbage through our
9 county. Thank you.

10 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.
11 Walter, and then Linda Greene after that.

12 MR. KLOEFKORN: Hi. I'm Walt
13 Kloefkorn from Springdale.

14 And I've only lived there for 16 years, but I can
15 vouch for the fact that there's many people in that area
16 who are my age who suffer from thyroid cancer and other
17 diseases as a consequence of living downwind from previous
18 Hanford releases.

19 They were going through all this down there, have
20 been for 10, 20 years, more than that, and will be for
21 hundreds, thousands of more years, and yet we're actually
22 considering making more of this stuff by building more
23 nuclear weapons and by building more nuclear power plants.
24 It's absolutely, 100 percent insane.

25 The DOE licenses these things, and you need to stop.



1 I favor as complete cleanup as possible. I want to see
2 the tanks emptied as completely as possible. I want to
3 see the tanks and the pipes removed, and I want to see the
4 spilled waste cleaned up, and I want the moratorium on
5 importation of any additional waste to be made permanent.

6 I understand that it's pretty much generally agreed
7 that the vitrification plant in process can only do about
8 half the job, so I want you to start building another one
9 tomorrow. I don't want you to wait until 2016 to make a
10 decision on that.

11 And since I generally try to find both sides of an
12 issue, I'm going to leave you with some helpful
13 suggestions as to where exactly this waste might be able
14 to go.

15 We seem to think that we can throw stuff away, and I
16 know of no place more away than Dick Cheney's undisclosed
17 location. It may not hold all of it, but I think we
18 should fill it up first.

19 Greenwich, Connecticut, is the richest community in
20 the country because of the high percentage of Wall Street
21 bankers that live there. I think you would find huge
22 amounts of public support to site this waste depository
23 there.

24 Georgia seems to think that they were going to be
25 the first state to build new nuclear power plants, and I



1 can think of nothing more appropriate than a Stone
2 Mountain nuclear waste dump.

3 And lastly, I hear there's a ranchette outside of
4 Crawford, Texas, that's no longer needed for propaganda
5 purposes. The brush is already cleared. Thank you.

6 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Linda Greene and
7 then Charles Fisk.

8 MS. GREENE: That guy is a hard act to
9 follow. I'm not going to be funny, I'm afraid.

10 My problem is that the EIS doesn't actually have an
11 alternative of not having a nuclear waste dump at Hanford.
12 That doesn't seem like an alternative that you have
13 thought about.

14 The number one thing you want to do is to not truck
15 other nuclear waste into Hanford. This has been something
16 that was talked about and voted upon by the people of the
17 State of Washington. They all agreed we don't want any
18 more waste here. So I just wish that you would listen to
19 the people of Washington.

20 We are supposed to first clean up the waste, and the
21 way we do that is with a clean closure model instead of
22 the landfill closure of the model, and I mean
23 99.9 percent, rather than 99 percent. I saw on the chart
24 there that showed 99 percent looked pretty good. But
25 99.9 percent looks a lot better as far as cleaning up.



1 And the moratorium here we're talking about, well,
2 maybe they'll continue the moratorium after that
3 vitrification plant is all started up, but that doesn't
4 sound quite right because we still have to have at least
5 half of that.

6 The waste at Hanford is not going to be cleaned up
7 with the vitrification plant that's currently there, so we
8 need to build another vitrification plant. That needs to
9 be done before any moratorium is stopped.

10 So I would say we should have a moratorium forever.
11 Thanks.

12 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.
13 Charles Fisk. After Mr. Fisk will be Rosemarie.

14 MR. FISK: I am Charles Fisk. I'm a
15 citizen here of Spokane, and I would like to amplify all
16 of the comments that have been made so far, particularly
17 Greenwich, Connecticut.

18 To me one of the only really practical alternatives
19 to this insanity of continuing to produce nuclear
20 fission -- nuclear fission materials is to get it buried
21 on site no matter how many thousand feet you have to go
22 down.

23 Your consideration of transportation, what we're
24 concerned about here is Spokane, but you magnify that by
25 all the other transportation corridors that you showed on



1 panel number 9, it's a huge risk, not only here in
2 Spokane, but all over the United States.

3 My feeling is that if they produce this kind of
4 things at Oakridge and the other DOE sites, you darn well
5 better figure out some way of putting -- or keeping it on
6 site, however deep you have to go.

7 You're not just thinking about 100 years. The way
8 the Hanford -- or, rather, the Heart of America people are
9 looking at projections down 125 years, but you're looking
10 at 1,000 and 2,000 years of radioactivity.

11 It's my understanding that the salt deposits in New
12 Mexico probably under the current management will melt.
13 Yucca Mountain has been discarded. I seriously doubt that
14 you know what a really good alternative site is, and
15 therefore a lot more consideration needs to go into this
16 process than just the draft EIS here.

17 You people really need to think far ahead. It's not
18 just our children or grandchildren; it's hundreds of
19 generations that you're dealing with and I don't think any
20 of you are really taking this seriously.

21 So my request would be a permanent moratorium on
22 messing up the sites that are already damaged, to clean up
23 the ones to the best of our ability now and in the future,
24 and certainly to consider those future generations.

25 Thank you for coming to Spokane.



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

1 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.
2 Rosemarie, and followed by Harvey Brown.

3 MS. BISIAR: First of all, I really
4 want to thank you for coming to Spokane because I kind of
5 got the impression that we were the lost child out there
6 that everybody seemed to be ignoring. And since we are on
7 a major interstate highway that runs right through
8 Spokane, we needed to have our voices heard here.

9 So thank you very much for allowing us to come and
10 speak our mind.

11 My name is Rosemarie Bisiar, and I won't expect you
12 to spell that.

13 FACILITATOR PARHAM: I have it spelled
14 here.

15 MS. BISIAR: You have it spelled
16 there, and I write clearly enough.

17 And I am here to represent Eastern Washington
18 Voters. We are a non-partisan progressive political
19 organization that tries to bring out what we feel Eastern
20 Washington needs to do governmentally or whatever in a
21 progressive manner.

22 We are concerned that the U.S. Department of Energy
23 is not proposing to adequately clean up the Hanford
24 Superfund site, which we all know is the biggest mess
25 around, and as the people of Washington State expressed



1 their desire in Initiative 297 in 2004, it was
2 overwhelmingly passed that we did not want this. We
3 wanted it cleaned up.

4 I learned in college many years ago that our world
5 is a complex, integrated, natural system. I come from a
6 science background. Not to say that I have a Ph.D. You
7 don't need a Ph.D. to understand that what we have on our
8 hands is devastating.

9 I have not read nor heard anywhere where we as a
10 people have yet figured out how to safely deal with these
11 toxic wastes where it will not adversely affect the
12 environment in which they're placed, or living organisms
13 that may have long-sustained exposure or short-term
14 intense exposure.

15 We should know by now. And I don't want to tell you
16 how many years ago I was in college, but if they were
17 telling me it was a very integrated system, we should know
18 by now that you can't mess up one part and not mess up
19 another part along with it.

20 We cannot just put toxic waste, quote, out of sight,
21 out of mind, without the dire consequences down the road,
22 and down the road I mean hundreds of thousands of years,
23 in this case.

24 Bringing more toxic waste to Hanford is not
25 acceptable until the current Superfund site can be cleaned



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

1 up to our fullest ability and there is a safe and
2 effective way to treat all incoming radioactive waste and
3 contain it to the extent that it cannot elevate the risk
4 of further contaminating the Columbia River and the
5 Hanford Central Plateau.

6 Transporting the radioactive waste via I-90 through
7 the heart of Spokane, Spokane Valley -- and I'm
8 disappointed to find that we don't have any Spokane Valley
9 mayor or council people here that I'm aware of -- Coeur
10 d'Alene exposes -- and Coeur d'Alene, not to mention all
11 the cities that were on your, your diagram showing your
12 route, and ours was not included, exposes our citizens,
13 but you also did not mention risk to children, and they
14 are our future generation.

15 Elevated risks of cancer. It would be a national
16 security risk in our current tourist -- terrorist-prone
17 world, and I take that extremely gravely because I think
18 it's going to be a short time before we find terrorism
19 within our own country. So this is a national security
20 issue as far as I'm concerned.

21 The Spokane area is completely incapable of handling
22 such -- any kind of an incident that would effectively
23 shutdown I-90, it's major link for evacuation, for days,
24 weeks, or months. We would like to see you come up with
25 an alternative that would more appropriately address these



DEPONET

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

1 issues. Thank you.

2 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Mr. Brown, Harvey
3 Brown, and then after that Bill Johns.

4 MR. BROWN: Yes. I'm Harvey Brown. I
5 live in Greenacres, Washington. I'm active in the
6 Republicans For Environmental Protection and Eastern
7 Washington Voters, but these remarks are my own and don't
8 reflect the views of those organizations.

9 Also, I should say that in my career as an engineer,
10 this was the thing that I would schedule a root canal to
11 avoid, so it is that important to me. So, again, I also
12 thank you for holding the hearings in Spokane and giving
13 us an opportunity to get some input into the process.

14 In my preparation I found the impact on Spokane is
15 much more than just being 130 miles downwind. There's
16 very complex issues, and at this point my remarks are
17 preliminary observations and I'll submit a more detailed
18 written comment later.

19 Cleaning the single-shell tanks to 99 percent with
20 landfill closure sounds good, but the long-term
21 groundwater contamination would be an order of magnitude
22 less if the tanks were cleaned to 99 percent, the leaks
23 were cleaned up, and clean closure were made. The Figure
24 S-16 in the EIS shows this. Alternative 6-B looks best to
25 me at this time.



1 I'm only going to risk trying to say "Fast Flux Test
2 Facility" once. I'm leaning toward Alternative 3,
3 disassembly and removal, rather than entombment; however,
4 the risks involved with taking it apart and transporting
5 some of the parts off site need to be weighed, and in all
6 of this, the safety of those who do the work is a concern.

7 But then I remembered last spring visiting a park
8 west of Portland where the Trojan plant was disassembled
9 and removed. That would be a nice addition to the Hanford
10 facility.

11 I'm disappointed that the waste treatment plant has
12 been delayed so long. The problem started shortly after I
13 was born and it looks like it will be -- that it will
14 outlive me by quite a bit.

15 The excuse for abandoning Yucca Mountain was -- as a
16 disposal site -- was sometime beyond 10,000 years from now
17 the EPA's safe drinking water standards could be exceeded.
18 At Hanford, water contamination is way over this standard.
19 Groundwater entering the Columbia now is thousands of
20 times higher radioactive contamination than drinking water
21 standards.

22 Using Hanford as a national waste dump will increase
23 groundwater contamination another order of magnitude. We
24 have a lot of radioactive waste scattered around the
25 country that should be treated, but there must be



DEPONET

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

1 alternatives to this that do not contaminate a major river
2 and does not endanger those that are near it. Just
3 waiting around until I'm not here to watch doesn't count.

4 I appreciate the work that's gone into this
5 document. There are some parts that I wish I had the
6 trees rather than the paper that went into it, but at this
7 point I can only ask that alternatives be chosen and
8 developed that do more than just -- do a more thorough job
9 of cleaning up and protecting us.

10 Thank you.

11 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Bill
12 Johns, and after Mr. Johns will be Gerry Pollet.

13 MR. JOHNS: Bill Johns, and I am for
14 the preferred alternatives that the DOE has come up with,
15 except for the FFTF. I'd like to have that in the
16 no-action alternative.

17 And I've worked on several landfill closures. I
18 would support the landfill closures over taking the tanks
19 out. They've been very effective, and when you take stuff
20 out of the ground like that, you've got to put it
21 someplace. So -- and especially how deep she was saying
22 it was in some cases. I'm not sure how you do that.

23 So thank you.

24 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Okay. Thank you.
25 Okay. After Mr. Pollet will be Amber Waldorf, I believe.



DEPONENT

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

1 Amber Waldorf.

2 MR. POLLET: It's Amber Waldref.

3 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you, sir.

4 Waldref.

5 MR. POLLET: She is a member of the
6 Spokane City Council, and I want to thank her and Council
7 Member Bob Apple and Steve Conway for being here tonight.
8 See, it's a problem. I have a friend named --

9 We have asked for several years that the Energy
10 Department and Ecology hold hearings in Spokane. And I'm
11 Gerry Pollet with Heart of America Northwest. It's the
12 region's largest citizen watchdog group for Hanford
13 cleanup, and we've asked for that not just because of
14 transportation concerns, but because, as everyone here
15 knows, you're all downwind.

16 And the downwind potential impacts did not just end
17 in 1965 from Hanford. If there is a serious earthquake
18 that is reasonably projectable and the tanks of nuclear
19 waste are not emptied, we do not know what the impact
20 would be if a dome collapsed on a single-shell tank. It
21 has been analyzed about whether or not they could
22 collapse.

23 We don't know what the impact would be if the K
24 Basins, where spent nuclear fuel was stored, failed in the
25 event of an earthquake, but we got the waste out of there



1 because we couldn't wait.

2 We don't have that luxury with the single-shell
3 tanks. We can't take until 2040. But the Energy
4 Department has failed in this impact statement to analyze
5 what are the risks for everyone downwind and the entire
6 region from its proposed delay taking until 2040 to empty
7 the single-shell tanks.

8 Let's jump ahead here. I want to show you some
9 slides -- keep going -- that the Energy Department hasn't
10 wanted to show you in these meetings, apparently, from
11 their own EIS.

12 First off, as was mentioned early today -- tonight,
13 radioactive strontium-90, according to DOE's own
14 groundwater monitoring report from last year, is now
15 entering the Columbia River and springs at 1,500 times the
16 drinking water standard.

17 The drinking water standard is not some strange
18 thing that's out there. It's hard for people to get their
19 hands around this -- "It's just a standard. What does it
20 mean? Oh, they violated." It means that one person out
21 of every 10,000 adults who drink that water would die of
22 cancer.

23 Children are three to ten times more susceptible to
24 get cancer from the same dose than an adult is. This is
25 just one contaminant flowing into the river today.



1 What we see in this EIS is if we don't empty the
2 tanks and remove tanks, if we don't clean up the leaks and
3 billions, that's billions with a B, of gallons of waste
4 that's discharged from the tanks, if we add 3 million
5 cubic feet of waste to the landfill at Hanford, we have
6 enormous impacts to the groundwater. After we spend
7 billions cleaning up Hanford, it gets recontaminated.

8 Let's jump ahead here.

9 This is a picture of one of the 40 miles of unlined
10 soil trenches at Hanford into which radioactive wastes
11 were dumped. 40 miles when they're stacked end to end.
12 The Energy Department's plan is to cap them, not dig them
13 up and retrieve what is leaking from them.

14 Let's keep going. Keep going.

15 This is just an illustrative map that was not shown
16 to you tonight by the agencies. This is carbon
17 tetrachloride, a poison and carcinogen, in the groundwater
18 today. That's the Columbia River flowing through Hanford
19 for 50 miles, as you see along the top and along the right
20 side of the map, which would be the east -- north and east
21 sides of the Hanford site.

22 The dark red is 50 times the drinking water standard
23 in the groundwater today, and this is the projection for
24 125 years from now. Next slide. You see it gets worse.
25 Next slide.



DEPONENT

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

1 The EIS projects that under the preferred
2 alternatives and the actions the Energy Department wishes
3 to take, that plutonium-239 levels entering the river
4 shore in the year 2983 would be 300 times the drinking
5 water standard.

6 That's after we've spent billions to clean up
7 Hanford, it gets recontaminated from what the Energy
8 Department would leave in the tank residues because
9 1 percent by volume is far more than 1 percent in terms of
10 the radionuclide and toxic waste that is in the tanks, and
11 from the tank leaks and from those burial grounds that
12 they cap but they don't clean up.

13 And the waste continues to seep through the soil
14 into the groundwater if you just put a cap over it. It's
15 already 100 to 200 feet deep in many places, the
16 contamination. Next slide.

17 This is uranium-238 125 years from now projected due
18 to the tank leaks, releases, discharges, and the failure
19 to clean them up under Alternative 2.

20 Next slide.

21 That's 2,000 years from now, uranium-238 in the
22 groundwater. Another spread of plume from the tanks
23 themselves and from what's in the ground under the tanks
24 if you don't clean them up.

25 Next slide.



1 Let's just jump ahead to the transportation slide.
2 Here. The Energy Department is in gross violation of
3 NEPA.

4 And I'd appreciate it if you could just at least
5 listen, Mary Beth.

6 The Energy Department is in violation of NEPA by
7 failing to analyze the specific routes that trucks may
8 take to Hanford. The Energy Department tried to pull this
9 once before saying we only have to analyze representative,
10 in quotes, routes, which is what was said tonight by Mary
11 Beth Burandt in response to a question. I want to make
12 sure that's now on the record that was the word she used.

13 Representative routes don't cut it because people
14 don't live in representative cities. You live in Spokane
15 where, as we've heard tonight, you're in a specific
16 valley. The trucks will go right past the front doors of
17 L.C. High School. They will go right past the hospitals.

18 People live on specific routes, not representative
19 routes, and they're entitled to have a specific route
20 analyzed when it is likely to be used --

21 FACILITATOR PARHAM: One minute.

22 MR. POLLET: -- have already ruled on
23 this.

24 And the final slide I'll just show is that the
25 Energy Department's own EIS for shipping high-level



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

1 radioactive waste to Hanford last -- in 2008 showed that
2 it would cause 816 fatal cancers without a transportation
3 accident, without a terrorist attack, just from the
4 radiation that comes out of the shipping casks for
5 high-level waste.

6 The greater-than-Class-C waste, which you left out
7 of this EIS, the Energy Department is proposing to look at
8 shipping it and burying it at Hanford. The Energy
9 Department said it has already made the decision that all
10 radioactive waste mixed with hazardous waste will be
11 disposed at Hanford from these sites.

12 It belonged in this EIS. It should have been
13 disclosed. And the risks from these wastes are as high as
14 the same risks as the 816 fatal cancers from high-level
15 nuclear waste.

16 FACILITATOR PARHAM: We have to
17 finish, Gerry.

18 MR. POLLET: I urge you to not mislead
19 the public any further. I urge the public to contact your
20 state officials. Tell your State of Washington officials
21 tonight, and go home, send an e-mail to the Governor
22 saying everything you said here tonight. Thank you.

23 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Amber
24 Waldref. I'll get your name this time. Thank you. And
25 after that Buell Hollister.



1 MS. WALDREF: Well, thank you. My
2 name is Amber Waldref. I'm a Spokane City Council member
3 here with a couple of my colleagues that have been around
4 a lot longer than I have. I've been on the job about
5 eight weeks, so I have a ways to go. But I have been
6 coming to Hanford meetings for ten years and I appreciate
7 that the Department of Energy came to Spokane and held a
8 hearing on this EIS.

9 It's a very important EIS, and I do appreciate that
10 it was completed. And the goal was to look at a
11 cumulative analysis, look at all the waste on the entire
12 Hanford site from the tanks, from waste that was dumped
13 into the ground, waste that's in the groundwater
14 currently, and potential waste that could come to Hanford.

15 And so having that cumulative look is really
16 important, and that information is pretty scary, though.
17 And, you know, just the existing waste at Hanford,
18 Plutonium contamination entering the river will grow to
19 over 300 times the drinking water standards just with the
20 existing wastes that are there, before you even look at
21 additional waste.

22 So that to me is a real concern. We -- we know
23 based on this EIS about the huge health and environmental
24 risks that are going to come in the future, if not now,
25 entering the Columbia River just from the current waste



DEPONENT

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

1 that we have, and that's why I feel like adding more waste
2 to Hanford is just -- it shouldn't even be an option, and
3 that's another comment.

4 It didn't seem like that was even an option in the
5 EIS, just to consider not bringing it. The option was "Do
6 you want it here or do you want it here?" Well, I'd like
7 it not to come at all and I'd like that moratorium to be a
8 permanent moratorium on bringing more waste to Hanford.

9 So in 2004, I think other people have mentioned here
10 tonight already, that Washington State voters
11 overwhelmingly said no to adding more waste to Hanford
12 until we cleaned up what we had there. And I still feel
13 like this EIS doesn't, to me, adequately address the tank
14 waste.

15 We know we can only vitrify or turn into glass half
16 the waste in those tanks. We still have to do something
17 with the other half of that waste. And I know the
18 Department of Energy says they will continue to look at a
19 preferred alternative for that, but I would like to see
20 that addressed in this EIS.

21 I think a lot of people have already touched on the
22 transportation issues. I feel like it's really hard to
23 comment when this EIS didn't include looking at I-90 as a
24 route and what the risk would be to folks along I-90 and
25 in Spokane and the whole Spokane Valley area.



1 And so it's really hard to comment when that
2 information wasn't even in the EIS. I don't believe that
3 just looking at kind of, you know, certain suggested
4 routes is adequate. So I think we need to make sure that
5 that is done and that we can have another chance to
6 comment on that.

7 So, again, for the closure, I would advocate for as
8 much clean closure as possible, removing as much as we can
9 of the waste, cleaning up the waste and the leaks.

10 It just seems like a waste of our taxpayer money to
11 be spending billions of dollars cleaning up all this waste
12 and then leaving it in the ground to then just
13 recontaminate the groundwater that we hopefully have been
14 cleaning up over the next ten years.

15 So it just doesn't make a lot of sense to me to
16 leave it in there and then recontaminate it, all the time
17 and energy we've put into cleaning up everything along the
18 river.

19 And just a couple of other things. The -- I thought
20 that Mr. Houff here had a really good question earlier
21 that didn't get on the record about just long-term
22 monitoring of this site.

23 If in 50 years the Department of Energy is no longer
24 -- you know, 50 years after the site is closed, no one is
25 there watching or telling people "Don't go here. Don't



1 drink the water here." That's a huge concern.

2 So we need to have a better sense of how that site
3 is going to be monitored in the long term for future
4 generations.

5 Thank you.

6 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Buell
7 Hollister, and after Buell will be Bill Houff.

8 MR. HOLLISTER: Well, thanks for the
9 chance to speak.

10 In reflecting on the history of this whole scenario,
11 it's been 65 years since they started putting all that
12 contaminated waste in the Hanford -- at the Hanford site,
13 and here we're talking about vitrification in another 12
14 years.

15 It seems to me like this is a project that's turned
16 into a cash cow for a lot of interested contractors and
17 communities that have a lot at stake here.

18 The initial estimate was 50 billion dollars. I must
19 confess, I don't know, but I do know that the multiple
20 contractors got generous cost overruns in there. So I
21 have no idea what the ultimate cost, if there is an
22 ultimate cost, if this thing ever comes to a conclusion.

23 I -- of course I don't want to repeat a lot of
24 things that have been said, but I think highway
25 transportation should be prohibited. I think we've got to



1 assure a measure of safety.

2 These vehicles are emitting radioactive, you know,
3 releases, and I understand there's no security there for,
4 you know, minimizing the release, no lead shielding within
5 those tanks. So I think that there shouldn't be any
6 highway, any highway transportation.

7 I'm going to end my comments now, but I just want to
8 recognize Bill Houff, who will be speaking next. Bill
9 started Hanford Education Action League way back with a
10 sermon at the Unitarian Church, and I applaud Bill for all
11 he's done in this effort.

12 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Bill
13 Houff, and after Bill Houff will be Steve Corker.

14 MR. HOUFF: Thank you, Buell.

15 My sentiments and concerns have already been well
16 expressed in the excellent statements that have been made.
17 Let's get on with the meeting.

18 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Okay. Thank you.
19 Steve Corker, and after Steve will be Jamison.

20 MR. CORKER: Thank you very much.

21 And I'm coming here tonight really with three hats
22 on. First, as a city council member representing a city
23 of 205,000, a majority of citizens who aren't comfortable
24 in testifying in events like this. Many of them who
25 really don't fully understand the impact.



1 But part of our responsibility as elected officials
2 is to serve our community, and probably more importantly
3 to serve future generations.

4 The second hat I'm wearing is the president of
5 Radiochemical Health Effects Archives, a foundation that
6 just completed a study funded by Resolve that looked into
7 potential effects and impacts of the Hanford facility on
8 the 32,000 young people under the age of 5 who were
9 exposed during that period of 1945, '44 and '46 with an
10 unbelievable amount of toxic materials that I think have
11 been impacted.

12 And, third, I was one of those 32,000 young people
13 under the age of 5 in Walla Walla. And in that study and
14 my life I've seen the impact or the potential impact of
15 what that radiation has caused on a number of citizens.

16 This state has done its share in terms of dealing
17 with all the responsibilities and impact of the facility
18 at Hanford. We've paid our dues, and I think this area,
19 this region, is entitled to have an attitude on the part
20 of our federal government that removes the impact of this
21 activity and that facility on our lives. I think we've
22 earned it.

23 I'm concerned about the transport, both rail and
24 truck. I'm more concerned about the impact on the
25 Columbia River long term as a vital waterway, something



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

1 critically important for the livelihood of this
2 neighborhood.

3 I would urge you to remove an unlimited amount,
4 coming close to perfection as possible, from that site.
5 And to our representative from the State of Washington, I
6 urge that the full authority of the Governor and your
7 department represent the interests of our citizens in
8 whatever decisions or actions evolve out of this study and
9 of the site in the future.

10 Again, I appreciate the fact that you've come here.
11 I think we would have had three more council members
12 participating if we didn't create that quorum that we all
13 seem to be concerned about. But I do appreciate the
14 opportunity to be a part of tonight's facilities.

15 Thank you.

16 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.
17 Jamison, and after Jamison will be Bart Haggin.

18 MR. SHAMARA: Shalom, everybody. It's
19 kind of like saying hi, and more.

20 I first of all want to thank everybody that showed
21 up. I'm an SCC student. My name is Jamison Shamara. We
22 currently had a guest speaker come to SCC and he talked
23 about them bringing waste to -- through Spokane and
24 bringing it into Washington.

25 And I feel really humbled because, like most of you,



1 I haven't been alive over 23 years yet. I don't know too
2 much about the topics we've been talking about, but I
3 don't know what kind of law they use here downtown but I
4 know the difference between right and wrong.

5 I'm not the wisest person, but when I look at an
6 apple, I can look at an apple and I can say, "That's a
7 good apple; it looks yummy to eat. You know, it's got a
8 worm in it, maybe I shouldn't eat that." I'm not going to
9 eat it, hopefully.

10 But I realize that we do live in times where we have
11 a lot of the waste coming in, we have a lot of these
12 things happening, so I'm very, very thankful that we have
13 the DOE here and I'm very grateful for all the hard work
14 they do in bringing us drinks, the cookies, and everything
15 involved.

16 However, listening to everything tonight and
17 listening to the guest speaker, I feel -- I feel very much
18 that it is absolutely not wisdom to bring the nuclear
19 waste through here. It's absolutely not wisdom to bring
20 the nuclear waste and drop it off where there's already 53
21 million gallons of it. And I think, personally, that
22 strikes me as common sense.

23 I look at -- I look at the statistics. I listen to
24 the speakers, and it was obvious that they also knew much
25 more than I did about the topics; however, I feel that



1 it's common sense that if we already have all these issues
2 at hand, we should not settle with our health, we should
3 not settle with our lives, with our children, and with the
4 people that we love, that we should do our best.

5 There may be a lot of contributing factors the DOE
6 has that they can't -- you know, there's certain things
7 that even if it were in their power and control, which it
8 is now, that it may go out of their control. Maybe, maybe
9 not.

10 But I'm saying personally from what I understand
11 now, I'm going to have to definitely say don't bring them
12 trucks through here, don't bring them trains through here,
13 don't drop that garbage off here. Do something with that
14 garbage, if you will.

15 Thank you.

16 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Okay. Thank you.
17 Let's see. Bart Haggin, and after Bart will be Lindell
18 Haggin, I think. Is that right?

19 MR. HAGGIN: That's right.

20 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Yes, sir.

21 MR. HAGGIN: Well, I'm just here to
22 really express our complete outrage. I think it's pretty
23 obvious what's happened over the years, and I want to call
24 you into account for that.

25 I mean, the reality is that for over 60 years you've



1 done a lousy job at Hanford, and you know it. And the
2 idea here is right now that we know that we have no trust
3 in you. We don't believe you. We can't trust you because
4 of the track record that you've done over the years.

5 We've always had to sue you in order to get any kind
6 of a decent resolution of our concerns about Hanford, and
7 you overruled the will of the people of the State of
8 Washington to come in here and do the lousy job that
9 you've got looking at us here tonight.

10 I call your attention, for example, to the fact that
11 you're going to deal with unlined -- unlined reservoirs
12 for this material. Why, it's been 20, 30 years since
13 municipalities have had to line all of their areas for
14 disposal.

15 I mean, how do you get away with that? You know, we
16 have -- we have no trust.

17 And you're going to leave this all to us for
18 thousands of years, not just a couple thousand of years.
19 The half-life of some of this stuff is 10,000 years and
20 you're reluctant to tear into this and get rid of it, take
21 care of it and ensure it doesn't get into the drinking
22 water, into the Columbia River, into the -- you know, a
23 great fishery.

24 I mean, how do you -- what kind of conscience do you
25 have for something like that? I can't believe it.



1 The trucks kill. People drive past them and the
2 radiation from them can affect them as they pass the
3 trucks on the road. You know that. And you know that
4 you're going to expect a number of people to die from
5 trucking that material just because of their exposure to
6 the radiation.

7 And let's not talk about vitrification. You're
8 talking about eight years? Come on, you've been at this
9 vitrification thing for years and years and years. The
10 mis-management at Hanford is legion. The incredible
11 mis-management there has resulted in the problems with
12 vitrification being bungled and destroyed for years and
13 years and years.

14 And you expect us to believe that in eight years now
15 it's going to be okay and then you're going to underfund
16 the eight years because it's not going to be adequate to
17 take care of the job that you have for it for 100 years.

18 It's just laughable. I really can't believe that
19 you're here to give us a half-baked, incomplete kind of a
20 program for this kind of thing. I mean, I just -- I don't
21 see how you have the testicular fortitude to show up.

22 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.
23 Lindell and then Kate Johnston after that.

24 MS. HAGGIN: Well, I moved here in
25 1970. We were talking about cleaning up the waste then.



1 It's 40 years later. I've got a grandchild now. It's
2 going to be before his grandchildren are around before we
3 get this cleaned up. It's not acceptable.

4 We need to have 99.9 percent cleanup. We need a
5 second vitrification plant. Capping is not sufficient and
6 we cannot accept any future waste.

7 It seems that it's alright to bring waste to Hanford
8 but there was a comment made it's too dangerous to take
9 waste away from Hanford, and I'm wondering what the
10 difference is between bringing waste to Hanford and taking
11 waste away from Hanford.

12 And we need to make sure that we take care of the
13 water table, the Columbia River, a vital part of our
14 Northwest economy and livelihood. And it's just criminal
15 that things are continuing to go on 40, 60, 80 years
16 later.

17 Thank you.

18 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Kate
19 Johnston and after Kate will be Lauri Costello.

20 MS. JOHNSTON: Hi. I'm a student at
21 Eastern Washington University, despite my WSU sweatshirt.
22 And I'm studying to be a teacher right now. I'm student
23 teaching on the north side of Spokane, and I've lived here
24 all my life.

25 And I'm not good at speaking in front of a lot of



1 people, so I'll just continue. Make sure you know that.

2 So as a future teacher, I really care about the
3 future of our community and our people in our community
4 and our country, for that matter, and I know that we face
5 a serious energy crisis and I know that deciding how to
6 provide that energy for our country is not an easy
7 decision, so I realize that you guys don't have an easy
8 job.

9 But I trust that you have some sense in terms of how
10 to keep people safe in communities and keep the
11 environment safe for those people in communities.

12 And we're dealing with radioactive waste. I think
13 it's got a half-life of 500 years? More than 500 years?
14 More? I just heard it tonight. That's a long time.
15 That's very -- that's not good for the environment,
16 anyway. I don't know what to say about that.

17 So it's not uncommon for me to meet students from
18 the Tri-Cities who they're quick to describe themselves as
19 glowing, and they have family members with what I've heard
20 are a lot higher rates of cancer and various other health
21 problems, and that's a serious issue. And this would only
22 make it worse if we don't clean it -- clean the tanks more
23 than 99 percent.

24 I also go to school with members of the Wanapum
25 Nation of Native Americans from whom I've heard that the



1 United States government is borrowing the Hanford land
2 from, technically. Don't quote me on that, but I did hear
3 that from a Wanapum Nation member.

4 And I know that the glowing students from the
5 Tri-Cities don't want the future Tri-Cities citizens to
6 glow more than they already do, and I know that the
7 Wanapum Nation still wants the use of its land back at
8 some point and want it to be productive and healthy land.

9 And I know that as a teacher it's my responsibility
10 to teach our kids about the world they're growing up in,
11 and I urge you to simply prepare adequately.

12 So I guess by doing that, clean the tanks more than
13 99 percent. 99 percent point 9, at least. Alternative 3,
14 I think it was, is the disassembly and removal of the
15 tanks. That's looking good. I imagine there's more
16 alternatives.

17 I think the word "preferred alternative" is just
18 weird. It's just, like, obnoxious. I'll just throw that
19 in there. And a permanent moratorium would be good.

20 And, please, I urge you to continue to let us know
21 and articulate it explicitly at something like below a
22 college level. I haven't read all the documents but I
23 imagine that like a lot of the citizens, the adults in
24 Spokane with grade school level reading levels, may not be
25 able to get through documents like that.



1 Please explicitly communicate what you're doing at
2 an understandable level, and clean it up.

3 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Okay. Thank you.
4 Now we have Lauri Costello and after Lauri Costello will
5 be Bob Barry.

6 MS. COSTELLO: Hi. Lauri Costello.
7 I'm a family physician here in Spokane and admit my
8 ignorance about a lot of this.

9 I was at the hearings and the discussion years ago
10 before Initiative 297 and thought when we overwhelmingly
11 passed that things were over, and then got an e-mail
12 yesterday saying this hearing was happening.

13 And so I appreciate all the previous speakers and
14 all the science and all the knowledge about everything to
15 do with waste and half-lives and all that, but my concern
16 is more for prevention of problems.

17 And it seems really clear to me that we could
18 prevent a lot of problems by bringing in not only no more
19 waste, but taking out the waste that is already there.

20 So when we've overwhelmingly spoken that we don't
21 want further waste at Hanford, I would take that to say
22 it's not because Hanford is in our backyard and it's not
23 the "not in my backyard" argument. It's the "not in
24 America," it's the "not in the world" argument.

25 So I would urge the DOE to be talking about why we



1 are continuing to produce waste that we can't get rid of
2 at the cost of lives. Not just human life, but all of the
3 life along the Columbia River and anywhere that's exposed
4 to radioactivity is threatened.

5 And I feel like everyone in this room gets it. I
6 mean, you don't want to be exposed to radioactive waste.
7 You don't want it in your backyard, literally at your
8 house. You don't want your friends and loved ones exposed
9 to it. So why does it feel like we come here as a group
10 of concerned citizens, educated, concerned citizens, who
11 can't understand 1,000 pages of rhetoric.

12 And somebody asked for a one-sentence statement. I
13 understand that you may not be able to condense it to one
14 sentence, but ten pages of scientific words, shall we say,
15 is not acceptable for us as concerned citizens to
16 understand what's going on. I get the distinct sense that
17 you don't want us to understand it because we wouldn't
18 agree with it.

19 So I get the concept of us as concerned citizens
20 debating with the Department of Energy, but I don't get
21 that the Department of Ecology doesn't seem to be coming
22 from our point of view, either.

23 I really appreciate you doing these hearings in
24 Spokane. As I said, I thought it was a done deal and here
25 it is back, so thank you for coming here to listen to our



1 comments.

2 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Bob
3 Barry and after --

4 MR. BATTY: It's Bob Batty, B-A-T-T-Y.
5 My R's look like T's.

6 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Yes. That's
7 okay. And Angela let's see, Mageras, after that, I think.

8 MR. BATTY: My name is Bob Batty. I'm
9 the immediate past president of the Washington Chapter of
10 Republicans for Environmental Protection.

11 This thing I have in my hand is the EIS summary. I
12 spent probably 20 hours on it developing a statement for
13 our group. I will be submitting a written comments
14 letter. I've got to draft that Saturday, and I'm not
15 looking forward to it.

16 And I appreciate you coming to Spokane to give me
17 new insight. I can't say anything that hasn't been said
18 already, but maybe just from a little bit different angle.

19 Our letter is probably going to support Alternative
20 6-B, and it goes along, it has some of the things I talked
21 about and commented on. But one of them I was a little
22 weak on.

23 But I was wondering -- our position is we do not
24 think any more waste should be shipped into Hanford or the
25 State of Washington until the cleanup is in fact complete.



1 And I thought that was just my own little hang-up,
2 and it's primarily because I don't think you can focus on
3 your huge job and deal with other waste. But when I hear
4 all these people saying the exact same thing from 57
5 different angles, I don't think I need any more support.

6 Your job would be so much easier at the DOE and
7 Ecology if you just gave up on that. You keep harping on
8 shipping waste in from other places. We have plenty of
9 waste.

10 I'd also like to say that Ecology's positions are
11 very similar to ours and I commend you for that. I think
12 you were a little guarded today, but we could have gotten
13 onboard on it.

14 I could have gotten onboard with a couple of your
15 other preferred alternatives, except for this outside
16 waste thing. If you'd lighten up on that and just get rid
17 of it, I think you'd have a lot more community support and
18 a lot more State support.

19 Thanks for coming.

20 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.
21 Angela, and after Angela will be Mike Nuess.

22 MS. MAGERAS: Hello. Well, I'm not
23 really sure what to say. I don't really know anything
24 about Hanford or what its intention was before coming here
25 tonight. I just wanted to say to everybody else, good job



1 at explaining what I wanted to say. So that's really
2 great.

3 I definitely don't support Hanford importing more
4 waste. I would like to see everything cleaned up that's
5 able to be cleaned up, because we need to look out for the
6 future. And we can't -- even if to bury it underground,
7 we can't just bury it and forget about it because that's
8 going to come to the surface one day.

9 And we need to invest in ways that aren't creating
10 waste that we can't get rid of, like you said. And I
11 appreciate you coming here today, and it's really great to
12 get my voice out there, as well.

13 And I think that we're battling a larger issue here,
14 especially of special interest, and I think that's why
15 this keeps coming up and why you keep suggesting that we
16 keep importing more waste, is, you know, because the
17 people's voice doesn't matter as much as the people who
18 have money. But hopeful that's changing and hopefully our
19 voice is mattering now.

20 That's everything. Thank you.

21 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Mike,
22 and after Mike will be Brian Burke.

23 MR. NUSS: Hi. I'm Mike Nuss, and
24 although I live downwind and near I-90, I don't feel that
25 this is a "in my backyard" issue. It's a "not in my



1 planet" issue.

2 The science is incontrovertibly clear that, you
3 know, the dis-associative nuclear forces of the
4 transuranics simply tear asunder the more -- the more
5 weaker but more sophisticated and complex electronic bond
6 between atoms that build the entire biosphere and all our
7 bodies and everything that's alive on the thin film around
8 our planet.

9 And the universe was wise in putting the Earth's
10 nuclear furnace 93 million miles away. And perhaps the
11 greatest scientist of the 20th Century -- his peers called
12 him the Michelangelo of our times. You know, one of those
13 guys with dozens of Ph.D.'s, honorary Ph.D.'s and patents
14 and books.

15 But he also predicted the atom's structure before
16 the electron microscope proved him right, and he also
17 discovered what might be nature's own mathematics, because
18 there are no irrational numbers for the physical
19 constants. So he's no dummy.

20 And he had something to say about nuclear waste. He
21 said that one day humanity will recognize that we have to
22 rocket the waste back to the sun where they belong. So
23 there it is. That's how you get rid of nuclear waste.

24 And that is a very difficult thing for humanity to
25 try to think about doing. Hugely difficult. So then why



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

1 do we keep making more? We must stop making more. He
2 said this in the middle of the last century.

3 Yeah, we need to take care of it, the mess we have,
4 store it leak-proof, monitor it, retrieve and move it as
5 necessary for thousands of years to preserve biological
6 life, and you want to go and throw some concrete caps over
7 it and walk away.

8 And trucking waste from new nuclear weapons
9 production and new nuclear power plants, what for? Why do
10 you want to do this? Do we need energy that bad?

11 Again, the science is incontrovertibly clear, there
12 is as much energy yielded from a single pound of silicone
13 deployed in the useful life of a solar electric panel as
14 there is in a pound of uranium consumed in a nuclear
15 plant. But there's 5,000 times more silicone in the
16 Earth's crust than there is uranium, and the renewables
17 family of solar electric, wind and geothermal are
18 engineeringly proven that they can expand cleanly, safely,
19 to a capacity that resiliently meets all human energy
20 needs.

21 Another of the greatest scientific minds, acclaimed
22 by his peers as the Einstein of linguistics, another one
23 of those guys with lots of Ph.D.'s and books, recently
24 outlined three urgent threats to the survival of the human
25 species that nearly all of us, Republican, Democrat, of



DEPONENT

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

1 any political or social persuasion, could agree upon.

2 Those three are nuclear war is imminent and more
3 dangerous than ever before, environmental devastation from
4 not just carbon sources but from nuclear sources, and the
5 democratic deficit of the government of this country that
6 doesn't listen to the polls when most of us say we do want
7 the clean, renewable energies, that most of us say we
8 don't want nuclear power, when we vote to say no more
9 waste at Hanford, get all the waste cleaned up first, we
10 want complete and comprehensive cleanup.

11 There is a huge deficit between what we want and
12 what our government tells you to do and does to us. And
13 those are the three greatest threats that I think most of
14 us would agree on.

15 Sophisticated polling tells us we're willing to
16 listen. The majority says no nukes, clean up the waste,
17 advance renewables, give us comprehensive healthcare, et
18 cetera, et cetera.

19 So why? What's left to explain why the cleanup is
20 so underfunded and mis-managed? Why is there a collective
21 sense we picked up in this room tonight of conflict
22 between us and those charged with the responsibility for
23 cleaning it up?

24 Rather than all of us sort of rowing together, we're
25 in this conflict. New waste and new weapons still come.



1 So who benefits? Why? What for? Who sends you out to
2 test the litmus of our resistance to bottling the nuclear
3 genie -- of our desire to bottling the nuclear genie.

4 We already voted on this and here you come again to
5 run us down. Could it be Greenwich, Connecticut, wants
6 you to run us down? Hmmm. Nuclear energy and weapons are
7 a cash cow for those who are too big to fail.

8 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Brian
9 Burke. Brian Burke? No? Okay.

10 At this time, that's the end of our list so we would
11 like to ask the people who have not commented yet who
12 would like to. Is there someone who would like to provide
13 comments who has not spoken yet?

14 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I would like to just
15 make one observation.

16 You have our young people in tears. That's our
17 future. You have our old people so frustrated they're
18 probably on hypertensive medication.

19 What more do you need? Okay? We don't want it
20 here. I'm grateful that you came. Honestly, I am. But,
21 you know what, when I see my young people -- I'm the
22 mother of somebody 30-something. Now, okay?

23 And they stand here, they're smarter than a whip.
24 They can multitask like you wouldn't believe. You know
25 what, they're in tears. People, our future is in tears.



DEPONET

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

1 What more do you need?

2 That's all I've got to say.

3 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.

4 Anyone else who would like to provide a comment? Yes,
5 ma'am. Go ahead.

6 MS. WIREMAN: I just wanted to let you
7 know --

8 FACILITATOR PARHAM: If you could go
9 to the microphone. Yeah. Please.

10 MS. WIREMAN: I'm Ginger Wireman. I'm
11 with the Washington State Department of Ecology. And we
12 do have -- I'm sorry it's not on a nice, printed table,
13 but I put on the back table some paper if you want to be
14 on the Hanford listserv for any Hanford comment period or
15 any Hanford related activity.

16 And also, I have my business card back there. If
17 any of you are with Rotary or something, we do try to do
18 public outreach if we can, realizing, of course, that
19 we've got the budget crisis and travel is kind of limited.
20 But if we could get a couple of presentations on one day,
21 we might be able to come back, especially like classrooms,
22 so.

23 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Okay. Thank you.
24 Yes? Additional comment, ma'am?

25 MS. BISIAR: I really appreciate you



1 being here tonight, I think way more than you realize.
2 And I think all of us in this room really do appreciate
3 you being here tonight and taking our comments.

4 I have a request. I spent a good share of this
5 weekend trying to get the word out about this public
6 hearing because I just got a little wind in the wisp that
7 told me it was coming and I saw it nowhere else.

8 And if it's a public hearing, the people need to
9 know it's coming. And I spent really a good share of the
10 weekend, and I think it was because of my work and my
11 husband's work this weekend that the majority of you
12 people are here. Thank you.

13 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.

14 MS. BISIAR: I just want you to find a
15 way to get it on the airwaves, to get it on TV, to get it
16 out that there is a public hearing coming and give us time
17 to get the public to come to these, because the weekend
18 before you just don't have the time.

19 People already have something else lined up and you
20 just don't have the time. I think we could have more than
21 filled this room.

22 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Okay. Thank you.
23 Any additional comments from people who have not commented
24 yet? Is there anyone yet? Yes, sir.

25 MR. POLLET: I want to thank all the



1 people who made phone calls, Rosemarie, Chuck, and all of
2 you who did to get people here.

3 I would like to ask: How many of you came to the
4 hearing on the last impact statement that the Energy
5 Department did in 2003 about Hanford being national waste
6 dump?

7 And keep your hand up for a moment if you -- now,
8 how many of you -- put your hand down if you did not
9 receive a new notice for this hearing. How many of you
10 received a notice from the Energy Department for this
11 hearing tonight?

12 We were promised, Mary Beth, from the Energy
13 Department, that the people who were on the list who
14 testified at these hearings 2003, 2002/2003 on your prior
15 failed draft EIS would be on the list and receive notice
16 of these hearings from the Energy Department.

17 Either the notice was so ineffective that people
18 threw it out because it was lousy or that promise was not
19 met that these people were going to get notice.

20 We need to redo this EIS and we need to do it with
21 proper notice that is effective that says what the impacts
22 of the decisions are right upfront and is mailed to the
23 hundreds -- excuse me, thousands of people commented on
24 the last EIS, and they were denied notice from the Energy
25 Department of this EIS, which is a redo of the past one.



1 And this is a very serious failing of the Energy
2 Department. You have not met the spirit of the open
3 government initiative of the president. You have not met
4 the spirit of the Hanford management that said that we
5 would make every effort to contact all the people who came
6 to the hearings last time around, and we're very
7 disappointed in that.

8 I want to also, for the record, clarify what I was
9 saying at the end of my testimony previously.

10 I had a slide up that showed the Energy Department's
11 analysis for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, which
12 was their plan to take high-level nuclear waste, spent
13 fuel from reactors, ship it to one of several locations
14 for reprocessing, melting it down in acid. Making more
15 liquid high-level nuclear waste is the dream of the
16 nuclear renaissance for some people.

17 And the EIS said if Hanford was used the
18 announcement was 816 fatal cancers along the truck route.
19 That is from the radiation emitted from the shipping casks
20 for spent nuclear fuel.

21 This proposal in front of us tonight in this
22 Environmental Impact Statement leaves out the most
23 radioactive waste that the Energy Department is looking at
24 shipping to Hanford, called greater-than-Class-C waste.
25 And you should be allowed to see what the impacts are of



DEPONENT

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

1 that.

2 They are as hot as those other shipments, is what I
3 was trying to explain. Not that high-level nuclear waste
4 fuel rods would come, but shipments just as hot would come
5 with similar radiation levels.

6 But even without the greater-than-Class-C waste, the
7 details in the appendices somewhere around page 5,000 of
8 the EIS when you get that far deep into it, show that the
9 Energy Department expects to ship what is called
10 remote-handled waste to Hanford, within 82,000 cubic
11 meters of waste that is proposed to be shipped to Hanford.

12 "Remote handled" means that it is so radioactive
13 that it cannot be handled by people, it needs to be
14 handled by machinery. It is all presumed to be mixed
15 radioactive chemical waste under DOE's analyses because it
16 is so radioactive that they can not analyze its chemical
17 composition, so it has to be presumed to be mixed with
18 hazardous chemical waste, and it is proposed to be shipped
19 to Hanford.

20 I've heard state officials say that they didn't
21 think it was the same, those high-level radioactive waste
22 shipments, nothing would be shipped to Hanford. That's
23 not bags and slightly contaminated stuff. That is not so.
24 Look at Appendix D and you'll see.

25 And finally what you see in Appendix D of the EIS is



1 this: The Energy Department is proposing to use Hanford
2 as a national radioactive waste dump not to help clean up
3 other contaminated sites somewhere around the country.
4 That's a myth they've put out there.

5 It is newly-generated waste that will be coming to
6 Hanford, waste from its nuclear weapons plants and its
7 nuclear energy programs, and it is not, oh, you should
8 help clean up some other site that is -- what's in their
9 soil. It is newly-generated waste that would be coming to
10 Hanford.

11 Very little of it therefore -- very little is known,
12 therefore, about its chemical composition. We don't know
13 exactly what the radionuclide composition is. But the
14 estimates are that it does include the remote-handled
15 waste, which is extremely radioactive.

16 And it should not -- and Washington State needs to
17 say you cannot allow any of these wastes to go into a
18 burial ground at Hanford because the state law requires
19 that you have a dangerous waste permit that specifies what
20 type of activity and what type of chemical components are
21 going in.

22 The Energy Department's EIS in Appendix D admits
23 that they don't know it because what they want to do is
24 use Hanford for 25 years or more of newly-generated waste.
25 What is the right alternative here? The right



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

1 alternative, folks, is don't create it.

2 And the law says you have to look at reducing your
3 wastes, and you failed to do that, once again. Not
4 surprising. It is the Energy Department. It never looks
5 at reducing its waste generation. Thank you.

6 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.

7 MR. HAGGIN: I'd just like to add that
8 the history of Hanford is just a tragic history and
9 tremendous corruption and people that have been arrested
10 for malfeasance and so forth there. And, you know, it
11 really comes down to the fact that Hanford, for years and
12 years, has really been a crime scene.

13 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. If
14 there's no -- an additional comment? Yes, sir?

15 MR. FISK: This may be more of a
16 question than a comment, but I'm one of the ones that
17 raised their hands.

18 I think I was here in 2003 or 2004 statements and I
19 remember a statement by a British corporation, -- "Ah, we
20 have this thing all solved. We can vitrify this and it's
21 all going to be accomplished real quick."

22 And I guess my question or my comment is: What
23 under the sun makes you people think that the
24 vitrification is going to work? Has the technology really
25 improved that much over four years where absolutely



1 nothing that I can see that's really foolproof has
2 happened?

3 And I really doubt -- as Bart Haggin says, I don't
4 think you've given us much cause for trust. Thank you.

5 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Okay. Thank you
6 for that comment. Sir, your name, again?

7 MR. FISK: Oh, I'm Charles Fisk.

8 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Charles Fisk.
9 Thanks. Okay.

10 Anyone else with additional comments?

11 If not, on behalf of the Department of Energy and
12 Washington State, thank you for coming out. Its been a
13 great evening and a great city. Thank you very much.

14

15

(9:24 p.m.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



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

1 STATE OF WASHINGTON)
) ss.
 2 County of Spokane)
 3
 4

5 I, Amy J. Brown, do hereby certify that at the time
 6 and place heretofore mentioned in the caption of the
 7 above-entitled matter, I was a Certified Shorthand
 8 Reporter and Notary Public for Washington and Idaho; that
 9 at said time and place I reported in stenotype all
 10 testimony adduced and proceedings had in the foregoing
 11 matter; that thereafter my notes were reduced to
 12 typewriting and that the foregoing transcript consisting
 13 of 56 typewritten pages is a true and correct transcript
 14 of all such testimony adduced and proceedings had and of
 15 the whole thereof.

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

19 Witness my hand at Spokane, Washington, on this
 20 _____ day of _____, 2010.

21 *Amy J. Brown*
 22 _____

23 Amy J. Brown, RPR
 24 WA CCR NO. 2133, ID CCR NO. 700
 25 Certified Court Reporter
 Notary Public for Washington
 My commission expires: 3-29-11



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