TSE-0014 (contd); TSE-0015

4 waste laws and to ensure safe storage.
Accidents, fires and earthquakes will release
5 plutonium, chemical, and radioactive wastes in
6 waste containers will degrade while stored at
Hanford for 20 or more years.
We believe that shipments to Hanford
should end. The priority for the health of our
7 people, fish and rivers is to safely contain
the ever threatening toxic soup that sloshes
around the Columbia Basin.
Focus this EIS on the effort to
8 clean up what is already in the soil, rather
than planning to add more to the nation's worst
contaminated area.
Thank you.
MR. DEE WILLIS: Tina, could
we have a copy of that?
MS. TINA SCHULSTAD: Yes.
MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you.
Becky Stanley.
TSE-0015 MS. BECKY STANLEY: Hi. My
name is Becky Stanley, and I am a botanist, and
an activist with the Sierra Club, Cascade
chapter.
The Columbia River supported 16

TSE-0015 (contd)

million salmon annually at the time of Lewis & Clark, just 200 years ago.

The Hanford Reach of the Columbia River, now the Hanford National Monument, supports the largest wild salmon population left in the Northwest.

1 But the Hanford nuclear reservation is the most contaminated site in the western world.

For 60 years in the name of progress and national security, millions of cubic meters of radioactive materials have accumulated at Hanford and 440 billion gallons of liquid waste were dumped into the soil.

Toxic chemicals continue to inch towards the mighty Columbia River, which could become a highway to distribute plutonium, uranium and other hazardous chemicals throughout the Columbia Basin.

2 The Hanford waste is a ticking time bomb, but instead of trying to diffuse this threat by cleaning up the waste, and preventing more from coming our way, the Bush administration is going the opposite direction. Threatening to clean up -- to stop cleanup

TSE-0015 (contd)

2 measures and planning to add at least 70,000 truck loads of radioactive and chemical wastes to this area.

3 And what effect would it have on the region? Without an adequate EIS, we honestly don't know.

The Department of Energy needs to fully disclose potential impacts on the Columbia River and the fishery. It needs to determine the baseline data and have monitoring in place before any more waste is brought in.

The USDOE must disclose the impacts from the burial grounds and other wastes already in the soil before we can begin to know the impact of adding more. Based on past performance, we are quite skeptical about their willingness and ability to protect our water and fish resources.

4

5 There are 1,400 waste sites at Hanford typified by rusty barrels and unlined trenches. Though it would be illegal for me to store my household garbage in such a manner, yet the Department of Energy continually ignores laws and stores extremely radioactive waste directly in the ground.

TSE-0015 (contd); TSE-0016

Already an estimated one million gallons of high-level radioactive waste have leaked into the soil. Plumes of contaminants have reached the groundwater.

5 Since the DOE will not voluntarily even consider stopping its dumping of waste in unlined soil trenches this year and are not saying when they will stop, we are pleased that Representative Inslee and others are introducing legislation to accomplish this long over-due compliance with basic standards.

Radioactive and chemical waste has not and will not stay inside Hanford boundaries. It is time to stop playing politics with our future, stop importing waste 6 into Hanford, and clean up the mess that already threatens our human, river and wildlife health.

7 Washingtonians don't want our state to become a national radioactive waste dump. Thank you.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Stacey Carlberg.

TSE-0016 MS. STACEY CARLBERG: Hi. My name is Stacey Carlberg, I am with Heart of

TSE-0016 (contd)

America Northwest.

I just want to voice my concern tonight about the public participation process.

I am really disappointed and angered that DOE has not met any of the requests to extend the comment period. I don't think 45 days is sufficient time for anyone to analyze this document.

I know that many of us in the audience here tonight are familiar with this topic, and we follow it pretty closely. But I also know that there are many new people in the audience tonight who are here because they are worried about the dangers at Hanford, and they are very concerned about the future of the region and the future of our river, and the impact that this will have on future generations.

So, if you think that tonight is their first exposure to this topic, they now have 12 days left, after hearing these presentations, to try to generate some good, adequate comments. And I don't know how that can happen.

So I just really want to reiterate

1 my disappointment that DOE has not extended the
2 comment period. And I think that their actions
1 3 speak a thousand times louder than their words,
4 considering what they think about public
5 participation.
6 Thank you.
7 MR. DEE WILLIS: There is a
8 white Nissan in the parking lot with its lights
9 on, license plate is 560ELP. Lights are on.
10 John Perreault.
11 **TSE-0017** MR. JOHN PERREAULT: Thank you.
12 My name is John Perreault, and I work for Heart
13 of America Northwest, but I do that because I
14 am interested in this issue, and I am a
15 citizen, and I do vote, and I do pay my taxes.
16 So it's not the only reason I am here.
17 The things that we know about this
1 18 are the currently buried wastes leaks,
2 19 groundwater monitoring wells are insufficient,
20 much of the TRU waste is not certifiable to be
3 21 moved to WIPP, and much of it cannot be
4 22 currently treated at Hanford, which means it
23 will be there for some time.
24 As for the transportation, we looked
5 25 at the accident reviews, and nobody mentioned

TSE-0017 (contd)

the fact that three trucks last summer, not directly related with Hanford, but related with transporting radioactive waste in the Northwest, had problems, and accidents.

5 In Bremerton, an empty truck's brakes failed.

In Idaho there was a car accident that was not the driver's fault, had nothing to do with the driver, it had nothing to do with the weather. It was just one of those things. And also in Idaho a driver fell asleep and his truck ran off the road.

These are without importing 75,000 more trucks to Hanford.

Now, knowing all of these things, and more, why do we need more waste to Hanford? Several sites in many states would end up being cleaned, by moving this waste to Hanford, and

6 that is really good for votes, because you have seven, eight happy states, and one very angry state.

The U.S. has also resumed plutonium production, or is in the process of resuming plutonium production for weapons, and that means more waste, as well as the increased

TSE-0017 (contd); TSE-0018

power production.

So, the DOE needs to now take responsibility for the actions that undeniably will cause long-term problems and have caused long-term problems as a result of these things. **7**

I'm against the importation of any new waste to Hanford because adding to this problem is not solving it, and is not responsible care of our country, our resources, and the people that live here. **8**

So, withdraw this illegal, incomplete, and insulting EIS and do not come back until you are ready to solve Hanford's problems. **9**

MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you. Hyun Lee.

TSE-0018 MR. HYUN LEE: My name is Hyun Lee. I am with Heart of America Northwest.

One of the things we had grave concerns about early on was the transportation of the transuranic waste, and actually all the waste described in the waste -- revised Draft EIS coming through Oregon on Interstate 5 and 84. **1**

Gerry brought this slide up earlier.

TSE-0018 (contd)

1 And you can see that the EIS does consider
2 coming up I-5 -- well, it plans to come up I-5
3 and through I-84.
4 What it doesn't consider is that
5 these highly radioactive shipments will be
1 6 shipped over some of Oregon's decaying bridges.
7 And these are some of them right here.
8 An investigation by the State of
9 Oregon has identified 221 critical problem
10 bridges on I-5 and I-84 that these shipments
11 will pass through. They were discussed in this
12 draft Oregon Department of Transportation
13 Economic and Bridge Options Report. This was
14 done in January of this year. This report
15 concluded that bridges throughout the state on
16 I-5 and I-84 are currently cracked and/or
17 restricted.
18 This next slide is a map, indicates
19 all the bridges along I-5 and 84 that are
20 currently restricted. All the little circles
21 represent the restricted bridges. And you can
22 see that a lot of them are on I-5, and a
23 significant number of them are on 84 along
24 here.
25 And in his declaration, Ken Niles,

TSE-0018 (contd)

1 the administrator for the Nuclear Safety
2 Division of the Oregon Office of Energy, stated
1 3 that based on the permits granted the truck
4 shipments from ETEC and the trucks from BCL in
5 Ohio were directed to use secondary roads and
6 detoured off the interstate highway.
7 Currently this year a truck carrying
8 transuranic waste was supposed to come off the
9 main highway because it was too heavy for some
10 of the bridges, and it was only after they
11 reweighed and recalibrated some of the weights
12 that they were able to keep it on the highway.
13 Now, he said the detours off
14 Interstate 84 may be necessary for future
15 shipments of Battelle Columbus Lab TRU waste or
16 other TRU wastes from other sites due to weight
17 restrictions or bridge construction.
18 Now, it was apparent that neither
19 USDOE nor the contractor carrier fully
20 considered the overweight status of the truck
21 shipments and the routes that would be used.
22 Now, back in, earlier this year a
23 bridge in Riddle and Canyonville was
24 unexpectedly closed down and they found that
25 1800 trucks were detoured off the main highway,

TSE-0018 (contd); TSE-0019

1 off of I-5, and through the small town of
2 Riddle. Now, this could result in community
3 safety concerns, damage to city streets, these
4 small communities, and negatively impact local
1 5 commerce.
6 They also found that these bridge
7 restrictions could detour be up to 100 to 200
8 miles, school buses could be rerouted, and
9 consequently, images like this become much more
10 real possibilities.
11 Thank you.
12 MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you.
13 Jennifer Moore.
14 **TSE-0019** MS. JENNIFER MOORE: My name
15 is Jennifer Moore, and my comment is that
16 Hanford already has a big enough contamination
17 problem without adding waste to it or
18 continuing to store waste in low-level burial
19 grounds.
1 20 According to a Spokesman Review
21 article published on May 6, 2003, 200 square
22 miles of groundwater beneath the Hanford Site
23 are currently contaminated with 440 billion
24 gallons of radioactive liquids from plutonium
25 production. At least one million of these

1 gallons are made up of liquid nuclear waste
2 from 67 high-level waste tanks at Hanford, and
3 in addition to this groundwater now contains
4 chemical and radioactive releases from the
5 low-level burial grounds, including carbon
6 tetrachloride releases 176 times the OSHA
1 7 worker safety level.
8 Adding waste to Hanford will slow
9 cleanup of tainted soil and water and it will
10 add to contamination levels at Hanford.
11 The U.S. Department of Energy should
12 not import any off-site waste into Hanford and
13 add to the enormous amount of contamination
14 already threatening the Columbia River and in
15 some cases having reached the Columbia River
16 already. And the Department of Energy also
2 17 needs to shut down the unlined burial grounds
18 at Hanford immediately.
19 MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you.
20 Martin Fleck.
21 **TSE-0020** MR. MARTIN FLECK: Thanks. I
22 am Martin Fleck. I work with Physicians for
23 Social Responsibility here in the state of
24 Washington.
25 Thanks for being here tonight; point

TSE-0020 (contd); TSE-0021

1 man, as it were. And I just want, I have a
2 very brief comment to follow up on the
3 physicians that were up here representing WPSR,
1 4 which that it is unwise, unfair, and
5 unacceptable for the DOE to ask the citizens of
6 Washington or Oregon to assume the additional
7 health risks that will come with additional
8 wastes imported to Hanford. That's my
9 statement.
10 But, I am not quite done. I also
11 have a friend who regrettably could not be here
12 this evening. He is a citizen, a taxpayer, a
13 voter, and a friend of mine, and he asked me to
14 read his statement to the DOE, which I also
15 delivered to Yvonne in writing. And this is
TSE-0021 16 from Dane Spencer, and he lives on Bainbridge
See L-0020 17 Island.
18 Statement to the Department of
19 Energy.
20 Let me see if I have this right. I
21 am a little confused about all this nuclear
22 waste and I want to see if it makes sense to
23 you, because it doesn't make sense to me.
24 In 1945 U.S. citizens paid taxes for
25 the Manhattan Project, a project we knew