

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

February 10, 2010

6:00 p.m.

Doubletree Hotel  
1000 N.E. Multnomah Street  
Portland, Oregon

Mr. James Parham, Facilitator

PANEL MEMBERS:

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

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



Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponent.com](http://www.deponent.com)

		Page	Line
1	FORMAL COMMENT SESSION (Cont'd.)		
2			
3	Lynn Ford	46	3
4	Thomas Layne	48	3
5	Melba Dlugonski	51	1
6	Chuck Johnson	54	1
7	Cherie Hostenstein	55	19
8	Dave Bybeey	57	23
9	Thomas Clark	60	10
10	Rochelle	62	15
11	Brett VandenHeuvel	63	24
12	Lang Davison	66	18
13	Fred Nussbaum	67	24
14	Robin Klein	69	11
15	Chris Henry	71	8
16	Christine Charneski	74	12
17	Ross Tewksbury	77	14
18	Joyce Follingstad	80	3
19	Laura Feldman	82	19
20	James Brunkow	84	16
21	Dorothy Land	85	6
22	Nancy Johnson	87	6
23	Lisa Van Dyk	88	1
24	Norm Santana	88	24
25	Lori Meserve	89	15



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

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

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION (Cont'd.)

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

\* \* \*



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

## 1 FORMAL COMMENT SESSION

2  
3 MR. PARHAM: I think we're going to go ahead  
4 and move to the comments. We have a lot of  
5 people -- right now, looks about 50 -- who want to  
6 comment. And I would like to start with the  
7 elected officials.

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

## 11 COMMENTS BY MARY GAUTREAUX:

12  
13 Thank you. And, Mary Beth, thank you very  
14 much for coming to Portland, to Oregon.

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

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

**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

14  
15 COMMENTS BY BRENT FOSTER:

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

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

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)



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

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

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

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

21           Thank you.

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

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



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

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

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

16  
17 COMMENTS BY JIM McNAUGHTON:

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

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



**DEPONENT**

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

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

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

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

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

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

10 MS. BURANDT: There was a court settlement in  
11 2006. And part of that court settlement said that  
12 there would be a moratorium against DOE receiving  
13 waste from other -- from Hanford receiving waste  
14 from other DOE sites until the Tank Closure and  
15 Waste Management EIS was final. What DOE has  
16 agreed to is extend that moratorium to the year  
17 2022 or when the waste treatment plant is  
18 operational.

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

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

22 MR. PARHAM: The material is in the room.

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



**DEPONET**

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

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

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

5 MR. McNAUGHTON: Thank you very much.

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

8

9 COMMENTS BY COLM BRENNAN:

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

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

19 And that's my comment. Thank you.

20 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Paul Libby.

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

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

25



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

COMMENTS BY PAUL LIBBY:

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

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

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

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



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

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

14 MR. PARHAM: Thank you, Paul.

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

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

19

20 COMMENTS BY GERRY POLLET:

21 I'm Gerry Pollet with Heart of America  
22 Northwest.

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



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

1 to them for nearly 30 years.

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

8 Let's roll the slides. Thanks.

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

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

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



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

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

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

25 Next slide, please. The voters told



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)



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

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

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

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

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

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

10  
11 COMMENTS BY JAN CASTLE:

12 Gerry, you're a tough act to follow.

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

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

1 citizen guides. And just a procedural thing here:  
2 I would ask that when you start the procedure for  
3 scheduling hearings next time, that you start with  
4 Heart of America Northwest in trying to set the  
5 appropriate dates so that they have the prescribed  
6 45 days in order to produce these guides.

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

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

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



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

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

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

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



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

9 Thank you.

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

12  
13 COMMENTS BY GLORIA BLACK:

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

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



**DEPONENT**

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

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

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

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

25 Thank you.



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

3 MR. BERTISH: Dvija.

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

6

7

COMMENTS BY DVIJA BERTISH:

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

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



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

3 The Fast Flux reactor needs to be removed  
4 100 percent, not just entombed. In terms of the  
5 tank closure, I agree with several of the speakers  
6 that we need to remove all of it and remove the  
7 shell casings from the ground as well, leave no  
8 residue. And that means digging up the soil and  
9 trying to remediate out of the groundwater as well.

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

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

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



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

3 Thank you.

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

6

7 COMMENTS BY MADYA PANFILIO:

8 My name is Madya Panfilio.

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

1 percent cleanup.

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

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

8

9 COMMENTS BY LOUISA HAMACHEK:

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

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

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



**DEPONET**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

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

15  
16 COMMENTS BY BREENA SATTERFIELD:

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

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

12

13 COMMENTS BY SANDY POLISHUK:

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

18 I was diagnosed with breast cancer when I was  
19 46 years old. That's not considered so young  
20 anymore. Women are now being diagnosed in their  
21 thirties, as we contaminate this planet more and  
22 more.

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



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

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

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

20 Thank you.

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

23  
24 COMMENTS BY SHARON LOAIZA:

25 I'm Sharon Loaiza. Why would we even consider



**DEPONENT**

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

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

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

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



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

3 At Hanford, the radioactive build-up within  
4 the reactor was regularly flushed loose and into  
5 the Columbia, along with the water used to cool the  
6 reactive cores. The HEDR -- Hanford Environmental  
7 Dose Reconstruction -- project has estimated the  
8 radiation doses the public may have received from  
9 Hanford from 1944 to 1992. They figure about  
10 2 million people were exposed, either through the  
11 air or the Columbia River or both, as our family  
12 was.

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)



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

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

9

10 COMMENTS BY MAJA MEYER:

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

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

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



**DEPONET**

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

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

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

13 But that experience flashed into my mind again  
14 as I read the documents that were finally released  
15 to the public through the Freedom of Information  
16 Act in 1986. I was stunned to read that the  
17 cancer-causing radiation doses were released from  
18 1944 through the '80s.

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



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

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

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

16  
17 COMMENTS BY DR. RUDI NUSSBAUM:

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

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



**DEPONET**

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

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

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

1 producers. Both of these claims are patently  
2 false.

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

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

25 Thank you.



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

3  
4 COMMENTS BY KELLY CAMPBELL:

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

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

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



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

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

18 Thank you.

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

21

22 COMMENTS BY DAVID DELK:

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)



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

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

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

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



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

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

14 Thank you.

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

17

18 COMMENTS BY PAIGE KNIGHT:

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

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



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

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

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

20 We want tank waste removed from the existing  
21 177 tanks to the greatest degree possible. We want  
22 the tank waste treatment plant to operate as it was  
23 planned, with two high-level waste melters and two  
24 low-activity waste melters. We have wasted enough  
25 time and money on alternatives that are proving to



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

24 Thank you.

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



**DEPONENT**

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

1 after Lynn will be Thomas Layne.

2

3

COMMENTS BY LYNN FORD:

4

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

7

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

12

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

22

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



**DEPONENT**

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

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

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

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

24 Thank you.

25 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. After Thomas Layne



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponent.com](http://www.deponent.com)

1 will be Melba.

2

3

COMMENTS BY THOMAS LAYNE:

4

5

6

7

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

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

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

15

16

17

18

19

20

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

21

22

23

24

25

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



**DEPONENT**

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



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

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

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

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



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

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

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

21          Thank you.

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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 BY MELBA DLUGONSKI:

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

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

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

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

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

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



Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

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

25           So what responsible thing would our government



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

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

22          MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Chuck Johnson. And  
23          after Chuck will be Cherie Hostenstein.

24  
25



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

COMMENTS BY CHUCK JOHNSON:

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

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

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

ATTENDEE: Jobs.

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



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

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

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

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

18  
19 COMMENTS BY CHERIE HOLENSTEIN:

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



**DEPONENT**

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

1           silence, please.

2           Thanks very much.

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

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

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

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





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

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

16 Thank you.

17 MR. PARHAM: Susan Nash.

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

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

22

23 COMMENTS BY DAVE BYBEEY:

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



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

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

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

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

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



**DEPONET**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

6 Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

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

9

10 COMMENTS BY THOMAS CLARK:

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

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



**DEPONET**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

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

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

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

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

13 Rochelle.

14  
15 COMMENTS BY ROCHELLE:

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

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



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

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

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

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

22 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Brett VandenHeuvel.

23

24 COMMENTS BY BRETT VANDENHEUVEL:

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



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

1 Columbia Riverkeeper.

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

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

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

25 This document, this process, this



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)



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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)



1 This is shameful.

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

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

20 Thank you.

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

23

24 COMMENTS BY FRED NUSSBAUM:

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



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

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

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

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

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

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



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

7 Thank you.

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

10  
11 COMMENTS BY ROBIN KLEIN:

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

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



**DEPONENT**

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

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

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

7

8                               COMMENTS BY CHRIS HENRY:

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

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

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



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

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

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

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



**DEPONET**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)



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

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

8 Thank you.

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

11  
12 COMMENTS BY CHRISTINE CHARNESKI:

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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





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

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

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

24           Thank you.

25           MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Joyce Follingstad.



Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

1 After Joyce will be Laura Feldman.

2

3 COMMENTS BY JOYCE FOLLINGSTAD:

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

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

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

21 And it's just a joke that now we have lined  
22 trenches that delay the leaching of those materials  
23 into the ground and into the water for maybe ten,  
24 15, 20 years. So I say drop all these  
25 considerations of the preferred alternatives. We





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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

18  
19 COMMENTS BY LAURA FELDMAN:

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



**DEPONENT**

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

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

12 Thanks.

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

15

16 COMMENTS BY JAMES BRUNKOW:

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

19 It just seems to me that anything less than  
20 cleanup is pretty much nothing to actually  
21 sacrifice. So I don't like the idea much. I don't  
22 think the future generations like it too much,  
23 either. I guess that would be tank closure  
24 100 percent.

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



**DEPONET**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

1 think I can speak any longer.

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

5

6 COMMENTS BY DOROTHY LAND:

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

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

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

25 They're sacrificing us. I've heard that



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

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

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

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

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

20 ATTENDEE: She left.

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

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



**DEPONENT**

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

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

3 Ma'am, did you want to comment?  
4  
5

6 COMMENTS BY NANCY JOHNSON:

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

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

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

19 And that's all I have to say.

20 MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

21 MS. JOHNSON: I'm Nancy Johnson.

22 MR. PARHAM: I believe we've got another  
23 person that would like to comment. Yes, ma'am.  
24  
25



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

COMMENTS BY LISA VAN DYK:

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

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS BY NORM SANTANA:

Hi. My name is Norm Santana. I live in





1 Portland.

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

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

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

14

15 COMMENTS BY LORI MESERVE:

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

18

19 COMMENTS BY HOLLY HOFFMAN:

20 Holly Hoffman, Portland, Oregon.

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



Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

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

20          Thank you.

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

23

24

COMMENTS BY TOM CARPENTER:

25

My Tom is Tom Carpenter. And I'm from



Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponent.com](http://www.deponent.com)

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

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

1 People were talking about iodine 129 that has a  
2 half-life of 15 million years. It's around for  
3 150 million years. These are scales that it's just  
4 hard to get our minds around. And you can't.

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

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

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



**DEPONET**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

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

23 Thank you.

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



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

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

3

4 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY JIM McNAUGHTON:

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

9 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Yes, sir.

10

11 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY CHUCK JOHNSON:

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

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

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



**DEPONET**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)



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

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

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

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

25 Thank you.



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

3

4 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY LOUISA HAMACHEK:

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

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

1 the site.

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

8           MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

9

10           ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY GERRY POLLET:

11           Gerry Pollet.

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

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

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

20 And, Mary Beth, I think you know this.

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



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

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

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

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



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponet.com](http://www.deponet.com)

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

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

14 Thank you.

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

18  
19 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY LORI MESERVE:

20 I've got one more word: Transparency.

21  
22 MR. PARHAM: Okay. If there are no additional  
23 comments at this time, I want to thank you for  
24 being so patient you stayed to this hour. And  
25 thanks to the DOE and the two departments from the



**DEPONENT**

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

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

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

(COMMENTS SESSION CONCLUDED AT 10:22 PM)



**DEPONENT**

Nationwide Scheduling  
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638  
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094  
[www.deponent.com](http://www.deponent.com)



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


C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

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

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

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Deelana Johnson, CSR, RPR  
CSR No. 90-0104



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