

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

February 9, 2010

6:00 p.m.

Columbia Gorge Hotel  
4000 Westcliff Drive  
Hood River, Oregon

Mr. James Parham, Facilitator

PANEL MEMBERS:

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

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



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

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

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

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION

	Page	Line
Gerry Pollet	4	9
Jurgen Hess	9	3
Brett VandenHeuvel	10	14
Steve Curley	15	12
Robin Klein	18	18
Mike Clement	20	1
Karen Harding	22	20
Hugh B. McMahan	24	20
Daniel Lichtenwald	26	18
Lisa Van Dyk	30	23
Keith Harding	32	19
Lauren Goldberg	35	16
Aera Atkins	38	20
Bonnie New, M.D.	40	11
Aaron Morehouse	44	5
Rollean	46	9
Theresa North	49	21
Catherine Fitzgerald	50	22
Dan Solitz	53	19



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

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION (Cont'd.)

	Page	Line
Doug Charters	55	15
Daniel Lichtenwald	57	12
Jurgen Hess	58	12

\* \* \*



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

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

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION

MR. PARHAM: Gerry Pollet from the Heart of America Northwest. We'd like for you to come to the microphone. And our court reporter here is starting to take the verbatim comments now. Thank you.

COMMENTS BY GERRY POLLET:

I've got some slides, so I'm going to use them. No disrespect, I'm going to face this way.

I went for a walk today along the Gorge on a trail with 200-year-old trees. And I was thinking about the fact that those trees were saplings when Lewis and Clark came by. And then tonight, you're talking about a legacy where, 200 years from now, after the Energy Department says it has cleaned up Hanford, walking along the Columbia River will be dangerous for our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren because of the levels of contamination under their proposed decisions.

And make no mistake, when the Energy Department says it has a preferred alternative, that means their proposed decision. And what you've heard tonight, unfortunately, was misleading



**DEPONENT**

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

1 in implying that that proposed decision is not to  
2 issue a formal decision, that is to use Hanford as  
3 a national radioactive waste dump. And indeed, if  
4 you listened carefully tonight, what you heard is  
5 that the Energy Department says they made that  
6 decision in 2000. And that is why they are  
7 illegally failing to include in this impact  
8 statement consideration of any alternative of which  
9 they do not dump more waste at Hanford.

10 Let's look at this -- Go to the next slide.  
11 We're here tonight because we're concerned about  
12 the Columbia River and the health of future  
13 generations; the river that flows past Hanford,  
14 past nine nuclear reactors, and flows past for 50  
15 miles.

16 Today, contamination is entering the river at  
17 1500 times the drinking water standard. What the  
18 Energy Department doesn't explain to you clearly,  
19 even in the EIS, is that the drinking water  
20 standard is set for each contaminant at the level  
21 of which one adult drinking that water out of every  
22 10,000 will die of cancer. You all can do the  
23 math. 1500 out of 10,000 per radioactive  
24 strontium 90 entering the river in seeps today.

25 Let's jump ahead. Forty miles of unlined



**DEPONENT**

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

1 burial grounds. This EIS fails to address the  
2 cumulative impacts truly from not digging up the  
3 waste in these burial grounds, that they were  
4 dumping waste into unlined ditches until 2004.

5 Next slide. The voters of Washington state  
6 and the people of Oregon have spoken clearly. We  
7 passed Initiative 297 saying, "Clean up before you  
8 dump more." This EIS shows that it is  
9 unconscionable, A, to dump more; B, to even leave  
10 the waste that is already at Hanford.

11 Next slide. You've seen some of these maps  
12 before. This one is carbon tetrachloride in the  
13 groundwater today. Next slide. In 120 years, the  
14 dark red area near where the river shore is now -- will  
15 then be at 50 times the drinking water standard.

16 Next slide. Plutonium in 1,000 years.  
17 Plutonium in 1,000 years will be 300 times the  
18 drinking water standard under DOE's proposed  
19 decisions to leave tank waste in the ground, not  
20 clean up the billions of gallons of liquid  
21 discharges from the tanks or the million gallons  
22 that have leaked from the tanks, not to clean up  
23 those soiled ditches, and to add more waste.

24 Next slide. Let's just skip over these maps,  
25 because you've seen some from Ken. This one shows



**DEPONENT**

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

1 that from the tank residues and the leaks and  
2 billions of gallons of deliberate discharges out of  
3 the tanks, over the next several thousand years,  
4 uranium 238 will be a hundred times the drinking  
5 water standard. And that's because of the waste  
6 from the tanks that they just only -- that they  
7 leave a percent behind and pour cement in. The  
8 waste will mobilize and move again. And if they  
9 just put a cap over the billions of gallons of  
10 different waste discharge sites, the waste will be  
11 mobilized and move, leave the cap, and go out  
12 through the groundwater.

13 Next slide. The Energy Department is not  
14 telling the truth about how the waste trucks will  
15 come to Hanford. 17,000 trucks of waste. The  
16 Energy Department says it's basing this analysis on  
17 the same analysis it did in 2004, which its own  
18 internal document said it was, quote, "technically  
19 indefensible." That analysis clearly showed that  
20 the waste streams included numerous sites from  
21 California sending waste to Hanford.

22 Also, the highly radioactive Greater-Than-  
23 Class-C shipments would come up I-5 and I-84 to  
24 Hanford. Those Greater-Than-Class-C shipments  
25 should be in this Environmental Impact Statement.



**DEPONENT**

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

1           Make no mistake about it. NEPA, the environmental  
2           law under which this EIS is conducted, says all  
3           federal actions and proposals have to be disclosed  
4           to you in one impact statement showing their  
5           impacts all together, the cumulative impacts. That  
6           means the impacts of the trucks that will go by a  
7           hundred yards from here. And make no mistake that  
8           they are dangerous.

9           This is the last slide. The Energy  
10          Department's own estimate was that 816 fatal  
11          cancers would occur if Hanford was used for its  
12          GNEP program, receiving radioactive wastes and  
13          spent fuel. The GTCC wastes are as hot as this.  
14          This is without an accident; this is just what  
15          happens from sitting in traffic or being exposed as  
16          it goes past your home, your community center, your  
17          school.

18          We have to say "No." Please join me in  
19          saying: Empty the waste out of the tanks all the  
20          way. Remove the tanks, clean up the leaks from the  
21          tanks and the discharges. And that it is  
22          unconscionable, unconscionable to add more waste to  
23          Hanford. Say "No."

24                 Thank you very much.

25                 MR. PARHAM: Next up is Jurgen Hess, and Brett



**DEPONENT**

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



1 will be after that.

2

3

COMMENTS BY JURGEN HESS:

4

5

6

I'm Jurgen Hess from Hood River. I'm here tonight, very, very frustrated. More on that later.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

Some specifics first: Please clean up all contaminated water, all of the 53 million gallons of radioactive waste. And not 99 percent, but 99.99999999 percent. Don't bury any of the tanks; they will eventually leak. Include cleaning up all of the unlined soil trenches, all of the leaked radioactive waste. Completely dismantle the Fast Flux Test Facility.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

On the off-site waste: None, nada, none; especially until all or 100 percent of the existing waste is cleaned up. There are just too many risks and dangers to our Gorge communities, with cancer risks, terrorism threats, spills. Even after the waste treatment plant is up, even then there shouldn't be any.

22

23

24

25

Now this gets to my frustration: Does it really matter what we say? We have been saying this for countless years. Local citizens have been unanimous about no off-site waste. The State of



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

1 Oregon has said that; now it appears tonight that  
2 the State of Washington has said that. Our  
3 senator, Senator Wyden, has said no off-site waste.  
4 Is anybody listening or do you even care what our  
5 comments are? I'm just so frustrated.

6 In closing, I want to say regarding off-site  
7 waste: Our future generations will say the same  
8 thing, no off-site waste. And we'll be telling you  
9 that for the next 5,000 years.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. PARHAM: Next will be Brett, after Brett  
12 will be Steve Curley.

13

14 COMMENTS BY BRETT VANDENHEUVEL:

15 I'm Brett VandenHeuvel with Columbia  
16 Riverkeeper.

17 First, a little bit of a victory. I know I  
18 see a lot of people in this room who were  
19 testifying at the mercury disposal hearing about a  
20 year ago. And you probably heard that about a  
21 month ago, they decided not to make Hanford the  
22 national repository for mercury. And so that's  
23 good to keep one extremely toxic chemical off of  
24 the banks of the Columbia River.

25 And I share Gerry's frustration about not



**DEPONENT**

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

1 listening. But I think in fact, people are  
2 listening. And I think a lot of your testimony for  
3 the mercury kept it out of here and actually  
4 shipped it to Texas, where it belongs.

5 A couple of quick issues. I mean, just simply  
6 our motto is to clean up first, no new waste, and  
7 protect our salmon. Very simple. There's lots of  
8 charts in the EIS. If you've had a chance to dig  
9 through it at all, 6,000 pages of fascinating  
10 charts, one of which I'm just going to briefly  
11 mention regarding the tank closure. Tanks should  
12 be cleaned up to 99.9 percent clean, or as clean as  
13 technology allows it.

14 I think Ken showed the slide, but we have a  
15 little flier we put together. And on the back of  
16 it, if you don't feel like digging through the  
17 6,000 pages of EIS, is the chart showing the cancer  
18 risks with the different cleanups. So at 99.9  
19 percent, the cancer risk, even then, is going to be  
20 about one in a thousand -- I mean, sorry, one in  
21 10,000 people. If we drop that down to only  
22 cleaning up to 90 percent, it goes down to one in a  
23 thousand people. So a dramatic increase in cancer  
24 risk by not cleaning up to the full amount.

25 I mean, it shouldn't even be a discussion



**DEPONENT**

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

1 we're having tonight when we're talking about  
2 orders of magnitude of more cancer if we don't do a  
3 full cleanup. So please, we encourage the most  
4 thorough cleanup possible on the tanks. Your own  
5 data show that there's a dramatic increase of  
6 cancer risk if you do not clean up to 99.9 percent.

7 That's not to mention the spilled waste, the  
8 waste that has been dumped or spilled or leaked out  
9 of these tanks. Over a million gallons already has  
10 been spilled. And this EIS, this proposal by the  
11 Department of Energy, does not address that. It  
12 does not propose to clean that up. That's not part  
13 of the preferred alternative.

14 So we ask that you clean up not only the waste  
15 that is in the tanks, but also the waste that has  
16 already leaked. It doesn't make sense to do an  
17 incomplete job, to clean up only part of it. You  
18 know, Hanford just got \$2 billion in stimulus  
19 money. And as a taxpayer, I strongly encourage  
20 that money be spent for cleaning up all of the  
21 waste. And we don't think that money should be  
22 spent on, a second point, bringing in new waste.  
23 Absolutely unacceptable to import more waste to  
24 Hanford.

25 The concept of cleanup first is widely



**DEPONET**

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

1           accepted by the public. You know, it was passed by  
2           an overwhelming vote in Washington, trying to  
3           prohibit this. The people do not want more waste  
4           coming to Hanford. Hanford sits -- I made a joke  
5           about Texas, like the waste should go there.  
6           That's not true. We shouldn't ship the waste  
7           anywhere.

8           But Hanford sits on the banks of the Columbia  
9           River, the lifeblood of the Pacific Northwest,  
10          vital to our economy, vital to the health and  
11          welfare of many of the communities that sit along  
12          its banks, to Native Americans who consume a lot of  
13          fish, to all of us in this room who use that river  
14          to recreate, who eat the fish from that river every  
15          day. It's completely inappropriate to ship more  
16          waste to Hanford.

17          I want to talk briefly about the State of  
18          Oregon and the State of Washington. For Oregon,  
19          you know, Ken Niles has been an amazing advocate  
20          for cleanup of Hanford, has done a tremendous job  
21          over the years and is continuing to do so. But I  
22          think it's time we need to step it up. I mean, I  
23          think Ken does an excellent analysis, raises good  
24          alternatives, but I think it's time for our  
25          leadership in Oregon to step it up.



**DEPONENT**

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

1 Ken makes a good point: There's not a lot of  
2 regulatory authority in Oregon, so we need to step  
3 up the political pressure. It's time that we  
4 demand Governor Kulongoski to make trips to -- to  
5 Washington, D.C., to stand up for the people, to  
6 meet with Secretary Chu, and say that this proposal  
7 today is unacceptable.

8 The State of Washington does have regulatory  
9 authority, which is even more exciting. Under the  
10 State Environmental Policy Act in Washington,  
11 Washington holds some stronger cards here. Not  
12 saying it's, you know, holding a trump card. But  
13 we certainly encourage Washington to utilize their  
14 authority under SEPA; and for all the Washington  
15 citizens in the room, to encourage your governor  
16 and agency to do so.

17 So Washington should consider the preferred  
18 alternative of cleaning up the 99.9 percent of the  
19 tank waste and consider to clean up the one million  
20 gallons of spilled waste. Do the analysis that DOE  
21 failed to conduct. Because DOE did not conduct  
22 this analysis, the State of Washington must do so.  
23 And you have the legal authority to do so.

24 And lastly, the -- Washington should also  
25 conduct the analysis of, surprise, what the people



**DEPONENT**

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

1 want of not importing more waste. All the  
2 Department of Energy did was said, "Where should we  
3 put this waste?" It wasn't an analysis of whether  
4 we should bring in the waste or not, but where to  
5 put it. Washington, in their SEPA analysis, should  
6 conduct the alternative of not importing off-site  
7 waste to Hanford.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Steve Curley. And  
10 after Steve will be Robin Klein.

11  
12 COMMENTS BY STEVE CURLEY:

13 I'm Steve Curley. I live here in the Gorge.  
14 I would like to thank you for having this meeting  
15 here in Hood River.

16 And it just blows my mind that we've been  
17 around for I don't know how many years -- some say  
18 millions of years and some say 6,000 years -- and  
19 since the mid '40s, we've been dumping this toxic  
20 goo in Hanford up there, that has a half-life of  
21 200,000 years. And we're just screwing it up for  
22 future generations, for hundreds and hundreds and  
23 thousands of years, for this short-term whatever it  
24 is that we're doing here. It's just ridiculous.

25 Why don't we keep the waste where it comes



**DEPONET**

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

1 from? So if it comes from Seabrook, New Hampshire,  
2 if it comes from Limerick, Pennsylvania, why don't  
3 you keep it back there? Or keep it back in  
4 Tennessee. Why are you shipping it across the  
5 country here, to my backyard? I don't appreciate  
6 it.

7 And I'll tell you what. I've been coming to  
8 these meetings for 20 years. National Geographic  
9 Magazine had an article right around 1990, and I  
10 remember they said it was going to take 20 years to  
11 clean up Hanford at the cost of X billion dollars.  
12 I forget, it might have been 12 billion, it might  
13 have been 50 billion. I don't know. But here it  
14 is, 20 years later. I'm 51 years old now. I was  
15 30 when I started coming to these things. This is  
16 ridiculous.

17 I believe that the voters of Washington state  
18 also passed a law requiring the Department of  
19 Energy to clean up the largest Superfund site in  
20 the western hemisphere; that would be Hanford. I  
21 believe they passed a law, and I believe that  
22 should be upheld.

23 This clean coal and clean nuclear baloney I  
24 heard from President Obama in the State of the  
25 Union Address is just nonsense. We all know



**DEPONENT**

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



1 that -- If there's a way to safely dispose of  
2 nuclear waste, you can sign me up; I'll buy that  
3 stuff. But you know what, there is no safe way.

4 I used to protest back at Limerick,  
5 Pennsylvania, back in the late '70s, when the thing  
6 in Harrisburg went off, when Three Mile Island went  
7 off. I'm an hour from there. I know all about  
8 this stuff.

9 Who is the contractor there now? I'm asking  
10 you.

11 MR. PARHAM: Dussens (phonetic spelling) is  
12 the contractor.

13 MR. CURLEY: Dussens. It was GE; it was  
14 Bechtel. I mean, it seems they just shuffle the  
15 paper around for five years and shuffle the paper  
16 around, and stick billions of dollars in their back  
17 pocket and just move on. And it's 20 years later.  
18 Wow, Mr. Curley is 51 now. Where did the time go?  
19 While these guys are getting totally rich.

20 It's time to clean the mess you've made and  
21 stop making any more and stop bringing any more  
22 here. Hanford should not be used as a radioactive  
23 waste dump. I urge you to dismantle the FFTF  
24 reactor. This waste is and always has been heading  
25 towards the Columbia, leaching towards the



**DEPONET**

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

1 Columbia. It's totally ridiculous that you'd even  
2 think of bringing more waste to Hanford.

3 The Department of Energy graphs showing the  
4 plumes of radioactive waste heading towards the  
5 river. I mean, is that correct?

6 MR. PARHAM: M-hm.

7 MR. CURLEY: Is that what I saw up there  
8 earlier? Yeah, it is. There's no logical reason  
9 to accept off-site waste to Hanford. I say clean  
10 up all 3 million gallons of buried nuclear waste to  
11 a 99.9 retrieval, and drop the proposal to ship  
12 radioactive waste to Hanford, across the nation to  
13 Hanford.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Robin Klein. And  
16 after Robin will be Mike Clement.

17

18 COMMENTS BY ROBIN KLEIN:

19 My name is Robin Klein. And this EIS, like  
20 perhaps so many in the past, seems like -- this one  
21 particularly seems like an analysis designed to  
22 prepare -- for the DOE to do what it was intending  
23 to do in the first place. It seems a sneaky way to  
24 do it.

25 It's not considering the opinions of the



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

1 public, which are well understood. We're asked  
2 whether we should clean up the tanks 99 percent or  
3 99.9 percent. You already know the public wants it  
4 completely cleaned up. The FFTF decommission or  
5 entomb decommission, these are easy answers.

6 But we're not asked whether or not you should  
7 bring in off-site waste. That seems a manipulative  
8 device in this EIS. It's just included in the  
9 analysis in case you want to do it later on. But  
10 you have a resounding answer on that. You have the  
11 initiative. You have a great answer on this  
12 subject.

13 I'm frustrated with being spoon-fed  
14 alternatives. And we're just part of the framework  
15 that enables the DOE to do what it wants, not what  
16 the public wants. What if we went with the no  
17 action alternative? Would that be the only way we  
18 could stop off-site waste from coming to the site?  
19 We're not making much progress in the cleanup,  
20 anyway. We certainly don't need to add to it;  
21 that's going in the wrong direction.

22 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Mike Clement. After  
23 Mike, Karen Harding.



**DEPONENT**

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

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

COMMENTS BY MIKE CLEMENT:

Thank you for coming. My name is Mike Clement. I live in Hood River. And I would like to voice my opinion for myself, my family, my children, my grandchildren, and for all future generations.

This is quite a lot of liability you people have taken on. I realize the problem is not your fault. It's unfortunate that this is here, but it is here. And the people who first started working with these materials are mostly dead, at a very early age, because they had no clue about what they were dealing with and how dangerous these things were, and how intransient they are as far as getting rid of.

There is no way technically now to get rid of the material, unless you're going to put it in a spaceship and send it off someplace. You can talk about cleaning it up. It's all a shell game, move it from Point A to Point B. You change what it looks like. It's still toxic; it's still radioactive waste.

So the first thing to do is quit making any more. If you've already soiled yourself, why would you stand there and do that again and again? I



**DEPONET**

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

1 mean, the United States -- in my opinion, the  
2 world -- needs to quit using radioactivity for  
3 anything until the number one problem is solved,  
4 which is: How do we really get rid of waste? And  
5 there is no answer to that right now.

6 So as far as the tanks are concerned, of  
7 course they need to be cleaned up to the point that  
8 modern technology will allow. And that's got to be  
9 to 99.99 percent. If you think it can be done that  
10 much, do it. And don't be covering them up in a  
11 landfill. That's just an "out of sight, out of  
12 mind" solution.

13 Secondly, the Fast Flux. You know, at times  
14 it seems like we're getting on the right track of  
15 closing these things down, and then they come back  
16 to haunt us again. Of course, it should be  
17 dismantled and removed and cleaned up to 99.9  
18 percent or whatever the capabilities are today.

19 The idea of bringing waste here from other  
20 parts of the country. I mean, it seems to me,  
21 being the dirtiest place in the nation, that we've  
22 done our share, so to speak. And that's an  
23 absolutely absurd idea. Get rid of that idea by  
24 quit making nuclear waste.

25 The vitrification, well, I sort of addressed



**DEPONENT**

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

1 that about it's not gone; it's just in a different  
2 form.

3 And, Mr. Lyon, I would just like to say to you  
4 that I have advocated in the past that Washington  
5 state, being in the seat of power, sue -- sue these  
6 people at every transgression. And I have sat at  
7 meetings where they have reported to you that "We  
8 will stop the process." That's great.

9 You go to court at that point, and you  
10 get a -- an injunction on that work stoppage, and  
11 you get them back to work. And you use the powers  
12 that you have, as a state, through the court  
13 system, through the vote of the people, et cetera,  
14 to make these people conform to what they know in  
15 their heart of hearts is the right thing to do.

16 Thank you.

17 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Karen Harding. And  
18 after Karen will be Hugh McMahan.

19

20 COMMENTS BY KAREN HARDING:

21 My name is Karen Harding. I live in Mt. Hood.  
22 I work with children. And I guess what I wanted to  
23 express first off this evening is that I often feel  
24 like a child when I'm coming up here, my emotional  
25 response to all this poison in the air and the



**DEPONENT**

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

1 water.

2 And there are times when I am directing a  
3 toddler and I will say, "Well, it's time to pick  
4 up. You know, are you going to pick up the truck  
5 or the doll?" And they -- they have to trust me  
6 that, you know, they're going to get lunch, and  
7 they are going to pick up the truck and the doll.  
8 Because I am moving that way. I don't offer them  
9 to sit down and watch their friends do all the  
10 work.

11 And there's sort of an analysis here of, you  
12 know, I feel like there was some decision made --  
13 whether it was in 2000 or whenever -- that we're  
14 going to truck in all the waste from the rest of  
15 the country. And who made that decision? Was it a  
16 president? Was it somebody, you know, under the  
17 Bush administration decided, well, we're going to  
18 do this as cheaply as possible?

19 Who is that shrouded, mysterious person or  
20 persons that decides, "Okay, that decision is made.  
21 You're just going to have to trust us and we're  
22 going to ship it all around the country."

23 Unacceptable. Unacceptable that there would  
24 be an EIS that totally disregards what they've been  
25 hearing over and over and over: Don't ship in more



**DEPONENT**

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

1 waste; clean up the waste 99.9 percent; take out  
2 the tanks; don't bury the FFTF plant; don't bury  
3 the trenches.

4 We want drinking water for the thousands and  
5 thousands of people who are going to be living in  
6 this area in those next hundreds of years. And  
7 because we aren't going to be around, well, we'll  
8 just, you know, do it on the cheap. Unacceptable.  
9 We are talking about humanity here, not government  
10 bureaucracy and decision making.

11 So I, like the folks this evening, that have  
12 said push the governors, push the states. I would  
13 highly recommend that we look very carefully at the  
14 analysis that Oregon is suggesting, their preferred  
15 proposal.

16 I think that is it. Thanks.

17 MR. PARHAM: Okay. Hugh McMahan, and after  
18 that will be Daniel Lichtenwald.

19  
20 COMMENTS BY HUGH McMAHAN:

21 My name is Hugh McMahan. And I'm a physician,  
22 a retired diagnostic radiologist. So I've had some  
23 exposure to radioactivity and health, no pun  
24 intended.

25 I support wholeheartedly the recommendations



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



1           you've heard here tonight. Clean it up 99.9999  
2           percent. As far as the cleanup of the single-wall  
3           tanks, clean closure, and remove the tanks and  
4           investigate and remediate the soil contamination  
5           from the tank leaks. Decommission the Fast Flux  
6           Test Facility, the way Trojan was taken care of.  
7           And absolutely no more waste.

8           And I would also make a comment here regarding  
9           the contamination, radioactivity into the Columbia  
10          River. And I don't know if Ken is aware of this,  
11          but the Umatilla Basin, which is in North Central  
12          and Eastern Oregon, has a huge agricultural area.  
13          And their groundwater, they've been pumping that  
14          for years. And the table is dropping.

15          And there is a program that they're working on  
16          called the Umatilla Aquifer Storage and Recovery  
17          Program -- or Project, which calls for pumping  
18          water in the winter out of the Columbia River, into  
19          the aquifer. Can you imagine what that's going to  
20          do when those radioactivity levels go up? And if  
21          the radioactivity level goes up beyond the Oregon  
22          DOE qualifications or standards, then they cannot  
23          do that. And that's going to plunge that whole  
24          area into an economic chaos.

25          And just some other comments: The people in



**DEPONET**

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

1 this room, as you've heard, have been coming here  
2 for 20 years and more. I've only been coming for  
3 four or five. But the whole thing is like spinning  
4 our wheels. We just can't have this drawing out  
5 forever. I mean, we Americans put a man on the  
6 moon in about ten years. There's no reason we  
7 can't clean up Hanford in that period of time.

8 The bureaucratic process should not be strung  
9 out forever. Some things need to be deliberated,  
10 but the Hanford cleanup is not one of them. As  
11 you've heard here tonight, everybody knows what  
12 needs to be done. So just do it. Do what is  
13 right. Clean it up and all of it.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. PARHAM: Daniel. And after Daniel, Lisa  
16 Van Dyk will follow.

17  
18 COMMENTS BY DANIEL LICHTENWALD:

19 My name is Daniel Lichtenwald. I live in  
20 Goldendale, Washington. Let's see.

21 This sort of has a -- you know, has a history  
22 of these kind of near-term decisions that really  
23 are kind of based on bureaucratic and institutional  
24 expedience. People get their tickets punched and  
25 come onto the job; they get promoted; they go away.



**DEPONENT**

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

1           Presidents get elected; they get replaced. On and  
2           on and on and on.

3           And so this all looks like, you know, there  
4           are these sort of decisions that are made that are  
5           sort of for the moment, based on pretty much what  
6           people would like to have done. And I'm with  
7           someone else who was up here saying, you know,  
8           these are crafted decisions that are run through a  
9           process, and we're part of the process to say that  
10          someone can sign off and say that there was a  
11          public hearing, and it moves on.

12          What needs to be done really is to look at the  
13          real goals, not just goals for the next 20 years,  
14          somebody's career while someone is in office, but  
15          the real goal, which should be that that area can  
16          be occupied safely by humans and animals forever.  
17          That's the goal. And that should be kept in mind.  
18          And all the other stuff, you know, is you do the  
19          best you can.

20          And in that regard, I think that the  
21          Department of Energy has a conflict of interest.  
22          And this has been brought up before. I claim that  
23          it's impossible for the Department of Energy to  
24          deal with Hanford. And I'm just talking about  
25          Hanford. See, this is what happens, is the whole



**DEPONENT**

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

1 rest of the Department of Energy, their whole  
2 bailiwick gets involved in this, gets sucked into  
3 it.

4 This has got to do with Washington state, the  
5 Columbia River, the Northwest. And the Department  
6 of Energy has a conflict of interest. I question  
7 even the -- the data that's been presented in these  
8 tomes that get bigger and bigger, more and more  
9 detailed. We come here tonight. We're supposed to  
10 look at these slides? You can't even read them.  
11 No, this is -- this is smoke and mirrors. This is  
12 just a way of throwing a lot of stuff at people,  
13 you know, impressing them with tables and charts.  
14 They're impressed.

15 The cleanup should be viewed as 100 percent.  
16 That's what you start with; that's your goal. It  
17 may not get done in anybody's lifetime that's in  
18 this room. Certainly not. But that has to be the  
19 goal. And you have to be able and willing to set  
20 up programs that go beyond your lifetime, beyond  
21 your government career. They have to go way beyond  
22 that.

23 And I'm a little disappointed that the State  
24 of Washington has sort of -- Well, anyway, they're  
25 doing the best they can, I guess. But this is just



1 not doing the job. These are unique situations.  
2 They call it a landfill. I mean, we've got a  
3 landfill in Klickitat County. And it's received  
4 certain kinds of waste, certain things that can't  
5 go into it, certain things that can; and it's  
6 designed for that purpose.

7 So now you say that you're going to cover  
8 these tanks that have been partially emptied, not  
9 completely, and they're going to be a landfill.  
10 It's a landfill solution. No, when you're talking  
11 about stuff that has -- I mean, this isn't  
12 household waste.

13 This is stuff that has -- You know, tens of  
14 thousands of years, it's almost beyond  
15 comprehension the things that it's going to have  
16 impact, you know, little by little by little. So  
17 you're not going to be here. That's a problem for  
18 someone else. Just kick the can off the road, say,  
19 "Well, we're going to do what we can in this budget  
20 cycle."

21 Also, somebody back here mentioned that when  
22 they first went in there, they didn't know what  
23 they were doing. Well, I think they did know what  
24 they were doing. I think they did know what they  
25 were doing. All they were saying was, "We'll let



**DEPONET**

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

1 the future take care of that." And that's exactly  
2 what you're doing now. You're setting up another  
3 set of circumstances where you're going to let the  
4 future take care of it.

5 No, you have to look beyond that, and you have  
6 to look to a total solution. And you may never  
7 achieve it, but you pass the best you can on to  
8 what comes later. But that -- that area has to  
9 be -- it won't be occupied by humans and animals  
10 safely. The drinking water, people have to be able  
11 to drink the water. That all has to come.

12 Anyway, that's -- this FFTF, we're trying to  
13 drive a stake through its heart, and it keeps  
14 coming back to life all the time. No, that should  
15 be dismantled, neutralized, ground up in little  
16 tiny pieces, whatever it takes. And the ground  
17 under it and around it, people can live on it.  
18 That's what needs to be done.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. PARHAM: Lisa Van Dyk, followed by Keith  
21 Harding.

22

23 COMMENTS BY LISA VAN DYK:

24 I'm Lisa Van Dyk, with Heart of America  
25 Northwest. I wanted to take the first part of my



**DEPONENT**

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

1 time to not ask my question, but turn it into a  
2 comment now since I didn't get the chance to get  
3 that in.

4 But this is a follow-up to Brett's question  
5 about off-site waste. And I just wanted to clarify  
6 that this fall, I read the consent decree. And I'm  
7 not a lawyer. But there was no language in the  
8 actual consent decree barring off-site waste. It  
9 was in the cover letter, pre-letter. I don't know  
10 what it's called. But it was not in the actual  
11 consent decree.

12 From what I understand, that does not mean  
13 that DOE is legally obliged to not bring waste to  
14 Hanford; it is more a promise of the order. So  
15 that's what I wanted to clarify.

16 Anyway, I will keep my comments short, because  
17 I agree with what everyone has said before me  
18 tonight. And it's clear that we're all concerned  
19 about the future of the Pacific Northwest. We all  
20 want a clean and healthy environment for future  
21 generations. And it is also clear that the  
22 preferred alternatives in the document that we're  
23 talking about simply don't cut it.

24 There absolutely must be an alternative under  
25 which no new waste is shipped to Hanford. The



**DEPONET**

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

1 public has told you this repeatedly. And with this  
2 document, as Ken Niles pointed out, we now have  
3 your own modeling that shows us how horrible it  
4 will be when we do bring it. So please, do not  
5 bring any off-site waste to Hanford.

6 And just a little bit on the impacts of not  
7 cleaning up the tank leaks are also horrifying, and  
8 are entirely unprotective of the groundwater in the  
9 Columbia River. So as everyone has said before me,  
10 99.999 percent must be cleaned up of the tank  
11 waste. And do not forget the tanks leaks and the  
12 burial grounds, cribs and trenches. I would also  
13 encourage you to do an analysis of the Oregon  
14 preferred alternative.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Keith Harding, and  
17 then following Keith will be Lauren Goldberg.

18  
19 COMMENTS BY KEITH HARDING:

20 Hi, I'm Keith Harding. I live in the Upper  
21 Hood River Valley, about ten miles from the edge of  
22 the Columbia River.

23 Hanford is one curse from our fathers laid  
24 upon us, and now we are following suit and laying  
25 even more curses on generations to come. Things



**DEPONET**

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



1           like the depleted uranium used in modern warfare,  
2           PCBs, dioxins, it's circulating all through the  
3           global ecosystems. Tens of thousands of chemicals,  
4           pesticides, herbicides. We're making this planet  
5           more and more perilous all the time for all life.

6           How wide is humanity's threshold of tolerance  
7           for all this garbage? We need to get serious about  
8           this. There's several things that come to mind.  
9           We need to, as other people have said, completely  
10          dismantle the FFTF. We've talked about that for  
11          years now. All the way down.

12          Drop all consideration of moving hazardous  
13          waste, toxic waste from anywhere else in the  
14          country. Now, there's some things that shouldn't  
15          be in anyone's backyard. But there is an upside to  
16          having it in your own backyard. You might focus on  
17          it more and clean it up.

18          Everything I've been hearing here for years  
19          tells me that someone far away is looking at making  
20          the Pacific Northwest a sacrifice area, literally.  
21          That's us. What is the significance of the Pacific  
22          Northwest in weather patterns, climate for the  
23          entire United States? Not to mention, the Pacific  
24          Northwest has a history of being a very rich and  
25          bountiful place. That's fast disappearing because



**DEPONENT**

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

1 of what we're doing here: dams, pollution,  
2 et cetera.

3 There's a lot to be said for decentralization  
4 versus centralization. When something is  
5 centralized, it's easy to put it out of mind. When  
6 it's decentralized, like where it is, people are  
7 more apt to work on it, clean it up. In a smaller  
8 amount, it may be easier to handle than in a  
9 humongous amount in one faraway place.

10 And like other people said, the real goal  
11 needs to be not 99.9999, but 100 percent. That  
12 needs to be the goal, to do it down to the very  
13 end, to clean those tanks up and then to process  
14 those tanks as best we can. You know, in this  
15 "United States of Amnesia," things can quickly go  
16 out of sight. And it needs to be held in sight for  
17 a long time to come.

18 According to Heart of America's presentation  
19 that Gerry gave us upstairs and his presentation  
20 here, even the Department of Energy's own  
21 scientific findings have some pretty horrendous  
22 casualties that even the DOE has found. That  
23 should tell you something. What is it really  
24 saying, that we'll just go along with these  
25 casualty levels? That's real human beings for a



**DEPONENT**

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

1 long, long time.

2 Another thing that comes to mind is  
3 vitrification seems to be the state-of-the-art  
4 method for processing some of the waste at Hanford.  
5 And if a second vitrification plant is needed, that  
6 should get into the pipeline for action also.

7 And the spilled waste at Hanford should be  
8 added into this EIS, also. And I understand that  
9 it is not there at the present time. But waste  
10 that has been spilled on site and is migrating,  
11 that should be added in also.

12 Thanks a lot.

13 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Lauren Goldberg. And  
14 after Lauren will be Aera Atkins.

15  
16 COMMENTS BY LAUREN GOLDBERG:

17 Hi, everyone. My name is Lauren. I'm a staff  
18 attorney with Columbia Riverkeeper.

19 I just want to thank everyone so much for  
20 coming out tonight. I've seen your testimony at  
21 other hearings. And it's very critical that we  
22 have this mass of people coming out tonight, in  
23 Portland, and also submitting comments.

24 And I just want to make two just general  
25 comments to all of you based on what you're hearing



**DEPONENT**

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

1           tonight in terms of the years of frustration and  
2           already being listened to. The first is that your  
3           comments are critical. Ultimately, this will all  
4           become part of a huge administrative record;  
5           ultimately, a record that a court could even  
6           review.

7           And your comments tonight and written comments  
8           will create what is really critical to demonstrate  
9           that the Department of Energy, our federal  
10          government, has not done their job under the  
11          National Environmental Policy Act in looking at a  
12          reasonable range of alternatives and looking at  
13          cumulative impacts of this project.

14          So please, continue to stay engaged in this  
15          process, as frustrating as it might seem at  
16          moments. We have had our victories, you know, just  
17          within the last two months. And we need to  
18          continue bringing that through the process.

19          And the second point is, outside of the  
20          Environmental Impact Statement, please do what you  
21          can to talk to your neighbors about this hearing  
22          tonight, to send a letter to the editor. As Gerry  
23          pointed out during the talk earlier, we need to  
24          make sure this moves out of the sight of just a  
25          small, public hearing to the general public.



**DEPONENT**

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

1           The words that, you know, Ken Niles shared  
2           tonight, this is critical. This is our Oregon  
3           Department of Energy saying that this isn't enough;  
4           this isn't going to bring us to the point of  
5           cleanup that will protect our state. So please  
6           share that with people outside of the public  
7           process.

8           And then my last two points go more  
9           specifically to the Draft Environmental Impact  
10          Statement. And that is that there's one really  
11          critical federal statute that you hear about a lot  
12          on the Columbia River, which is the Endangered  
13          Species Act. And it's noticeably missing in this  
14          Draft Environmental Impact Statement. That is, we  
15          see very little mention of how the Department of  
16          Energy's decision will impact endangered and  
17          threatened salmon and steelhead and other species  
18          on the Columbia River.

19          And that's a really critical flaw. Because by  
20          not discussing those impacts, the Department is  
21          electing not to consult with the expert science  
22          agencies on how its decisions will impact those  
23          species. So that's a really important comment to  
24          make to the DOE in your comments as well this  
25          evening.



**DEPONENT**

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

1           And the last point is the National  
2           Environmental Policy Act. Over the last several  
3           decades, courts have repeatedly said that the heart  
4           of this whole exercise in preparing an  
5           Environmental Impact Statement is the agency's  
6           analysis of the alternatives.

7           And, you know, what's clear this evening, in  
8           comments from the State of Oregon and from many  
9           members of the public, is that there's a major,  
10          reasonable alternative that's missing here, which  
11          is not importing waste to Hanford. And so let's  
12          all join in reminding the agency that at the heart  
13          of this analysis, the public deserves and the  
14          agency is required by law to provide reasonable  
15          alternatives.

16          Thank you.

17          MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Aera Atkins, and  
18          after Aera will be Bonnie New.

19  
20                           COMMENTS BY AERA ATKINS:

21           My name is Aera. Good evening, everybody.  
22           And thank you for your presentations.

23           A bit of a caveat with that though, because  
24           just feedback for our technical expert here: Not  
25           very understandable to me. And I feel like it's



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

1 all a little -- that there's a big disconnect going  
2 on, and that the technical information that we've  
3 been given is very hard to receive. But I hear  
4 that in court, the technical information has been  
5 called indefensible. So it leaves me feeling  
6 like -- very uncertain that anything I'm hearing is  
7 the bottom line of truth.

8 Having said that, I would just like to record  
9 my request, my desire that everything at Hanford  
10 that can be cleaned up is cleaned up, including the  
11 trenches, the contaminated water, the tanks taken  
12 out, the Fast Flux Test Facility completely  
13 dismantled, all the spilled waste taken care of. I  
14 don't know if I'm supposed to say 99.9999 percent  
15 or 100 percent, but I'm sure you get my drift.

16 And please, the State of Washington, please  
17 conduct the analysis that's being proposed by the  
18 Oregon DOE. No outside waste, please. No more  
19 outside waste coming into Oregon and to Hanford.  
20 Clean closure, I think that's another thing I'm  
21 supposed to say, that will speak your language,  
22 hopefully. Yes.

23 Please, let's -- I mean, it seems to me that  
24 Hanford as a place for nuclear waste is completely  
25 inappropriate. Shouldn't we be looking for



**DEPONENT**

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

1            somewhere that's away from a major river, where  
2            it's somewhere that's very sparsely populated or,  
3            preferably, not populated at all? I mean, these  
4            seem like common-sense alternatives to be pursuing.  
5            And I would like to urge everybody to move in that  
6            direction.

7            Thank you.

8            MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Bonnie New, and after  
9            Bonnie will be Aaron Morehouse.

10  
11            COMMENTS BY BONNIE NEW:

12            Thank you. Good evening. My name is Bonnie  
13            New. I'm a physician from Hood River and a public  
14            health specialist.

15            This is a health issue. There are lots of  
16            other ramifications: political, economic,  
17            technical, and so on. But it's generally a health  
18            issue, health of the biological community. My  
19            little niche in the biological community happens to  
20            be human health, so I'll sort of stick with that  
21            one.

22            From the public health point of view, it would  
23            be best to have a very complete cleanup of  
24            equipment, like the single-shelled tanks, whether  
25            leaking or not. Those that aren't leaking, thank



**DEPONET**

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



1 God for that. But they have the potential to leak  
2 in the same ways that the ones before them have  
3 leaked. The tanks should -- need to be completely  
4 emptied, same reasoning. The tanks need to be  
5 removed.

6 In regards to treatment of the nuclear waste,  
7 both the low-activity waste and the high-level  
8 nuclear waste: The most solid and health-  
9 protective approach is vitrification of both of  
10 those waste streams. The so-called alternative  
11 methods have not shown the effectiveness or  
12 efficiency that vitrification has. And the  
13 proposals for vitrifying just portions of it really  
14 are incomplete.

15 I can't imagine how you would decide what  
16 to -- I mean, I understand there are some technical  
17 criteria for deciding what to vitrify or not. But  
18 from a public health point of view, health is not  
19 going to be protected unless it's all rendered in a  
20 non-mobile state, which is the point with  
21 vitrification. This applies to nuclear waste  
22 that's in tanks, in the unlined trenches, in  
23 contaminated soils and water; in fact, in any  
24 mobile or potentially mobile form.

25 The Department of Ecology has made a very



**DEPONET**

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

1 sensible, brief statement of the goal, which is to  
2 do what is as much as is technically possible. Not  
3 economically feasible, not any of those sort of  
4 slippery legal terms that mean not doing too much.  
5 It needs to be done to the extent that's  
6 technically possible and at least 99 percent.

7 I would suggest also that it might be useful  
8 in -- in the DOE's communications to specify -- to  
9 explain to the public exactly what vitrification  
10 and other methods of treatment accomplish. And I  
11 think this might have been the substance of our  
12 first question tonight. That is, it's not clear,  
13 from some of the materials produced by DOE, exactly  
14 what vitrification offers to a cleanup and  
15 specifically to the public.

16 That is, does it just keep the radioactivity  
17 from moving around; it immobilizes it? Or does it  
18 somehow reduce the radioactivity and, therefore,  
19 the public health risk? It's my understanding that  
20 it keeps it from moving around. If you have other  
21 information on that, you might share that with us.  
22 But I believe the questions were: I'm hearing  
23 about vitrification. How much does this reduce the  
24 risk?

25 On the subject of no new waste: This has some



**DEPONET**

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

1 significant public health implications. It is not  
2 strictly "Not in my backyard," although there is  
3 certainly that sentiment being expressed. The  
4 transportation risk of off-site nuclear waste being  
5 brought here, or anywhere else, is significant.

6 And the numbers we heard of 856 cancer deaths  
7 or whatever. However you count that, that is the  
8 tip of the iceberg. That refers only to cancers;  
9 that refers only to deaths. The non-cancer health  
10 effects of radiation exposure are much more  
11 numerous. And the non-mortality, that is the  
12 morbidity aspect, just the illness, is significant  
13 also. So the idea of transportation being a  
14 significant risk goes way beyond this, you know,  
15 856 body count.

16 Another aspect that is relevant to public  
17 health is that to be able to ship waste to Hanford,  
18 or somewhere else that is not where they  
19 originated, gives them the mistaken impression that  
20 the health risk has been attenuated or maybe even  
21 cured. It hasn't; it's been moved. And the same  
22 applies to the decommissioning of the FFTF, the  
23 aspect of "Should parts of it be moved to Idaho for  
24 further processing?" The answer from a public  
25 health point of view would be "No."



**DEPONENT**

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

1 Thank you very much.

2 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Aaron Morehouse. And  
3 after Aaron, Rollean.

4

5 COMMENTS BY AARON MOREHOUSE:

6 First off, thank you to everyone that's  
7 brought this all together tonight. My name is  
8 Aaron Morehouse.

9 And as a recent newcomer to the Gorge, this is  
10 my first Hanford meeting. And I'm in my thirties.  
11 And I'll come back to that at the end.

12 But I like stories. Before coming here, I was  
13 late tonight because I was at home, reading two  
14 stories to my children before they went to bed.

15 And we're told a story; there's been a story  
16 that's been formed here for decades. And this is a  
17 story that will be told -- it's been formed for  
18 decades, but it will be told for generations. And  
19 what I want to know is, what's the end of that  
20 story? Is it the kind of story that I read tonight  
21 to my children?

22 There's stories that take millennia to form.  
23 And this Gorge, this region is full of stories that  
24 have taken millennia to form. And needless to say,  
25 out of 6,000 pages, and out of as many comments



**DEPONENT**

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

1           tonight and out of every meeting there is and will  
2           be about Hanford, there is a story being made.

3           What we hear from the DOE tonight is not only  
4           dishonoring the stories and the legacies that have  
5           formed this place, this region, but the legacies  
6           that recognize the Columbia as the lifeblood of our  
7           region. The preferred alternative is to target the  
8           collapse of the ecological integrity of our region.  
9           They threaten the economies of our communities. It  
10          drains the life -- literally, the lives -- from the  
11          generations today, from the generations to come.

12          So what will be the stories that my children  
13          and grandchildren will tell? What will I tell them  
14          when they read the story that's being written in  
15          these days? What did we do? So bringing it back  
16          to the heart of it, what we need to make sure gets  
17          written on that little machine over there is what  
18          needs to be done.

19          So no off-site waste; it's absolutely  
20          unthinkable. To leave any waste behind is  
21          absolutely unthinkable. 100 percent removal of all  
22          the waste. Let's go beyond that 99.9999 percent.  
23          Let's completely dismantle the FFTF. Endeavor for  
24          that hundred percent cleanup. The clean closure is  
25          the words, I think, I heard earlier.



**DEPONENT**

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

1           And let's be expedient. Let's not delay.  
2           Because like I mentioned, I am here in my thirties.  
3           And if I'm here in my fifties, like the gentleman  
4           earlier, I will not be nearly as cordial as he was.

5           Thank you.

6           MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Next, Rollean. And  
7           then after that, Theresa North.

8

9

COMMENTS BY ROLLEAN:

10           All right. All right. Yeah, yeah. Nuclear  
11           stuff. It's pretty creepy stuff. You're making  
12           money off it, huh? Get a nice check. I've worked  
13           with the government. I liked getting a check; it  
14           was good. Oh, boy. I was in the Army. When I was  
15           like 17 or something, I was living in South  
16           Carolina, pretty close to the Savannah River Plant.  
17           They called it the bomb plant. I was just a kid.  
18           My daddy worked back there for DuPont. Have you  
19           heard of DuPont? War profiteer. War profiteer.

20           I think the DOE is kind of, what you would  
21           call, a PR firm sort of for the war profiteers, to  
22           sort of absorb all the possible reactions from  
23           people who kind of come to their senses and go,  
24           "Gee, my dog's fur is falling out. Gosh. What  
25           should I do?" They don't want you to do anything.



**DEPONENT**

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

1 I started doing something in 1986. I went on  
2 the Great Peace March for Nuclear Disarmament. And  
3 I spent a year going cross-country, trying to talk  
4 people into -- trying to educate people about  
5 nuclear power, and particularly nuclear missiles,  
6 this type of thing. Then the next year, I decided  
7 I wanted to start getting arrested. I was going to  
8 start sticking my neck out more, see if I could  
9 maybe go to jail or something like that.

10 I went down to Florida and I snuck onto, what  
11 do you call, Cape Canaveral. Got caught trying to  
12 stop some nuclear missiles being flown out of a  
13 submarine, so they could go 5,000 miles over to  
14 Russia. And they already had a missile that would  
15 do that. But this new missile, we spent millions  
16 of dollars on, was going to shrink the target area  
17 by -- from, I think, a mile down to a hundred  
18 yards, so they could knock out hardened missile  
19 silos. But they would never admit that. They said  
20 they wanted to be more accurate.

21 I kind of learned that anything I hear from  
22 the government is very suspect. Very suspect. In  
23 fact, it's pretty much -- I'll just leave it at  
24 that.

25 But then back in the early '90s, I spent the



**DEPONENT**

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

1 night on top of a nuclear power plant itself, in  
2 Vermont. Ever heard of Vermont Yankee? It's this  
3 crazy-ass, GE-built nuclear reactor. It's a box,  
4 concrete box, that's not even got a dome on it.  
5 And a guy told me -- After I got arrested for  
6 spending the night on that and got taken down and  
7 locked up in jail, went to court and had my two  
8 days in court, represented myself. Hey, I'm a  
9 lawyer. For two days, I was.

10 And you know what? The guy told me, in court,  
11 that we didn't even know this. "What do you do  
12 with the spent fuel? What do you do with it?" He  
13 said, "We take it out on the top, on this rail on  
14 the top of the reactor. And we put it in this  
15 swimming pool up on stilts." I had no idea. It  
16 sounds crazy, you better believe it. But I mean,  
17 that's the truth.

18 And this particular power plant, they had it  
19 in a raised, elevated swimming pool, 80 feet above  
20 the ground, where it was going to stay  
21 indefinitely. It's still there today, in  
22 Brattleboro, Vermont, where I used to live.

23 And this is the kind of mentality. That's  
24 kind of the preferred choice at the moment. What  
25 are you going to do? Are you going to truck it



**DEPONET**

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



1 out? That's what they're saying. "Truck it out  
2 here to Hanford; it will be safe here." That's so  
3 ludicrous. It's like this crazy-ass joke, you  
4 know, that -- that -- I don't know what to do about  
5 it. I've got to laugh a little bit about it, but  
6 it's killing us at the same time.

7 So I want to, bottom line, say, really, thank  
8 you for coming down here and sitting through this.  
9 And just listen and keep it up. Keep it going.  
10 Put pressure on these folks.

11 And if you're not involved actively in  
12 resisting this kind of death culture, I would  
13 really appreciate if you would get involved at some  
14 level. Stick your neck out a little bit. And if  
15 you don't have the time to please maybe send one  
16 of your friends or just, you know, kind of help it  
17 build. Because we're probably going to have to  
18 eventually deal with this ourselves. Could be.

19 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Theresa North.

20

21 COMMENTS BY THERESA NORTH:

22 Good evening. I guess I should start out by  
23 saying: Clean it up and don't bring anything new.  
24 Just so you don't misunderstand my position.

25 But what I'd like to do is talk to all of you,



**DEPONENT**

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

1           who work for the DOE and hold these hearings again  
2           and again and again, as people. I'm sure your job  
3           probably sucks sometimes; this evening, for  
4           example.

5           And so I'd like you, tonight or this weekend  
6           or this month, to go home and look at your kids and  
7           your grandkids. And if you don't have those, I'd  
8           like you to look at your nephews and nieces. And  
9           when you read those statistics about cancer and  
10          other illnesses, I would like you to put the faces  
11          of the ones you love on those statistics.

12          Thank you.

13          MR. PARHAM: Thank you. That's the end of our  
14          registered list. I'd like to turn to anyone who  
15          has not commented yet, who would like to comment  
16          now, given the finishing of our official list.

17          Do you want to start?

18          Again, after we get done with people who  
19          haven't spoken yet, we'll come back to those who  
20          have spoken and want to go again.

21  
22                            COMMENTS BY CATHERINE FITZGERALD:

23           My name is Catherine Fitzgerald. I used to  
24           live in the Gorge; I don't anymore. I moved out in  
25           2002. But my son still lives here. He works at



1 Skamania Lodge. And he fishes a lot. And he's  
2 really active. He used to swim in the river. I  
3 didn't like it. Good thing he's healthy still.

4 But one thing after one of the speakers was  
5 commenting that, you know, I think if the  
6 government can shift over this nuclear waste to the  
7 Columbia Gorge, where it's -- it's -- it's in an  
8 earthquake fault; it's in the ring of fire; it's on  
9 the river. You know, if we can store it right  
10 there where it's really dangerous, maybe this  
11 nuclear waste is not so bad. The DOE probably  
12 doesn't want you to know how bad it is. Because  
13 then nuclear power won't be very popular, and this  
14 won't be a very good moneymaker for whoever.

15 And, Mary Beth, I'm sorry, but I have to  
16 comment. If the DOE's intention is to deliver a  
17 very bland, emotionless presentation that nobody  
18 can understand, they've succeeded. I applaud you  
19 on that. And I'm sorry to direct my comment  
20 personally toward you. But I had a very hard time  
21 understanding anything you were saying. You had no  
22 emotion whatsoever. Sorry about that.

23 I agree with all the other comments that have  
24 been given here, in full, to everything they've  
25 said. I completely agree. I completely agree that



1           this man here has given a lot of his life to be a  
2           part of the process. We should completely look at  
3           what Oregon's proposal is.

4           And I know that we -- we can't wait. I know  
5           that we must not wait. If there's stuff leaking,  
6           we have to stop the leak. If you had a leak in  
7           your house, and it was coming down through the  
8           ceiling, you would stop the leak first. But then  
9           you would clean it up, correct? You'd dry it out;  
10          you'd pull the roof down; you'd put a fan in there.  
11          For however long it takes, you'd dry it out.

12          So if there's a leak, stop the leak. Stop the  
13          leaks however you have to. Which we all know what  
14          that means. And then get to cleaning it up.  
15          Because if it's still leaking, it's leaking. You  
16          know, I'm not a rocket scientist. I'm a massage  
17          therapist and an energy worker and a healer. And I  
18          know what needs to be done.

19          And we're all very emotional about this,  
20          including myself. But one thing, I want to make my  
21          last point is that we can make this a positive. We  
22          really can. If we all come together and work  
23          together and bring bigger guns in, whatever it  
24          takes, we can make this terrible, terrible,  
25          terrible problem that really doesn't -- None of us



**DEPONENT**

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

1 did it. Anybody go out there and dump nuclear  
2 waste? I didn't think so. It wasn't me. It  
3 wasn't you, it wasn't you, it wasn't you.

4 But we can make this a positive when we can be  
5 the ones that bring in this legacy of this amazing  
6 cleanup, this amazing feat. We can build like  
7 these huge trains under hundreds of feet of water,  
8 but we cannot clean up Hanford? I don't  
9 understand. It's 2010. We have the technology. I  
10 know we do. So get off your butts and do what  
11 needs to be done. I'm really mad. And that's all  
12 I have to say.

13 Thank you.

14 MR. PARHAM: Let me check to see if anyone  
15 hasn't spoken. Anyone else hasn't spoken who would  
16 like to?

17 Yes, sir, come on up.

18  
19 COMMENTS BY DAN SOLITZ:

20 My name is Dan Solitz. I'm from Eugene. I  
21 was in the Navy with the propulsion service. And  
22 after I got out, I was an anti-nuclear activist.  
23 And then I followed waste for a while. And I've  
24 been following nucleonics ever since, although I  
25 haven't been very active in it. And this is my



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

1 first night on the Hanford waste thing for me.

2 And I guess it must be clear by now to  
3 everybody that both sides are holding the waste  
4 hostage to the future of the nuclear power. The  
5 environmentalists are holding it hostage to the  
6 future of nuclear power, and the people who are  
7 promoting nuclear power are holding the waste  
8 hostage and the environmentalists hostage in the  
9 future of nuclear power.

10 And seems to me like a big picture that needs  
11 to be developed, and I think the Department of  
12 Energy is in a position to do that. Because all of  
13 this "Not in my backyard stuff." The waste exists;  
14 it exists in massive amounts. Something has to be  
15 done with it. It seems to me like there should be  
16 a study made where -- of the most stable geologic  
17 formations. And regardless of whose backyards  
18 they're in, that's where it should go, to protect  
19 the life of however the long the stuff is  
20 radioactive.

21 And it can be done. There's a natural reactor  
22 in Gabon, Africa, that is no longer a hazardous  
23 waste site; it's in a stable formation. So there  
24 are other places on Earth and in this country where  
25 that stuff can go. And it needs to be cleaned up.



**DEPONENT**

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

1           It seems to me that the proper approach to  
2           Hanford would have been to stop the spread of the  
3           waste to begin with and then clean up what waste  
4           you have, so it doesn't spread anymore or endanger  
5           anybody. But if it has to go someplace else  
6           because it's a geologically unstable area, well,  
7           then it has to go someplace else. If this is a  
8           geologically stable area, then it has to come here.

9           People's own interests or prejudices need to  
10          have a good, hard look taken at them. That's all  
11          I've got to say.

12          MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else that's  
13          not spoken yet who would like to?

14  
15                                   COMMENTS BY DOUG CHARTERS:

16          My name is Doug Charters. I've been here in  
17          the Gorge for almost 50 years. I was born here,  
18          lived here all my life. I'm an Oregonian by birth  
19          and Washingtonian by residence. We kind of called  
20          ourselves river rat kids because we all grew up on  
21          the river. I spent many a summer down there,  
22          playing in the water. Sometimes it's kind of  
23          worrisome, but so far hanging in there.

24          What worries me is, bringing the waste here is  
25          putting all your eggs in one basket. It's a



**DEPONET**

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

1 geological or astrological impact-type thing, you  
2 know, something of that disaster level. And you  
3 have all of your nuclear waste in one basket, so to  
4 speak. It could be far more devastating than what  
5 it could be.

6 And in the immediate terms or whatever, you  
7 know, on-site, you know, storage of the other  
8 facilities may be more logical until, you know, a  
9 more permanent solution is devised in the future.  
10 And like Yucca Mountain, you know, at one time they  
11 looked at it. But I believe it's shut down or  
12 going to be shut down. That one geologically  
13 worried me.

14 But some things take more research in time or  
15 whatever. And some of the logic, doesn't seem  
16 logical to move it or whatever at this time,  
17 because with some of the devices they've built to  
18 move or whatever, there may be a better way to do  
19 it. But, you know, keep up what you're doing.

20 And one thing, when you entomb the stuff or  
21 whatever, you might want to consider making it  
22 reaccessible in the future, you know, in your  
23 methods of what do you there. Because you may want  
24 to remove it from Hanford or do some other process  
25 that's developed scientifically that's more



**DEPONENT**

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



1           economical and feasible. So one of the things that  
2           you may consider is, you know, your options are  
3           viable in the future of what you do do.

4           But lining things and making sure the  
5           groundwater is safe should be a very high priority  
6           for not just us, but the people that come after us.

7           Thank you for your time.

8           MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else that has  
9           not commented that would like to? If not, we can  
10          turn to people that would like to come back up.

11

12          ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY DANIEL LICHTENWALD:

13          My name is Daniel Lichtenwald. I live in  
14          Goldendale, Washington.

15          This is kind of an administrative addition of  
16          the health provider testified about something. I  
17          want to clarify when I say "cleanup." It's  
18          probably immobilizing and concentrating and  
19          isolating as best as possible from the rest of the  
20          environment. So that would, in effect, substitute  
21          for every time I've mentioned "cleanup" would be  
22          that.

23          The other thing also, someone mentioned about  
24          the ESA: Endangered Species Act. Also in the EIS,  
25          whether there's been any -- and I don't know



1           whether it's EIS material, but the cost benefit  
2           with respect to the treaties with the tribes. In  
3           other words, if over the eons, the millennia, the  
4           river becomes -- impacts to the river have an  
5           effect on the survival of the tribes' cultures,  
6           whether the Department of Energy has analyzed those  
7           costs and what they're willing to pay for.

8           Thank you.

9           MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else have  
10          additional comments? Yes, sir.

11  
12           ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY JURGEN HESS:

13          Jurgen Hess. I just want to also pick up with  
14          what Mr. Lichtenwald said about the tribal treaty  
15          rights. My wife and I spend a lot of time at the  
16          Celilo Indian Village, which is 40 miles east of  
17          here on the Columbia River. We've gotten to know  
18          them, several of them, as good friends.

19          And they basically eat fish. You look in  
20          their freezers, they're packed with fish. They eat  
21          fish; they sell fish. And when I look at those  
22          scenarios of the pollution for the next thousands  
23          and thousands of years, I think it's more than  
24          treaty rights. I think it goes deeper than that.  
25          It goes to our ethics of humanity.



**DEPONENT**

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

1           Those pollutants get into the fish. They get  
2           into the flesh in especially fish like salmon and  
3           steelhead. So I think we, as people that took  
4           their lands, we have those obligations to do what's  
5           right for them and clean it up, and make sure that  
6           for their seventh generation, their children will  
7           have healthy food.

8           Thank you.

9  
10           MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else with  
11           additional comments at this time? If not, thanks  
12           for being here this evening, and thanks to the  
13           Department of Energy and various state officials.  
14           And we'll be around here for a few minutes to take  
15           additional questions or talk.

16           So this concludes the formal part of the  
17           hearing for now. Thank you.

18  
19           (COMMENT SESSION CONCLUDED AT 09:25 PM)



**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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

And I further certify that pages 1 through 59 contain a full, true, and accurate record of my stenotype notes, to the best of my ability.

Witness my hand at Portland, Oregon, this 17th day of February, 2010.

151 Deelana Johnson

Deelana Johnson, CSR, RPR

CSR No. 90-0104



**DEPONENT**

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