TPO-0002

MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you. Greg. And after Greg, Susan Fay.

TPO-0002 MR. deBRULER: My name is Greg deBruler. And I represent Columbia Riverkeeper.

And I am officially, as of two nights ago, the official riverkeeper for Columbia Riverkeeper, so I have a new status. Like I haven't ever talked for Columbia Riverkeeper.

The first general comment is: You know, I listen to Gerry and I listen to Paige, and I've read a fair amount of this EIS, and I

1 guess from the public perspective, what you have to think of, this is a shell game.

The reason why they're doing this, and Gerry had this wonderful slide up here about how much they want to bring in, that 70,000 truckloads is, this is kind of like the initial salvo.

2 Once they get through that 70,000, it could go up to 150,000. It could go higher than 70.

3 But if you think about what they're trying to do and why they're so interested in

TPO-0002 (contd)

3

doing one thing, as you said, sir, bringing more waste in, is because they have a directive that's out of headquarters that says they have to close 40 percent of the complex by 2006.

That's why they're in a rush. That's why everything is accelerated. That's why when this gentleman here -- and I'm not going to pick on you, but he's the guy that has to cumulate the documents, and is the manager, has a real hard job on his shoulders, because he's hopefully going to think that all this stuff is done properly and they've done the final analysis and has met all the requirements under the federal law.

Well, unfortunately, the task, you couldn't accomplish in the amount of time that you have.

So comments. Columbia Riverkeeper, the first major comment is: public involvement.

4

NEPA requires the adequate time for the pubic to read and assimilate the information written in any Environmental Impact Statement.

The USDOE has failed to grant a

TPO-0002 (contd)

4

30-day extension to the comment period, even though USDOE received requests from the state of Washington and Oregon and multiple public interest organizations and the Hanford Advisory Board.

The state of Washington asked for an extension to at least the -- have meeting in June.

USDOE has denied any extension, expecting the public and all reviewing agencies to adequately review the 3,000 page document in a very short period of time.

If you think about this, since the signing of the tri-party agreement in 1989, DOE has never, ever denied an extension request.

So if you think of the law, if you think it was required by NEPA, they are clearly in violation. For us, that's fine, because there's other remedies that we can seek later on.

Cumulative risk. Think of Hanford. Think of 50 years of waste. Think of cumulative impacts, cumulative assessing how much waste we have.

Think of 1,600 to 2,000 waste sites

TPO-0002 (contd)

at Hanford. Think of them taking solid waste and they want to bury it here and bury it here and bury it here.

Well, that's kind of okay; so they myopically think, "We'll bury it here, look here, look here," but what they aren't looking at is they aren't looking at all the waste that is existing in the soil column.

450 billion gallons of radioactive liquid and chemicals was dumped in there.

5 They aren't looking at the fact that over time, for as long as that material remains hazardous, it's going to leach. It's going to impact the groundwater.

They aren't looking at all of the waste sites all over the Hanford site and looking at the cumulative impacts to groundwater over time.

Their simplistic model that they call, they use the SAC, System Assessment Capability, is like a Volkswagen in 1942.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Greg, two minutes.

MR. GREG deBRULER: Very, very crude; can run, but can't perform very well.

TPO-0002 (contd)

It doesn't give you an idea of really what's going on.

There are other tools they could be using. They aren't. They have made a commitment, the Department of Energy in 1989, to use the Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment requirements document which was put together by the state of Washington, the state of Oregon, the Tribes, was endorsed by the Department of Energy, and said that they would use CRCIA as the template for all risk assessments. So if you think simply, it's the baseline.

If you're going to do a risk assessment, you have to look at all of these requirements and you have to at least incorporate this in your assessment process.

6 This EIS says that they've used CRCIA, I was the chair of the CRCIA team, it does not. It fails miserably. And it's very easy to prove later on.

Waste disposal, transportation risk:

7 The EIS fails to assess and disclose the risk to the public on all transportation routes, including detours off major highways from the

TPO-0002 (contd)

7

point of shipment to Hanford. All detours from the point of shipment.

The waste management Programmatic EIS, which is the one before this, looked at shipments from the different sites to Hanford. That was prior to 9-11.

They are not assessing a potential terrorist attack on one of these dirty -- these trucks holding this highly radioactive waste.

One large rocket into one of these trucks on a detour route going through Salem would ruin the lives of many, many people in Salem. The analysis in the EIS never even looked at it.

So when we look at this thing, we basically are saying, "It doesn't even cut it. It doesn't cut it." And it's unfortunate, because as we all know, we're in a very difficult time with the Department of Energy right now. They aren't listening.

Gerry has suggested that they take this EIS and redo it. If they don't, they'll issue a record of decision, I understand, sometime in July. That's their goal. Fast track, fast track, fast track.

TPO-0003, TPO-0004

So probably by September, if it fails to meet the adequacy under NEPA, and all the other requirements, it will end up in court again, unfortunately.

So I hope they kind of look at it seriously and undo it. Thank you.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you. Susan Fay. How do you spell your last name.

TPO-0003 MS. SUSAN FAY: F-A-Y.

Hi, I'm Susan Fay. What we've asked for and what we've been promised is clean up. To import additional waste is immoral, it's unconscionable.

1

To assume that everything's going to be fine without looking in to all the probabilities and possibilities and planning for all the potential outcomes is unacceptable.

2

That's all I have to say.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Barbara Pereira.

TPO-0004 MS. BARBARA PEREIRA: My name is Barbara Pereira. There's great speakers out here, I don't think I could be compared to them.

But it's such a mess right now at

TPO-0004 (contd); TPO-0005

the Hanford grounds, but I don't -- I think it's an embarrassment to the Department of Energy.

1 How can you send truckloads of waste when you haven't done anything to what you have there now? And we've been fighting this for years.

2 And so it's embarrassing. It's also, health wise, it's destructive for us and for everything -- for environmentally, the water, the air, everything. That's all I have to say. Thank you very much.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Doug -- Tobi.

TPO-0005 MS. TOBI CANTINE: My name is Tobi Cantine. You have to forgive me, I have a little bit of a cold tonight.

I was thinking about my cat. I like my cat very much. And I was thinking that there's a potential that with this kind of chemicals, these kinds of things in the ground, we'll have a lot more cats with cancer than we already have.

1 It has an effect on all of our lives. Not just the humans, but all the other creatures that live in our society.

TPO-0005 (contd)

I was thinking that, you know, the life quality that we have here in Oregon is very good quality of life.

But I just saw a movie with my friend, it's called the Erin Brockovich, some of you might have seen it.

These people were all told it was fabulous. "Everything's wonderful. Look, we were giving you something healthful."

The problem with nuclear things is it's difficult to trace, you know. The truck drives through near my house, because I live near the 205 freeway, a truck drives past and then 20 years from now my mom or my dear friend finds herself with cancer. Now, what caused it?

2

It's not the same as if I took a gun and shot somebody, you could tell my gun shot the person, you know. Or not my gun, I was the one who shot the person with my gun. You see what I'm saying.

So I thought I would mention this: that until we're sure that it's really safe, don't do it. Because otherwise it's suicide. It's murder. That's what I say. Thank you.

TPO-0005 (contd)

So then one of the things I thought is, "What do we need this for?"

I have a couple more comments, sir, okay? What do we need this for? It's designed to protect us.

I mean, why do we have the nuclear arms? To protect us from our enemies, perhaps it's from terrorism.

But then you think "Well, you have these things in the ground, and it could be causing us serious potential of physical conditions."

Negative things happening to us, which is just as bad as terrorism, if not worse, because we ourselves are doing it to ourselves.

Now, another thought I had was that what about if there was a bomb that was put -- the terrorists were to drop a bomb similar to the kind we dropped in Iraq, where it would go underground and somehow -- I don't know exactly how it did this, but it would go underground.

And it was sort of a smart bomb. And it would go in there and supposedly finding the weapons of mass destruction, which may or

TPO-0005 (contd)

may not have existed. But they were -- you
3 follow what I'm saying. What if someone
dropped a bomb on Hanford.
The other thought I had was I was
thinking about myself being in my kitchen and
taking care of some chicken that I was going to
prepare for dinner.
And one time I dropped the chicken
on the floor. Well, here you have raw chicken
and you dropped it on the floor. And there's
all these potential germs spreading.
Now, what if at that moment while I
was trying to clean up the mess, that my hands
are filled with chicken that has contamination
of potential, that could be very serious. My
mom is 83 years old. I don't want her to have
a problem.
At that moment, somebody brings me
1,200 more chickens. And throws them all over
the kitchen.
I think that, you know, the idea's:
Here we have Hanford. And we have -- it's
4 already a mess. And they're trying to clean it
up, but they're not succeeding.
And now we're going to add

38

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TPO-0005 (contd); TPO-0006

4

multi-millions of, you know like in terms of magnitude, the amount of compared to what there is. Maybe not millions.

But I'm trying -- I'm exaggerating. But geometric amounts, more than what there already is there to make it even more difficult.

See, what I'd like to see happen would be that we don't be so glib about this. We don't go, "Well, we did change the statement before, so we listened. So now it's okay."

I don't want that to happen, because I want my kitty cat and the birds and the snakes and the people, for generations to come, to be able to live here in Oregon and be healthy and have the high quality of life that we have. Thank you.

MR. DEE WILLIS: How do you spell your name.

MS. TOBI CANTINE: C-A-N-T-I-N-E.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Now Doug Riggs.

TPO-0006 MR. DOUG RIGGS: I like the chicken story. It's the best analogy you'll