

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

March 8, 2010

6:00 p.m.

Seattle Center

305 Harrison Street

Seattle, Washington 98109

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



**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

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

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION

1	Toby Nixon.....	4	19
2	Eva Kosmas.....	6	22
3	Elizabeth Heffron.....	7	8
4	Lisa Van Dyk.....	8	5
5	Lisa Lightner.....	9	7
6	Janice Faris.....	9	25
7	David Ortman.....	11	17
8	Cherie Eichholz.....	14	6
9	Thomas Buchanan.....	16	21
10	Michael Baron.....	20	6
11	Joan Lawson.....	21	21
12	Al Rasmussen.....	22	25
13	Valerie Shubert.....	23	25
14	Bobbie Morgan.....	25	5
15	Adrian Villarreal.....	26	8
16	Robert Stagman.....	28	19
17	Oliver Bazinet.....	30	11
18	Richard Frith.....	31	11
19	Dorli Rainey.....	33	21
20	Richard Ellison.....	34	20



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

				3
1	21	Lane Rasberry.....	38	7
2	22	Casey Howard.....	40	8
3	23	Kate Hellenthal.....	40	24
4	24	Frank Zucher.....	42	1
5	25	Jacinta Heath.....	43	4
6	26	Reed O'Beirne.....	44	21
7	27	Carol Isaac.....	46	20
8	28	Phoebe Warren.....	49	6
9	29	Merry Ann Peterson.....	51	8
10	30	Roxy Giddings.....	51	13
11	31	Ryan Jarvis.....	54	4
12	32	Helga Kahr.....	55	24
13	33	Brian Bessembinders.....	57	24
14	34	Ruth Yarrow.....	60	17
15	35	Barbara Zepeda.....	62	8
16	36	Jim Kelley.....	64	25
17	37	Fred Miller.....	67	6
18	38	Richard Heggen.....	69	9
19	39	Jim Dipeso.....	70	23
20	40	Gerry Pollet.....	71	23
21	41	Lane Rasberry.....	75	8
22	42	Carol Isaac.....	76	11
23				
24				
25				



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

1 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. So we are going to  
2 get started with that, okay. I have said this a  
3 couple of times, three minutes on comments, period.

4 This is a -- you have heard a lot of people  
5 up here talk, now it is time for you to talk. Our  
6 first person to speak is someone who has already been  
7 up and that is Gerry Pollet from Heart of America  
8 Northwest.

9 Gerry, do you want to make any additional  
10 comments?

11 MS. POLLET: I prefer someone else and I will  
12 come back.

13 MR. PARHAM: He will come back.

14 Richard Heggen, any additional comments at  
15 this time?

16 MR. HEGGEN: Not at this time.

17 MR. PARHAM: Okay, thank you.

18 Next, Toby Nixon.

19 MR. NIXON: I am Toby Nixon from Kirkland,  
20 Washington, former state representative for the 45th  
21 Legislative District of Washington, member of the  
22 board of directors of Heart of America Northwest, and  
23 former board member for Republicans for Environmental  
24 Protection.

25 We just saw the results of a magnitude



**DEPONENT**

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

1           8.8 earthquake in Chile. It was quite impressive and  
2           we just learned in the newspaper today that the city  
3           of Concepcion actually moved ten feet west, so we can  
4           see -- and our area is geologically similar to that  
5           area -- that my understanding is that the draft EIS  
6           shows that there is an earthquake fault right on the  
7           site that could produce up to a magnitude 6.5  
8           earthquake right on the Hanford site, so imagine what  
9           that kind of a quake would produce in the way of  
10          disturbance of the soil, liquefaction, those types of  
11          things.

12                        I think it is terribly irresponsible for us  
13          to even consider leaving any of this radioactive waste  
14          behind when the potential for a very large earthquake,  
15          it could happen today, we are told it happens about  
16          every 300 years in this area and it has been 300 years  
17          since the last one. We owe it to the future  
18          generations to do everything we can to clean up our  
19          mess as much as possible. We need to remove 99.9  
20          percent or more of the waste from the tanks and not  
21          leave it behind, and that is to be simply in  
22          compliance with Washington State law. We need to have  
23          a clean closure and restoration of the Hanford site as  
24          much as possible to what it was before the Department  
25          of Defense took it over.



**DEPONET**

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

1                   You have got to keep in mind, back on the  
2 earthquake issue, they didn't choose that site because  
3 of its geological stability, they chose it because of  
4 plentiful cold water, plentiful electricity and its  
5 remoteness so they could just move everybody off the  
6 site. Geological stability just wasn't the issue.

7                   I have recently, just to conclude my  
8 comments, read an article in the IEEE Spectrum  
9 magazine in which they talked about the deep  
10 geological storage of radioactive materials in  
11 Finland. And Finland isn't, you know, considered to  
12 be a real conservative area, they're very concerned  
13 about radioactive materials there, too, and yet they,  
14 in Finland, have figured out how to deal with this  
15 kind of a problem. We are a wealthier country, we are  
16 at least as smart as the Fins, we should be able to  
17 figure this out, too, and I expect that the Department  
18 of Energy and the Department of Ecology to do exactly  
19 that. Thank you.

20                   MR. PARHAM: Thank you, sir. Next up is Eva  
21 Kosmos, and after Eva will be Jim Kelley. So, Eva.

22                   MS. KOSMAS: I am Eva Kosmas, I am from  
23 Portland, Oregon, and I just have a real quick  
24 statement. I feel that clean closure is the best  
25 solution to this issue and is the absolute best to



1 preserve the health and safety of our environment and  
2 the future populations of the Pacific Northwest. If  
3 99.9 percent cleanup is a possibility, which it is,  
4 then it is the best and should be the only solution.

5 MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

6 Jim Kelley, followed by Elizabeth Heffron.

7 Jim? No? How about Elizabeth, are you here?

8 MS. HEFFRON: Hi, I'm Elizabeth Heffron, I am  
9 a writer and a teacher and I live in Washington State  
10 with my husband and two children. I feel it is  
11 extremely important that Governor Gregoire and you  
12 guys with the Washington State Department of Ecology  
13 take an active, not a passive stance in protecting  
14 current and future Washington citizens. I think you  
15 should take all steps necessary to fight for a full  
16 cleanup of the existing waste, so that includes a  
17 clean closure of the tanks and cleaning up all of that  
18 soil that is under those tanks and everywhere else in  
19 those unlined ditches.

20 I also would like you to do everything in  
21 your power to prevent the DOE from importing  
22 additional off-site waste to Hanford, no matter what  
23 classification it is. Over the last 50 years,  
24 Washington citizens have taken on more than their fair  
25 share of the hazards from our national nuclear



1 policies. It is time for our state to stand up and  
2 say "no more." Thank you.

3 MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

4 Lisa? After Lisa, will be Lisa Lightner.

5 MS. VAN DYK: Hi, I am Lisa Van Dyk, I am a  
6 field organizer at Heart of America Northwest. I just  
7 wanted to thank the Department of Energy for holding  
8 eight hearings on this document, even though I am  
9 absolutely exhausted after organizing for all of them,  
10 and thank everyone who's here for coming out tonight.

11 The more I learn about this EIS, and I've  
12 written down some of the more detailed written  
13 comments later, but as a resident of Washington, I am  
14 simply stunned. When I look at the maps of  
15 groundwater of contamination in the EIS, it is  
16 extremely obvious that Hanford is an inappropriate  
17 location for a national radioactive waste dump. It  
18 simply doesn't make any sense that the Department of  
19 Energy is taking this decades old plan to import waste  
20 to Hanford. That is assuming that DOE has looked at  
21 the impact analysis in the EIS. So tonight, I just  
22 have a few points.

23 Empty the tanks to the limit of technology,  
24 which is 99.9 percent or more; do not leave the tanks  
25 and tank leaks in the ground where they will only



**DEPONENT**

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



1           contaminate the groundwater again in the future;  
2           vitrify all of the waste; and please, make an  
3           enforceable ban on no off-site waste coming to  
4           Hanford. Thank you.

5                   MR. PARHAM: Lisa Lightner. After Lisa will be  
6           Janice Faris.

7                   MS. LIGHTNER: Thank you. My name is  
8           Lisa Lightner, I am a resident of Seattle, Washington.  
9           Upon learning the history of Hanford, I have found  
10          that there are way too many examples of the US DOE  
11          using flawed and piecemeal EIS reports and not  
12          following through with what is necessary to protect  
13          our health and our environment. We need clean  
14          closure. The preferred alternative does not go far  
15          enough. The reason for not using clean closure is  
16          risk to workers, but I wonder what impact and risks to  
17          further generations will follow. Somehow this seems  
18          more of a political play than a concern for our future  
19          and our generations -- and following generations. But  
20          most importantly, do not add off-site waste to this  
21          site. Not in ten years, not ever.

22                   MR. PARHAM: Thank you.  
23                   Janice Faris. After Janice will be  
24           David Ortman.

25                   MS. FARIS: I am Janice Faris from Renton,



**DEPONENT**

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

1 Washington. I have had many friends and relatives who  
2 were so-called downwinders, who were cut from here  
3 down to their chest when they were 18 years old to  
4 remove cancerous tumors and their thyroid gland.  
5 Okay.

6 Passing on nuclear waste to future  
7 generations is cruel. It is our moral responsibility  
8 to not create more waste and to treat and dispose of  
9 current waste in the safest manner possible. That  
10 means on-site, not hauling radioactive waste down the  
11 freeway to Idaho National Lab or bringing more to  
12 Hanford. We all know the hazards involved with  
13 highway travel and with rail travel, too. Given the  
14 vulnerability of any cargo container that is in  
15 motion, one can easily imagine it to be a perfect  
16 target for a terrorist or mentally unstable person, to  
17 say nothing of weather-related accidents or driver  
18 error -- which, of course, never happens.

19 So what about the vitrification plant? How  
20 many years behind and millions of dollars overbudget  
21 is it? How are the design plans coming? These are  
22 all rhetorical questions. Are there design plans or  
23 does it continue to be design-as-you-go, or should we  
24 really be calling it the Forever Project? We have all  
25 feared an insane sociopathic leader whose finger could



**DEPONENT**

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

1 ignite a worldwide nuclear war, but now we are faced  
2 with an insane sociopathic alternative presented by  
3 DOE which are just as fatal. "This is the way the  
4 world ends. This is the way the world ends. This is  
5 the way the world ends. Not with a bang but a  
6 whimper," T.S. Elliott.

7 Check out how-to websites and books to learn  
8 how radioactive contamination acts on all living  
9 cells. Google depleted uranium and birth defects in  
10 Fallujah to see what uses our spent nuclear waste have  
11 been put to. I think once you are informed, you will  
12 agree that the use of depleted uranium should be  
13 declared a crime against humanity, as should many of  
14 these DOE alternatives. Thank you.

15 MR. PARHAM: David Ortman. And after David  
16 will be Robert MacDonald.

17 MR. ORTMAN: Thank you. My name is  
18 David Ortman, I live here in Seattle, Washington, and  
19 after following Hanford issues for about 35 years, I  
20 have concluded that Hanford must stand for half-ass  
21 energy foot-dragging on radioactive decontamination.  
22 Three minutes to cover 6,000 --

23 MR. BLANK: That is brilliant.

24 MS. BLANK: Could you say that again?

25 MR. ORTMAN: You can put it on a bumper



**DEPONET**

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

1 sticker.

2 Three minutes for 6,000 pages is a bit  
3 formidable, so let me just cover four short points  
4 here. One is looking through the summary and the DOE  
5 material, Department of Energy material that is out  
6 there, it is very clear they have a preference for the  
7 word closure, not cleanup. I think most members of  
8 the public would be surprised to learn that somehow  
9 these tanks are still open for business. I think  
10 there was an assumption that these tanks had long  
11 since been closed, and the use of the term closure, I  
12 think, just simply muddied the water in terms of what  
13 it is really needed, which is cleanup, because the  
14 time for cleanup is now and no new waste should be  
15 imported into Hanford.

16 Secondly, there is virtually nothing except  
17 for the occasional pretty picture on the Columbia  
18 River. The ecology documents talk about things that  
19 have leaked and where waste may reach the Columbia  
20 River, but even the history of Hanford in the summary  
21 document really has nothing about the Columbia River,  
22 which is one of the main things we are trying to  
23 protect.

24 Third is you have to go through those 6,000  
25 pages all the way through Appendix Q to find out any



**DEPONENT**

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

1           useful information or useful can be about half-lives  
2           of the radionuclides that are filtering through the  
3           groundwater and elsewhere. This type of information  
4           needs to be summarized and put into the summary and  
5           into the fact sheets in a much better fashion so  
6           people can understand what is at risk, not having to  
7           plow through to some Appendix Q in some Alice and  
8           Wonderland hole to find out what is going on.

9                        Finally, although there is a mention that the  
10           Bureau of Reclamation's EIS in the Yakima Basin water  
11           storage has determined that no new irrigation dams in  
12           the Yakima Basin has had a positive benefit cost  
13           ratio, which is no kidding, including the proposed  
14           black water project, the Yakima Irrigation District  
15           lobbied the Bureau of Reclamation not to make a  
16           finding record of decision on this particular  
17           conclusion, which simply keeps the door open, and I am  
18           here to tell you that former Congressman Sid Morrison  
19           has not given up on this project and this is going to  
20           come back and I would like to encourage both Ecology  
21           and Department of Energy to keep the lid on that  
22           particular irrigation proposal as it would potentially  
23           have an adverse impact on Hanford as water may seep  
24           out of the dam through Hanford and take things back.  
25           Thank you very much for the opportunity and we will



**DEPONENT**

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

1 see what happens next.

2 MR. PARHAM: Robert MacDonald? Robert?  
3 Robert MacDonald? No? Cherie Eichholz, from  
4 Physicians of Washington, and after Cherie will be  
5 Thomas Buchanan.

6 MS. EICHHOLZ: Hello, my name is  
7 Cherie Eichholz, I am with Washington Physicians for  
8 Social Responsibility, I am the executive director.  
9 PSR is a nonprofit advocacy organization that is a  
10 medical and public health voice for policies to  
11 prevent nuclear war and proliferation and to slow,  
12 stop or reverse global warming and toxic degradation  
13 of the environment.

14 As a public organization, we represent  
15 approximately 5,000 health care professionals  
16 throughout Washington State. We have worked hard to  
17 promote the safe, effective and timely cleanup of the  
18 Hanford Nuclear Reservation and to educate the public  
19 regarding the disastrous consequences of nuclear  
20 weapons. We strongly believe that failing to take  
21 action today is a prescription for a deadly future.

22 In addition to my work at PSR, I'm a veteran  
23 of the US Army. I served in 2003 and 2004, and since  
24 serving, I have had the opportunity to meet many other  
25 veterans, including many poisoned by depleted uranium



**DEPONENT**

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

1 and Agent Orange. These men and women carry these  
2 effects of these poisons, and some may have cancer,  
3 others have had trouble conceiving children. These  
4 veterans carry scars similar to many residents of the  
5 Columbia corridor who have been poisoned by waste  
6 hidden on the Hanford Reservation which has seeped  
7 into the soil and water. Most veterans who have been  
8 poisoned by DU or Agent Orange had no choice in the  
9 matter, nor did the native victims of those respective  
10 countries, but the people of Washington State have a  
11 choice.

12 The EIS as presented and if it's accepted  
13 will poison hundreds of people in the near future and  
14 thousands within a generation. In effect, in  
15 accepting this EIS, we will sign the death sentence  
16 for thousands when other alternatives are available.

17 What specifically am I advocating? I am  
18 asking that this panel and the powers that be consider  
19 this EIS with an eye on the future and respect for the  
20 millions of people who will be impacted. Permitting  
21 anything less than 99.9 percent of tank waste to be  
22 removed would be a danger to public health and  
23 unconscionable. Using the clean closure standards is  
24 the best way to protect current and future  
25 generations.



**DEPONET**

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

1                   In addition, the idea of transporting  
2                   hazardous waste to Hanford should be taken off of the  
3                   table. The dangers to those who live along the  
4                   shipping roads, coupled with the risks associated with  
5                   adding additional waste to a still contaminated area  
6                   make this an unreasonable proposal. Hanford cleanup  
7                   must center on removing the toxic threat that already  
8                   exists and is still not adequately dealt with.

9                   Veterans know that war is easy to start, hard  
10                  to stop, and that those most often hurt are  
11                  bystanders, and physicians similarly recognize that  
12                  taking action after the fact or after harm has been  
13                  caused is a poor second choice to taking preventive  
14                  action. I urge the US DOE to consider the standards  
15                  involved and take action that prevents further harm.  
16                  Thank you.

17                 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Thomas Buchanan, and  
18                 after Thomas Buchanan will be Amy Easton.

19                 MR. BUCHANAN: Can I face the people?

20                 MR. PARHAM: Just there.

21                 MR. BUCHANAN: My name is Thomas Buchanan,  
22                 also with Physicians for Social Responsibility. Thank  
23                 you to the panel for at least giving citizens of this  
24                 Seattle area a time to comment on the 6,000-page  
25                 document. But let's be perfectly clear about some of



**DEPONENT**

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



1 the proposed actions and the options. Given the  
2 unsafe and intensively radioactive waste in the forms  
3 of leaking single- and double-shell tanks and the  
4 billions of gallons of radioactive and chemical toxic  
5 waste already escaping from Hanford, we will not  
6 accept any more importing of so-called off-site waste  
7 until the present storage is safe in the environment  
8 that it is in now. Imagine 17,000 truckloads of  
9 radioactive waste on our nation's highways from  
10 private nuclear waste to Hanford. That is a nightmare  
11 waiting to happen. We will oppose any new shipments  
12 of these new wastes into Hanford.

13 Further, this EIS has no consideration for an  
14 option of dry test storage on radioactive waste sites,  
15 including the power plant sites, as an option not to  
16 store it in a central repository. That dry option is  
17 safe, it is above ground, it is can be easily  
18 monitored, and there's no -- not a mention of it in  
19 this 6,000-page document.

20 With all of the high-tech equipment,  
21 processing buildings, tank farms, and storage cribs  
22 storage at Hanford already, the principal storage  
23 medium of radioactive wastes at the Hanford site, just  
24 like the rest of America, is cardboard and dirt. From  
25 the most extremely radioactive nuclear fuel cell, to a



**DEPONENT**

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

1 Mason jar of plutonium found in a safe in a trench at  
2 Hanford, to the corroding barrels of waste and Tank  
3 105A, most of the wastes are kept in over 40 miles of  
4 unlined trenches, ditches, and holes at Hanford.

5 Most of these -- most importantly, these dirt  
6 and cardboard mediums leak into the environment and  
7 are now seeping into the Columbia. This national  
8 treasure, our Columbia River, is currently carrying  
9 micro curies of radioactive plutonium, uranium,  
10 iodine, tritium, technetium, cesium, zinc, and  
11 strontium downstream. These radionuclides have been  
12 detected as far as the Puget Sound and the Willapa Bay  
13 on the Washington coast.

14 I am going to skip a couple and then I will  
15 go to the final issues. When we also suggest that the  
16 first tank that be cleaned -- that should be cleaned,  
17 containing its wastes and leaks be Tank 105A. And the  
18 reason we suggest that is this a double-shelled tank,  
19 that when its contents were heated up in 1965, the  
20 emergency demanded more water be poured into the tank  
21 to cool it off and some of it was intentionally dumped  
22 into the ground. The excess heat still caused an  
23 explosion. That explosion, which blew out a hole in  
24 the tank about the size of a mini bus and dumped more  
25 waste and the zone of the surrounding soil, it still



**DEPONET**

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

1 measures now, that soil, at over 200 degrees of  
2 temperature near that tank. This tank and some of its  
3 known faults are an ideal test case of prototype. We  
4 want to take the worst case and solve that and do it  
5 safely.

6 So we want a small vitrification plant  
7 facility, not the whole big project all at once. Make  
8 it safe and a smaller operation, and we recommend that  
9 the contractors also begin stabilizing the trenches  
10 and begin the so-called capped landfills and dig  
11 underneath and start emptying and cleaning up the  
12 soils. These so-called low radioactive waste sites  
13 are the principal storage of mediums right now for all  
14 the radioactive waste and they need to be cleaned up  
15 because it is not just a soil column that is  
16 contaminated, the column has moved and it is in many  
17 ways approaching and is already contaminating the  
18 Columbia. So finally --

19 MR. PARHAM: Three minutes.

20 MR. BUCHANAN: -- this cleanup matters to all  
21 of us.

22 We get started safely and with no more  
23 radioactive waste imported into Hanford, no more  
24 radioactive waste into the Columbia, make the cleaning  
25 process legal, and accept outside state and EPA



**DEPONET**

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

1 inspectors on-site to monitor all parts of the cleanup  
2 process. Thank you very much.

3 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Next is Amy Easton,  
4 and after Amy would be Michael Baron. Amy? No?  
5 Michael Baron? After Michael will be Joan Lawson.

6 MR. BARON: Thank you, Mr. Moderator,  
7 panelists, fellow speakers, fellow citizens, thank you  
8 for this opportunity to put my views into the record.

9 Hanford was created by the Department of  
10 Defense under their responsibility to protect our  
11 borders and our citizenry. I am a member of that  
12 population, as is my wife, my two children, my  
13 83-year-old mother, my friends, my 1800 co-workers, as  
14 well as the six-and-a-half million citizens of  
15 Washington and the more than three-and-a-half million  
16 citizens of Oregon. With the transfer of the Hanford  
17 site to DOE, the responsibility for our protection  
18 that justified the very creation and the operation of  
19 that facility does not just evaporate as if we had  
20 made an investment with dirty math. That  
21 responsibility to no small degree is now in your  
22 hands, therefore, you have two choices.

23 Option one, cleanup Hanford completely and  
24 without delay. Completely means clean closure.  
25 Treating this exceptional site as if it were an



**DEPONENT**

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

1 ordinary landfill is an approach worthy of Milo  
2 Minderbinder. Completely means dismantle site  
3 cleanup -- dismantle and site cleanup for FFTF.  
4 Completely means not bringing in more radioactive  
5 waste to the shores of the Columbia River.

6 Or option two -- I hope you like this --  
7 reinstate the draft. Then draft all citizens whose  
8 health will be negatively impacted by radiation  
9 releases you're allowing so that their injury or  
10 deaths can be rationalized as the unavoidable  
11 consequences of war.

12 If you cannot muster the political will to  
13 enact option one, then at least arm us with option  
14 two. That way the Geneva Convention might afford the  
15 10 million residents of the states through which the  
16 Columbia River flows, the protection these vocal  
17 citizen advocates have been fighting for for over  
18 three decades and will continue to fight for.

19 MR. PARHAM: Joan Lawson. After Joan is  
20 Al Rasmussen.

21 MS. LAWSON: Hello, my name is Joan Lawson, I  
22 am from Seattle, Washington. I have a friend whose  
23 neighbor probably said to his dog, "not in my back  
24 yard," so the dog dumps his waste in my friend's back  
25 yard. My friend takes his shovel and throws the poop



**DEPONENT**

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

1 back over the fence. If only we could do the same  
2 with the nuclear waste. We in Washington State do not  
3 even want our own nuclear waste and are waiting,  
4 waiting, waiting, for the solution for its disposal,  
5 so surely we don't want our neighbors' waste.

6 My brother worked at Hanford some years ago,  
7 making good money as those whose tyranny for Hanford  
8 also did, the contractors, the people who make the  
9 tanks and build the facilities, and the executives  
10 from companies with names like Clean Energy. He said  
11 to me one day another container of liquid waste was  
12 opened up and it too was empty. Where did the  
13 contents go?

14 I saw a billboard today that said Washington  
15 Poison Center. I looked it up on the web and see that  
16 national poison prevention week begins March 14. I  
17 suggest it begin tonight and that large signs be put  
18 all over Hanford announcing Washington Poison Center.

19 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Al Rasmussen, and  
20 after Mr. Rasmussen will be Valerie Schubert.

21 MR. RASMUSSEN: Up here in Seattle we say  
22 Rasmussen.

23 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. I am not from here,  
24 that's true.

25 MR. RASMUSSEN: I know, you said that.



1                   As with all important issues, the questions  
2                   of cleanup at Hanford should be considered very  
3                   broadly instead of with just narrow focus on the  
4                   technical issues. A basic step in correcting a bad  
5                   situation is simply to stop doing the things that make  
6                   it worse. In the case of radioactive waste at  
7                   Hanford, this basic step is simply to stop bringing in  
8                   more waste. Considering the question broadly, which  
9                   is how I started, this leads to examining the creation  
10                  elsewhere of waste that cannot be successfully stored  
11                  or treated. Weapons development and new nuclear power  
12                  generation programs should both be abandoned --

13                                   (Audience applauds.)

14                  MR. BUCHANAN: -- for substantial reasons of  
15                  their own, as well as the addition of nuclear  
16                  radioactive wastes that they produce.

17                                 Instead of sending radioactive waste from  
18                  those places to Hanford, money saved by abandoning  
19                  those projects instead should be sent to Hanford to  
20                  accelerate the cleanup here.

21                                   (Audience applauds.)

22                  MR. PARHAM: Thank you, sir.  
23                  Valerie Shubert, and after Valerie will be  
24                  Bobbie Morgan.

25                                 MS. SHUBERT: I have already sent in some



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

1 written comments on this and I'm assuming that -- I am  
2 hoping that the comments I made on earlier versions  
3 have also been forwarded and are still being kept on  
4 file. Basically I have not been able to get through  
5 this document. I don't have a stable of readers, I  
6 don't have the time to do it myself, so I have gotten  
7 through most of the summary and there is a couple more  
8 comments I wanted to make before at this point and  
9 then I will make more later.

10 One was that I am getting through the  
11 definitions and I am glad there is a glossary, because  
12 frankly those definitions are nothing like the  
13 vernacular definition of the terms would be, and I  
14 would like to have some indication in the document of  
15 who developed those definitions and what the input  
16 was.

17 And the other thing is that there are  
18 statements in several places about endangered and  
19 threatened species, but they're not listed. Maybe  
20 they are listed somewhere else, I haven't gotten to  
21 that part yet, but they are not listed in the summary.

22 And furthermore, they're not -- they are  
23 parts of communities and there are species that are  
24 not endangered or threatened yet that may be in the  
25 future and I would like to see an overall study of



**DEPONET**

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



1 what impacts these things will have on the environment  
2 in general. And that is basically what I had to say.

3 MR. PARHAM: Okay. Thank you. Bobbie Morgan  
4 and then Adrian Villarreal.

5 MS. MORGAN: Hello, my name is Bobbie Morgan  
6 and I live on Bainbridge Island. I am a retired  
7 speech language pathologist and so I have a long  
8 commitment to good communication. I am here with what  
9 seems to be a very simple message. We know what the  
10 right thing to do is here. This EIS statement needs  
11 to go back to the drawing board and you need to just  
12 cleanup Hanford, period.

13 I am also here because I am a grandmother, a  
14 brand-new grandmother. Last week our first grandchild  
15 was born and I want to be able to imagine her future,  
16 and I want to be able to pretend that 50 or 75 years  
17 from now, that I look back on her as a grown woman and  
18 possibly a grandmother, and I want to be able to say  
19 we did the right thing for you, sweetheart. You are  
20 able to drink water here, enjoy delicious salmon, play  
21 safely in our gem of the Columbia River. I don't want  
22 to have to imagine myself looking back from the mists  
23 of time and say I am sorry that you have cancer, we  
24 didn't do the right thing.

25 So I am here as a person, I want to call you



**DEPONENT**

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

1 Mary Beth, I want to call you Jeff, that we have had a  
2 lot of facts, a lot of initials and acronyms, but we  
3 are here as people to remind you to do the right  
4 thing. Thank you.

5 MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

6 Adrian Villarreal, and after Adrian, it will  
7 be Robert Stagman.

8 MR. VILLARREAL: Good evening, everyone. I  
9 am from Bellingham, Washington, and I am a registered  
10 nurse, and when I first learned about this at the  
11 University of Washington, Bothell, when Gerry came  
12 over to do a presentation on the subject matter, after  
13 the end of the presentation, I was kind of like ready  
14 to hit my head up against the wall, because I couldn't  
15 understand how this complex matter was actually made  
16 into a bigger problem than it needs to be. I mean, it  
17 is not rocket science, okay? I mean, when it comes  
18 down to it, you have nuclear waste that is in the  
19 ground, okay, it is going to our groundwater, okay,  
20 and it is already contaminating the Columbia River,  
21 okay? Any type of radiation, okay, that human beings  
22 come in contact with, besides any other type of life  
23 form, okay, it puts that organism at risk for  
24 developing cancer, if not dying. I mean, there is no  
25 reason that the preferred plan should be just



**DEPONENT**

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

1 99 percent, okay, removal of nuclear waste. It should  
2 be 99.9 percent or that 100 percent, okay? Whatever  
3 is humanly possible.

4 To hear this evening that the concept of the  
5 preferred plan was accepted because of minimal risk to  
6 the workers that are currently going ahead to do the  
7 cleanup process, I think we are slapping the workers  
8 in the face by going ahead and allowing the work that  
9 they are currently doing to go ahead and cleanup  
10 Hanford, okay, to just be cut short. So therefore,  
11 they think what are they doing then? And they are  
12 already risking their lives now. We already have over  
13 30 workers that have been subjected to beryllium  
14 poisoning, okay, because that toxic metal that is in  
15 the environment, you know.

16 The tanks, they need to be clean closure,  
17 okay? The environment needs to be cleaned up. The  
18 flux capacitor, no contaminants need to be shipped  
19 over to Oregon or Utah or any other state, okay,  
20 everything needs to be contained, okay, we need to  
21 clean this environment. There are too many -- right  
22 now, our biggest environmental issue is that the  
23 United States is facing a water shortage. We need to  
24 make sure that our underground water supplies that are  
25 available, okay, are clean and able to be used, okay?



**DEPONENT**

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

1 We do not need to go ahead and continue to pollute a  
2 valued underground water supply. Every state is  
3 pretty much activating, okay, laws to prevent the  
4 exportation of water. We need to conserve the water  
5 that we have and we need to prevent the spread of  
6 radiation to our population, okay, because we don't  
7 need to promote a society built on cancer, okay.

8 It's -- Rachel Carson clearly said it, we  
9 have the right not to be poisoned. We have the right  
10 not to be exposed to toxins. At the same time that  
11 Hanford was being developed, our government clearly  
12 went ahead and was reckless with the use of  
13 pesticides. Let's not be reckless about forming  
14 another plan, okay, that does a half-ass job of  
15 cleaning up the issue. Thank you.

16 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Robert Stagman, and  
17 after Robert will be Oliver Bazinet from Hanford  
18 Challenge.

19 MR. STAGMAN: My name is Bob Stagman and I am  
20 a retired surgeon, specializing in diseases of the  
21 head and neck. Included in my responsibilities was  
22 the management of tumors of the thyroid gland, which  
23 have been unequivocally associated with radiation  
24 exposure and most importantly during childhood.

25 My personal health history includes a course



1 of low level radiation therapy to the head at age five  
2 as part of a national misadventure to treat enlarged  
3 tonsils and adenoids. The unintended result of this  
4 treatment has included a plethora of thyroid tumors,  
5 among other conditions, occurring usually after a lag  
6 period of many many years, and that lag is important  
7 to understand.

8 At the age of 42, I was diagnosed with a  
9 tumor of the inner ear, and at the age of 44, with a  
10 tumor of the thyroid gland, both clearly linked to  
11 childhood radiation exposure by multiple clinical  
12 studies. Radiation exposure is a potentially lethal  
13 risk for our citizens, particularly for our children.  
14 We need not be unduly alarmed by a vague potential  
15 threat from Al-Qaeda when we are being subjected to  
16 continuous chemical nuclear terror being inflicted  
17 upon us by our own United States Department of Energy,  
18 via tragically and misguided and irresponsible plans  
19 to transport through our communities and dump vast  
20 quantities of dangerous radioactive material into  
21 Hanford, where responsible cleanup of all nuclear  
22 waste has never been accomplished and active nuclear  
23 contamination of our soil and groundwater continues  
24 unabated and certainly encroaches the lifeline of the  
25 Columbia River.



**DEPONET**

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

1                   Radiation exposure of our Northwest citizens  
2                   currently is certainly much higher than generally  
3                   conceded and will escalate dramatically as current  
4                   leakage continues and escalate incredibly if new waste  
5                   is added. The only acceptable action for Hanford is  
6                   clean closure of all existing waste sites and no  
7                   addition of any further nuclear waste at Hanford.

8                   Thank you.

9                   MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Oliver is next, and  
10                  after Oliver, Richard Frith, I believe.

11                  MR. BAZINET: Hello, my name is Oliver  
12                  Bazinet and I am a volunteer with Hanford Challenge.  
13                  I've read the summary of the draft EIS. I didn't get  
14                  through all 6,000 pages of the actual document, and I  
15                  guess I have two things that I would like to focus on.  
16                  First of all, one percent of 54 million gallons is  
17                  still 540,000 gallons, and that is a totally  
18                  unacceptable amount of waste to leave in the tanks. I  
19                  am very disappointed with that aspect of the cleanup  
20                  proposal, as well as just the clean closure  
21                  alternative presented in the EIS in general. I  
22                  believe that it only includes remediating the soils  
23                  three meters below the surface of the tank. Some of  
24                  these tanks have been leaking for over 30 years or  
25                  more. It seems like three meters is awfully shallow



**DEPONENT**

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

1 to dig. We should probably dig a little bit deeper.

2 I would also like to address the new waste  
3 that DOE is proposing bringing on-site. As Toby Nixon  
4 pointed out, Hanford is a very geologically active  
5 site, not to mention in the flood plain of a river  
6 that is dammed quite a bit upstream. It doesn't seem  
7 like a very good idea to put more waste there.

8 MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

9 Richard, I messed up your last name, and then  
10 after Richard is Dorli Rainey.

11 MR. FRITH: Hi, my name is Richard Frith, I  
12 am from Seattle. Unlike a lot of the other speakers  
13 here, I am going to have to identify myself as a  
14 strong supporter of nuclear energy. I believe that  
15 nuclear energy is valuable and has great possibilities  
16 for the future, as soon as we show that we can clean  
17 it up. Now, as soon as you can show you can clean it  
18 up, this is the time and place to show you can clean  
19 it up. This site was contaminated 50 years ago and  
20 this is the time and the place to show you can clean  
21 it up. In the meantime, we should not put any more  
22 waste here until you can show you can clean it up.

23 Formerly I was a certified residential  
24 heating oil tank remediation specialist. I did that  
25 for myself and also for the city. When you remediate



**DEPONENT**

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

1 a tank, frequently at the bottom of the tank you will  
2 find a tiny little hole, usually smaller than a  
3 quarter. Under that, you find a humongous plume of  
4 contaminate, and those you start digging and you dig  
5 for a long time. Three meters, I have done that for a  
6 300-gallon residential tank. For the City of Seattle,  
7 we did sub-subbasements, we dug up entire city blocks  
8 down near Westlake. The contamination underground can  
9 be massive, and we all know this, we're not -- lots of  
10 us here have had our tanks yanked out of our own yards  
11 here. There is nothing here that needs us to be so  
12 disingenuous as to say we will remove the tank or the  
13 contents of the tanks and somehow magically we won't  
14 look underneath because there won't be any problems  
15 down there.

16 The DOE -- or Department of Ecology would not  
17 let us get away with that here, the City of Seattle  
18 would not let me get away with that here, why on earth  
19 would the feds be allowed of being that disingenuous.  
20 There should not be any new waste when we clean up the  
21 old.

22 The problem about why not clean it up  
23 completely? Well, there are two reasons I hear about.  
24 It costs a lot of money -- a complete cleanup would  
25 cost a lot of money. It is better to just hide the



**DEPONET**

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



1           problem and take part of it out and cover the rest up  
2           with dirt and concrete so you can't see the problem.  
3           There is a lot of money available. It is DOE's  
4           bailiwick now, but this is the military that did this  
5           and we have a huge military budget. The amount of  
6           money in the military budget, we should clean this  
7           site up and we should because this was a military  
8           project. So there is not a money problem here. There  
9           is a lack of will and a lack of willingness to show  
10          just how bad the situation is. We have the money, we  
11          have the ability, it is the military's budget, that is  
12          where the money comes from.

13                         In closing, when we clean this site up, we  
14          will have to recognize that geologically this is a  
15          terrible place for the waste. In the meantime, let's  
16          not bring any more new waste in until they clean it  
17          up, and the problem with our new waste will be moot  
18          because this is a lousy place geologically.

19                         MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Dorli and then  
20          Richard Ellison after that.

21                         MS. RAINEY: Hello, I am Dorli Rainey, I'm a  
22          citizen of Seattle. I have a brand-new hobby, it is  
23          going back a few years, I attend Hanford meetings. I  
24          have learned language that I never thought I would  
25          ever hear and my children say mom, you go around the



**DEPONENT**

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

1 house mumbling things like fast flux and covered stuff  
2 and names of contaminants, what is this with you, you  
3 used to be fun.

4 Now, I look at what is going on now. We have  
5 this problem with cleanup, and just recently the  
6 Department of Energy has decided that they were going  
7 to permit a new nuclear power plant. Will they try to  
8 send their spent uranium here? Why are we now  
9 allowing new nuclear power plants after Chernobyl,  
10 after Three Mile Island, after the problems of  
11 Hanford? I think we need to once and for all say we  
12 need clean energy, but not through nuclear energy, and  
13 I think we need to also cleanup Hanford once and for  
14 all, and not 99.9 percent, but 100 percent and get it  
15 done, and this man who said take it out of the  
16 military budget, he is right on.

17 MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

18 Richard Ellison, and after Richard will be  
19 Lane Rasberry.

20 MR. ELLISON: Hello, my name is Richard  
21 Ellison, I would like to encourage, first of all, that  
22 these hearings in the future be televised. I think we  
23 are at that level of technology now and I think we'd  
24 have more input from citizenry if people were able to  
25 observe hearings.



**DEPONENT**

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

1 I -- I am a professor who teaches biology and  
2 environmental science at a local community college,  
3 and I had the honor of visiting Hanford about 25 years  
4 ago. I was a graduate student with a congressional  
5 aide, and it was very interesting because the head of  
6 the Environmental Services there assured me that from  
7 the leaks that occurred at Hanford, none of it could  
8 ever reach the groundwater, that was the lingo at the  
9 time. So my experience from that meeting, many things  
10 that were said to both of us, the congressional aide  
11 and myself, is that Hanford has a long history of  
12 wishful thinking.

13 Hanford will never be safe. You can tell me  
14 you are going to clean it to 99 percent, 99.9 percent,  
15 or 100 percent, I don't believe it. I don't believe  
16 that we are capable of doing that, because for one, I  
17 have observed this process for a long time, it has  
18 taken a long time to cleanup. I see numbers dallying  
19 up, well, the year 3890, this and that and that and  
20 this, where civilization is barely a thousand or two  
21 thousand years old.

22 I see -- the question I wanted to address  
23 was, what are the effects of climate change on  
24 Hanford? Because we don't really know how things are  
25 going to swing, and I think a lot of the repository



**DEPONENT**

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

1 nature of Hanford is to no rainfall, nine inches or  
2 ten inches of rainfall. What if the rainfall rate was  
3 to increase? What if the Columbia River was to raise  
4 in level, because part of the problem is that the  
5 water table is so close to the surface.

6 I think we can only go for full clean closure  
7 and I think that is a very modest and noble goal  
8 should we ever actually get there. I think the best  
9 available technology, what we are looking at, I think  
10 we can only try and use the best available technology,  
11 and as the years go by, as we go towards 3890, we will  
12 see more technology will come forward to help us clean  
13 it up. I don't think you can put a cap on it and  
14 it'll go away.

15 I think when we call a waste nuclear reactor  
16 from a submarine as low level nuclear waste, as it's  
17 defined, I think that's a misnomer, and I think part  
18 of the problem is there is so much waste at Hanford  
19 that really it is an impossibility to try to cleanup  
20 and make it safe. So how do we make it as safe as we  
21 can I think is what we are trying do. I think we need  
22 to support as much full closure as we can get.

23 I agree that the money can come from a lot of  
24 places like the war in Iran and Iraq, from a lot of  
25 all of these places that we want to have fun in. I



**DEPONET**

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

1 don't think we should have any more nuclear waste  
2 imported into Hanford. I don't think we should be  
3 generating nuclear waste. I don't think that one  
4 percent left behind is a good idea in any storage  
5 tanks. I would agree that any plumes underneath  
6 leaks.

7 I mean, part of the leaks that occurred that  
8 made science magazines, I think in the '70s were  
9 130,000-gallon high level liquid waste leak was that  
10 the technician was out there everyday, recording down  
11 the levels of the tank were going down everyday. He  
12 would write the number as it would go down everyday,  
13 but his boss is away on vacation for a month. When he  
14 came back from vacation, he saw oh, my gosh, we have  
15 lost all of this high level nuclear waste. Well,  
16 human error is a big factor. Chernobyl was a big  
17 factor, Three Mile Island was a big factor and human  
18 error was involved very much in the causality of a  
19 huge problem, so I don't believe that we can just  
20 science away this thing, and I think that as much  
21 money as we can spend, as much as we can do, I applaud  
22 your efforts of trying to do something to clean it up,  
23 but the reality is we are still waiting, and the  
24 citizens of the state have said in a citizens'  
25 initiative, we don't want any more nuclear waste. We



**DEPONET**

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

1 don't want anyone's nuclear waste. We didn't want it  
2 in the first place. We don't want anymore. Thank you  
3 very much.

4 MR. PARHAM: Okay. Thank you.

5 Lane Raspberry. After Lane, it'll be Casey  
6 Howard.

7 MR. RASBERRY: My name is Lane Raspberry, I  
8 live in Seattle. I don't like toxic waste and I don't  
9 want any more brought here, but I don't think that is  
10 really what you are asking about. Unfortunately, I  
11 don't know why you are here. I-- just to say  
12 something about myself, I don't want to talk about  
13 myself, but I studied chemistry at the University of  
14 Washington, I have got a degree, I work in science. I  
15 feel like I ought to be able to understand something  
16 about what you are saying, but when you were speaking  
17 at the beginning of this hearing, I couldn't  
18 understand you. I don't know what you are talking  
19 about.

20 I read the Hanford website before I came  
21 here -- I went to Hanford, I took the tour last year,  
22 and I have been reading about Hanford in my free time,  
23 I am interested, I am an interested person. I can't  
24 understand your website. I don't understand these  
25 posters you have. They are beyond my understanding.



**DEPONENT**

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

1 And I really tried. You've got that book back there,  
2 it is 6,000 pages, I can't read that. Who is your  
3 target audience? It doesn't seem to be me. I don't  
4 know who you are writing these things for or who you  
5 are speaking to.

6 I don't have any comment about what this  
7 proposal or what you are talking about doing, because  
8 I just don't understand it, and I don't know how to  
9 get that understanding. I could propose some things.  
10 I really wish that you could advise someone to revise  
11 your website, make it comprehensible, more  
12 comprehensible to laymen. You can't make it too  
13 simple. I think if your target audience was maybe  
14 high school kids, that would be appropriate for me. I  
15 am glad that you have a Facebook account, I don't know  
16 if any of you know this, but Hanford has a Facebook  
17 account, and I understand you also have a Twitter  
18 account, I am following you, thank you.

19 Your use of electronics is first rate. I  
20 really like your videographer. You have a lot of  
21 videos, continuing ed. videos. Why don't you have a  
22 DVD of your videos here? Not everyone can access  
23 YouTube and I really wish that I could take a DVD of  
24 your videos and show them to other people. It's  
25 really not fair that you are not distributing these



**DEPONENT**

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

1 things.

2 I really want to understand, but you make it  
3 very difficult for me. I wish you could do more to  
4 meet me. Thank you very much.

5 MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

6 Casey Howard? After Casey, we will do Kate  
7 Hellenthal.

8 MS. HOWARD: Hi, I am Casey Howard. I am a  
9 UW student and I am representing the growing number of  
10 citizens with a vested interest in Hanford cleanup.  
11 We are next in a long line of generations to deal with  
12 the contamination in the future.

13 Hanford is scary, all of us here think that.  
14 We are concerned that the transport of new waste will  
15 affect the way we can clean now and in the future.  
16 The radiation will be there forever. We need to do  
17 all we can to remove all of the current waste. We  
18 didn't ask for this mess to cleanup, and I don't want  
19 to leave an even bigger mess for future generations.  
20 Thank you.

21 MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

22 Kate Hellenthal, and after Kate will be  
23 Warren Jories.

24 MS. HELLENTHAL: So as an aside, I'm Kate  
25 Hellenthal, I am from Spokane, Washington, and I am a





1 Seattle University undergraduate student and I am  
2 involved with Heart of America Northwest. Despite  
3 that, this EIS really confounds me. I feel that it is  
4 extremely inadequate in addressing the dangers that  
5 Hanford presents. Entombing it does not solve the  
6 problem. It's a Band-Aid approach that only postpones  
7 the true impact. Clean closure is the only feasible  
8 option, and the contamination of the lands and water  
9 needs to be addressed.

10 Furthermore, outside waste from around the  
11 country cannot be transported to Hanford. If Hanford  
12 becomes a national nuclear waste dump site, especially  
13 before the current mess is cleaned up, our health, the  
14 health of future generations, and our environment are  
15 then sacrificed for the DOE's purposes.

16 Hanford must be cleaned and cleaned fully.  
17 The tanks must be emptied completely, the  
18 contamination in the land and groundwater must be  
19 alleviated, and the proposal to transport national  
20 nuclear waste to Hanford must be dropped. Thank you.

21 MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

22 Warren Jones? No? Frank Zucher; is that  
23 right? Frank?

24 MR. ZUCHER: That is fine.

25 MR. PARHAM: Okay.



1                   MR. ZUCHER: My name is Frank Zucher and I  
2 live in Seattle with my wife and child. I find it  
3 disturbing that we have to keep coming back here to  
4 these hearings to remind the Department of Energy,  
5 which is now run by Nobel physicist, we have to remind  
6 them about lessons that we should have all learned in  
7 kindergarten, and I find that they're now teaching in  
8 preschool, and these include, if you make a mess,  
9 clean it up. Before we bring out the new toys, put  
10 away your old ones, and don't run with scissors. They  
11 are fairly simple.

12                   Specifically, I urge the Department of Energy  
13 to reconsider their preferred options to cleanup to  
14 99.9 percent of the toxic waste, the tank waste,  
15 excuse me. Don't leave the worst one percent of the  
16 tanks to leak and kill future generations. Clean up  
17 the contaminated soil. Clean closure, not sweeping it  
18 under the rug with a capping. Start vitrification as  
19 soon as possible and start planning for building more  
20 vitrification plants immediately, not five years from  
21 now.

22                   In terms of no running with scissors, don't  
23 chop up the FTFF and send it to Idaho and bring it  
24 back. Don't bring in more waste until you cleanup  
25 what you have got. Thank you very much.



**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. Let's see here,  
2 Jacinta Heath; is that right? And after that, Reed  
3 O -- O'-B-e-i-r-n-e.

4 MS. HEATH: Hello, my name is Jacinta Heath,  
5 I am a student here at the University of Washington,  
6 and I am pursuing a career in international  
7 environmental law. I'd just like to retouch on an  
8 issue that I think is really important and we haven't  
9 spent enough time on, and that is the concept of  
10 environmental justice. I am going to use your own  
11 words from your summary, "Environmental justice, the  
12 fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all  
13 people, regardless of race, color, national origin, or  
14 income, with respect to the development,  
15 implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws,  
16 regulations, and policies. Fair treatment means no  
17 group of people, including racial, ethnic, and  
18 socioeconomic groups should bear a disproportionate  
19 share of the negative environmental consequences  
20 resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial  
21 operations, or the agencies to make achieving  
22 environmental -- I am sorry, I lost my place -- should  
23 bear a disproportionate share of the negative  
24 environment consequences resulting from industrial,  
25 municipal, or commercial operations, or the execution



**DEPONENT**

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

1 of federal, state or local or tribal programs or  
2 policies.

3 "Executive Order 12898 directs federal  
4 agencies to make achieving environmental justice part  
5 of their mission by identifying and addressing  
6 agencies disproportionately higher than groups in the  
7 agency programs, policies and activities on minority  
8 and low income populations."

9 So if we take that into account, I would like  
10 you to -- I challenge you to attempt to view this from  
11 different perspectives and create more incentives for  
12 clean closure, not the development of new nuclear  
13 energy plants. I think we should all consider  
14 changing our views of nuclear energy and realize that  
15 it is not clean or safe, and that it is  
16 disproportionately affecting people that aren't  
17 reflected in your policies.

18 MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

19 Reed? And after Reed will be Lex Voorhoeve.  
20 Did I blow that one too?

21 MR. O'BIERNE: Hello, my name is Reed  
22 O'Bierne, I live in Seattle, Washington, thank you all  
23 for being here.

24 In the last two months, I live in a house  
25 nearby here, actually we found that the heating fuel



**DEPONENT**

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

1 tank in my front yard, which was actually, ironically,  
2 put in the ground around the time that World War II  
3 ended, that tank has been leaking, similar to what the  
4 gentleman spoke about earlier tonight. It is a  
5 relatively small hole. We have dug the whole ground  
6 up, dug up the tank, done an incredible amount of  
7 environmental remediation, both in the front of the  
8 house and the back of the house, which has a slope  
9 towards the back. We had to pay for this out of our  
10 own pocket. The remediation is still going on.  
11 People came to my house today and actually poured  
12 these microbes in the ground that supposedly eat the  
13 contamination.

14 The question is, how can we possibly be  
15 forced to pay for this kind of stuff, which I am happy  
16 to do, because we need to clean it in my yard, but  
17 something the size of this, what is going on in  
18 Hanford, has there even been any thought as to whether  
19 we would clean it or put ground in it, and talk about  
20 not digging all the way down to the bottom of the  
21 ground to where the contamination is and removing it.  
22 Ultimately it has got to be removed. The only way to  
23 do it is to do it right the first time. That's my  
24 main comment.

25 My second point is I would like to point out,



**DEPONENT**

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

1 or like to ask, we have got, on one hand, this long  
2 convoluted question about what to do about this stuff  
3 and there is other conversations somewhere that DOE  
4 and Ecology are involved in about licensing additional  
5 open nuclear -- putting in nuclear power plants. I  
6 don't see how you can have such a complicated issue as  
7 what is going on with Hanford remediation, and none of  
8 us being able to agree on how you are going to solve  
9 that problem, and still consider the possibility that  
10 you are going to produce more of this stuff.... by the  
11 way, no commercial enterprise will fund. So my second  
12 comment is I wish that DOE and Ecology would make  
13 comments from whatever department you are in to  
14 whatever department issued those licenses and share  
15 some of this information with them, because the  
16 consequences of this and the cost of this need to be  
17 taken into account. Thank you.

18 MR. PARHAM: Lex? Carol Isaac? Is Carol  
19 Isaac here?

20 MS. ISAAC: I am Carol Isaac, I have spent 25  
21 years in the Department of Surgery doing research and  
22 a couple of years working with earthquake remediation.

23 First of all, our Department of Ecology, I  
24 would like to address that. I would have been  
25 appreciative had you done more to bring up your own



**DEPONET**

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

1 alternatives rather than only accept what the feds  
2 have given us.

3 (Audience applause.)

4 MS. ISAAC: One alternative that really  
5 stands out and that is the cap. That cap is cosmetic.  
6 There is no other way around this. If you were in my  
7 Department of Surgery at the University of Washington  
8 and you walked up to a patient and say yes, you have a  
9 horrible mess there, that is a boil, huge infection  
10 under there, one of the worst in the country, as we  
11 have, we are going to put a Band-Aid on it, don't  
12 worry about it, you won't see it. It might go through  
13 your bloodstream, don't worry about it, it has a  
14 beautiful Band-Aid. We can't do that to Hanford. We  
15 can't do that to the worst place in the country. We  
16 have to be the model for cleaning this up.

17 Now, when you have this situation -- also I  
18 am also one of the people who had the oil tank with  
19 the nickel hole in the bottom of it. In the Summer of  
20 2008, under that whole routine, I could look down, I  
21 swear I saw China on the other side. We had to do  
22 that, 250 feet. If there was oil under there or coal  
23 under there, we have the technology to get it out in  
24 no time and certain people would get the money for  
25 that.



**DEPONENT**

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

1                   By the way, I think the military owes us this  
2 and a lot more, and this cleanup delay is cleanup  
3 denied by the military.

4                   (Audience applause.)

5                   MS. ISAAC: We have this problem sitting  
6 there. It isn't just materials going down into  
7 possibly the groundwater, spreading out like crazy.  
8 This is a 40-mile trench of absolutely toxic  
9 radioactive material. We don't know how much, where  
10 it is going, we aren't following this stuff to where  
11 it is really going. What we do in the Department of  
12 Surgery, we have monthly morbidity and mortality  
13 reports so we track what our record is, what we are  
14 doing, who is being harmed. Even if you can't clean  
15 it up, we should have somebody out here telling us, or  
16 giving us a protocol for surveying what is going on  
17 with the human population in the area and the fish, of  
18 course, and all of the other ecological problems with  
19 the species. This is wrong.

20                   Even if you are not going to put the money  
21 right now into cleaning up, you should be there  
22 monitoring, and we should be asking -- we should be  
23 telling, we should be telling the military come here,  
24 look at our collateral damage while you're making it  
25 over there. We need this taken care of here first.





1 We are the taxpayer.

2 I think I will let it go there. Thank you.

3 MR. PARHAM: Phoebe Warren. After Phoebe  
4 would be Ken or Merry Ann Peterson, whichever would  
5 like to go.

6 MS. WARREN: Thank you for coming to gather  
7 our comments today, and thank you, my fellow citizens,  
8 who have the energy and intelligence to study this  
9 topic for decades and decades. I am a mechanical  
10 engineer, I work in Seattle, my name is Phoebe Warren,  
11 and I went into mechanical engineering 30 years ago to  
12 look at alternatives for nuclear power because it was  
13 clear 30 years ago, as it is today, that we aren't up  
14 to the task.

15 In simple terms that are being proposed to us  
16 today, I would recommend prohibition of off-site waste  
17 entering Hanford and I recommend vitrification of all  
18 high level waste, clean closure. But I don't really  
19 think these are the proper terms, so stepping back for  
20 a moment, as far as I understand it, and this is not  
21 after a huge study, there are people in the room who  
22 know a lot more than I do, what we have at Hanford is  
23 numerous outcomes of previous cleanup efforts. After  
24 a lot of work and many decades, we have got  
25 contamination that is pretty befuddled from previous



**DEPONENT**

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

1           efforts.

2                       So if we proceed now, ignoring secondary  
3 waste and GTCC waste, in coming up with proposals and  
4 recommendations, we are likely to come up with another  
5 muddle that will produce another solution that will  
6 create another generation of contamination. These  
7 things don't just go away. They get mixed, they get  
8 displaced, they get contained to various degrees.

9                       As an engineer, all I can say is that we  
10 don't want the best possible technology. What we want  
11 is to figure out what the hell we are going to do and  
12 not piecemeal. And if as a society we have any sense  
13 of ethics, we should be coming up with minimum  
14 standards that need to be met, by whatever is being  
15 proposed.

16                      So, for example, if we are not meeting  
17 drinking standards, why aren't we spending more money?  
18 The military in the United States is probably the  
19 richest organization in the world. If any  
20 organization could make these costs, the military  
21 could. It's a deliberate decision to permit such  
22 conditions.

23                      I think part of the problem with these  
24 dialogues is that a lot of the real basics aren't  
25 brought to the table. You know, if we have a



1 vitrification plant that is being built without a  
2 design and we are looking at levels of future  
3 pollution without considering GTCC waste and secondary  
4 waste, we are not really thinking clearly, and I am  
5 sure no one in the room is individually responsible,  
6 but as a society, it is reprehensible. Thank you.

7 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Merry Ann Peterson.

8 MS. PETERSON: I am Merry Ann Peterson,  
9 M-e-r-r-y, A-n-n. Please, let's clean it up 100  
10 percent, no excuses. Thank you.

11 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Roxy Giddings  
12 followed by Ryan Jarvis.

13 MS. GIDDINGS: Hi, I am Roxy Giddings. It's  
14 fun to see all of my buddies and friends who have been  
15 coming to these things forever and a day. I am a  
16 downwinder, went through fourth grade through high  
17 school, that is your growing up and maturing years. I  
18 pray everyday that I won't do what my sister did, get  
19 breast cancer, and dad died of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma,  
20 which is cancer of the lymph system, and he and mom  
21 grew up on Whidbey Island and that was a good thing,  
22 because it seemed to be kind of clean out there, so  
23 they got a good start.

24 I've got these things that have been coming  
25 out in the paper lately, very interesting. Hanford



**DEPONENT**

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

1 might become a national park, January the 25th this  
2 year. Boy, the National Parks really knows how to  
3 take care of stuff. How far behind are they in their  
4 cleanup?

5 A new era for nuclear industry, this is from  
6 the Tacoma paper. I live in Tacoma now. February 17,  
7 "The federal guarantees authorized by Congress in 2005  
8 were seen as an essential for construction of any new  
9 reactor because of the huge expense involved." I am  
10 sure it doesn't take any energy to make one of those  
11 plants, I mean, really, we are saving energy by having  
12 the new plants.

13 Nuclear waste politics trumps science, sense,  
14 that is certainly something I would agree with. That  
15 is an opinion from the editors at the News Tribune.  
16 Mixing politics with radioactive waste is never a good  
17 idea. Boy, you have got that. Everything that has to  
18 do with radioactive waste is mixed with politics.

19 Hanford to restart shipments of nuclear waste  
20 to the southwest. Okay. So they are going to cleanup  
21 contractors, CH2M Hill Plateau Remediation Company has  
22 hired 60 more employees to help dig up waste and  
23 determine if it is suitable for shipment. Well, we  
24 will see.

25 Oh, my favorite one, where is my favorite



**DEPONENT**

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

1           one? That is the one where we are going to build a  
2           new plant -- no, my favorite one is where the Vermont  
3           Yankee plant is leaking tritium out now and they said  
4           it wasn't, they said they didn't have the kind of  
5           pipes that would do that, and then in the same article  
6           it says something about there's a whole bunch of other  
7           plants that are leaking tridium too.

8                         And today, I just got this from the AAA  
9           magazine, Hanford tours reveals atomic age secrets.  
10          Don't you believe, don't you believe what they tell  
11          you, because they lie, the people that work at Hanford  
12          lie to us all the time, and so do all the people that  
13          build the nuclear plants. We have been lied to for  
14          50 -- how long has it been? 50 years? Let's see, I  
15          am a great-grandma now.

16                        Two botanists find rare life on an old  
17          nuclear reservation. This article is so full of  
18          errors, I can't believe it, but it is a result of  
19          simply the distance between my grandparents, my  
20          parents, and my generation. There is, you know, some  
21          more generations beyond me now.

22                        Are we out? Oh, that is too bad, because I  
23          wanted to tell you that we need to follow the state  
24          law, we need to have cleaner than the clean closure,  
25          no more waste dump, no more stuff brought in, and that



**DEPONENT**

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

1 tridium can't be removed from the groundwater.

2 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Ryan Jarvis. After  
3 Ryan, will be Karin Engstrom.

4 MR. JARVIS: Hi, my name is Ryan Jarvis, I am  
5 a law student here in Seattle. I would just like to  
6 address a couple of things. First of all, I learned  
7 about Hanford just last year for the first time, and I  
8 was really amazed that it is the most contaminated  
9 site in the western hemisphere, and I was actually  
10 more amazed to learn about the befuddled cleanup  
11 attempts that have been going on longer than I've been  
12 alive. I'm only 23 and as I understand, not much has  
13 happened, and some attempts that went down in flames  
14 to cleanup. So I urge the Department of Energy and  
15 Ecology to really make the effort to do what is right  
16 here. Empty the tanks to 99.9 percent of what is in  
17 there, use state waste management laws to really -- to  
18 avoid landfill closure and clean closure, and also no  
19 off-site waste.

20 It seems a little absurd to me to consider  
21 accepting more waste to Hanford, considering it is  
22 already the most contaminated site in the western  
23 hemisphere. And then finally, I would like to address  
24 Mr. Lyon. I was a little disappointed that as you  
25 stood up here and discussed what the Department of



**DEPONENT**

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

1 Energy has put in their EIS and you have considered  
2 it, but you haven't really taken a stance as of yet,  
3 and I would just like to read to you a provision from  
4 your organic statute, the statute that created the  
5 Department of Ecology. It says, "The legislature  
6 recognizes and declares it to be the policy of this  
7 state that it is a fundamental and inalienable right  
8 of the people of the State of Washington to live in a  
9 healthful and pleasant environment, and to benefit  
10 from the proper development and use benefit of its  
11 natural resources."

12 I don't understand how the Department of  
13 Ecology could -- this could be their guiding statute,  
14 and yet at the same time not take a stand on what is  
15 right at Hanford and really insuring that our strong  
16 state laws are enforced there to do what is right.  
17 Thank you.

18 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Karin Engstrom?  
19 Sylvia Haven? Sylvia?

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She left.

21 MR. PARHAM: She left, okay. Anne Jess?  
22 Anne? Helga Kahr. After Helga will be Brian  
23 Bessembinders.

24 MS. KAHR: Helga Kahr, Seattle, three minutes  
25 is inadequate to address this draft EIS, so I am going



**DEPONENT**

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

1 to reserve my right to submit extensive written  
2 comments.

3 When I was in the fourth grade, our class was  
4 taken on a field trip to the Zion nuclear plant in the  
5 state of Illinois, one of the first nuclear plants --  
6 commercial nuclear plants in the United States. I  
7 remember standing on a catwalk looking down at the  
8 spent fuel pool glowing blue. That was in April. In  
9 September, the girl who was standing next to me, my  
10 best friend, Leslie Collins, came down with a rare  
11 aggressive form of leukemia and died within two  
12 months. It was several decades later that I found out  
13 what killed her. I was representing atomic workers  
14 and medical workers who had radiation injuries.

15 The EIS is entirely inadequate in addressing  
16 the biological effects of ionizing radiation.  
17 Briefly, there is no safe level of ionizing radiation  
18 to which human tissue can be exposed; and second,  
19 there is no way to hide from gamma rays. You simply  
20 can't.

21 Plutonium 239 is an isotope that remains  
22 dangerously radioactive and toxic for 250,000 years.  
23 The draft EIS doesn't begin to look at that time  
24 frame. One pound of plutonium in the atmosphere,  
25 breathed in by the people, will kill every human being



**DEPONENT**

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



1 on this planet, and yet we are discussing, you know,  
2 dealing with this stuff. That is insane.

3 The draft EIS talks about how many adult men  
4 will get cancer in the future from the drinking water  
5 from the leaching of radioactive isotopes into the  
6 ground. They do not address what ionizing radiation  
7 will do to children, and ionizing radiation harms  
8 children more because their cells are dividing more  
9 quickly. In the state of Belarus, which is where most  
10 of the Chernobyl contamination went, the medical  
11 doctors there are writing reports about the health of  
12 the children there. There is not one healthy child in  
13 the entire country of Belarus. They all have thyroid  
14 disorders and cancers and childhood leukemias. That  
15 is what radiation does.

16 There is really no ideal solution to this  
17 problem of nuclear waste, but we need to do the very  
18 best we can do, and that is to vitrify as much as  
19 possible and to develop a deep geologic site to put  
20 the waste. That is not Hanford, that is not Yucca  
21 Mountain. Any other solution is insanity.

22 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Brian, and after  
23 Brian will be Ruth Yarrow.

24 MR. BESSEMBINDERS: Okay. So first, this is  
25 a horrible place to put nuclear waste. It is going to



**DEPONENT**

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

1 get into the drinking water, it is going to get into  
2 farms, agriculture, shipped around the country,  
3 bottled water, I don't know, do we take any from this  
4 area, we should look at that. And yeah, it is  
5 affecting Oregon, Washington, anyone down river, and  
6 it is guaranteed to cause cancer. At what amount, you  
7 guys can argue.

8 This keeps happening in many places. Where I  
9 am from in Omaha, we had a drinking water plant that  
10 was going to be put in. There was a former weapons  
11 manufacturing plant in the area, and basically they  
12 were like, you know, it is not going to leak in until,  
13 you know, 30, 40 years, but we are going to put this  
14 drinking water plant, which will suck more water out.  
15 It is providing water to a city with the richest man  
16 in the world, so it is still happening there.

17 Tennessee, I mean, all over the country,  
18 gigantic pools of sludge from coal power plants, I  
19 mean, no matter what energy you are talking about  
20 here, except for renewable resources, which we can  
21 actually utilize, are going to cause a negative  
22 effect. Natural gas, tracking, putting benzonite into  
23 the water.

24 You know, we just can't keep fighting this.  
25 We can't keep fighting it forever. We can't have



**DEPONENT**

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

1           these alternatives. We can't have these half efforts  
2           at cleaning it up. It has been happening forever, and  
3           basically policy is to just keeping having these  
4           meetings and saying, well, we will take that  
5           opportunity to bury the waste in the areas you care  
6           about most.

7                       The federal government is overtaking the  
8           state standards, make no mistake. There are state  
9           standards that do not allow this to happen and why  
10          isn't the federal government taking this into account?

11                      Yeah, Governor Gregoire, she has the  
12          authority to stop this, why isn't she? She needs to  
13          use her abilities to stop the permitting process. It  
14          should not happen in the future, it should not happen  
15          now. We shouldn't have to keep on fighting this, but  
16          it seems we're going to have to.

17                      Environmental impact statements are only  
18          supposed to be 300 pages, they are supposed to be  
19          understandable to the common layman, the public.  
20          These are becoming legal documents, rapidly, and as  
21          we've seen earlier, chemistry professionals can't  
22          figure this stuff out. I mean, this needs to be on  
23          the Seattle channel, this needs to be broadcast to  
24          people. We need to get over -- we need to realize it  
25          is our own greed that causes this, too, and it has



1           caused a lot of the other problems.

2                       Yeah, clean closure, I mean, clean -- we need  
3           98 percent, whatever we can do. We need to switch to  
4           clean energy. We need to stop trying to push the  
5           nuclear agenda, and we need to consider that -- I  
6           mean, is Obama -- hopefully what he is trying to do is  
7           offer this ridiculous proposal in the hope that the  
8           people around the country will realize that we can't  
9           build nuclear power plants, and hopefully, you know,  
10          we actually comment and we say this is ridiculous and  
11          hopefully that is his plan.

12                   MR. PARHAM: Three minutes.

13                   MR. BESSEMBINDERS: Yeah, water will be more  
14          expensive in the future. Go to Portland.

15                   MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Ruth Yarrow, and  
16          after Ruth will be Barbara Zepeda.

17                   MS. YARROW: My name is Ruth Yarrow, I am an  
18          ecologist who came here to work with Physicians for  
19          Social Responsibility on the Hanford issue 13 years  
20          ago. At that time, the Department of Energy said  
21          there are 200 feet of soil beneath the tanks, and if  
22          any leaks, it would adhere to the soil particles and  
23          would not enter the groundwater. Six months later,  
24          there were blaring headlines in the newspapers in  
25          Seattle saying radioactivity found in the groundwater



**DEPONENT**

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

1 under Hanford.

2 When I read about the amount of radioactivity  
3 that is considered acceptable or on the verge of  
4 dangerous, if you graph that, it has gone down very  
5 steeply over the many decades that we have dealt with  
6 radioactivity, to a tiny fraction of what we  
7 originally thought was what human beings could take.  
8 In other words, given the mistakes that DOE thought  
9 that the groundwater was not going to get  
10 contaminated, or our original naivete about what  
11 radioactivity could do to the human body, I think we  
12 need to put a huge chunk of humility into any of these  
13 decisions and realize we don't have any idea of the  
14 long-term effects, the synergistic effects of what is  
15 happening at Hanford. So that is one point I would  
16 like to make.

17 The other is the money is there. I made a  
18 graph once at one of these hearings with a piece of  
19 string, and one represented the billions that have  
20 been spent on producing and delivering nuclear and --  
21 weaponry and it went all the way around a building, a  
22 room this size. At that point, the DOE was saying we  
23 don't have enough money to do the cleanup. The amount  
24 that was being asked for for cleaning up Hanford was  
25 like that much. So we have spent incredible amounts



**DEPONET**

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

1 in producing this waste. We can find the money to  
2 clean it up if the political will is there and if our  
3 Department of Ecology will stand up and use the laws  
4 that it has at its back to demand what cleanup is  
5 needed. Thank you.

6 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Barbara, and then  
7 after that, will be Blair Anuntson.

8 MS. ZEPEDA: Yeah, I live in Seattle and I  
9 have been coming to these things for years. I was a  
10 Bomber, a Richland Bomber, I was -- I went to high  
11 school in Richland and my mother died of pancreatic  
12 cancer, she worked in a decontamination lab. They  
13 were very low paid workers, all of the workers, and so  
14 there was one person there that I had to listen to her  
15 all through high school come home and complain about  
16 how none of the supervisors there would allow them to  
17 really follow the safety rules. They'd have safety  
18 meetings, but they were never allowed to follow them,  
19 except for Russ Knights, and I don't know if you can  
20 find any Russ Knights in Hanford anymore, because  
21 essentially, the problem with Hanford is the problem  
22 with the military industrial complex that Eisenhower  
23 talked about, and it is intellectual and economic  
24 incest.

25 It is the worst form of incest, because it



**DEPONENT**

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

1 hides the facts, it hides the dollar facts, and if you  
2 can't even get the dollars straight, how in the hell  
3 can you get all of the protons, neutrons, and the  
4 million chemical formula right? It is deliberate and  
5 yet they are brilliant people. I was late to this  
6 meeting because I was listening to European Journal on  
7 CBTBS, a Tacoma PBS station. A German -- one of the  
8 best German engineers was talking about why the new  
9 subway train tunnel in Cologne was a catastrophe. It  
10 flooded, it undermined a building there and museum,  
11 and he said the reason is that they are allowing the  
12 contractors to monitor themselves.

13 You cannot have -- and I would -- if you  
14 would take this book and print it in your -- this is  
15 Eldon Caldicott's book, a New Nuclear Danger, and  
16 talks about George Bush and the military industrial  
17 complex, but this goes back to Eisenhower and it is a  
18 list of the Dirty Dozen, the ten top contractors that  
19 have been involved in the weapons and in so-called  
20 cleanup and the so-called peaceful uses of nuclear  
21 energy, which our leading politicians, Andrew Jackson  
22 and John Adams pushed, and they bought off the  
23 environmentalists because they gave them some little  
24 parks. They didn't tell them the parks -- that the  
25 water running through those parks was all going to be



**DEPONET**

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

1 nuclearized with those darling little plants.

2 And here is the other -- this is the  
3 political incest of the military industrial complex,  
4 with the documentation of the major corporations that  
5 have played this game because they need more money,  
6 the more messes they make. When you have got an  
7 economic system, like Wall Street, you not only  
8 destroy the environment, you destroy the economy, and  
9 while you're ruining the world.

10 And then here I have -- I am going to give  
11 you these 20 pages from 159 pages of the latest City  
12 Light bond prospectus. In this is a hidden subsidy of  
13 City Light through the Northwest Energy that we are  
14 subsidizing nuclear plants and this is what allows  
15 Obama to come forward with this big plan, because he  
16 can hide it in the budget, because in here, they tell  
17 you, okay, it's like 50 million but it has gone up to  
18 500 million within ten years of financing within City  
19 Light, because we have got all of this wonderful  
20 unused bonding capacity, which the municipal ownership  
21 lead built the first public utility in the  
22 United States at City Light in 1905 and it has been  
23 bastardized. Thank you.

24 MR. PARHAM: Blair Anuntson? Jim Kelley.

25 MR. KELLEY: I am Jim Kelley from Seattle.



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



1 Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment. I  
2 wanted to say, first off, I am not a scientist. My  
3 training is in communications and the law, and because  
4 of that, I am not going to make a scientific argument,  
5 but I do want to make a personal appeal and I am going  
6 to direct it to you, because you are the two public  
7 employees who are here.

8 I am a former state and county employee, and  
9 so Jeff and Mary Beth, I just want to say that, you  
10 know, I am a citizen of the United States and a  
11 lifelong resident of Seattle, Washington, so you both  
12 work for me, and you both work for all of the people  
13 here, but more importantly, you work for all of these  
14 people's children and their children and future  
15 generations that will go on, hopefully, for many, many  
16 generations, and you might be also pleased to know  
17 that I haven't reproduced, but it is important to keep  
18 that in mind, because when government deals with big  
19 issues, and I mean, really important issues, like the  
20 abolition of slavery and the kinds of things that have  
21 made this, you know, have made this a great country,  
22 when it has always taken heroes to step up from the  
23 ranks of everyday workers, and, you know, the thing is  
24 that when you work for government, it is so easy to  
25 just do things the way it has always been done, and



**DEPONENT**

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

1 this environmental impact statement, I am sorry to  
2 say, I have worked on some EISs myself, this  
3 environmental impact statement is the perfect example  
4 of that.

5 This is a 6,000-page document that no one can  
6 understand, because chemists can't understand it and  
7 attorneys can't understand it. What we can do is we  
8 can try to boil it down and understand bits and  
9 pieces, and yes, I'll make the same points that  
10 everybody else here has made, you know, that the --  
11 about the cleaning up to 99.9 percent and all of that,  
12 but that is not the important issue here. The  
13 important issue here is for someone, and I'm saying  
14 this for the record, someone who works on these issues  
15 at the US Department of Energy, at the state  
16 Department of Ecology, and the governor's office, and  
17 the Oval Office, somebody should step up and say  
18 enough is enough. This has to change. Our approach  
19 to the way we deal with the cleanup of nuclear waste  
20 has to change.

21 This is a critical, critical issue to the  
22 health of our future generations and to the health of  
23 our environment, you know, our ecosystems and  
24 everything else that depend upon clean water, and boy,  
25 I am just begging you, please, step out of that --



**DEPONENT**

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

1 that inertia that comes with being a part of a system  
2 that does things over and over the same way. Step out  
3 of it, be a hero. Thanks.

4 MR. PARHAM: Fred Miller. After Fred Miller  
5 will be Robert MacDonald.

6 MR. MILLER: My name is Fred Miller, I am the  
7 president of Peace Action of Washington and a board  
8 member of Peace Action, which is America's largest  
9 peace organization.

10 First, I want to talk a little bit about 90  
11 percent and 99 percent and 99.9 percent. Speaking to  
12 someone whose formal education in mathematics ended  
13 when I was 15, recently there were headlines about a  
14 middle-aged white man who went to the Pentagon and  
15 started killing people. I am a middle-aged white man,  
16 and his father and mother had reported that he was  
17 crazy. My father has been saying I was crazy for  
18 years. And he hadn't spoken to his parents for quite  
19 a while. I haven't spoken to my parents for about  
20 three weeks now. So I want you to think, okay, what  
21 are the chances that middle-aged white men in this  
22 audience are psycho gun toters? Would you keep your  
23 job if you knew that you were going to a place where  
24 there was about 50 middle-aged white men and you knew  
25 that 90 percent of them were not psychotic gun toters?



**DEPONENT**

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

1           Would you keep your job if that was 99 percent?  Would  
2           you keep your job if it was 99.9 percent?  Which means  
3           about, oh, one headline nationwide every 20 hearings.  
4           99.9 percent is not that high.

5                       We had an attorney and a chemist with much  
6           more education than me, who couldn't understand the  
7           EIS.  It only took me a few minutes and I have no  
8           college background.  One thing I noticed is it doesn't  
9           seem to talk about the ecology of the Hanford area in  
10          the time we are talking about.  I have spoken with  
11          atmospheric scientists and I asked them, I was just  
12          having fun, okay, how bad could it get?  Could we have  
13          West Texas weather in Hanford?  You know, West Texas,  
14          they get thunderstorms that dump an inch of rain in  
15          four or five minutes, that dumps a foot of rain, and  
16          this not wildly unusual.  It happens someplace in --  
17          actually East Texas more or less every year, a foot of  
18          rain in 24 hours.  He said we have no idea.  It is  
19          entirely possible that we could make East Texas  
20          weather look placid.

21                      Are you planning to have it clean enough for  
22          who knows what kind of weather is heading for Hanford  
23          in the next hundred years, to say nothing about a  
24          thousand years?  How clean are you planning on making  
25          it?  Thank you.



**DEPONET**

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. Robert MacDonald,  
2 it's a late sign-up. Robert? No?

3 Have I covered everyone who signed up? I  
4 believe I have. There are a lot of names here. I  
5 would like to turn now to people who have not signed  
6 up who want to offer comment.

7 Is there anyone who would like to provide --  
8 yes, sir. Come on up.

9 MR. HEGGEN: Hello, my name is Richard  
10 Heggen, H-e-g-g-e-n, and I am a former ecology  
11 employee who used to work on the single shell tanks,  
12 and I will keep this kind of brief. Basically, in  
13 reviewing the EIS and my knowledge of other documents  
14 and issues on Hanford, there is about four key points  
15 I would like to make.

16 Institutional controls, this is the first  
17 point, institutional controls, like covers, liners,  
18 fences, et cetera, will fail over time and a shorter  
19 time than you probably think. Existing -- the second  
20 point is existing contamination has already been shown  
21 to show serious human health and environmental  
22 effects. Even if you clean it up to 99.9 percent or  
23 better, you have already got issues out there. You  
24 can't get to some of these amazing amounts of  
25 chemistry and radiological inventory from past ditches



**DEPONENT**

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

1 and cribs and so forth, which actually kind of thwarts  
2 the tank form inventories.

3 Point No. 3 is that the EIS is incomplete. I  
4 covered those points earlier in Gerry's presentation,  
5 and the last point is a lack of meaningful  
6 characterization out on-site. This has been going on  
7 for years, just kind of a real slow paced  
8 characterization. There is not enough  
9 characterization to actually support the modeling done  
10 in the EIS. It is pretty standard methodology is to  
11 validate your model characterization, go out and take  
12 some field samples, find out if that model is valid or  
13 not. I didn't see that in the EIS.

14 Because of all that and other issues, I would  
15 just like to say for the record US DOE needs to  
16 conduct the most thorough possible cleanup on-site,  
17 and I am talking at least 99.9 percent or better. Dig  
18 those tanks out, you know, take a good look at the  
19 linings and other containmented areas on-site. And  
20 also, the most important point is not to bring any  
21 more waste to Hanford whatsoever. Thanks.

22 MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

23 MR. DIPESO: Good evening. Jim Dipeso,  
24 D-i-p-e-s-o. Good Italian name. Please spell it  
25 right.



1 I'm with the Republicans for Environmental  
2 Protection. We will have detailed written comments to  
3 be submitted later. Very briefly, the primary theme  
4 of our letter is there should be no further  
5 consideration of importing off-site waste into  
6 Hanford. Hanford should not be a nuclear waste  
7 repository, or as -- if you will forgive me the humor  
8 for the lateness of the hour, a former Nevada senator  
9 once said in regard to Yucca Mountain, he called it a  
10 nuclear waste suppository.

11 Anyway, importing off-site waste is at cross  
12 purposes with thorough cleanup of the radioactive and  
13 chemical wastes that endanger the Columbia River. We  
14 support 99.9 percent cleanup standards, a clean  
15 closure, not landfill closure, because all landfills  
16 leak. Anything else is irresponsible and thank you  
17 and we will be in touch.

18 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone who has not  
19 provided a comment yet is invited to at this time.

20 No? We'd like to turn to people who have  
21 already commented who would like to provide additional  
22 comment.

23 MR. POLLET: Gerry Pollet with  
24 Heart of America Northwest. I have several points I  
25 would like to make tonight. First, I would like to



**DEPONENT**

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

1 start thanking those who have stayed to this late  
2 hour. Your participation and your presence makes a  
3 big difference, and hopefully someone back on the top  
4 floor of the Forestal (ph.) building, Energy  
5 Department headquarters, will hear about your comments  
6 tomorrow morning, and perhaps someone at the  
7 governor's office as well.

8 First off, in this very room, not so many  
9 years ago, several people here remember that there was  
10 a hearing on the proposed restart of the FFTF nuclear  
11 reactor, and there were probably 3- to 500 people here  
12 that evening. There are at least 100 people I counted  
13 here tonight talking about the legacy of nuclear  
14 weapons and reactor production at Hanford and a need  
15 for full cleanup. Luckily, we won a decision after  
16 five or six years of hard citizen organizing that that  
17 reactor was to be shut down.

18 What is beyond me and inexplicably is why the  
19 Energy Department is even asking the question as to  
20 whether or not you fully remove the reactor. There is  
21 a standard in state law that for all energy facility  
22 sites, we restore the site by removing the reactor.  
23 Oregon did this with the Trojan nuclear reactor on the  
24 Columbia River. For the other nine nuclear weapons  
25 production reactors along the Columbia River, the



**DEPONET**

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



1 Energy Department has long agreed that it has to  
2 remove them entirely. So what is different about this  
3 FFTF reactor? There is no difference. It should be  
4 removed entirely, not just to grade level, but remove  
5 it entirely so that that portion of the Hanford site  
6 can be restored for other uses, including treaty  
7 rights to use that portion of the site, which are not  
8 compatible with leaving it under account. And this  
9 decision is one that is so by bizarrely sensible that  
10 I have been listening to presentation after  
11 presentation and going, how come the State of  
12 Washington ignores its own site closure standard for  
13 reactors and energy facilities, when it says in its  
14 presentation, we agree there isn't much difference  
15 between capping it or taking it apart and removing it  
16 entirely.

17 Did the State of Washington Department of  
18 Ecology forget about its own site restoration  
19 standards? Yes, apparently so. And that's not  
20 excusable. The Energy Department should have been  
21 reminded of that standard. It wasn't really -- it was  
22 up to the contractor and the Energy Department to be  
23 knowledgeable about it, but it is certainly logical  
24 for them to rely on the State of Washington to say,  
25 hey, we are a cooperating agency, you need to know, as



**DEPONET**

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

1           you draft this, that we have such a standard. So what  
2           is going on here? I would like to hear from the State  
3           of Washington how it missed this. I would really like  
4           to hear that answer.

5                        It is important that the reactor be entirely  
6           dismantled and the site restored to as beneficial use  
7           a condition as is possible. As has been stated over  
8           and over again tonight and in prior hearings, caps  
9           fail. Caps fail and result in exposures to people.  
10          Sometimes they fail because of deliberate intrusions,  
11          so it's not wise to have isolated spots all over the  
12          560 square miles of Hanford where you have got caps as  
13          opposed to trying to consolidate as much of the waste  
14          as possible on this one small area in the central  
15          plateau. That is inevitable, but the landfills that  
16          are proposed are also projected to leak without even  
17          adding off-site wastes, and let's think about that in  
18          a final thought for tonight.

19                      The landfills will release far in excessive  
20          standards, even without off-site waste being added,  
21          and therefore, the reasonable alternative is not only  
22          to not add more off-site waste, but this EIS needs to  
23          ask the question how much of Hanford's existing waste  
24          should be exhumed, dug up, treated, and sent to deep  
25          geologic repositories elsewhere in the country? Not



**DEPONENT**

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

1 above groundwater, not next to rivers, but dug up and  
2 removed and sent to deep geologic repositories because  
3 it doesn't belong next to a major river, it doesn't  
4 belong above potable groundwater. Thank you.

5 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else who  
6 would like to provide a comment who has already. Yes,  
7 sir.

8 MR. RASBERRY: No one has brought this up,  
9 but I think it is of interest to most people here that  
10 the US Department of Energy just had a press release  
11 on March 4th, tours of Hanford are available. You  
12 usually can't go to Hanford, it is usually closed, but  
13 one day a year, they make reservations for the rest of  
14 the year. If anyone wants to take a tour, then you  
15 have to register on that day. The tour is free, it is  
16 information intensive, it is rather exhausting, it is  
17 about five hours. You are going around Hanford site.

18 The date to register is tomorrow. If you  
19 want to go on a tour sometime in the next year, you  
20 have to go to the web site tomorrow early and  
21 register. I have been on the tour, it is a lot of  
22 fun, I recommend going if you are interested. You get  
23 to meet some of the people there, it is what it is.  
24 If anyone would like to talk to me about it, I will be  
25 around. Thank you.



**DEPONENT**

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

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Does it say when the  
2 tour is going to be?

3 MR. RASBERRY: It is April until September,  
4 tours.

5 MR. PARHAM: Do we have an additional  
6 comment?

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you give us the  
8 web site?

9 MR. RASBERRY: I will be around.  
10 Hanford.gov. Hanford.gov.

11 MS. ISAAC: I would like to make an  
12 additional comment. When we are using these units of  
13 99.9 percent, this is by volume. I would like us to  
14 use a different way of talking about it. Instead of  
15 by volume, I would like to be talking about this with  
16 respect to its toxicity or its radioactivity, heavy  
17 metal content, whatever the bad stuff is. I want that  
18 to be talked about. What percent of that is being  
19 left, not what percent of volume is being left. That  
20 is part of the obfuscation of this statement.

21 And the other thing is, you probably don't  
22 know this, but the federal government does have a law  
23 concerning consent forms. When people participate in  
24 research, which I feel we are all doing right now is  
25 research, when people participate in research, the



**DEPONET**

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

1 federal government requires that consent forms be  
2 written in language that the average person  
3 participating would be able to understand. Now, it is  
4 very low for medical research, it is seventh grade.  
5 But we have to take those consent forms to people,  
6 committees, whatever is set up, boards, review boards,  
7 to look at those for us and let us know if we have  
8 passed that test. I think that you folks should be  
9 submitting your materials and the -- to some board and  
10 to let you know if you have passed that test before  
11 you come to us. Thank you.

12 MR. PARHAM: We would like to thank you for  
13 coming out tonight. That concludes our program. This  
14 is No. 8 in the series and thank you very much. You  
15 have been a very patient and curious crowd. Thank you  
16 very much and see you later.

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

(The meeting concluded at  
10:00 p.m.)



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF WASHINGTON )

) ss.

COUNTY OF KING )

I, Holly Buckmater a Certified Court Reporter and an officer of the Court, under my commission as a Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing deposition transcript of the witness named herein was taken stenographically before me and transcribed under my direction; that the transcript is a full, true and complete transcript of the proceedings, including all questions, objections, motions and exceptions of counsel, made and taken at the time of the foregoing proceedings, to the best of my abilities;

That I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any party to this action or relative or employee of any such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in the said action or the outcome thereof;

That the witness, before examination, was by me duly sworn, and the transcript was made available to the witness for reading and signing upon completion of transcription, unless indicated herein the waiving of signature.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand on this 15th day of March, 2010, at Shoreline, Washington.

*Holly Buckmaster*

Holly Buckmaster  
Notary Public in and for  
the State of Washington

residing in Seattle.

My commission expires:

November 9, 2010.

