

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

DATE: FEBRUARY 22, 2010

6:00 p.m.

EASTERN OREGON UNIVERSITY

Hoke Union Building

One University Boulevard

La Grande, Oregon 97850

James Parham, Facilitator

PANEL MEMBERS:

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

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

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

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

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION	PAGE	LINE
Ed Edmo	4	7
Gerry Pollet	9	1
Maxine Hines Huber	15	3
Lance C. Shoemaker	17	17
Shelley Cimon	20	19
Brian Kelly	27	14
Brett VandenHeuvel	29	5
Lauren Goldberg	34	4

	FORMAL COMMENT SESSION	PAGE	LINE
1			
2			
3	Cheryl Simpson	36	19
4			
5	Sandy Ryma	37	22
6			
7	Stephen Donnell	38	13
8			
9	Norm Cimon	41	3
10			
11	Ted Taylor	44	1
12			
13	Donald D. Isadore, Jr.	46	20
14			
15	Mia Turner	49	2
16			
17	Ed Shawl	49	24
18			
19	Sandra Moylen	50	25
20			
21	David Wonk	53	4
22			
23			
24			
25			

1 (8:15 p.m.)

2 FACILITATOR PARHAM: We'll move right into  
3 our comments. And I'd like to invite to the  
4 microphone up here, to provide comments is Ed Edmo  
5 from the Affiliated Tribes of the Northwest Indians  
6 of the United States. Ed, are you still here?

7 MR. EDMO: Thank you. Yes. I'm the right  
8 size, they build everything too big. (Facilitator  
9 Parham adjusted the microphone).

10 I am Ed Edmo. I am Shoshone, Bannock, Nez  
11 Perce from Yakima. I come with authority, because my  
12 bones are made up of depths of this land.

13 We have been on the Columbia River for  
14 20,000 years. I was raised at Celilo Falls. When  
15 the river was a true blue, I'd reach in and drink as  
16 a boy. Now I won't do that, because we know the  
17 river is polluted.

18 2010 Winter Conference, Great Wolf Lodge,  
19 Grand Mound, Washington Resolution No. 10-02, Tribal  
20 input for the 2010 Hanford Clean-up Environmental  
21 Impact Statement.

22 Preamble: We, the members of the  
23 Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians of the United  
24 States, invoking the divine blessing of the Creator  
25 upon the efforts and purposes, in order to preserve

1 ourselves and our descendants rights secured under  
2 Indian Treaties and benefits to which we are entitled  
3 under the laws and constitution of the United States  
4 and several states, to enlighten the public toward a  
5 better understanding of Indian people, to preserve  
6 Indian cultural values, and otherwise promote the  
7 welfare of Indian people, do hereby establish and  
8 submit the following resolution:

9 WHEREAS, the Affiliated Tribes of  
10 Northwest Indians (ATNI) are representatives of and  
11 advocates for national, regional, and specific tribal  
12 concerns; and

13 WHEREAS, ATNI is a regional organization  
14 comprised of American Indians in the states of  
15 Washington, Idaho, Oregon, Montana, Nevada, Northern  
16 California, and Alaska; and

17 WHEREAS, the health, safety, welfare,  
18 education, economic and employment opportunity, and  
19 the preservation of cultural and natural resources  
20 are primary goals and objectives of ATNI; and

21 WHEREAS, the United States Department of  
22 Energy's (DOE) Hanford Nuclear Site, located in  
23 southeastern Washington along the Columbia River,  
24 contains chemical and radioactive waste that has  
25 contaminated our people, our water, air, and land;

1 and

2 WHEREAS, the health of the Columbia River  
3 and the salmon that spawn in the Hanford Reach are  
4 critical to the Indian people; and

5 WHEREAS, ATNI Member Tribes have invested  
6 countless hours and resources fighting to require a  
7 faster and more thorough cleanup of the Hanford Site  
8 while DOE has disposed of radioactive waste in 149  
9 underground single-shell tanks, among other places,  
10 and many tanks are leaking or have leaked radioactive  
11 waste which has in the past and currently is  
12 contaminating the groundwater, soil, plants, and is  
13 leaching into the Columbia River.

14 THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that ATNI hereby  
15 recommend that Hanford not be the national clearing  
16 dump site. Thank you.

17 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that ATNI  
18 recommends that DOE shall reject any alternatives  
19 that propose shipping more waste to Hanford; and

20 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that ATNI supports  
21 the principles of "cleanup first."

22 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that, when making  
23 decisions, the risk of exposure to Native Americans  
24 should be projected by the Tribes themselves, not  
25 DOE's exposure to scenarios because Tribes are in the

1 best position to judge the exposure of risk; and

2 WHEREAS BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that ATNI  
3 demands that DOE choose the most aggressive plan to  
4 contain and treat radioactive and chemical wastes at  
5 Hanford with the goal of making the entire area safe  
6 for traditional uses; and

7 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that ATNI demands  
8 DOE should remove and treat as much waste contained  
9 in the single-shelled tanks as possible to reach the  
10 goal of 99.9%; and

11 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the ATNI demands  
12 DOE should immediately develop plans to clean up the  
13 million gallons of radioactive waste that has already  
14 leaked from the storage tanks and completely treat  
15 all of the leaked waste and evaluate and treat miles  
16 of unlined ditches, trenches containing nuclear waste  
17 that DOE currently has no plans to clean up; and

18 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that ATNI demands  
19 DOE should ensure that the Waste Treatment Plant create  
20 ultra-stable waste forms that are "good as glass,"  
21 and DOE should reject all less stable treatment  
22 systems; and

23 BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that ATNI demand  
24 DOE select cleanup plans that protect the health of  
25 all people today and future generations.

1                   Certify, the foregoing resolution was  
2                   adopted at the 2010 Winter Conference of the  
3                   Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, held at the  
4                   Great Wolf Lodge, Grand Mound, Washington, February  
5                   8 - 11, 2010 with a quorum present.

6                   And I speak as a father and grandfather.  
7                   Thank you very much.

8                   FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Next on  
9                   the sign-up list -- and we're asking to keep it three  
10                  to five minutes, please. We've got a number of  
11                  people who want to speak.

12                  Next is Gerry Pollet, Heart of America.  
13                  And after that, Maxine Hines Huber will follow.

14                  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excuse me, sir.

15                  FACILITATOR PARHAM: Yes.

16                  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could we have the  
17                  speakers in the front if they choose to be?

18                  FACILITATOR PARHAM: We're going to have  
19                  them at this speaker. We actually need to see  
20                  their -- she needs to see their mouths moving, so we  
21                  can catch their sound, so --

22                  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. I feel like  
23                  they're not quite --

24                  FACILITATOR PARHAM: Okay. Well, you can  
25                  turn around too. Thank you. Go ahead, Gerry.



1                   MR. POLLET: That's a great point.  
2           We're -- I'm Gerry Pollet with Heart of America  
3           Northwest, which is the region's longest lived and  
4           largest Hanford cleanup watchdog group.

5                   And I want to thank you all for coming out  
6           tonight. It's really incredibly important that  
7           you're here to talk about the future, the river, and  
8           the health of generations to come.

9                   And without you being here, the Energy  
10          Department would persist in its decisions to use  
11          Hanford as a national waste dump and to do what I  
12          refer to as cover-up, instead of clean up.

13                   As you've heard already tonight, their  
14          preferred alternative, which is to say their plan if  
15          they can make a decision today, is not to clean up  
16          the billions of gallons of waste that has leaked from  
17          high-level nuclear waste tanks, but to cover it up.  
18          And it will spread through the soil.

19                   Their plan is to use Hanford's national  
20          radioactive waste dump and add 3 million cubic feet  
21          of radioactive waste to Hanford's problems.

22                   And you're here -- and I'd like to  
23          encourage you, even if you didn't sign up yet, to  
24          speak from your heart tonight and tell the Energy  
25          Department to go home with the message that what

1 they're proposing to do is unacceptable for now and  
2 for hundreds of years and thousands of years to come.  
3 And to do the right thing and do it right now.

4           We can jump ahead a couple of slides.  
5 Right there is great, (indicating). We're here  
6 because right now as we speak tonight, what the  
7 Energy Department did not speak -- what the Energy  
8 Department did not tell you tonight is that as we're  
9 speaking tonight, radioactive strontium-90 is already  
10 seeping into your Columbia River.

11           The Columbia River, along with the Yakima,  
12 Umatilla, Nez Perce Nations have the right to fish  
13 and live along in perpetuity.

14           At 1,500 times the drinking water  
15 standard, radioactive strontium-90. What does that  
16 mean? The drinking water standard is set at a level  
17 at which one adult out of every 10,000 who drink it  
18 die of cancer.

19           You're all smart enough to do the math  
20 here. That is one contaminant, radioactive  
21 strontium-90 in those seeps today.

22           And what you've already seen tonight from  
23 Ken Niles is how many contaminants would be added to  
24 those plumes, under the Energy Department's cover-up  
25 instead of cleanup and the Energy Department's plan

1 to dump 3 million cubic feet more radioactive waste  
2 into the soil.

3 Please let's jump ahead a bit. 40 miles  
4 of unlined trenches exist at Hanford like this,  
5 (indicating).

6 Your Energy Department, your Energy  
7 Department dumps radioactive waste in unlined ditches  
8 around the country.

9 You can't dig a hole in your backyard and  
10 put a pizza box in, it's against the law. Your local  
11 government can't operate unlined landfills, but your  
12 Federal Government thinks that it's okay to dump  
13 radioactive waste in unlined trenches.

14 In 2004, they stopped doing this at  
15 Hanford only because we showed pictures like this  
16 during the initiative, to stop Hanford from being a  
17 national waste dump.

18 In other places in the country, they still  
19 do this. And their plan for cleanup is just to put  
20 dirt over the top and walk away and it will migrate  
21 through the soil, into the groundwater.

22 Let's jump ahead. Let's keep going. Here  
23 is carbon tetrachloride in the groundwater today,  
24 (indicating). The darkest red area is 50 times the  
25 drinking water standard.

1                   You see the river going through Hanford  
2 for 50 miles. And let's take a look at the next  
3 slide. 125 years from now, is their projection,  
4 (indicating). We can show the same for uranium.

5                   Plutonium in a thousand years, the Energy  
6 Department projects will be 300 times the drinking  
7 water standard along the river shore.

8                   That means for your great, great, great,  
9 great grandchildren, it is genocide. Because people  
10 will be using that river water, people will be living  
11 along it, the Tribes with treaty rights will be  
12 there, but their children will get cancer from using  
13 the water there.

14                  Let's jump ahead to the slides about  
15 transportation. The Energy Department proposes to  
16 ship 3 million cubic feet of radioactive waste to  
17 Hanford.

18                  That waste does not include a separate  
19 proposal they have to ship something called  
20 greater-than-Class C waste, which is as hot as  
21 high-level nuclear waste.

22                  It is deadly hot. And it would come  
23 through La Grande on I-84. And how hot is it? Well,  
24 a year ago, a year and a half ago, the Energy  
25 Department had a proposal to ship high-level nuclear

1 waste to Hanford.

2 Next slide please. And for that proposal,  
3 the Energy Department's own estimate is that even if  
4 there is no accident, no terrorist attack on a  
5 truckload, 816 adults along the truck route would die  
6 from radiation that comes through the shipping casks,  
7 to the people stuck in traffic, the children, in  
8 schools, community centers along the truck routes.

9 Now, the Energy Department only estimates  
10 this for adults. I care about the children and I  
11 think the rest of you do.

12 Children are three to ten times more  
13 susceptible to get cancer than an adult, from the  
14 same dose. It is unconscionable that the Energy  
15 Department only estimates for adults.

16 But more unconscionable that the Energy  
17 Department has failed to honor its obligation under  
18 the National Environmental Policy Act tonight and  
19 disclose to you how much greater-than-Class C waste,  
20 that really hot radioactive waste, they would also  
21 ship to Hanford.

22 The Energy Department is supposed to  
23 disclose all of this in one impact statement. Not  
24 tell you that you can come back out in another few  
25 months to another meeting and will separately tell

1 you the piece of impact to your health from that one,  
2 and then another proposal down the road.

3 They're supposed to put it altogether in  
4 one statement, that you get to comment on at one  
5 time. And you should demand that your Energy  
6 Department meet that obligation.

7 So please comment. The other reason it's  
8 important that you're here tonight is we ask -- my  
9 organization asks that there be a hearing in  
10 La Grande. It's been years since there's been one.

11 And having such a great turnout tonight,  
12 is a sign that there's interest, that you care. So  
13 please speak tonight.

14 Come to the microphone, even if you didn't  
15 sign in. Speak from the heart for two minutes. And  
16 tell the Energy Department and the State of  
17 Washington what you want.

18 And I hope that you'll urge them to clean  
19 up, not cover up, and put cleanup first before they  
20 dump more waste at Hanford. Thank you.

21 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Maxine  
22 Hines Huber. And that will be followed by Lance  
23 Shoemaker.

24 MS. HINES HUBER: Hi. Can you hear me or  
25 do we need to adjust it?

1 FACILITATOR PARHAM: I'm going to adjust  
2 it a little bit.

3 MS. HINES HUBER: Okay. So this isn't my  
4 favorite part. But, okay. Can you hear me over  
5 there?

6 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Yes.

7 MS. HINES HUBER: All right. Good. I  
8 live here in La Grande. I've been involved with  
9 Hanford issues for 25 years, as long as they've been  
10 having their very first meetings here years ago,  
11 because of transportation issues.

12 And Gerry speaks to the worst of it. And  
13 I have to agree with a lot of it. But I also want to  
14 say there's been a real shift and some real progress  
15 made at Hanford.

16 The fact that USDOE is having a real  
17 meeting here with a lot of people is very different  
18 than it used to be.

19 And so I commend the people coming. And  
20 if you've taken the time to get here and listen, make  
21 sure you take the time to get a comment in.

22 If you want further information, I live  
23 here. Find me. I'll get you whatever you need, if  
24 you can't find it on the websites.

25 But one of the things that I do want to

1 say is that, you know, you see the projections out  
2 7,000 years.

3 Right now Hanford, everybody assumes it's  
4 always going to be this dry place. And so the idea  
5 of leaving the ground that is so highly contaminated  
6 under the tanks is just never going to be acceptable  
7 to me. We don't know how it's going to go, we don't  
8 know what's going to happen to the dams.

9 The Tribes have the right to their land  
10 back. That land is going to be used by people.  
11 People are going to want to build houses and put  
12 plants on there. It's really a pretty piece of land.

13 And we don't have the right to just assume  
14 that it's always just going to be this dry, desolate  
15 place. The Tribes have the right to their land back.

16 One of the things that it is -- it's hard  
17 to understand a lot of this. And if you get lost --  
18 I've been at this a long time and I'm always lost.

19 I always feel totally overwhelmed by all  
20 the issues. It is so complicated, way more than I  
21 ever can grasp. And I know that most of you are just  
22 going to get a little taste of it tonight.

23 But I'm a real believer in that if we --  
24 I'm going to cry -- if we do cleanup with really  
25 intense hard action, not just thinking about it, not



1 just taking the short time, but doing it so we're  
2 really in sync with Mother Earth, Mother Earth will  
3 cooperate. And Mother Earth takes really good care  
4 of our planet.

5 Because, you know, we make messes and they  
6 get cleaned up. And rivers clean themselves again,  
7 if we just quit polluting them.

8 So I want to do the very best we can. We  
9 owe it to people and to the planet. And so please  
10 make your comments and please stand up and say no,  
11 you don't get to leave contamination in the ground  
12 under any circumstances. There's a way. It may not  
13 be this year, it may not be in ten years. But if the  
14 intent is set, we can clean this up.

15 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Next is  
16 Lance Shoemaker, followed by Shelley Cimon.

17 DR. SHOEMAKER: Hi, my name is Dr. Lance  
18 Shoemaker. My home here is in the Grande Ronde  
19 Valley. But I actually grew up in Benton City,  
20 Washington, which is very close to the Hanford  
21 nuclear site.

22 My grandparents moved to Benton City,  
23 Washington in 1936 before the nuclear site ever  
24 existed.

25 I used to work out at Hanford. I spent

1 four summers out there. I actually did research on  
2 the 32 of the miscellaneous single-shell waste tanks  
3 and I also did occurrence reporting out there. So  
4 I've got a little experience. I have numerous  
5 relatives that have worked out there.

6 And I'll be honest with you, I really do  
7 like Hanford. It is a great facility. It's amazing  
8 what goes on out there, and it's not just waste.

9 I do believe that the DOE has a definite  
10 responsibility to clean up the mess that's there, to  
11 do what they can.

12 But realistically speaking, there's no way  
13 it will ever be 100 percent cleaned up. It will  
14 probably never be inhabitable.

15 You go out there and there's areas that  
16 are contaminated and they have a little plastic chain  
17 around them with a sign that hangs there and says,  
18 "Contaminated area."

19 And you're over here shooting baskets at  
20 lunch, and the dust is blowing over there. So it's  
21 kind of ridiculous.

22 And I'm not saying anyone is intentionally  
23 responsible. There was a lot of ignorance there. We  
24 just didn't know what we were doing.

25 But you know what, I'm proud of the war

1 effort that went on there. My grandparents on both  
2 sides contributed to that.

3 And I know it saved a lot of lives on both  
4 sides of the war for what was done. And I'm proud of  
5 what went on out there, but I think we have a  
6 responsibility to clean up what we can. But  
7 realistically, it's not going to be this ideal,  
8 beautiful Pollyanna place.

9 If you start dredging all that stuff up,  
10 it's just like tearing up asbestos. It's in the air,  
11 it's everywhere.

12 And if you've lived over in that area, you  
13 know how dry and arid it is and how easily everything  
14 spreads. And if you think that that's not already in  
15 the water, you're sadly mistaken.

16 But by the same token, I know for a fact  
17 that the earth has a great ability to handle the  
18 wastes that are presented.

19 If you look at Chernobyl, if you look at  
20 Hiroshima and Nagasaki, you look at how well they're  
21 doing.

22 You can't tell me that we think that we're  
23 so all powerful and we've got all these great  
24 answers, well, we don't.

25 And the technology is not there. And I'll

1 guarantee you, the technology won't be there in a  
2 thousand years to clean it up.

3 But on the other hand, we've got an FFTF  
4 out there, Fast Flux Test Facility, that should be  
5 reopened, should be making radioisotopes for the  
6 medical community. Absolute disaster that it was  
7 mothballed.

8 We've got all kinds of research that goes  
9 on out there that should continue. Hanford's been  
10 good to a lot of people.

11 Unfortunate, and it's just an unfortunate  
12 circumstance of history, but it's something we have  
13 to deal with. It's something we have to live with.

14 But if you think you're going to build a  
15 subdivision out at Hanford, you're sadly mistaken.  
16 So there's my comment.

17 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Shelley.  
18 And then after that will be Brian Kelly.

19 MS. CIMON: Thanks very much. Shelley  
20 Cimon, La Grande, Oregon. My heart is really full,  
21 because there's so many people in this room tonight.

22 Thank you so much for turning out for an  
23 issue that I have probably worked on now for -- what  
24 did you say, Maxine, 25 years? Probably that long.

25 I'm going to speak as a citizen, not as a

1 member of the Hanford Advisory Board. Although I do  
2 have the luxury of all of that information and time  
3 with wonderful, disparate beliefs and the opportunity  
4 to come together with the consensus in that arena.

5 This is my perspective tonight as a  
6 citizen, an Oregonian. I really appreciate your  
7 coming.

8 And so we can grapple with what you're  
9 grappling with, which is the risk now and thousands  
10 of years into the future to human health and the  
11 environment of the northwest.

12 We need long-term protection of the  
13 Columbia River. It's always been considered to be  
14 the lifeblood of the Pacific Northwest.

15 We need the legal milestones to commit to  
16 comprehensive characterization and technology  
17 development to support all needed cleanup. And we  
18 need it now with no delays.

19 I've seen an inertia, and I'm saying this  
20 to the Washington Department of Ecology. It's been  
21 brought on by the agencies, that I feel are held  
22 hostage to the politics of getting the waste  
23 treatment plant built.

24 I don't believe that this EIS has the  
25 answers to adequately address and commit to the state

1 standards for cleanup of groundwater, of the vadose  
2 zone, and the waste sites. Gerry talked, showed a  
3 picture of -- you know, we've got 43 miles of  
4 trenches unlined, full.

5 I believe that it's really Washington  
6 Department of Ecology's responsibility not to  
7 aggregate their responsibility to this cleanup. And  
8 it's their job to comprehensively protect the people  
9 of the northwest.

10 There's no one here in this room that's  
11 going to deny how compelling 53 million gallons of  
12 high-level waste is as a target for an intense  
13 focused, you know, cleanup mission that demands  
14 vision, it demands the best of science, it demands  
15 the best of technology, development, and also public  
16 will.

17 And I think we have the will. I think  
18 what we need is the commitment from our government,  
19 our government, to do the job right.

20 But the rest of the site, the pieces of  
21 Hanford that are not included in this EIS, the  
22 unlined burial grounds, the Pre-70 TRU transuranic  
23 waste, the contaminated vadose zone both shallow and  
24 deep, the groundwater under the site that's  
25 migrating, plumes moving through to the Columbia

1 River are not the legacy that a society that I live  
2 in, wills to the future generations and who will  
3 follow us.

4 And I -- you know, sometimes in our  
5 discussions, my husband and I says I think -- my  
6 husband will say, "I think we're a society in  
7 decline." I'm not going to go there. I don't want  
8 to believe that.

9 I think we've got the will. I think we've  
10 got the opportunities for jobs. Let's look at the  
11 deed.

12 Let's move forward with every engineering  
13 possibility that we've got, technology that we've got  
14 to get the job done.

15 Specific to the tanks, there needs to be  
16 an examination of the impacts associated with  
17 potential tank leaks due to the delay in the waste  
18 treatment plant starting.

19 There is not an adequate contingency, if  
20 we see multiple tanks leak. And we see failures  
21 occur at one time, prior to the start of the vit  
22 plant.

23 I would support the removal of tech-99 as  
24 a pretreatment step in the vit process, along with  
25 iodine-129.

1           And what I see is a situation where the  
2           facility at the front-end of the waste treatment  
3           plant addresses those issues and also the issue of  
4           blending, the potential issues of blending waste  
5           prior to the vitrification.

6           And I think that this is an opportunity to  
7           also plan for contingency, that we can look at  
8           building new tanks within that front-end system that  
9           will help protect us until we get that vit plant up  
10          and running.

11          I support 99 percent retrieval of volume  
12          as a goal. But I don't believe that you can assume,  
13          as the EIS does, that there's -- what's remaining  
14          within the tanks, that rad limit is homogenized over  
15          the breadth of the tank system.

16          I think that the tank heels have to be  
17          evaluated on a case by case basis. Coupled with that  
18          is the need to characterize the soils under and  
19          around the tanks and look at the leak history of each  
20          tank individually.

21          My preference is to remove, treat, dispose  
22          all contaminated soils associated with leaking tanks.  
23          Capping's not going to provide long-term protection,  
24          the migration through the vadose zone, the  
25          groundwater, or the Columbia River. And to my mind,



1 capping's really a sign of failure.

2 In terms of importation of waste, no way.  
3 There's only one way to achieve the legal standards,  
4 SEPA, for the contaminants here at Hanford.

5 And that's to decrease the waste burden  
6 remaining or disposed of on site or to remove waste  
7 from the site to our yet to be determined geologic  
8 repository, which our nation hasn't identified. No  
9 further receipt of technetium or iodine-bearing waste  
10 should come to the Hanford site.

11 The shell game of transporting  
12 contaminants around the DOE complex without defining  
13 ultimate disposition has no merit.

14 This places a higher burden of risk on the  
15 public. My home is the Grand Ronde Valley. It's  
16 bracketed by two of the worst sections of winter  
17 interstate driving in the nation.

18 The truckers, that's what they talk about,  
19 Ladd Canyon and Cabbage Hill. We've had an accident  
20 within the last 14 months here.

21 There needs to be a separate EIS for both  
22 the vadose zone and the groundwater. These issues  
23 are not adequately addressed in the EIS.

24 We need to see points of compliance that  
25 are set at the boundary of the operable units or the

1 geographic area that's been determined to be cleaned  
2 up, not at the edge of the river or at the edge of  
3 the Hanford site.

4 We haven't talked about hazardous metals.  
5 And I don't see that adequately addressed in the EIS.  
6 An example out in N area, just beyond the appetite  
7 area, there's an increase in arsenic chromium,  
8 mercury, selenium, barium, among other things. We've  
9 got to look and it's got to be dealt with.

10 There are tremendous data gaps. I do  
11 think that this EIS probably should go forward and  
12 can go forward towards the building of a record of  
13 decision. But the data gaps are fierce.

14 And it's going to take filling those, in  
15 order to build that record of decision with any kind  
16 of strength and integrity.

17 FFTF was a dinosaur of a facility, of a  
18 reactor. Very expensive. It needed to be  
19 decommissioned. And I think it's on the right  
20 pathway.

21 It was said, you know, that digging it up  
22 would make it the largest dig in the USA. And I  
23 think I say, "Why not?"

24 We paid dearly with lives, with a  
25 compromised environment. A river where the salmon

1 who build their redds, have seepage coming into their  
2 nests as we speak.

3 We have -- already have the dubious honor  
4 of being the most radioactive site. Now, why not the  
5 biggest dig? It's a jobs project and we can do it.

6 And we're into areas, we've cleaned up  
7 contaminants at Hanford waste sites that 20 years ago  
8 many of us scratched our heads and could not even  
9 imagine that they would be done. And they are. So  
10 forward thinking. That's it.

11 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Brian  
12 Kelly. And then after Brian will be Brett from  
13 Columbia Riverkeeper.

14 MR. KELLY: Hi, I'm Brian Kelly. I've  
15 lived in La Grande for a long time. And I work for  
16 Hell's Canyon Preservation Council.

17 And I spent a lot of time trying to make  
18 sure that when the salmon and the steelhead make  
19 their way all the way up into the Blue Mountains and  
20 the Wallows, that they have a place, they have  
21 habitat up here, they have a home waiting for them.

22 And they all come right up the Columbia  
23 River. And as was mentioned earlier, the Snake River  
24 enters in the Tri-City area just downstream from the  
25 Hanford site.

1                   And so when the fish come up here, we want  
2 to make sure that they have a chance to make it past  
3 the Hanford site area.

4                   We plan to submit written comments, so I  
5 just want to cut to the chase tonight. Basically,  
6 clean it up. Clean it up to the best extent  
7 possible. And don't bring any more waste in. That's  
8 kind of the bottom line.

9                   When I was researching over the last  
10 couple of weeks -- and I know a lot of you folks are  
11 really close to this issue, but when you really first  
12 start looking at it, you go, "53 million gallons of  
13 waste, okay."

14                   I also read there was a million gallons of  
15 contaminated groundwater, is an estimate. And I was  
16 just trying to visualize a million gallons, let alone  
17 highly radioactive contaminated groundwater heading  
18 towards the Columbia River.

19                   I've also read that it was the most  
20 contaminated site in the hemisphere. That's  
21 impressive. And I've also read that it's the biggest  
22 cleanup site in the world. So that's both  
23 impressive.

24                   And to look at it in a more positive way,  
25 that could be inspiring. So let's look at it as a

1 challenge. Let's clean it up. Let's do the best job  
2 humanly possible. Thank you.

3 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. After  
4 Brett will be Lauren Goldberg. Brett, then Lauren.

5 MR. VANDENHEUVEL: Hi, I'm Brett  
6 VandenHeuvel. I'm the director of Columbia  
7 Riverkeeper.

8 We're a river conservation group dedicated  
9 at protecting the Columbia. And I live downstream  
10 from here in Hood River.

11 I looked at the sign-in sheet back there.  
12 And I wanted to thank -- I saw there was some --  
13 Representative Walden had a staff member here as does  
14 Senator Merkley and Wyden. So I think that's great.  
15 And thanks for coming. And it's really important.

16 I also thank Ed Edmo with -- for reading  
17 the resolution on behalf of the Affiliated Tribes of  
18 the Northwest Indians.

19 If you haven't had a chance, Ed is an  
20 accomplished storyteller, poet, and playwright. And  
21 if you ever get a chance to see him when he's not  
22 just reading a resolution, but actually reading some  
23 of his own words, it's quite a show. So I'd  
24 recommend that as well.

25 Hanford, you know, there's -- the EIS back

1 there is 6,000 pages. There's lots of graphs in it,  
2 there's lots of charts and thousands of pages of  
3 text.

4 I think to keep it simple, it's stunning  
5 to me and to a lot of people here tonight, in the  
6 state of Oregon and Washington, that we're even  
7 contemplating bringing more waste to Hanford.

8 We should have no new waste. We should  
9 clean up first. There's currently strontium-90,  
10 uranium, tritium, carbon tetrachloride, toxic and  
11 radioactive chemicals that are right now leaching  
12 into the Columbia River. Right now affecting our  
13 fish, right now affecting downstream communities.

14 The Columbia River is the lifeblood of the  
15 Pacific Northwest. From the commercial fishermen  
16 down in Astoria, to the irrigators right here near La  
17 Grande, all of -- a tremendous amount of people,  
18 tremendous sections of our economy depend on a clean  
19 and healthy Columbia River.

20 And to even contemplate threatening that  
21 with shipping in waste from Tennessee, from  
22 California, from New Mexico is absolutely insane.

23 What we're seeing in this EIS is we're  
24 being presented with a false choice. And the false  
25 choice is, you know, you read it and it says the

1 alternatives are should we bring in radioactive waste  
2 from across the nation, from across the nation, make  
3 Hanford the nation's nuclear waste repository, should  
4 we bring it in and put it in the east landfill or the  
5 west landfill.

6 That is absolutely a false choice. That's  
7 unacceptable. I refuse to even contemplate which is  
8 the better landfill to make a radioactive waste dump  
9 on the banks of the Columbia River. It's simply not  
10 appropriate.

11 We should have a full evaluation, not just  
12 a no action alternative, but a full evaluation of  
13 what to do with this waste that does not include  
14 shipping more waste to Hanford.

15 We talk about -- you hear the word  
16 moratorium a bit. And they say there's a moratorium  
17 on shipping new waste to Hanford.

18 This EIS talks about shipping waste from  
19 across the nation to Hanford, as soon as the waste  
20 treatment plant is built in 2022. There's not a  
21 moratorium. As soon as it's built, it's fair game.

22 We shouldn't have to wait for that to  
23 happen to reanalyze it now, so our children have to  
24 come back and do the same thing. We need to put an  
25 end to this right now.

1           I just want to talk about risk a little  
2 bit. We looked at some of the charts. If you look  
3 at the risk scenarios of cleaning up the tanks, the  
4 different levels, at 90 percent it's one in a  
5 thousand cancer risk.

6           I mean, one in a thousand people who are  
7 using this area in the future would die of cancer.  
8 Even looking out in the year 3000, 4000, 5000 -- and  
9 in fact, it's shocking, cancer, I'd point this out a  
10 little bit, it goes up.

11           It means, the cancer risk is going to  
12 continue to climb. And the one in a thousand risk  
13 versus one in a hundred thousand, which do we choose?

14           If we have the choice to make one in a  
15 thousand people die of cancer, one in a hundred  
16 thousand, it seems like an obvious choice.

17           It's going to cost money. But that money,  
18 I mean, \$2 billion of stimulus money came to Hanford  
19 right now this year. It's decades behind schedule.  
20 We've just pushed back another 20 years of delay.

21           It's going to cost money, but it's going  
22 to create jobs. And let's do the job right, right  
23 now.

24           It's not fair to push this delay off on to  
25 our children, on to the next generation, because it's



1 going to get worse.

2 Even if we do a good job, it's going to  
3 get worse. So now is the time to take care of it  
4 right now.

5 I'm going to wrap up by just saying that  
6 there were some slides earlier showing the Columbia  
7 River, the White Bluffs area. Beautiful area. I'm  
8 sure some of the folks here have been up there.

9 But if you ever get a chance to do a float  
10 trip on the Columbia, there's great fishing there,  
11 there's day trips. You can go from the Vernita  
12 Bridge.

13 You can take out a half day trip at White  
14 Bluffs. It's phenomenal, crystal-clear water,  
15 beautiful.

16 You go around corners and there's hulking  
17 old nuclear reactors. It's a really stunning  
18 experience. I highly recommend you try it.

19 Columbia Riverkeeper leads some trips  
20 there each summer. So check out our website, if  
21 you're interested in going.

22 But it really shows like the potential  
23 beauty or the beauty that's there at this site. And  
24 that we need to clean up this site, not only for us,  
25 but for future generations. Thank you.

1 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Lauren  
2 Goldberg. Lauren, and after Lauren will be Cheryl  
3 Simpson.

4 MS. GOLDBERG: Thank you. My name's  
5 Lauren Goldberg. I'm the staff attorney with  
6 Columbia Riverkeeper.

7 And I just want to thank everyone so much  
8 for coming out tonight. We had the opportunity to  
9 attend a number of Hanford hearings. And it's  
10 remarkable throughout the northwest, how many people  
11 will come out and encourage you.

12 There's -- if you don't feel like coming  
13 up here tonight, you can see the e-mail address up  
14 there.

15 It's important that the Department of  
16 Energy know how many people here in this region care  
17 about these issues. They definitely need to hear  
18 from you.

19 And I just want to make a couple of quick  
20 points, since the night is getting late. And the  
21 first is that we just recently had a major victory in  
22 terms of proposals to bring more waste into Hanford.

23 You might have seen it in the papers.  
24 Just last year there was a major nationwide proposal  
25 to import mercury, elemental mercury, from across the

1 United States into Hanford.

2 And a number of people like yourselves  
3 came out to the public hearings and explained, as Ken  
4 explained tonight, why we don't need more waste at  
5 Hanford. We have enough on our hands as it is.

6 And the Department of Energy did listen.  
7 And they chose the site. It's unfortunate that this  
8 waste has to go anywhere.

9 But they chose the site, unlike Hanford,  
10 which is located on a major river that serves an  
11 entire region, let alone a number of different  
12 people.

13 And the second point is, you had the  
14 opportunity to hear tonight from one of our officials  
15 here in Oregon, which is that we're really at a  
16 unique moment in time at Hanford.

17 And that for the first time we have a  
18 tremendous amount of data coming from the Department  
19 of Energy on the kind of impact that adding more  
20 waste will have.

21 And I encourage all of you to use this  
22 moment of time to start talking to your elected  
23 officials, to folks within your community, because  
24 now is the time to be active on these issues.

25 And then the last point is something that

1 the Department of Energy has more or less put into a  
2 footnote in the 6,000 page EIS.

3 And unfortunately it needs to be front and  
4 center, which is that we need to have our federal  
5 agency complying with all federal laws. And that  
6 includes the Endangered Species Act.

7 And unfortunately, the Department of  
8 Energy is not consulting with the expert science  
9 agencies on the impacts of their cleanup decisions  
10 and how much waste is going to be left in the soils.

11 And so that's a really key issue and an  
12 important one for the public to be aware of. That  
13 there are a lot of impacts that are disclosed in that  
14 document, but they're not entirely being disclosed.  
15 And we need to have that from our federal agencies.  
16 Thank you.

17 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Cheryl  
18 Simpson. And after Cheryl will be Sandy Ryma.

19 MS. SIMPSON: My name is Cheryl Simpson.  
20 I'm a resident of La Grande.

21 And no more waste. Do it now, do it  
22 right. Thanks to all of you who have helped give a  
23 balanced perspective to the evening.

24 Hanford is casting a long shadow that  
25 we're counting in hundreds of years. It started

1 casting a shadow on my life in 1946.

2 I was born in Pasco. And I had the  
3 dubious right as a citizen of Richland to have  
4 iodine-131 in my air and in my food, because we  
5 didn't know it was being released over us, for many  
6 years.

7 So I don't know if I'll have thyroid  
8 cancer. I know many people that are down-wind too.  
9 It's atrocious.

10 I think that the people that are here this  
11 evening are here with well meaning and good thoughts  
12 and good information, but it's just not enough. It  
13 doesn't really do it right.

14 So why don't we all write a note. Send an  
15 e-mail, we love to send e-mails. I don't know that  
16 they're tweeting or twittering or whatever. But  
17 let's make sure that everybody knows that we really  
18 need to do it better.

19 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.

20 Sandy. After Sandy will be Stephen  
21 Donnell. Yes, ma'am.

22 MS. RYMA: I'm Sandy Ryma of La Grande.  
23 I've lived here for 35 years as of March 1st of this  
24 year.

25 And I can't speak your language, you know.

1 I'm really not familiar in detail with this  
2 information, but I do have a science background.

3 And I started out with extreme shock that  
4 landfill closure was being recommended for the  
5 single-shell tank system. And I would encourage us  
6 to have clean closure of that.

7 And basically overall I would take the  
8 stance of extreme cleanup, that would be my  
9 preference as a citizen of this area.

10 So thank you for coming. And thank you  
11 for taking our input.

12 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Stephen.

13 MR. DONNELL: My name is Stephen Donnell.  
14 And I live in La Grande.

15 I've looked through your exhibits here.  
16 And I think we've missed a major point. It's not  
17 what you're going to do to clean up Hanford, it's how  
18 you're going to do it and when.

19 Because right now you're sitting on a  
20 situation, if you should get a major breakthrough  
21 from anyone of those plumes into the river, you could  
22 shut all commercial shipping, all fishing on a  
23 corridor that starts where that leak is, all the way  
24 to the sea, shut down the Port of Vancouver, the Port  
25 of Portland, and take the whole guts of the whole

1 northwest out of commission and not usable by anyone  
2 or anything.

3 Now, you have classified your material by  
4 its severity and its type and kind. I would class  
5 it, if I were to do this study -- and I did a couple  
6 of studies on the use of radioactive materials when I  
7 worked for Lockheed Missiles & Space Company. And we  
8 didn't proceed with the programs.

9 But the point I'm getting at is you've got  
10 a number of different kinds of materials. You've got  
11 those that have feet and walk very easily, those that  
12 are semi-fixed, and those that are going to be  
13 stationary. And this means they are what they are.

14 The point is that if they are going to be  
15 a hazard to the people and the environment, those  
16 that have feet, and that would include the liquid  
17 materials, those that are soluble, and those that are  
18 available to get out into the environment, they're  
19 going to move. I don't care what you do with them.  
20 Unless you make them into a solid, they won't move.

21 So my point I'm trying to make is very  
22 simply this: We originally back in the '40's and the  
23 '50's and the '60's, at one time we were going to use  
24 atomic energy from the sampling of radioactive  
25 materials for a whole lot of things.

1                   One of them was a -- blast a nuke canal  
2 across Panama with small atomic bombs. I had to do  
3 this analysis on whether that was practical and  
4 feasible.

5                   Another one we were going to use atomic  
6 energy, a small reactor, fill it with hydrogen for  
7 propulsion in spaceships. And for very obvious  
8 reasons, that didn't go forward either.

9                   But what I'm trying to get at is, you can  
10 study all day long. But until you immobilize that  
11 material and you put it in a situation where nobody's  
12 going to really get to it unless they do it by  
13 design, you're sitting on a potential ecological and  
14 sociological disaster beyond all comprehension.  
15 Chernobyl will be a cake-walk compared to what you  
16 will have.

17                   FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Several  
18 people have asked, I encourage you to come up and  
19 speak at this time. And we're down to our sign-up  
20 list. We've completed with our pre sign-up list.

21                   I'd now like to turn to anyone who would  
22 like to comment who hasn't yet. And okay, yeah, come  
23 on up.

24                   We will ask those who -- there are several  
25 people who may want to go again. We'd ask for those



1 people who haven't gone yet, to come up. And then  
2 we'll get to the other people. Thank you.

3 MR. CIMON: Yeah. My name is Norm Cimon.  
4 And my wife spoke earlier. She's the one who  
5 referred to me as worried about a society in decline.  
6 So you have to explain to me why we're not in  
7 decline.

8 A little bit about my background. I was  
9 trained as a mathematician. I worked for the EPA for  
10 quite a few years. And in fact I worked for the  
11 Environmental Monitoring and Support Laboratory in  
12 Las Vegas.

13 And one of our arms included the public  
14 health service officials, who were actually radiation  
15 experts working at the test site, at a test site.

16 I have a passing familiarity with the  
17 problems of radiation. But a considerably greater  
18 familiarity with the mathematics and physics of some  
19 of the nonlinear chemistry and physics that you  
20 potentially face if the cleanup is not done to a  
21 standard that I'll admit is not easily defined.

22 But what I'm going to tell you is this:  
23 If you leave even one percent of that 54 million  
24 gallons, that's 540,000 gallons or essentially half a  
25 tank.

1                   But as my wife pointed out, it's not just  
2 the idea of leaving a certain amount in there. The  
3 deposition of the sediments has not been uniform.

4                   I'm quite aware of some of the nonlinear  
5 sort of reactions that were going on a few years  
6 back, when there was all kinds of interesting  
7 bubbling and boiling that was very poorly understood.

8                   That, I think, is a very significant  
9 potential problem from leaving the crusts at the  
10 bottom when they are poorly characterized and people  
11 simply have no idea how they might in fact react to  
12 something as simple as exposure to air. Now, that  
13 needs to be honestly delineated and discussed.

14                   I'm also in agreement, great agreement  
15 with my wife about how the EIS really fails to deal  
16 with the much larger issue of the vadose zone, the  
17 current movements that are already in the ground, and  
18 the idea of bounding the areas themselves for  
19 sampling purposes and purposes of characterization, I  
20 think is the right way to go with this.

21                   Using the whole of Hanford by sort of  
22 monitoring at the fringes is cheating, as far as I'm  
23 concerned.

24                   It's time to start delineating the  
25 problems much more carefully than they have been

1 delineated in the past.

2 I am absolutely and adamantly opposed to  
3 the transportation of additional high-level waste for  
4 the very simple reason that, from a mathematical  
5 point of view, all you do is compound the probability  
6 of just another catastrophic event along the road  
7 somewhere.

8 Every transfer event simply adds to the  
9 probabilistic risk of an additional load being dumped  
10 somewhere in a river.

11 Let's face it, our roads all go along  
12 rivers or they go in canyons. That means those are  
13 sinks.

14 When you go dumping something, what you're  
15 going to do is end up dumping it into a sink, some  
16 kind of channel that transports something somewhere.

17 That's also where we put so much of our  
18 infrastructure, that it also potentially puts that at  
19 risk.

20 In any case, I'm adamantly opposed to the  
21 idea of additional transport. And I think everybody  
22 in the northwest will be also. Thank you very much  
23 for the time.

24 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Yes, sir,  
25 come on up.

1                   MR. TAYLOR: Good evening. I'm Ted  
2 Taylor. I live in La Grande. I retired from the  
3 U.S. Department of Energy, where I did environmental  
4 cleanup at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Our  
5 cleanup was under the Resource Conservation and  
6 Recovery Act and DOE orders.

7                   And from what I've heard tonight, it  
8 appears that the EIS is really in very good shape.  
9 The alternatives considered, are pretty much  
10 bounding.

11                   My comment is going to relate more on what  
12 I would term interim actions. From the time a site  
13 or sites are characterized and radiation plans are  
14 made, there are times when something called an  
15 interim action is appropriate.

16                   I've heard a lot of comment tonight about  
17 continued migration of contaminants into the Columbia  
18 River and down into the vadose zone.

19                   And I think I'm addressing this mainly to  
20 the Washington Department of Ecology, but also to the  
21 Department of Energy, such that when the permits are  
22 issued, I hope that DOE will take the opportunity  
23 when a site is fairly well characterized, if some of  
24 these action levels are triggered, that it would be  
25 appropriate to develop interim actions to try to --

1 you probably can't neutralize the waste, but you can  
2 maybe slow down the path of migration.

3 And to me this is something that's very  
4 important to do, because it's fairly immediate. I  
5 see the modeling results that go out to the year  
6 5500.

7 I can't imagine that we're really worried  
8 about something that's going to happen in 3,000  
9 years.

10 I mean, there's no technological society  
11 that's ever existed for a thousand years. Ours has  
12 existed, sort of, for 230 years, at least as a  
13 nation.

14 We have real problems that can be  
15 addressed in the fairly short term. And if it  
16 weren't for radioactive waste, under the EPA  
17 regulations, you think in terms of one average human  
18 lifetime, 70 years.

19 And that's the basis for your risk  
20 assessments, that's the basis for the cleanup, and  
21 that's the basis for the monitoring.

22 It's only because of these radionuclides  
23 that we're thinking in terms of 3,000, 4,000 years,  
24 which I quite frankly think is ridiculous.

25 The requirements -- I understand the

1 requirements, 10,000 year containment, and that sort  
2 of thing.

3 But when the opportunity presents itself  
4 with \$2 billion. And as you said, Ms. Burandt,  
5 there's only so much work you can actually do, even  
6 with \$2 billion.

7 And I'm saying that one thing that could  
8 be done as the EIS is finished and the action plan is  
9 done, and the mitigation plan is done, is focus  
10 wherever possible on interim actions to forestall the  
11 migration of contaminants, so the problem doesn't get  
12 worse in the fairly near future and then worry about  
13 the actual remediations.

14 Because I think that's where the benefit  
15 to society will be the best, because the so-called  
16 accessible environment can be protected in the near  
17 term as well as in the long term.

18 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. To you,  
19 okay.

20 MR. ISADORE, JR.: Good evening. My name  
21 is Donald D. Isadore, Jr. I'm a Tribal council  
22 member for the Yakima Nation Confederated Tribes and  
23 Bands of the Yakima Nation.

24 And I truly am glad to be here this  
25 evening for the comments that are being made here by

1 the public.

2 I just wanted to advise the panel that I  
3 just spoke with Russell Jim, which I know all of you  
4 are very familiar with.

5 The Yakima Nation will be submitting a  
6 written form regarding our comments to the cleanup  
7 here, what we're discussing this evening.

8 One thing I wanted to advise, you know,  
9 the United States Department of Energy, to remind you  
10 as I've reminded Mr. Brockman as well, the United  
11 States has a responsibility to the Yakima Nation  
12 because we're a treaty Tribe.

13 And that treaty has some very strong  
14 language within it. And to remind you as well that  
15 Hanford sits on what once was our land, which is now  
16 called ceded land. So to remind you of that.

17 And I appreciate the comments that are  
18 being made here this evening. You know, I've heard  
19 many positive comments. It's very heartening, to say  
20 the least, to hear what I've heard here this evening.

21 You know, as a parent as well, I will  
22 inform you that I know what it's like to lose a child  
23 of cancer.

24 My wife and I, yesterday was 31 months  
25 that we lost our daughter to acute lymphoblastic

1 leukemia.

2 So I've been on the Tribal Council for two  
3 and a half years now. I'm currently the chairman of  
4 the Radioactive Hazardous Waste Program, which is the  
5 program that oversees Russell.

6 So when you want to talk about cancer, I  
7 know firsthand what cancer does, what it's all about.

8 And I will let you know that since I've  
9 become an elected official for the Yakima Nation, and  
10 I sit on the Hanford topics, I have truly taken heart  
11 to read everything to be sure that our voices are  
12 heard. That, you know, this is real.

13 Contamination is very real to each and  
14 every one of us. It doesn't matter what color our  
15 skins are, what race or denomination we come from.

16 We're here for one purpose. And that's  
17 what we want you to do as the Federal Government, is  
18 to clean up your mess. And I can't stress that  
19 enough.

20 So with that all being said, I just want  
21 to again thank you for the opportunity to be here.  
22 You will be receiving our written comments. But just  
23 to let you know, that Yakima Nation was present here  
24 this evening. Thank you.

25 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Come on



1 up.

2 MS. TURNER: Hi. My name is Mia Turner.  
3 I'm a 13 year old girl of La Grande, Oregon. I'm a  
4 child of my generation.

5 And we are talking about a generation yet  
6 to come. We're not talking about my generation. I'm  
7 wondering about me.

8 What is going to happen to me when the  
9 millions of gallons of radioactive stuff is coming  
10 through our roads and polluting our rivers, our  
11 lakes, our air.

12 The cancer that can come is going to be  
13 painful, I can probably tell you that. Millions, not  
14 millions, but hundreds of people are going to die a  
15 painful death because of this stuff.

16 And I may be young, but I do know what's  
17 coming. And I don't want to have my children, me, my  
18 great grandchildren to have to deal with this stuff  
19 that has happened and what we put here.

20 I truly believe that we need to stop this.  
21 I mean, we have the income to stop it. I think we  
22 need to stop it now.

23 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.

24 MR. SHAWL: She inspires me to speak. My  
25 name is Ed Shawl, La Grande.

1           And in a past life before I was retired, I  
2 worked 17 years for the Foxboro Company, which was  
3 then a 110 year old company, incidence controls  
4 systems. 63 percent of our business was outside the  
5 United States, based in Foxboro, Massachusetts.

6           And I was the public relations manager  
7 when the Wall Street Journal called me one morning  
8 and asked me why our control systems failed at Three  
9 Mile Island. And I had to answer that.

10           Fortunately it was a human error, not an  
11 instrument error. It was people that did not know how to  
12 control an automatic to manual control systems.

13           Since that time, there's been a lot of  
14 simulators built. Now everything is triple  
15 redundancy in nuclear plants around the world.

16           And I'm very dismayed that our present  
17 administration, having voted for the administration,  
18 is thinking about future nuclear plants, which  
19 further complicates the problem for your generation.

20           Until we find a way to do continuous  
21 processing to neutralize the byproducts and a place  
22 to put the product, we should not be building any  
23 more nuclear plants at this time. Thank you.

24           FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.

25           MS. MOYLEN: My name is Sandra Moylen.

1 I'm presently from Elgin. I grew up on the lower  
2 Columbia River in Clatskanie. I'm 60 years old. I'm  
3 a survivor. I'm a down-winder.

4 I previous commented on EISs. We could  
5 look at all the numbers, all the statistics. My  
6 family has been those statistics. You can say all  
7 minus to the fifth degree.

8 My aunt, my uncle, my cousin, all who  
9 lived in The Dalles and Pendleton and we're  
10 down-winders, all died of cancer.

11 My aunt at about 40 years old. My uncle  
12 luckily lived into his 70's. My cousin died at 50  
13 years old, ten years younger than me.

14 My other cousin currently has a rare form  
15 of lymphoma. He was a commercial fisherman on the  
16 lower Columbia. He's 48.

17 My aunt who is about 42 years old also  
18 died of cancer. She loved swimming in the river.  
19 All of us ate far more fish and clams, and so forth,  
20 out of the river than any of the so-called alleged  
21 2.2 pounds or whatever per week.

22 You know, statistics lie. They really lie  
23 a lot. No more waste here. No more nuclear plants.  
24 We need to clean up the river now.

25 I can no longer eat the fish from the

1 river. My family no longer fishes the river. We're  
2 afraid of it. We don't hardly ever swim in it.

3 We used to laugh as children when we'd  
4 walk on Jones Beach or Mayger Beach and we'd scuff  
5 our feet in the sand. And it glowed in the dark.  
6 And we'd laugh and say, "Oh, we wonder if this sand's  
7 radioactive." Gee, guess what, it was.

8 I've already myself suffered from a rare  
9 form of bladder cancer, which I'm recovered from or  
10 recovering from.

11 My family -- and I haven't even mentioned  
12 the other cousins -- oh, talk about low birth rates.  
13 Clatskanie had some of the highest low birth rates  
14 and low baby rates in the entire nation.

15 We are down-winders of Hanford. Several  
16 of my cousins have had babies that were two pounds,  
17 three pounds, four pounds.

18 No more waste, clean it up now, get it  
19 started. Prioritize stuff near the river. Stop it,  
20 whatever. Use whatever technology. Get it started  
21 now.

22 The EIS, we can look at future  
23 containment. But let's start doing stuff now. Put  
24 people to work. Quit just BS'ing for another 20  
25 years. Thank you.

1                   FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone  
2 else who would like to comment at this time? Yes,  
3 sir.

4                   MR. WONK: Hi. My name is David Wonk.  
5 And I don't know that I would be in disagreement with  
6 the gentleman that -- he left. I saw -- that said  
7 that we should think in a lifetime sort of thing.

8                   But I couldn't help, and I've thought  
9 about this for sometime, that there's a real ethical  
10 concern here about responsibility to future  
11 generations.

12                   And so I do think we need to think about  
13 thousands of years. He did mention, which I  
14 appreciate that, you know, we've managed to hold this  
15 nation safe together for a little over 200 years.  
16 We've had a lot of unusual advantages to be able to  
17 do that.

18                   And I also appreciated the courage of this  
19 gentleman that, you know, kind of played the devil's  
20 advocate, because we've all been the beneficiaries of  
21 some of these things that have happened.

22                   But in terms of ethics, we don't know  
23 what's going to happen a hundred years from now. I  
24 know recently the financial crisis, there were a lot  
25 of us that were saying, "Wow, you know, how is this

1 one going to sort itself out?"

2 We really don't know what it's going to be  
3 like a hundred years from now, 500 years from now.  
4 We don't know. We just don't know.

5 And that's the main reason why we have an  
6 obligation to countless unknown people in the future  
7 to do whatever we can, however we can.

8 To make sure that if they're wandering  
9 around in more of a tribal existence, up and down the  
10 river, trying to make a living however they can, that  
11 they don't have to deal with what we benefited from.  
12 And that's an ethical question.

13 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Would  
14 anybody else like to comment at this time? Anybody  
15 whose commented previously, want to comment?

16 If not, we thank you very much. The  
17 Department of Energy and the two states. But mostly  
18 thanks to you for coming out tonight and taking your  
19 evening to do this. Thank you very much.

20

21 (9:15 p.m.)

22

23 \* \* \*

24

25

1 STATE OF OREGON )  
 2 )  
 3 County of Umatilla )  
 4

5 I, Susanne Starkweather, do hereby certify  
 6 that at the time and place heretofore mentioned in  
 7 the caption of the foregoing matter, I was a  
 8 Professional Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public for  
 9 Oregon; that at said time and place I reported in  
 10 stenotype all testimony adduced and proceedings had  
 11 in the foregoing matter; that thereafter my notes  
 12 were reduced to typewriting and that the foregoing  
 13 transcript consisting of 54 pages is a true and  
 14 correct transcript of all such testimony adduced and  
 15 proceedings had and of the whole thereof.

16 Witness my hand at Pendleton, Oregon, on  
 17 this 4th day of March, 2010.  
 18

19  
 20 *1st* *Susanne Starkweather*  
 21 Susanne Starkweather  
 22 Professional Court Reporter  
 23 Notary Public for Oregon  
 24 My commission expires: 12-21-2012  
 25

