TSE-0027 (contd); TSE-0028

MR. DEE WILLIS: Next, Gerry Pollet.

TSE-0028 MR. GERRY POLLET: Thanks. What started much of the concern about the import of waste was a Freedom of Information Act document we obtained a year ago that said Hanford will make receiving remote handled transuranic waste from off-site generators a priority over award fee work scope. That means a priority above Hanford cleanup work.

Remote handled transuranic waste is extremely radioactive. As radioactive or more so than spent nuclear fuel.

But it is not shipped in the same casks as spent nuclear fuel, and they are less resistant to many different types of vulnerabilities.

They are tested, however, and we do know that, for instance, a spent nuclear fuel cask is not designed to withstand a fire of 1,400 degrees for greater than 30 minutes.

We also know that shipments of spent nuclear fuel and remote handled transuranic waste will go through tunnels and be exposed to many hazards that will involve fires, potential

TSE-0028 (contd)

fires of 2000 degrees for extended periods of time.

There are, we have commented on this many times in the past, that there are numerous tunnel fires involving interstate highways that burn for hours at 2,000 degrees Fahrenheit.

1 It is fallacious to say that this EIS considered either the site specific or route specific impacts of importing transuranic wastes to Hanford. Nor does it consider the terrorist attack.

Despite your claims, Michael, there is no model of what happens if there is a terrorist attack on one of the remote handled transuranic waste shipments.

2 Instead the EIS in one and a third page, discusses the terrorist attack and says, we actually just borrowed the analysis of a severe accident involving spent nuclear fuel, and trust us, that ought to be the same.

And it is not the same as a benevolent event, nor does it consider the site specific and route specific conditions. And more amazingly, what about mixed waste shipments?

TSE-0028 (contd)

3

The accident analyses in this EIS are woefully inadequate, they assume that no one is exposed within 100 meters of the accident. And it fails to consider many of the actual chemical constituents and their immediate dangers to life and health values.

Astonishingly, whoever the contractor was who prepared this left blank the immediately dangerous life and health values which are known for numerous chemicals. So, this EIS is not adequate in regards to the accident consequence, and it will not be adequate in terms of lifting the injunction against transuranic waste.

4

In the event of an earthquake, the Waste Management Programmatic EIS said the number of latent cancer fatalities ranged to 200 at Hanford from the quantities of transuranic waste proposed to be imported, and said that the impacts of this will have to be considered in a site specific Environmental Impact Statement, and mitigation measures taken into account.

Any future decisions regarding transfers of transuranic waste would be subject

TSE-0028 (contd)

4

5

to appropriate review and the agreements DOE's entered into, and as Judge McDonald said, although DOE intends to select sites the Waste Management PEIS will not be the basis of selecting locations, and there will be a site specific review of all the impacts and the specific mitigation measures, including both the earthquake, the accidents, and the treatment required of imported transuranic waste.

All of those things are missing from this EIS, despite the commitment made in 1997 to do those analyses and the fact that you had plenty of notice that we would obviously go to court if you didn't do them, and you know darn well you're not going to get away with importing the waste on August 1st without an analysis of those impacts.

And finally, let me just say, the Department of Energy has also asserted in Federal Court that it is exempt from Washington State and Federal hazardous waste laws for the storage of this transuranic waste.

If it is exempt, bizarrely, it asserts in this EIS and the Waste Management

TSE-0028 (contd); TSE-0029

5

PEIS that it will, all the accidents analyzed assume that the waste was treated to meet those standards.

You have to redo it, and you have to assume and disclose that you are not treating these wastes or give up your claim of preemption.

Thank you.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Before we go to Tim Takaro, is there anyone else that hasn't signed up but that would still like to comment?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How many comments do you have left?

MR. DEE WILLIS: Just one. Your name?

TSE-0029 MS. ROXY GIDDINGS: Roxy Giddings. G-i-d-d-i-n-g-s. I am from Pierce County, where we take sex predators by the gross, and we take Everett's waste of their arsenic from their smelter down to our arsenic waste place.

We seem to be a pretty good dumping ground right there in Pierce County.

But I'm a downwinder. I was over in Pasco from 1945 until 1954 when I graduated

TSE-0029 (contd)

from high school. My little brother's eight years younger than I am. Do the math. He was a tiny baby.

And we're watching our health. I have a sister four years older. So she was only there for four years. And getting the junk that they were dumping on us.

I agree with all the remarks that were said and sung about this inadequate revised draft March 2003 report. This is the summary.

So, I was looking at it, and I of course hadn't read the whole thing. There's no way to clean up nuclear waste, and so the one thing that's good about us all being here is we are getting more education than we had before, from each other. We have to do the best we can

1 to contain this stuff, and quit adding any more at all.

But I wanted to say something about a few years ago when I went to Nevada to the test site there, where they do underground testing, and none of it gets out, you know. That's why everybody's so healthy down there.

I watched the Indian chief get

TSE-0029 (contd)

arrested for trespassing on his own reservation. That was something.

But on page S.37 of this summary, I just wanted to point out a couple of weasel words about mitigation here. Weasel words are like we could take, or might occur, or

2 potential mitigation, or we could mitigate.

And this is in relation to how they are going to treat the tribal cultural resources that they find, they are going to determine appropriate management actions with the tribe. I thought that was nice.

In addition, if the mature sage-steppe habitat needs to be removed to construct a solid waste management facility, we could mitigate the habitat loss by revegetating.

3 I have been doing a lot of work on native vegetation. They've got a lot of work to do if they think they're going to revegetate shrub-steppe. And protecting other parcels of land, or protecting other parcels.

In other words, we are going to screw this place, but we're going to be real nice, we're not going to screw that place, you

3

know. If that's mitigation, it just doesn't fly.

Anyway, I like to hear peacocks. They are crying out there.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Jeanine Sedgely.

TSE-0030 MS. JEANINE SEDGELY: My name is Jeanine Sedgely, with Physicians for Social Responsibility.

1

I do want to acknowledge and tell you that I appreciate the fact that DOE did have a public meeting in Spokane. I know that was in the plan. And that was appreciated. And believe it or not, when you do things right, sometimes people do notice. That I am afraid concludes my positive comments for the evening.

2

We have heard a lot in recent months about DOE's accelerated cleanup plan. And it seems to me that this is all about acceleration, and very little about any actual cleanup. The rush to get this EIS through I think is a perfect example of that. Despite numerous requests from a number of organizations, just in the comment period,

TSE-0030 (contd)

Department of Energy's refused. It's particularly disturbing that DOE would refuse to extend the comment period, even for the Hanford Advisory Board. **2**

I think this is a very ominous sign. In fact, it seems to me that DOE's accelerated cleanup plan for Hanford is actually about accelerated cleanup at the smaller sites, at Hanford's expense.

I concur with most of the comments given tonight. Of course we should not bring in 70,000 truck loads of additional waste to the most contaminated site in the western world. **3**

And of course the use of unlined burial grounds is unacceptable, and that should be halted by the end of this year. **4**

The groundwater monitoring is grossly inadequate, in fact, and in this EIS. **5**

But I guess the biggest concern I have, is that I am genuinely saddened by the growing and blatant disregard that the Department of Energy has for the public process. And that frightens me as much as some of the specifics in this Environmental Impact **6**

98

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

TSE-0030 (contd)

Statement.

And I guess I would just like to -- I have a question. I don't know if you will be able to answer it. But where's the Department of Ecology tonight?

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: I can't answer that.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Where are they?

MR. TIM HILL: Back here. I would be glad to make a statement, if you would like.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Come on down to make a statement.

MS. JEANINE SEDGELY: I would be glad to here if the Department of Ecology has a statement.

MR. TIM MILLER: My name is tube Miller with the Department of Ecology.

We are not prepared to make comments yet. We are going through the document. You have seen it, somebody brought it up here earlier. It is very thick. We have staff working on it.

As you may recall from the last

TSE-0031

time, we weren't very happy with it. I think some of our comments from the last time are out there, if you want to look at it.

We will have comments ready by the end of the comment period, if you are interested at all in getting them then. Why don't you talk to me afterwards and I will take your name and I will send it to you. Tim Takaro.

TSE-0031 DR. TIM TAKARO: Thank you. I am Tim Takaro. I am an occupational and environmental medicine physician. I take care of some of the Hanford workers who have suffered from exposures at the site.

Because we are in a zoo tonight, I am going to do an animal metaphor, and this is a blind man, blind people actually, and the elephant.

And I seem to have gotten a part of the elephant that is very long, it's about 30,000 pages, and it's also very narrow. It

1 does not include high-level waste. It does not

2 include most liquid waste. It does not include

3 spent nuclear fuel. It does not include

4 nuclear reactors from the Navy. It does not

TSE-0031 (contd)

5 1 include nonreactive hazardous wastes. It does
2 not include most environmental restoration
6 3 wastes that are generated as part of the CERCLA
4 process, it does not include commercial
7 5 low-level waste destined for U.S. Ecology, it
8 6 does not include commercial nuclear fuel, it
9 7 does not include high-level waste from other
10 8 sites, it does not include TRU waste.
9 The list goes on and on about what
10 is not in the document. Which does have an
11 impact on what happens at Hanford. We are all
12 in this together. And what I'm asking for is
13 to be able to see or feel at least the rest of
14 the elephant.
15 The focus on cumulative impacts
16 is -- requires that we feel the whole element.
17 Otherwise we can't possibly understand these
18 impacts.
19 The document does note that there is
20 a lot of uncertainty about the cumulative
11 21 impacts, but it does very little towards
22 resolving those uncertainties.
23 It talks about an upper bound
12 24 scenario, which is 50 percent greater than the
25 Hanford only scenario. But it does this in

TSE-0031 (contd); TSE-0032

12 terms of volume only, and not in terms of risk,
risk to humans and risk to the environment.
And in order to evaluate the cumulative
impacts, we need to understand the cumulative
13 risks, not just the cumulative volumes.
How can we calculate cumulative risk
when the risk of the current waste at Hanford
is not understood?
So, I am joining the chorus, asking
for the Waste Management EIS to be withdrawn,
reworked, so that we can feel the whole
14 elephant, so we can understand what the nation
is expecting of all of the sites in the country
that are taking waste and giving waste, before
we begin to accept new waste.
Thank you.
MR. DEE WILLIS: Is there
anyone else? Yes. Come forward, please.
TSE-0032 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: Barbara
Zepeda. And I am going to say what I always
say at these meetings, is tellers and
international atomic energy agency page in this
21 pounds of documents that says that we are
beginning to address the real problems.
1 I don't trust my government, because

TSE-0032 (contd)

1 this government is spending a billion dollars a
2 day spreading depleted uranium on other
3 countries in the form of bombs.
4 We are worried about international
5 terrorism. Our Department of Energy is
6 committing terrorism on our country. In fact I
7 suppose they are going to have to ship some of
8 our uranium over to RUX, because they can only
9 find precursers, and we have got all the
10 postcursers here.
11 I think that we have a government
12 that doesn't represent us, and that dealing
13 with the Department of Energy is like dealing
14 with a Patonkin village. It is just a facade.
15 It is a pretense.
16 The Environmental Impact Statements
17 have been a total fraud. There's not even the
18 appearance of fairness. They don't have any
19 intention of keeping their contracts. And when
20 your government doesn't believe in keeping its
21 own contracts, it's -- it loses legitimacy.
22 I think the philosophy of the
23 current administration is that of Herman
24 Geuring, which he said in '46 at the Neurburg
25 trials, that a government can make the people,

TSE-0032 (contd); TSE-0033

clothe them in patriotism, and do anything they want with the people.

And this is what our government's doing.

I think we should be aware that McDermott has H.R. 1483 for Congress. He introduced this legislation in March to require comprehensive studies of the health and environmental impacts of depleted uranium in munitions, as well as cleanup and mitigation of depleted uranium contamination in sites within the United States where DU has been used to produce, used it or produced.

The Bill is entitled Depleted Uranium Munitions Study Act of 2003, and numbered H.R. 143.

I think we should get behind this and we should start electing a government in this country that does protect the people.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Anybody else like to comment on the EIS? Yes. Come down.

TSE-0033 MS. PATTY SINGER: My name is Patty SINGER, and I hadn't really intended to speak, but the reason I'm here is because I grew up in Walla Walla, Washington, I was born

TSE-0033 (contd); Panel Discussion

in 1947, and I saw so many of my friends die from cancer and become really ill over the years. We can't know what it was about.

But I think the reason I'm here is because I really want to make a statement that we really need so desperately to take care of our entire planet, and we need to do that by being responsible citizens and being aware of what we're doing to our environment, our citizens, our friends, our family members, and our children and their children.

So, I think that we really have to take it seriously, and do as much as we can to make it a better world, and make it a world that all of us can live in, and be healthy and safe in.

Thank you.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Who is next? Okay.

At the other five meetings we have had, at the end of the meetings we have had a different format, we have had an informal panel, and it's been interesting.

Do you want to try that? We have 30 minutes left. Do you want to try it? Okay.

Panel Discussion (contd)

So let's do it. At least for half an hour. So Mike, and Gerry, and Matt, is Matt still here, Matt McCormick. Matt is the assistant manager of central plateau of DOE. He is Mike's boss. And Tom Carpenter. Come on down.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could we have a rest break first.

MR. DEE WILLIS: Do you want a rest break?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

MR. DEE WILLIS: The restrooms are out the door to the left. Just take a rest break. When they get down here, I will tell you the rules.

So here is how I want to do it. I will take a question from one of you. If you want to direct the question to one of these four gentlemen, do that. You don't have to. They will get the question, they will discuss it among themselves. When they are finished discussing it among themselves, we will take another question. Is that clear?

I would like to go first to anybody who hasn't spoken tonight that has a question for these four gentlemen.

TSE-0034; Panel Discussion (contd)

Yes, Ma'am. And speak to the mike and give us your name.

TSE-0034 MS. MARY ELLEN SMITH: My name is Mary Ellen Smith.

I don't know a whole lot about this whole issue, but as I sit here and listen, it seems to me that with all the scientists we

1 have, we ought to be able to figure out a way to keep the groundwater from becoming more contaminated. That doesn't seem to me like that's rocket science.

And it seems to me that it's something that we as members of this state and we as members of the universe have a responsibility to do, we have a responsibility to our grandchildren and our great grandchildren, and all the generations that come after us.

So why can't you guys figure it out?

MR. GERRY POLLET: I will take that as a comment as well as a question.

MR. DEE WILLIS: That is a comment. Does anybody have a response to that?

MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: Well, we have started some groundwater remediation