

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

PUBLIC HEARING
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE
DISPOSAL OF GREATER-THAN-CLASS C (GCC)
LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE AND GCC-LIKE WASTE

- - - - -

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PUBLIC HEARING

Before Heather A. Summers, Certified Court Reporter,
at the Double Tree Hotel, Cascade Room, 1000 NE Multnomah
Avenue, Portland, Oregon, on Thursday, May 19, 2011,
commencing at 6:30 p.m.

- - - - -

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

A P P E A R A N C E S

Hosting Public Hearing for the Department of Energy:

Facilitator: Mr. Holmes Brown

- - - - -

INDEX TO PUBLIC HEARING

	Page
INTRODUCTION BY MR. BROWN	3
PUBLIC COMMENTS	5
COURT REPORTER CERTIFICATE	107

1 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PUBLIC HEARING
2 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE
3 RADIOACTIVE WASTE AND GCC-LIKE WASTE

4 - - - - -

5 INTRODUCTION

6 MR. HOLMES: If the folks in back will take
7 their seats. It's now time to reconvene for your
8 comments on the Draft EIS. This is your opportunity
9 to provide DOE with oral comments on the Draft EIS,
10 including what you would like to see as a preferred
11 alternative or the factors DOE should consider in
12 developing a preferred alternative for the Final EIS.

13 A court reporter will transcribe your comments
14 for the administrative record. Our reporter tonight
15 is Heather Summers. DOE has --

16 (Applause.)

17 She'll deserve that applause at the end of the
18 evening.

19 DOE has stated how critical your input is to the
20 development of the EIS. This evenings' format is
21 designed to ensure that all interested parties have
22 equal opportunity to provide this input.

23 In order to do this, let me review a few ground
24 rules for this part of the agenda. Please step up to
25 the microphone over there when your name is called,

1 introduce yourself, providing an organization
2 affiliation where appropriate. If you have a written
3 version of your statement, please provide a copy to
4 the court reporter after you've completed your
5 remarks. I will call two names at a time. The first
6 is the speaker; the second, the person to follow.

7 In view of the number of people who have already
8 signed up to provide oral comments, I reluctantly
9 will ask people to confine their statements to three
10 minutes. We're already -- if I multiply the three
11 minutes out by the number of folks who have signed up
12 to speak, we're going to still run well over time.

13 And, really, as a courtesy to those who have
14 signed up to speak and who have taken the trouble to
15 attend this meeting, in order to allow all of them to
16 have their say, I'll ask you to summarize your
17 statement and keep it to within three minutes,
18 remembering that there are a variety of ways of
19 submitting your comments even after your oral
20 comments tonight.

21 The closing date is June 27th. All comments
22 count equally in the preparation of the Final EIS,
23 whether they're verbal, as they would be tonight;
24 electronic; written and so forth.

25 I will keep track of each presentation and will

1 let you know when you have a minute left. Usually I
2 try and be quiet and hold up the one-minute sign, but
3 given the configuration of the podium tonight and the
4 fact that most people will be addressing the
5 audience, I'm afraid I'm going to have to give you
6 kind of a verbal cue, which after two or three hours
7 gets a little tiring. But, of course, if you end
8 before three minutes, I won't have to do that.

9 So with that by way of introduction, let me say
10 Arnie Edelman will be serving as the DOE's hearing
11 officer during this formal comment period, but he'll
12 not be responding to questions or comments. So with
13 that by way of introduction, let me call our first
14 presenter, Mary Gautreaux, from Senator Wyden's
15 office.

16 MS. GAUTREAUX: Thank you.

17 MR. BROWN: You're welcome. Glad to see you
18 again.

19 - - - - -

20 FORMAL COMMENT SESSION

21 MS. GAUTREAUX: Because we actually have our
22 honorable mayor here tonight, I would very much like
23 to defer to the honorable mayor first.

24 MAYOR ADAMS: Thank you. Thank you for the
25 courtesy, and I apologize for skipping ahead in line

1 for those of you that signed up earlier. We have,
2 actually, a budget hearing across town, but I wanted
3 to personally deliver a summary of our remarks as
4 Portland City Council.

5 The Portland City Council opposes the
6 transportation of nuclear waste through our region
7 and supports the alternatives in the GTCC EIS, which
8 are most protective of the long-term health of
9 Columbia River and its citizens. We are dismayed
10 that there has been potential changes to the criteria
11 of some of the proposals that might unduly rank
12 Hanford as a suitable site. It is not. We believe
13 that there are alternatives for dealing with this
14 issue, but that Hanford is not the site.

15 Given that we already have many barriers to
16 quickly and adequately cleaning up the existing
17 nuclear waste at Hanford, one of the most polluted
18 sites in the world, it is plainly unacceptable to
19 consider importing additional waste from other sites.

20 The City urges the U.S. DOE to follow through on
21 the agency's fourth strategic theme, environmental
22 responsibility, protecting the environment by
23 providing a responsible resolution to the
24 environmental legacy of nuclear weapons and weapons
25 production long before this is considered for any

1 other uses.

2 Clean up Hanford first. Thank you.

3 MR. BROWN: Well, Mayor, you've set a fine
4 example for brevity, even with the applause.

5 MS. GAUTREAUX: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

6 Senator Wyden could not be here tonight, so I
7 briefly want to read a statement, and there's a copy
8 of it on the front table.

9 The U.S. Department of Energy is once again
10 coming to Oregon to solicit public comment on yet
11 another version of its misguided effort to solve the
12 nuclear waste problem by bringing more hazardous
13 material to Hanford. I have opposed using the
14 Hanford Nuclear Reservation as a dumping ground for
15 the nation's nuclear waste every time DOE brings it
16 up. I oppose it again today. The stated goal of DOE
17 is to clean up Hanford, yet it continues to propose
18 adding more waste and wasting more money on studies
19 to bring in more waste.

20 DOE has been working on Hanford cleanup for more
21 than 20 years, and at best, they probably have
22 another 35 years to go. I think it's time to point
23 out the obvious, Hanford cannot be cleaned up by
24 adding more waste. Hanford, with its 40 miles of
25 unlined trenches, sit along 50 miles of the Columbia

1 River, which is the lifeline of the Pacific Northwest
2 economy. This is a formula for disaster. Bringing
3 more (radioactive) waste from across the country is
4 only going to increase the odds of that disaster, or,
5 at worst, make it inevitable.

6 It is not just the disposal of waste at Hanford
7 that puts the public at risk. It's also the
8 transportation on public highways. When a semi truck
9 loaded with radioactive waste jackknifed on I-84 near
10 La Grande in December 2008, it brought into sharp
11 focus the serious concerns about whether DOE can
12 adequately protect the environment and the safety of
13 other travelers and communities. The proposal to
14 bring GTCC, which would add more than 12,000 more
15 truckloads of radioactive waste on its way to
16 Hanford, will only add to that risk.

17 For those of us living downstream, we know all
18 too well the U.S. faces a daunting challenge figuring
19 out what to do with waste from weapons or from our
20 existing generation of nuclear power plants. But as
21 we know, bringing more waste to Hanford at a time
22 when DOE is missing almost every major milestone in
23 cleaning up the site, does not inspire confidence. I
24 have said many times, Hanford should not be turned
25 into a national sacrifice zone. I am not satisfied

1 with the progress to date, and I'm absolutely opposed
2 to bringing more waste, and I'm not supportive of
3 adding more truckloads of waste to the Gorge to take
4 it there. Thank you.

5 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

6 Marc Siegel is next, with Senator Merkley's
7 office, and Ken Niles will follow Marc.

8 MR. SIEGEL: Thank you. I'm Marc Siegel with
9 the office of U.S. Senator Jeff Merkley. I would
10 like to take this opportunity to say a few words on
11 behalf of Oregon Senator Jeff Merkley.

12 Tonight is an important opportunity for the
13 Pacific Northwest and Oregonians to let their voices
14 be heard about the future of Hanford. The people of
15 the Pacific Northwest have had the opportunity over
16 the years to witness the complications of politics
17 and bureaucracy in dealing with nuclear waste and the
18 problems that are created when waste is poorly
19 handled.

20 This region will be dealing with the reality of
21 Hanford's nuclear waste legacy for many decades as we
22 work to protect our communities and our environment.
23 And that future shouldn't include transporting more
24 dangerous waste through our communities for permanent
25 storage at Hanford. The current timeline for

1 cleaning up the existing contamination at Hanford is
2 decades away, and we can't afford to start talk about
3 bringing more waste into the region.

4 Senator Merkley recognizes that there aren't
5 many good options that exist today for storing
6 nuclear waste, but given the history of waste storage
7 at Hanford and the contamination it has caused, he
8 does not believe Hanford is an appropriate location
9 for additional permanent waste storage. The
10 environmental health of the Pacific Northwest and the
11 Columbia River are closely linked to Hanford nuclear
12 site, and this region looks forward to a toxic-free
13 Hanford site.

14 Again, on behalf of Senator Merkley, thank you
15 for letting me say a few words about this issue.

16 MR. BROWN: Ken Niles is speaking next, and
17 Gerry Pollet will follow.

18 MR. NILES: Thank you. Good evening, everyone.
19 My name is Ken Niles. I'm the nuclear safety
20 division administrator for the Oregon Department of
21 Energy. I want to thank all of you for coming out
22 yet one more time to give that same message again.

23 I'd like to read a short letter that is
24 co-signed by the states of Oregon and Washington on
25 this topic.

1 We are very disappointed that the Draft EIS for
2 the Disposal of GTCC and GTCC-like Waste continues to
3 list Hanford as a viable location for the disposal of
4 these highly radioactive wastes. We believed that a
5 thorough analysis would clearly demonstrate that this
6 additional burden of waste would create unacceptable
7 environmental consequences. Rather than focus on
8 analyzing the most appropriate site for disposal of
9 these wastes, the EIS appears to try to preserve
10 every potential option and alternative - to the
11 detriment of the entire process.

12 The states of Washington and Oregon adamantly
13 oppose use of Hanford for disposal of GTCC wastes.
14 Both of our states have been deeply engaged in, and
15 supportive of, cleanup of radioactive and chemically
16 hazardous wastes at Hanford for over 20 years.
17 Adding more waste to the subsurface - especially
18 waste that is highly radioactive and long-lived - is
19 incompatible with the cleanup that has come at such a
20 high price and that we all support.

21 Since the Hanford cleanup began in 1989, the
22 federal government has spent more than 30 billion
23 taxpayer dollars in trying to clean up the extensive
24 environmental injury caused by 45 years of plutonium
25 production. The U.S. Department of Energy will be

1 cleaning up the existing contamination at Hanford for
2 many decades to come, at a cost of tens of billions
3 of additional dollars. Problems DOE faces at Hanford
4 are so daunting that no precise estimate is possible.

5 Even when the work is complete to the best of
6 our collective ability, extensive contamination will
7 remain. DOE's own analysis in the draft Hanford Tank
8 Closure & Waste Management EIS shows persistent
9 contamination of Hanford's groundwater for thousands
10 of years due to waste now in the subsurface.

11 It is inconceivable to us that DOE would spend
12 billions of dollars to try to clean up the
13 environmental damage at Hanford, yet ignore that work
14 by proposing to dispose of additional highly
15 radioactive waste on the site.

16 Protection of the Columbia River is a core value
17 of the states Washington and Oregon and the people of
18 the Pacific Northwest. The consideration of Hanford
19 as a disposal site for GTCC waste is contrary to that
20 value. We strongly urge DOE to remove Hanford from
21 the list of possible sites for disposal of this
22 waste.

23 This letter is signed by Ted Sturdevant, who's
24 the director of the Washington Department of Ecology,
25 and Bob Repine, who is director of my agency, Oregon

1 Department of Energy. Thank you.

2 MR. BROWN: Gerry is next, and Ellen Leatham
3 will follow Gerry.

4 MR. POLLET: He will get a PowerPoint on the
5 projector. While he's doing that, Gerry Pollet with
6 Heart of America Northwest, a citizens watchdog group
7 for Hanford cleanup.

8 I want to thank you all for being here tonight.
9 The only way we're going to stop the Department of
10 Energy's repeated efforts to try to use Hanford as a
11 radioactive waste dump again --

12 (PowerPoint presentation projected on large screen.)

13 MR. POLLET: -- the only way we stop Hanford
14 from being used as a national radioactive waste dump
15 once again is by your being here, speaking up
16 tonight. And so even if you haven't signed up, at
17 the end, speak, say something from your heart, and
18 then take 20 minutes every month in the next couple
19 of months -- until we've stopped this -- to write a
20 letter to the editor, thank your Senators, write your
21 Congressman, thank the mayor, write another letter to
22 the editor, and come out to hearings next fall.

23 If the Energy Department chooses Hanford, it
24 will send 12,000 truckloads of highly radioactive
25 waste to Hanford. They will be coming through our

1 communities, and they are extremely radioactive.
2 This is on top of the Energy Department's other
3 proposal, which it insists it is sticking with, to
4 use Hanford as a national radioactive waste dump for
5 another three million cubic feet of radioactive waste
6 with 17,000 truckloads of waste. We urge you tonight
7 to tell them, you cannot be credible in your claims
8 that you want to clean up Hanford when you refuse to
9 withdraw your decision to use Hanford as a national
10 waste dump from 2004, and you keep trying to add more
11 waste on top of the incredible levels of
12 contamination that exist today.

13 There are 40 miles of unlined ditches at Hanford
14 like this (indicating), 40 miles into which
15 radioactive and chemical wastes were dumped. And
16 instead of trying to remove those wastes, the Energy
17 Department says, let's just put dirt on top of them
18 and let's add another massive quantity of radioactive
19 waste to the soil. The amount of radioactive waste
20 they would propose to add tonight is nearly as much
21 as in all the high-level waste tanks that we're
22 spending billions of dollars to empty. But the
23 Energy Department refuses to look at this logical
24 alternative of deep geologic disposal in the granite
25 shield of North America. Instead, it limits its

1 search to cheap surface disposal. And the one
2 repository it already owns, in New Mexico, but where
3 it is illegal to add this waste.

4 Three years ago the Energy Department did
5 another EIS, had hearings right here, and said, if we
6 use Hanford for spent nuclear fuel, because the casks
7 cannot stop the radiation from going through, over
8 800 adults along the truck routes will die of cancer,
9 even if there is no accident and no terrorist attack.
10 Those high-level waste trucks are no hotter than the
11 greater-than-class C waste, same levels of radiation.

12 If they move these wastes, people die. Don't
13 believe it when they say no one dies, because they've
14 refused to include in this impact statement anything
15 about the specific truck routes they'll use or how
16 they've calculated this or why they say no one dies
17 now, but three years ago, 800 people would die.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Adults.

19 MR. POLLET: Eight hundred adults. They said,
20 we can't study children, we can't model them. But
21 we're more concerned about the children because they
22 are more susceptible to get cancer from a given dose
23 of radioactive. If there was an accident at the
24 intersection of 205 and 84, over 300 square miles of
25 Portland would have to be evacuated. And the U.S.

1 government would likely do the same as the Japanese
2 government has just done: Raise the radiation limits
3 instead of trying to clean up what cannot be cleaned
4 up.

5 If that waste is added to Hanford, the
6 groundwater will be contaminated, the river will be
7 contaminated, and the three Native American tribes
8 with treaty rights to live along and fish the
9 Columbia River and live in that area and use the
10 groundwater will suffer cancer rates, from using the
11 groundwater for their children, of between two and
12 four percent.

13 The Department of Energy proposes tonight to use
14 a landfill right next door to the other landfill that
15 they want to use as a national radioactive waste
16 dump, right next door to the other landfill that's
17 leaking unlined trenches used for commercial
18 radioactive wastes. Those two trenches alone --

19 MR. BROWN: Just about a minute left.

20 MR. POLLET: Those two landfills alone add 70
21 millirems of radiation per year to a child drinking
22 the groundwater. We're trying to clean up Hanford to
23 meet a standard that no one gets any more than 15
24 millirems of radioactive a year. That's the EPA
25 standard. At that level, eight adults out of 10,000

1 who drink the groundwater every day die of cancer.

2 Children are believed to be ten times more

3 susceptible to die of cancer from the same dose.

4 They're saying if we use GTC -- Hanford as a
5 national radioactive waste dump for GTCC waste, we're
6 tripling above the allowable dose we're trying to
7 clean up Hanford. And then you add in the commercial
8 leaking radioactive waste dump, and we're more than
9 quadrupling it.

10 That's not cleaning up. You can't clean up
11 until you stop dumping more. And unless the Energy
12 Department says, We're committed to cleaning up and
13 we withdraw our 2004 decision to use Hanford as a
14 national waste dump and we withdraw this scheme,
15 you'll have no credibility whatsoever in saying that
16 you're committed to cleaning up Hanford.

17 Please speak up, not just tonight. Keep it
18 going. In the fall, there will be hearings --
19 probably in Vancouver. So come across the river --
20 over the Hanford Hazardous Waste Permit. That's how
21 we can stop this, using the state of Washington's
22 authority to say no more until you've shown you can
23 clean up. So be there, join us on Facebook, come to
24 our Web site, stay involved. Thank you all for
25 getting here tonight.

1 MR. BROWN: Thanks, Gerry. Ellen Leatham. And
2 Ed Martiszus will be after Ellen.

3 MS. LEATHAM: I'm celebrating my 63rd birthday
4 tonight to be here about Hanford. I'm secretly
5 really shy. My justification for being here is that
6 I've missed two primary elections since I was old
7 enough to register to vote. I'm here as a citizen
8 and I'm here as a grandmother of two-and-a-half
9 children to whom I am answerable, as are we all.

10 In 2004, the year you decided Hanford was a safe
11 place to dump waste, in the state of Idaho alone
12 there were 351 heavy truck accidents that involved
13 fatalities. In 2010, the federal government advised
14 whatever the association is of insurance people,
15 people who provide automobile insurance, that we had
16 more than 500,000 large truck, semi and commercial
17 vehicle accidents. That was 2010. They also advised
18 those agencies, the insurance industry, that
19 20 percent more trucks will be on U.S. highways by
20 2012.

21 Chernobyl, 1986. I just finished reading an
22 essay by Steve Featherstone, who was visiting
23 Chernobyl a year ago. There are trees there that
24 haven't yet rotted because there is no bacteria left
25 alive in the soil. We depend on the soil. Japan's

1 accident has just been upgraded to the same level as
2 Chernobyl. I think we need to quit subsidizing the
3 nuclear industry.

4 Eight years after Chernobyl, in 1994, the
5 Finnish people decided that no more radioactive waste
6 would leave Finland. Finnish waste would be taken
7 care of in Finland. They are just finishing a
8 tunnel, which Greenpeace is not happy about because
9 proper studies were not done, but they are burying
10 their nuclear waste 500 meters into the bedrock. We
11 could at least try to do something that responsible.
12 We've got granite. Thank you.

13 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much.

14 While Ed is coming to the podium, let me
15 explain. Folks were able to sign up electronically,
16 so nine people signed up before those who signed up
17 in person out front. So be patient. We're almost
18 there. Ed, Chuck Johnson will be after you.

19 MR. MARTISZUS: Hi, folks. Thanks for coming
20 tonight. I (inaudible) in the state of Oregon
21 environmental and have worked in this area for just
22 over 30 years and cleaned up a lot after Hanford, a
23 lot of the disease, things other than cancer, that
24 the DOE wants you just to only think about cancer.
25 There's a lot more other diseases that people are

1 exposed to. In fact, there's about 3,000 people
2 right now suing the government in Spokane that are
3 downwinders to Hanford. I didn't see anything up
4 here about that.

5 But anyway, Fukushima kind of refocused me on
6 what was happening in the Northwest here as far as --
7 you know, when I went to the meeting at the Red Lion
8 about a month ago, they were saying how troubling it
9 was to characterize the waste, that they were going
10 to have to make a waste disposal processing plant.
11 Before we could really design it, they had to kind of
12 figure out what the heck was in the waste so they
13 could start knowing how to deal with it. So that's a
14 problem right there, that basically people have said
15 already, deal with what you have right now.

16 The second point would be leave what you have
17 out there on-site where it's at. Why bring it into
18 the Northwest, you know? Let it -- if it's in an
19 area where it's not going to be earthquakeed or washed
20 out or flooded, let it burn off. You know, let it
21 degrade some of the isotopes, burn off and degrade to
22 more stable isotopes in the meantime.

23 And the third thing would be, why are we
24 subsidizing a nuclear industry? This meeting
25 tonight, how many solar panels would this --

1 everything to rent this hotel, how many solar panels
2 are we buying? Why are we cleaning up after an
3 industry? I mean, Japan just said the other day,
4 these three reactors over here -- they're not at
5 Fukushima, but they're up north, but they're on an
6 earthquake zone -- you close them right now. So
7 governments have the power to tell industry what to
8 do.

9 Although there was a story in the New York Times
10 last week about how the industry had gotten into the
11 NRC and the NRC is, in a way, afraid to challenge.
12 Well, these challenges are going to have to be made
13 for our own survival. The Columbia River is already
14 polluted. The land around the Columbia -- around
15 Hanford is already polluted. It's just going to
16 pollute it even more.

17 These scenarios, to me, are new ways -- new
18 strange, loathing ways that the DOE comes into the
19 Northwest and says, this is a new way we're going to
20 make you sick and kill you. Accept this.

21 We don't have to accept this. So I think the
22 DOE needs to serve notice on these nuclear power
23 plants, these owners right now, we're not going to
24 accept nuclear waste from power plants that aren't
25 built, because you're not going to build them.

1 You're going to convert over to wind and solar.

2 MR. BROWN: Chuck Johnson is speaking, and Toby
3 Cantine, I believe, will follow.

4 MR. JOHNSON: I'm Chuck Johnson. I'm a board
5 member of Columbia Riverkeepers, and I'm going to
6 express some general comments in opposition to this
7 proposal in the EIS to store additional radioactive
8 waste. In this case, greater-than-class C waste at
9 the Hanford site on the Columbia River, the lifeblood
10 of the Pacific Northwest.

11 Columbia Riverkeepers' staff members will speak
12 later with more specific comments. The fact that we
13 are here at all reflects to me the tone-deafness of
14 the U.S. Department of Energy and the antidemocratic
15 nature of the nuclear power and weapons complex. The
16 people of Oregon and Washington have spoken out
17 clearly, consistently and repeatedly against the
18 storage of additional radioactive waste at Hanford
19 until the existing massive volume and hazard of
20 radioactive waste already leaking and lurking under
21 the surface and seeping through the aquifers into the
22 Columbia River has been fully cleaned up.

23 In a statewide vote in Oregon in 1987, and in
24 Washington in 2004, the voter's of both states voted
25 by greater than three-to-one margin to oppose any

1 storage of additional radioactive waste at the
2 Hanford site until they've had a complete cleanup of
3 that site. Just this morning, the Oregonian,
4 Oregon's largest circulation newspaper, strongly
5 editorialized against this particular
6 greater-than-class C plant.

7 Back in the Clinton administration, U.S. DOE
8 Secretary Hazel O'Leary promised that the Hanford
9 site would become a cleanup site, not a site for
10 additional radioactive waste generating activity.
11 Washington State, the tribal government put sovereign
12 treaties over the land, and the DOE signed the
13 tri-party agreement to change the Hanford site's
14 mission from generation of waste, from waste
15 producing activities, to waste containment and
16 cleanup.

17 This proposal blows a hole in the tri-party
18 agreement large enough to drive over a thousand
19 radioactive waste trucks through it. It is absurd
20 that the U.S. DOE continues to come to our region
21 with a straight face and propose to double the amount
22 of long-lived radionuclides to the Hanford site, or
23 even to bring any additional waste at all in the face
24 of universal, consistent public opposition. We
25 expect dictatorships to behave in this way, but not

1 representatives of the U.S. government.

2 Finally, your EIS is deficient for any location
3 in the U.S., not just at Hanford, because your
4 proposed methods of disposal guarantee migration from
5 the site of lethal, extremely long-lived nuclear
6 elements.

7 The best course for U.S. DOE at this point is to
8 go back to the drawing board. The fact that no
9 granite rock sites are being considered for long-term
10 disposal is purely a political consideration and a
11 scientific travesty. You need to know that we will
12 fight you bitterly every step of the way if you
13 proceed with any proposal for storing additional
14 radioactive or chemical waste at Hanford. Thank you.

15 MR. BROWN: Toby -- did I get the last name
16 correct -- I think Cantine?

17 (No response.)

18 We'll come back. Katja Freeborn, are you ready?
19 And then Amanda Vasquez is after Katja.

20 MS. FREEBORN: Hi. My name is Katja Freeborn.
21 I'm a teacher over at Aloha High School, and some of
22 my students have come to speak tonight too.

23 When you open a dump in a community, a cheap
24 dump, people come and want to unload their garbage,
25 and I think that's what's going to happen when you

1 open up Hanford as a new facility to dump more of the
2 waste that is being produced in the United States.
3 Even if the promises are made that only 12,000
4 truckloads of waste, or only one football field
5 seven feet deep of waste, will be planted there, once
6 you open the floodgates, people will be screaming to
7 unload their nuclear and their radioactive trash
8 here.

9 Hanford does not have a clean track record of
10 saying no to dumping or self-regulation. We are
11 predicted to be paying for the cleanup of the nuclear
12 trash for the next 50 years, and already now the
13 Department of Energy is considering accepting more
14 trash before the other trash is even cleaned up.
15 This is totally unacceptable. I am so grateful that
16 Trojan is shut down and that the Umatilla Chemical
17 Weapons Depot is finally cleaning house. We've
18 waited many years for this.

19 We have got to protect the clean lands and
20 rivers and air that we have left. In light of
21 Fukushima, how can we even consider asking one region
22 to collect all the country's radioactive waste into
23 one central location, which is already leaking
24 poisons into the Columbia River Basin. How can the
25 federal government do this to its own people? Just

1 because we are 3,000 miles from D.C. does not mean we
2 are the perfect location for this trash. Regional
3 dumps seem much more appropriate if it's hard to
4 dispose of the waste. If it is hard to dispose of
5 the waste, it is a natural deterrent for creating
6 more waste. Please keep my Columbia and its land and
7 its people safe from radioactive silt.

8 My father worked at Trojan in the late '70s and
9 the early '80s. He died in 1984 at age 48 from
10 cancer he believed was caused by exposure to toxins
11 at Trojan. Please keep these Trojans out of my
12 backyard. Sorry. Please keep these toxins out of my
13 backyard so my own children, Mila and Paul, can have
14 a mom that lives past 48.

15 MR. BROWN: Amanda is next, and then Jackie
16 McClary.

17 MS. VASQUEZ: Good evening. My name is Amanda
18 Vasquez, and I'm a senior at Aloha High School. And
19 five years ago I used to live in Nevada. And if you
20 guys have been there, there's a lot of desert. So I
21 would always get really bad allergies. So my parents
22 were, like, let's move to Washington or Oregon. And
23 we chose Oregon because it's really clean and fresh.
24 And so when we got here, it was really nice. It is
25 really beautiful, and my allergies went away. And I

1 don't want that to change. I don't want -- I don't
2 want to, like -- breathe without worrying. Like, is
3 there something in the air that might harm us?

4 Not only that, but what kind of people would
5 let -- would let somebody else come in their home and
6 put a bunch of bags full of garbage in it? I mean, I
7 wouldn't let nobody do that. So how can we let
8 somebody -- how can we let somebody put 20,000
9 truckloads of radioactive waste into our home?
10 Because this is our home. Even if it's in
11 Washington, it's our home. So I oppose the
12 Department of Energy's plan to bring more nuclear
13 waste to Hanford.

14 MR. BROWN: Jackie will be followed by Esmeralda
15 Flores.

16 MS. McCLARY: Hello. My name is Jackie McClary.
17 I'm a third generation Portlander, a fourth
18 generation Oregonian, and a mother of two, and that
19 is why I care to be here tonight.

20 Hanford is a total failure as a waste
21 containment facility. It does not contain; it leaks.
22 Please, I beg of you, leave Hanford alone and out of
23 consideration. Many, many people have put in
24 countless hours to fight this fight and will, no
25 doubt, put in countless more. So who is it that is

1 insisting on wasting these people's time by bringing
2 up Hanford again?

3 You've heard the facts, you have seen budget
4 cuts, you've seen past promises and deadlines go
5 unfulfilled and unmet. So tell me, how can Hanford
6 safely take on new waste? Hanford needs to be
7 cleaned up, and they need to apologize to future
8 generations and Native Americans whose land has been
9 virtually destroyed for centuries to come. I once
10 thought the beauty of our region meant something, but
11 now I know it is not pristine; there is Hanford. It
12 is a blight on our region, and it seems that it is in
13 your plans to only make it worse. Thank you.

14 MR. BROWN: Esmeralda is next, and she will be
15 followed by James McNaughton.

16 MS. FLORES: Good evening. My name is
17 Esmeralda, and I'm a senior at Aloha High School.

18 I opposed the proposal of bringing more waste
19 into Hanford. It's ridiculous that Hanford is in the
20 process of cleaning up, and for more waste to be
21 dumped in it, it's crazy. Even the smallest amount
22 brought in can still have an impact on our
23 environment. I love Washington and Oregon because of
24 the clean air, so let's keep it that way. This waste
25 is not good for our health, and we don't need any

1 more of it. The Department of Energy can find
2 another place to dump that waste in, but not in our
3 backyard.

4 MR. BROWN: James McNaughton. He'll be followed
5 by Jiovani Guerrero.

6 MR. McNAUGHTON: I'm Jim McNaughton from
7 Fairview. I'm a member of the Alliance for
8 Democracy.

9 Now, the Columbia River is bordered for
10 50 miles. In prior statements it has been said there
11 is no contamination of the fish, it has never been
12 found. However, in prior testimony, it has been
13 stated, due to lack of funds, only around the McNary
14 Dam have they been tested. What are the facts? I
15 would like to ask you people, what are the facts? Is
16 that river contaminated or not?

17 (Audience chorus of "yes.")

18 MR. McNAUGHTON: And I'm asking you. You're the
19 Department of Energy. Can you give me an answer?

20 MR. BROWN: I think that's a question that will
21 be responded to in the Final EIS.

22 MR. McNAUGHTON: Okay. Well, anyway, I'm 81
23 years old, and I find this process (inaudible)
24 engaging the people of this area, insanity, and I
25 think you all agree with me.

1 MR. BROWN: Jiovani will be followed by Jason
2 Davis.

3 MR. GUERRERO: Good evening. My name is Jiovani
4 Guerrero. I'm an Aloha High School student. After
5 hearing about the trucks loaded with radioactive
6 waste, I've been thinking about the dangers that
7 occur in the place I consider my home. I used to
8 live in California, Salinas, and then in Mexico. In
9 Mexico, you don't even imagine the pollution there.
10 And in California, my family used to have bad
11 allergies, and we always thought about moving out of
12 state. The first thing I saw in Oregon was the fresh
13 air, and I guess I liked it, and we came here. I was
14 surprised. It was beautiful, fresh air, and I had
15 family here, and they told me it was really nice.
16 And after a while, my family noticed their allergies
17 went away. And I love Oregon, and I want it to stay
18 that way, and I consider Oregon as my home.

19 MR. BROWN: Jason Davis. And Georgia Pinkel
20 will follow.

21 MR. DAVIS: Hey, my name is Jason Davis, sixth
22 generation Klickitat County and Wasco County.

23 Well, I've got some things I wrote down today.
24 I decided to write them down so I wouldn't have too
25 many swear words in there, but I have a

1 four-year-old, and he told me that it was clear
2 enough. So they should be okay to get the message.
3 But then I sat here and I said to myself, 160 million
4 curies. I think there's a few people in this room
5 who know how many curies -- how much radionuclides
6 that is, and I know you guys do.

7 Trenches? Boreholes? These are your best
8 ideas? Please. This is disgusting and insulting. I
9 hope the recent letter from Washington State and
10 Oregon was clear enough. But in case you didn't get
11 it or didn't read it or weren't listening, because it
12 was read to you tonight, let me speak for the people
13 of the Northwest. We do not want more nuclear waste
14 brought here. We have been used as guinea pigs, we
15 have had our air and water polluted by the U.S.
16 government for generations, and we are tired.

17 I'm sure you're tired as well, each of you tired
18 of listening to people at these forums describe in
19 detail how their families have been devastated by
20 Hanford and other nuclear sites around the nation,
21 and I hope you are sick of it, because we are sick of
22 having you come to give us excuses of why Hanford has
23 not been cleaned up. And now, why you would ever
24 consider bringing more nuclear material to a site
25 that is continuing to leach into the environment.

1 So I will save you the time of listening to my
2 personal pain, but please do us all the favor of
3 returning to Washington, D.C. with this message:
4 Oregon and Washington do not want more nuclear
5 material brought to the base of the Columbia River.
6 In case you don't already know, what we want is for
7 the U.S. government to properly clean up what is
8 already there. We want you to scrap this EIS and
9 find a location for permanent disposal.

10 And I was thinking as you mentioned 10,000 years
11 ago -- or 10,000 years from now the radioactive
12 exposure at these sites, and I was struck with the
13 natural event at Fukushima, what happened, and I
14 thought to myself, what would happen at Hanford if
15 Grand Coulee Dam were to rupture? Can you imagine
16 the untold devastation of radionuclides across Oregon
17 and Washington?

18 Thank you.

19 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Georgia is next.
20 Kenneth Hodge is after her.

21 MS. PINKEL: I'm Georgia Pinkel, and the
22 co-convener of the Women's International League for
23 Peace and Freedom, Portland branch. And, of course,
24 my branch, as well as national and international,
25 supports you in this effort to stop the further

1 pollution of our area.

2 For those that have the little book that they
3 were handing out, on page S16 it shows you where all
4 of that nuclear waste is going to come from. It's
5 all east of the Mississippi. It seems to me we ought
6 to set our scientists to find a way to neutralize it
7 where it sits instead of hauling it all around the
8 countryside. We're opposed to the trucks or the
9 trains. We are dismayed that Hanford is still
10 polluted, and we have had very little effective
11 cleanup in spite of the amount of money that has been
12 spent.

13 I think I'll leave you just with this idea. Oh,
14 besides this (pointing to her shirt.) My shirt says,
15 Democracy is not a spectator sport. You guys know
16 that. We need to let everybody know that, and we
17 need to work towards the situation where public
18 opinion becomes public policy. We need to take back
19 our sovereignty and to make them listen to what we
20 are saying and to believe us.

21 So WIL says, indeed, the only sane approach is
22 to cease production of nuclear weapons and nuclear
23 power plants and to begin dismantling both for the
24 welfare of the entire earth.

25 Thank you.

1 MR. BROWN: Kenneth will be followed by Wallace
2 Hodge.

3 MR. HODGE: My name is Kenneth Hodge. I live
4 across the river, Vancouver, Washington. We say over
5 there it's Vancouver, not B.C.; Washington, not D.C.

6 I read in the papers where you guys from the
7 Department of Eco- -- I mean Energy, you want to
8 bring in all this radioactive material on a site
9 you've been spending billions of dollars over the
10 last 20 years cleaning up. Are you guys out of your
11 friggin' minds? If this is the kind of thinking
12 that's going on in D.C., it's no wonder the Chinese
13 are eating our lunch.

14 I've got some other comments here about the
15 Department of -- one of your fellow members of the
16 Department of Energy. The Bonneville Power
17 Administration has been spending a lot of money
18 trying to bring back the endangered salmon runs, and
19 here you are, another branch right down the hallway,
20 and you want to come in and create more danger for
21 our salmon, as well as for us to live here.

22 Now, we have a place called Yucca Mountain, I
23 think it is pronounced. Yucca Mountain in Nevada.
24 There has been billions of dollars spent on preparing
25 it all these years. And because one man, Senator

1 Harry Reid, doesn't like it in his state, I guess the
2 president let that be off the board, so it's out of
3 the picture now. So I don't know. Maybe we need to
4 get a new president or something to get this thing
5 back in the Yucca Mountain where it belongs.

6 But another place that would be suitable,
7 perhaps, to Senator Reid would be in the state of
8 California. Now, any plumber will tell you that
9 water and sewage runs downhill. So why not put this
10 waste in the lowest place in the United States, a
11 place that's actually below sea level? The only
12 place it can go is to hell where it belongs. I'm
13 talking about Death Valley. Sure, it's a national
14 park, but this is a national problem. It's nothing
15 but sand and rocks anyway. But as far as putting it
16 in a dump at Hanford, all I can say is, you
17 half-lived halfwits can take this dump and shove it.

18 MR. BROWN: Wallace Hodge is next, and then
19 Lauren Paulson.

20 MR. HODGE: It is tough to follow that act. I
21 don't have much to say, except I have a question, but
22 I guess you guys can't answer it. What does Japan
23 and Germany do with their waste? Where do they
24 depose -- Japan, where do they take their waste? Can
25 you tell me that?

1 MR. BROWN: I can't tell you that.

2 MR. HODGE: What about Europe in general? Do
3 you know what they do with it?

4 MR. BROWN: Well, I think DOE has some studies
5 about what other countries -- this question has come
6 up at some other meetings, and I think DOE is going
7 to be providing that information, because there is
8 something like 10 or 12 countries that are working
9 on --

10 MR. HODGE: I would think that it would be a lot
11 bigger problem in Europe than the United States with
12 the landmass that we have.

13 MR. BROWN: That's a good question. Thanks.

14 MR. HODGE: Didn't we spend a lot of money to
15 develop Yucca Flats, getting ready for the -- you
16 know, what happened to all the -- What happened? You
17 know, that just died politically? Is that what
18 happened?

19 MR. BROWN: Well, I think we just had an
20 analysis of what happened there.

21 MR. HODGE: Because of Reid?

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah.

23 MR. HODGE: Okay. Thank you.

24 MR. BROWN: Lauren Paulson, and then Jan Castle.

25 MR. PAULSON: My name is Lauren Paulson, and I'm

1 from Aloha. My story is going to make you cry. It's
2 about a love story. It's a love story about the
3 Columbia River. I first got acquainted with the
4 Columbia River in 1965 and hung out with somebody
5 that rented a houseboat. 1970 I bought my houseboat
6 and faced a group like this with the League of Women
7 Voters when the government and the Port of Portland
8 wanted to expand the airport into the Columbia River.
9 The League of Women Voters won that fight. In 1995 I
10 bought the home of my dreams on the Columbia River
11 out by St. Helens across the river from Woodland.
12 And I'm sitting on my deck one day, and I noticed a
13 rather sinister looking barge coming up the Columbia
14 River towing a platform with a tarp over it and a
15 gunboat lurking close by. What do you suppose that
16 was? A nuclear reactor from a submarine. It took me
17 a while to find out what that was.

18 So I started coming to meetings like this and
19 learned something else. There's a plume coming close
20 to my river. And the more I looked into it, the more
21 I couldn't find out how close it was coming. So I
22 don't know if anybody here knows the answer to that,
23 but I would love to find out how close that nuclear
24 plume is coming to the Columbia River.

25 A couple more things. After 9/11 something even

1 more sinister was occurring around these gunboats and
2 barges coming up the Columbia River by St. Helens.
3 They were having commando exercises, apparently, to
4 protect homeland security against anybody raiding
5 these nuclear -- it didn't say anything about that in
6 the Oregonian. I finally decided it was time to
7 leave the Columbia River, and I did.

8 A couple more things. This is a story of
9 surprises. A couple months ago I'm dropping off a
10 radical newspaper at Reed College, and I picked up
11 their school newspaper. How many of you know that
12 Reed College has a nuclear reactor? I didn't. How
13 many of you know they got a delivery just a couple
14 months ago? So that's my story. It's a story of a
15 love of the Columbia River, and I hope we can keep it
16 unradioactive.

17 MR. BROWN: Janet Castle is next. She will be
18 followed by Gregory Sotir. And before you start, if
19 folks have conversations, particularly in the back,
20 as a courtesy to the presenters, talk out in the
21 hallway. Thanks.

22 MS. CASTLE: Thank you. My name is Jan Castle.
23 First, I'd like to say a special thank you to the
24 high school students who have come. This takes a lot
25 of courage. You are the future, and we as adults are

1 answerable to you, as is the Department of Energy.

2 The second thing I'd like to say is just to
3 mention -- there have been a couple of mentions of
4 Yucca Flats -- Yucca Mountain, thank you. And I've
5 noticed in the news coverage, which has been
6 generally very good lately, they just keep mentioning
7 that was taken off the table by President Obama.

8 There's a reason for that. It's not just
9 because Harry Reid doesn't like it. It's because
10 there's water running through that site and also
11 volcanic activity there. It is not a suitable site
12 for this. Not only that, even if it were built, its
13 capacity would be completely taken up by fuel rods
14 that were already intended to be buried there. So
15 the kind of waste that we're talking about here would
16 not be buriable in the Yucca Mountain facility.

17 I would just like to say that I've noticed in
18 the EIS that all of the sites that DOE is
19 considering, which are ones that they own, all have
20 disqualifying features about them, and I think
21 Hanford is right up there. It is completely
22 disqualified, if for no other reason, because of the
23 risk of contamination to the Columbia River, which is
24 already going to be contaminated, and which would be,
25 of course, further contaminated for even longer and

1 at higher rates if we were to bury this waste there.

2 I think DOE should broaden their view and take a
3 good hard look at the North American granite shield
4 as a place for deep geologic repository for this. I
5 know that wouldn't be very politically palatable to
6 people in the Northern states, but it is something
7 that is going to have to be addressed.

8 Equally unpalatable for people in localities
9 where there are currently nuclear power plants, I'm
10 sure, would be the idea of leaving the reactors in
11 place. I would like to see DOE take a good, hard
12 look at the idea of in-site entombment of the
13 reactors rather than trying to take them apart. I
14 realize there may be some sites, like the Vermont
15 Yankee plant, where there are pipes leaking into the
16 soil. Perhaps that really does need to be dismantled
17 in order to get to that, but that is something that
18 should be explored.

19 None of us has a right to expect to get the
20 benefits of nuclear power without sharing in the
21 risks. It is time we came to grips with the fact
22 that there is no solution for the waste problem, for
23 nuclear waste, and we should not build any more
24 reactors.

25 MR. BROWN: Gregory will be followed by Gabe

1 Sheoships.

2 MR. SOTIR: Hi, everybody. I just moved to this
3 region, and I hope to become a homeowner soon. I'm
4 looking for properties. And, you know, this area is
5 so wonderful. I'm coming from a desert climate.
6 And, well, you can feel the rivers here. You can
7 feel them. And it just constantly blows me away the
8 effects of the watershed, the way you can really just
9 feel it moving.

10 That said, you know, this EIS, this puts me at
11 risk. This really puts me at risk. Looking through
12 it, it doesn't even talk about liabilities of
13 companies like, you know, Bechtel and Yostocology
14 (phonetic), for example, who will be contractors at
15 the site who have violated local, state and federal
16 laws over and over and over again, and will, no
17 doubt, continue to do so if they're allowed to expand
18 the contamination zone at Hanford.

19 So you really need to redo this, and you really
20 need to include those liabilities in it to let people
21 know, you know, that we're subsidizing these
22 corporations to kill us down the road. I mean, that
23 would really be environmental justice. And in this
24 there's a lot of talk about environmental justice,
25 but environmental justice is not dumping all this

1 nuclear waste into 930 boreholes, you know, within
2 the Columbia River watershed.

3 That's not environmental justice. It's not
4 subsidizing, you know, an industry, such as nuclear,
5 which is going to constantly produce products that
6 are extremely radioactive and very, very dangerous.

7 That's not environmental justice. Environmental
8 justice is not saying that we need to create a
9 nuclear sacrifice zone, you know, in this part of
10 North America, because that's what Hanford would be
11 if it's turned into a nuclear dump site. It would be
12 a sacrifice zone; that is, the whole country would
13 sacrifice it forever.

14 I think it's really just a matter of time,
15 right, in terms of contamination. Once the product
16 is in the ground, whether it's next year or ten years
17 or 10,000 years, it will reach the watershed. And,
18 you know, time, though, is kind of a scientific
19 construct. The lichens that live in that area, they
20 don't experience time. The wolves, the hawks, the
21 salmon, they don't know anything about time. They're
22 contaminated today, they're going to be contaminated
23 tomorrow, and they're going to be contaminated in
24 10,000 years, you know.

25 The perennial plants that exist there, you know,

1 they're going to be contaminated. And the humans
2 that live in the vicinity, well, maybe -- do we know
3 better? Do we? I don't know. When you have an EIS
4 like this, it doesn't really seem like we do, because
5 basically what this EIS is doing is, it's saying
6 there's nothing wrong, there's nothing wrong, trust
7 us.

8 Bechtel? Oh, they're great. They're going to
9 do a good job. They're going to protect you. That's
10 what this says, and it's wrong. It's a lie. In
11 terms of acceptable risk, you know, this is not
12 acceptable risk. I am not an acceptable risk. My
13 future cancer and my future home contamination is not
14 an acceptable risk.

15 So I would encourage the DOE to not only redo
16 this and talk about the truth of the liabilities of
17 the outside contractors involved, but you really need
18 to decommission and get away from nuclear power in
19 general. You really need to demolish this whole
20 cycle of nuclear military, you know, industry as
21 well. And we need to start thinking about our
22 watersheds a lot more than we have been.

23 MR. BROWN: I may have misread the next speaker.
24 Is it a Gabe, possibly, Sheoships? Are you here?

25 (No response.)

1 I can come back to you, then. Dorothy Lamb.

2 And after Dorothy, it will be Louisa Hamachek.

3 MS. LAMB: MY name is Dorothy Lamb and -- can
4 you hear me?

5 (Adjusting microphone.)

6 Hanford made bombs for World War I in the '40s.

7 (Mumbling in the audience.)

8 Oh, excuse me. I'm nervous. I was born in the
9 '40s, and I was called a downwinder, because at that
10 time, it was in the air. And when it's in the air,
11 it causes thyroid problems. We were called the
12 Thyroid Belt. That's all along the -- it's kind of
13 between Oregon and Washington where the wind blows
14 from the Columbia. Pendleton, Mountain Freewater,
15 Walla Walla, et cetera, et cetera. So, so many of us
16 have thyroid problems. And I still -- I'm still --
17 my whole life I've taken thyroid medicine. My sister
18 had her thyroid removed.

19 Now, when it is in the water, it is more cancer
20 and leukemia. And people keep saying cancer, but
21 there's quite a few things that it can cause besides
22 cancer. I agree with the several people who have
23 said we don't need nuclear at all. There are
24 alternatives. There's all kinds of things. If we
25 would take the money that we're planning to put into

1 building more nuclear and to developing some of these
2 really harmless alternative things, we wouldn't have
3 to have these meetings. So it must be politics. But
4 this is pretty expensive politics, if you ask me.

5 We just need to learn our lessons and to get our
6 politics really in favor of the people. Thank you.
7 I don't want to be around (inaudible). Downwind is
8 enough.

9 MR. BROWN: Louisa. Eva Kronin will follow you.

10 MS. HAMACHEK: I'm Louisa Hamachek from Eugene,
11 and I'm the chair of the Whiteaker Community Council,
12 our neighborhood association, and we have agreed that
13 we oppose the transportation of nuclear waste through
14 our neighborhood. Our neighborhood has a smaller
15 highway. We're about a mile and a half from I-5. We
16 have a smaller highway that is the one chosen as the
17 detour route if there's an accident on I-5, which
18 means that the nuclear trucks would come through our
19 neighborhood. And we have decided to oppose that and
20 not allow any nuclear waste trucks to come through
21 our neighborhood.

22 MR. BROWN: Eva will be followed by Daniel
23 Serres.

24 MS. KRONIN: Hi. I'm Eva Kronin. I came with
25 Louisa and Matt from Eugene, carpooled. It is really

1 important to be here. I'm against the use of Hanford
2 for continued hazardous nuclear waste site. I'm
3 against nuclear power because we can't afford it. We
4 can't afford it financially; we can't afford it
5 environmentally.

6 If the nuclear industry agrees to no more tax
7 subsidies or any subsidies, and if they can find a
8 sustainable way to keep nuclear waste from polluting
9 our land and water, then I could have an open mind.
10 But the nuclear industry kind of reminds me of the
11 story of the emperor who wears no clothes. You know
12 the story.

13 The king is fooled into believing he is wearing
14 the most elegant garment ever created. The nuclear
15 industry has done a good job to made the public
16 believe that it is clean energy, too cheap to meter.
17 Well, the voices here to oppose it are saying the
18 emperor is naked. And we see through the industry's
19 lies, the public relations, the bureaucratic double
20 speak. It is almost as transparent as the king's
21 clothes.

22 I use the story of a fairytale partly because I
23 work with children. I work with Head Start in Lane
24 County. And I want to say that I have a lot of
25 compassion for Mr. Edleman, because I could not do

1 your job. I'm glad -- I make a lot less money, I'm
2 sure, but I'm working to sustain life, and I wouldn't
3 want to work for an agency that is supporting the
4 destruction of life.

5 I work with these children, and I have to look
6 at them every day. And many days I shed tears
7 because our water is polluted, our air is polluted,
8 and what can I tell them to make them understand why
9 we're doing this?

10 We all have to look at our energy use. Nuclear
11 power is there because we use energy. I think we
12 need to be thinking about conservation more and --
13 yeah, no more waste. Thank you.

14 MR. BROWN: Daniel is advancing on the podium,
15 and he will be followed by Ross Tewksbury.

16 MR. SERRES: Thank you for the opportunity to
17 comment. I also want to take this opportunity to
18 thank the Washington Department of Ecology and Oregon
19 Department of Energy for telling it like it is and
20 for taking a strong position. It's nice to have our
21 state agencies backing up the vast majority of people
22 in this room who oppose new GTCC waste coming to
23 Hanford.

24 Columbia Riverkeepers, like Oregon and
25 Washington, oppose the use of Hanford for importing

1 greater-than-class C waste. There is class A waste,
2 class B waste, class C waste, and all this
3 miscellaneous nuclear junk that's way more
4 radioactive than any of those other three.

5 What's proposed to come to Hanford is a real
6 risk to the Columbia River, and that means it's a
7 risk to the river environment, to the salmon that
8 spawn in the Hanford reach, and to the people who eat
9 those salmon. And that's a risk that will last for
10 thousands of years as it is, without even importing
11 new GTCC waste. So that is why we think, as so many
12 of you said so eloquently, it is pure insanity to
13 even look at this.

14 The Columbia River -- to answer the question
15 that was posed earlier -- is already contaminated by
16 radioactive waste coming off the Hanford site. There
17 are groundwater plumes that include tridium and other
18 radionuclides that hit the river now. You can detect
19 radiation in the Columbia from Hanford as we speak.
20 The idea of contributing more waste to that is
21 something that will obviously make cleanup much more
22 difficult.

23 Ultimately, you know, the long-term plan for
24 Hanford and the Columbia River Treaty Tribes that
25 (inaudible), that people should be able to live

1 there, literally should be able to live on the site.
2 That's the agreement that existed between the tribes
3 and the federal government when they claimed this
4 land.

5 And so that's something -- you know, long-term,
6 by adding this additional nuclear burden, you're
7 foreclosing that option, certainly, for another
8 thousand -- 10,000 years. The dose levels in the
9 long term for things like uranium and plutonium in
10 the next 50 to 100 to 1,000 years are very high and
11 completely unacceptable.

12 There are major problems with technetium-99,
13 iodine-129, and various isotopic uraniums already at
14 the Hanford site. GTCC makes it worse.

15 And I think, you know, one of the ways we look
16 at this is -- it was said in the presentation that
17 deep geologic repository, that alternative may not be
18 reasonable at this time. And from my perspective,
19 what you should do then is to back out. Okay, if we
20 don't have a good place to put this stuff, we should,
21 at the very least, stop making it.

22 And this point has been made, and it is a really
23 good one, but there are two groups of waste in the
24 EIS. The one is Group I, and that involves waste
25 that has already been produced -- I'm sorry -- that

1 would come from nuclear operations that are already
2 ongoing. So that's the ongoing operations and
3 decommissioning of existing licensed nuclear
4 facility.

5 And then there is Group II, which are things we
6 might build in the future. And that, actually, by
7 volume is the majority of the waste, by volume. So
8 what we are contemplating here today is not just
9 using Hanford as a nuclear waste dump. It is looking
10 upstream at where this stuff comes from, and I'm
11 really encouraged. There's some people here who made
12 that point over and over. It is really important.
13 It may not be something that the Department of Energy
14 gets to deal with directly, but they should. They
15 should look at it, and it is something you can pass
16 through the line to NRC and say, Hey, our good
17 friends, we encourage you to solve this problem for
18 us.

19 Ultimately, you know, from Columbia
20 Riverkeepers' perspective, we plant our heels on the
21 source of the Columbia River, and we look at what's
22 coming off the Hanford site to the Columbia.
23 Anything that goes in is going to come out. I mean,
24 the story is, plutonium is forever. And what we
25 bring in, along with highly mobile radioactive waste,

1 will be a problem for generations to come. And I am
2 very inspired by all the testimony tonight. So thank
3 you very much.

4 MR. BROWN: Gregory Kafoury will follow Ross.

5 MR. TEWKSBURY: My name is Ross Tewksbury. I
6 live in Portland, and I'm actually the seventh
7 generation of my family that has lived here in
8 Oregon, and my ancestors came out on the Oregon
9 Trail. And, you know, you want to think, what is
10 happening seven generations from now? And people who
11 still, amazingly, are going to be dealing with this
12 stuff, you know, because it basically never ends. So
13 I'm against putting this waste at Hanford. They
14 already have way too much waste there they have to
15 deal with or clean up for the past 70 years, and we
16 don't need any more.

17 I think that a couple other people mentioned
18 that nuclear waste ought to be handled by the
19 proponents in the geographical areas that they're
20 producing this, in the Midwest and South, because
21 they're the ones that want the stuff. And, you know,
22 they shouldn't be able to just get the benefits and
23 not any of the costs.

24 One thing that I was thinking about is the
25 transportation. The transportation is sort of dealt

1 with in this whole thing kind of, what I would say,
2 sort of cavalierly or something. You're not really
3 thinking about the real -- what really happens out
4 there. You know, it is like some imaginary truck
5 gets from point A to point B with no kind of problem
6 or anything.

7 But, you know, what I want to ask these
8 proponents, you know, what if your wife or husband or
9 your children are stuck in traffic sitting next to
10 one of these trucks getting irradiated? What about
11 that? What if -- you know, I've seen these trucks
12 before on the road, down in California, and I took
13 pictures of a few of them.

14 What if you were, you know, eating lunch in a
15 Burger King and a truck is parked in the back, you
16 know, the driver is, you know, eating lunch? How
17 much radiation are you getting there? I've actually
18 seen that before. You know, what if you're at a rest
19 stop and the truck pulls in behind, you know, where
20 you're parked? There's many opportunities for -- you
21 know, you can get a little bit here, a little bit
22 there, and how much is too much? You need a Geiger
23 counter to keep track of this.

24 And then what about, you know -- I mean, people
25 mentioned accidents. But what about storms and

1 calamities? Certainly in the last few weeks we've
2 had, you know, more examples of those than anybody
3 would ever -- there's terrorist attacks, there's
4 tornadoes, hurricanes, earthquakes, flood, you know,
5 these last few weeks.

6 I was just thinking, you know, what if a truck
7 happened to be going through Tuscaloosa, Alabama,
8 when the tornado hit? Then somebody had got
9 (inaudible). Besides you have a section wiped off
10 the map, then it is wiped off -- irradiated, like in
11 Japan. But people don't seem to think about that too
12 much.

13 There is always a lull, you know, of things
14 happening, but lately there's been a lot higher
15 things happening, because they keep happening, you
16 know. So I do think that the idea about the --
17 putting them in deep granite areas deep in the earth,
18 you know, is about the best thing I've heard so far.

19 And finally, I think the one statement that you
20 mentioned earlier about if there were no new nuclear
21 facilities, there would be no more waste to be
22 disposed of; then we wouldn't need this in the first
23 place. So that's really the answer, as many people
24 have pointed out, that we just need to use solar
25 power and wind power and conservation, all the other

1 alternatives, which are not completely free of
2 problems. But compared to nuclear, it's like
3 nothing, you know. Who wants to spend, you know, a
4 hundred thousand years watching it take care of
5 itself. Thank you.

6 MR. BROWN: David Hess will follow Gregory.

7 MR. KAFOURY: Hi. I'm Greg Kafoury. I'm here
8 for the Oregon Progressive Party.

9 Why do we have to tolerate torture, black sites,
10 a government that listens to our phone calls, that
11 tracks our e-mails? Terrorism. Why do we have to
12 subject our children to being sexually abused at
13 airports? You have heard about the terrorists,
14 haven't you?

15 Now we're going to have to eat other people's
16 nuclear waste because of terrorism. Somebody is
17 going to get this stuff and make a dirty bomb. Well,
18 really? Ninety-eight percent of the radioactivity is
19 encased in steel. It's irradiated metal. What are
20 they going to do with that? Put it in the air?
21 Dissolve it in the water? Who you kidding?

22 You know, if somebody wants to hurt us -- and
23 our national security state is very busy dreaming up
24 plots to entrap more stupid people in so they can
25 parade them before press conferences and try and

1 scare us all. If you really want to hurt us, it's
2 really easy to do. All you have to do is climb over
3 a cyclone fence and slap some dynamite or plastique
4 to the side of one of these chemical plants.

5 You know, the highly respected GAO, the
6 government's investigative arm, in 2003 reported
7 there were 700 sites, chemical sites, where an
8 explosion could kill as many as a hundred thousand
9 people. There were many where you could kill a
10 million people. It's not that tough to do. Congress
11 investigated this. The chemical industry came in and
12 said, Well, we don't need federal regulation. Just
13 let us create some voluntary standards.

14 Congress said, Well, that's okay. Because the
15 chemical industry is the evil twin of the nuclear
16 industry when it comes to running Congress. And now
17 they try to scare us with a dirty bomb? Who are you
18 kidding? The truth is, we got rid of our nuclear
19 installation, the Trojan Nuclear Plant. A lot of the
20 people in this room worked for 15 years to make it
21 happen, and we backed them over the edge, didn't we?

22 Well, you know what? If there's one place that
23 doesn't deserve to get the poison pill, it's the
24 state of Oregon. And we are the big city near the
25 Columbia River. We are the big city downwind from

1 Hanford. Not here.

2 MR. BROWN: David Hess is next, and Martha Perez
3 will follow.

4 MR. HESS: Hi. My name is David Hess, and I'm
5 also a member of the Oregon Progressive Party. And,
6 you know, I'm here, actually, tonight to speak on
7 behalf of Lloyd Marbet, who unfortunately wasn't able
8 to be here. But following on Greg's thought, you
9 know, we've been recently told by the FBI that the
10 threat of terrorism in this region was so great that
11 we had to rejoin the Joint Terrorism Task Force. I
12 mean, we just couldn't be separated from it.

13 But now the federal government wants to come in
14 here and tell us, don't worry, it's completely safe
15 to bring 12,000 moving terrorist targets through your
16 region; I don't see a conflict.

17 But on behalf of Lloyd Marbet, I want to read
18 this statement. He says: I, Lloyd Marbet, apologize
19 for not being able to attend this meeting due to
20 conflicting events in my schedule, and I appreciate
21 Dave Hess reading this short statement in the record.
22 I, and the Oregon Conservancy Foundation, would like
23 to go on record in opposition to any storage of
24 radioactive waste as Hanford. Hanford needs to
25 completely clean up its own nuclear waste.

1 We also wish to go on record opposing any
2 licensing extension of the Columbia Generating
3 Station Nuclear Plant with its continuing
4 accumulation of nuclear waste on site. The recent
5 nuclear diaster at Fukushima shows the failure in
6 disaster planning for all the nuclear power plants.

7 So this DVD that I have been handing out
8 tonight -- and I have plenty more if you haven't got
9 one yet -- is entitled "At the Source." It has a
10 four-part interview with Dr. Jan Sherman. She is
11 author of Life's Delicate Balance and editor of
12 "Chernobyl: The consequence of the catastrophe for
13 people and the environment."

14 So the interview covers the book, the Chernobyl
15 book, which is a recent study of the health effects
16 of above-ground nuclear testing, and responses to
17 Stewart Brand's book Whole Earth Discipline with its
18 misguided promotion of the greening of nuclear power.
19 And it also contains free copies of both of
20 Dr. Sherman's books. I really highly recommend that
21 you download them and you read them and give them to
22 your friends.

23 So Lloyd wants to end by saying: We need to
24 make a massive commitment to renewable energy in
25 response to the growing impact of climate change.

1 The time to disinvest ourselves of nuclear power is
2 now.

3 MR. BROWN: Robert Weisman will follow you.

4 MS. PEREZ: Okay. Thank you. My name is Martha
5 Orta Schonchin Perez. I'm a descendant of Chief
6 Schonchin of the Klamath Tribes of Southern Oregon.
7 I'm a general political activist. I'm a former
8 employee of Bonneville Power Administration Energy
9 Efficiency Office of the Portland branch.

10 I am here to speak on behalf of 40,000-plus
11 urban Indians who already suffer disproportionate
12 rates of diabetes and obesity. Hence, my concern for
13 the three Native American tribes that would be
14 impacted by additional disposal of any class
15 materials additionally imposed as a result, and as a
16 consequence, of disposal of materials on the Hanford
17 site or any site. We need to insist to Congress to
18 secure additional funding for the granite shield and
19 reallocate nuclear tax refunds and invest in the
20 north granite shield now.

21 The Draft EIS and the Final EIS is inadequate.
22 And pretty much, when I'm talking about fish
23 populations, when I talk about impact on surrounding
24 vegetative, flora and fauna, aquatic and
25 land-based/plant-based habitat, the EIS is

1 inadequate. In addition to how it's impacting our
2 commerce considerations, impacting safety of highway
3 transportation systems, including both state and
4 federal. The impact on animal habitations and
5 ecosystems and economic costs associated with
6 relocation, destruction, and our loss of animal
7 species, habitat, ecosystems, associated areas, per
8 EPA law.

9 I am a former employee and want you to know that
10 while I'm proud of my civil service, I learned about
11 where we are having significant limitations on how to
12 be responsible stewards of our existing resources,
13 which includes nuclear waste, and how to be good
14 stewards and proper stewards in dealing with that
15 mess.

16 You know, the state of Washington can challenge
17 the permit process that will keep additional
18 shipments of class hazardous materials to be sent to
19 Hanford site. In addition, I would advocate and
20 argue that these matters of national and regional
21 security shall need to continue to be referred via
22 legal means, not excluding the following actions be
23 taken. And there's so many, but I'll just talk about
24 one.

25 A state or federal court imposed injunction on

1 any trucks containing any and all class material,
2 including, but not limited to, class A, B, and C
3 hazardous material. Thank you.

4 MR. WEISMAN: I'm Robert Weisman, a fairly new
5 member of the Heart of America Northwest. I try to,
6 probably like a lot of you, relate things from other
7 parts of my life than the fear and concern about
8 nuclear power, nuclear weapons, nuclear waste
9 storage. I'll try to relate things, events and
10 activities from the rest of my life to these nuclear
11 issues.

12 And one thing I did within the last two weeks is
13 I saw a film that went into some of the caves where
14 there were drawings in southern France, and the time
15 scale in that movie was 40,000 years. Now, 40,000
16 years is probably the longest -- no, it's the oldest
17 human artifact I've seen; beautiful things to see in
18 the movie. But you figure that's one and a third
19 life -- half lives for plutonium. We don't have many
20 human experiences to deal with some of these numbers
21 that are critical to the nuclear issue.

22 And I'm afraid, I think, government hides behind
23 some of the sort of screens. A very prevalent screen
24 when I heard this evening that in 12,000 truckloads
25 over 40 years they'll be no nuclear-related deaths

1 and maybe two or three people would be killed in -- I
2 guess when a wheel flies off.

3 Cancer, another favorite -- it is a favorite
4 number of mine. Cancer takes 25 years, most often,
5 to develop. So if we were looking at the instance of
6 exposure to radioactive particles and saying, well,
7 there's no cancer evident this year, there's no
8 cancer evident next year, there's no cancer evident
9 in ten years, so I guess there's no cancer. Wrong.
10 So I think the government is hiding -- DOE estimates
11 of harm are hiding behind that very simple, central
12 fact.

13 The other thing is -- again, from every day
14 experience, within the last couple months -- and this
15 relates to the Columbia River -- I was in Astoria and
16 saw the sweet little museum there of the history of
17 crossing the bar and how it's the most dangerous --
18 the most dangerous river, treacherous river area in
19 the United States, continental United States. And I
20 forget the numbers, but, say, 500 ships have been
21 wrecked there. How many lives have been lost?
22 5,000? I don't know. I don't remember that one.
23 But compare it to a true contamination of radioactive
24 material into the Columbia River through the aquifers
25 to the river that's occurring right now. We can only

1 guesstimate the lethality of what's going on.

2 Therefore, my overall point is, these are really
3 difficult issues to conceptualize beyond the fact
4 that it's bad stuff. We've got to get it out of
5 here. We've got to quit making it. We've got to
6 store it in the Rockies. Yes, all that's true. But
7 to really grasp -- the devil's in the details of the
8 atomic genie, and I don't trust the DOE at all except
9 as doing the master's work. I mean, if --

10 MR. BROWN: I'm sorry. You're kind of over the
11 time.

12 Colm Brennan is our next speaker. And after
13 that will be Carol Reilley -- is it Urner?

14 MS. URNER: Urner.

15 MR. BROWN: Urner. Okay.

16 MR. BRENNAN: Hello. I'm Colm Brennan from
17 Aloha, and I would just like to say that I went to a
18 meeting in Cascade Locks, I believe it was three or
19 four months ago, and the DOE was there with the
20 dog-and-pony show. They told us that they were
21 cleaning up the site at Hanford. And what we found
22 out is they were decommissioning a nuclear reactor
23 and they found that, oh, boy, there was a crack in
24 the concrete below the reactor, and there was leakage
25 of technetium and chromium. And this was new to

1 them, and they didn't know what they were going to do
2 about it, and the contractors didn't know what to do
3 about it.

4 So now they come to us and say they want to dump
5 more nuclear waste at Hanford. They can't deal with
6 the waste they have now. How are they going to deal
7 with any new waste? And why should we allow them to
8 deliver any new waste to Hanford? I'm against it
9 because it's totally unsafe, and it's insanity. If
10 you can't deal with what you have now, how can you
11 deal with any more? And the waste they are talking
12 about bringing should be left where it is. We should
13 not be the dumping ground for the waste of the United
14 States. Thank you.

15 MR. BROWN: Carol will be followed by Ken
16 Ferguson.

17 MS. REILLEY URNER: Well, someone who spoke here
18 was 81. I'm 82. And we became Oregonians way back
19 when I was 29. And it was when we were here, my
20 husband was a planner for metro -- the metro area of
21 Portland, and I am very proud of the work that he did
22 and the fellow planners. I think that Oregon,
23 Portland and the surrounding communities, are
24 something very special in this country. And I think
25 we owe it to all the people that have helped make

1 this a wonderful place to live as well, as Mother
2 Nature and Mother Earth themselves, who've made it a
3 wonderful place. Not to let this desecration occur
4 along our Columbia River.

5 When my children were only two and five the
6 Berlin crisis happened, and we were teetering on the
7 edge of nuclear war. Some of you haven't had to live
8 through that. We lived through it several times.
9 And a newspaper columnist asked, Where are the people
10 in this country? Why aren't they speaking out?

11 And so I wrote a letter saying the reason we
12 weren't speaking was we were helpless. And I'm sure
13 that when I looked at my own children and realized
14 they probably weren't going to grow to adulthood, and
15 I thought Russian women -- who at that point, by the
16 way, were demons because they were Communists -- I
17 was sure that they felt the same when they looked at
18 their children.

19 Well, the next day, after -- well, the paper put
20 it in the paper with a five-column headline. The
21 next day, women all over Portland were calling me,
22 women, most of them I'd never met and didn't know.
23 And they said, Carol, we have to do something. So I
24 felt helpless, had to help, and I love the women of
25 Portland and will ever since, because they gathered

1 together, formed a movement, and helped get that
2 nuclear test ban that stopped dropping fallout on our
3 children and helped to put a break and get people to
4 think, where are we going? Why are we preparing to
5 kill?

6 Well, for 35 years we lived overseas, because my
7 husband worked with poor countries. He wanted to
8 help them lift up. He didn't want to be involved in
9 killing or the military in any way. And I came to
10 love all the countries we lived in and all the
11 hundreds of countries we visited, and all the people,
12 the poor people. There were so many wonderful people
13 that we think about killing without a second thought.
14 And these are precious people, and we need to
15 recognize their preciousness, just like the Columbia
16 River is precious and Oregon and Washington are
17 precious.

18 And now I've come back, and I don't know as much
19 as a lot of you do about the details of Hanford and
20 nuclear power and nuclear weapons, but I do know,
21 listening to you and reading and looking, this is
22 crazy. My people are worth more than this. The
23 world is worth more than this. We can't keep going
24 in this direction.

25 And in those years overseas -- I'll end with

1 this -- I mostly worked with very poor people to help
2 them work for their own human rights, their own
3 communities. And I learned that they had a power in
4 them and that they were smart and that they knew what
5 was best, and they wouldn't have done foolish things.
6 But I also learned when I took them up to meet with
7 ambassadors or generals or corporation presidents, in
8 everyone we met, there was something we could reach.
9 But they too knew that what they were doing to these
10 people was wrong. And we stopped a lot of bad things
11 that way.

12 So I know that we together, and these people
13 with us, can stop this madness. We have a great
14 country and a great people and a great world. So
15 let's stop messing with nuclear bombs, nuclear power,
16 killing people, and piling up this waste that nobody
17 knows what to do with.

18 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

19 Before our next speaker starts, we are now just
20 halfway through the folks who have signed up. So I
21 really hate to interrupt people, but please try to
22 stay within that three-minute limit or less so that
23 all who have signed up will have a chance to speak.
24 Ken Ferguson is our current speaker, and Rebecca Em
25 Campbell will follow him.

1 AUDIENCE MEMBER: How many people are signed up?

2 MR. BROWN: Sixty-seven, and we're at 33.

3 MR. FERGUSON: I've got three minutes to discuss
4 the next 30,000 years or more, so I'll make it quick.
5 I was hoping to speak when there was more people in
6 the room, but thanks for everybody coming out on this
7 beautiful evening to sit in a windowless room.

8 How many would come out to help me block a train
9 track or a railroad? Get them up there (indicating).
10 I mean, that's what -- so obviously nobody said, oh
11 yeah, ship it to Hanford. So nobody wants it, and if
12 the DOE is not going to listen to the public here,
13 we're going to bear witness to an injustice, and
14 we're going to get out there and stop these
15 shipments, nonviolently, peacefully, and with love in
16 our hearts. So can I see those hands again? You can
17 make a little tally.

18 So shut them down. Shut the plants down. Stop
19 creating the waste. Keep it on site. No action as
20 far as the EIS is concerned. Take no action. No
21 transporting those wastes. Let's end nuclear power.
22 Let's stop doing any sort of fission whatsoever.
23 We've got alternatives. Clean, renewal energy. The
24 roadblocks are political. Take that message back to
25 Washington, D.C. That's what everybody says around

1 here, not just me.

2 I also represent a newly formed student group at
3 Portland State called, ISSUE, the International
4 Students Supporting Universal Equality. Check us out
5 at orgzynz.org. That's O-R-G-S-Y-N-Z.O-R-G, and
6 that's open to, you know, anybody in the community.
7 So thanks for coming out, and have a good evening.

8 MR. BROWN: Rebecca will be followed by Nick
9 Wilson.

10 MS. CAMPBELL: Rebecca Em Campbell, Seattle,
11 Washington. Here because there were too few public
12 hearings in the venues there should have been and too
13 little publicity by the U.S. government and by those
14 nonprofits tasked with dealing with nonnuclear
15 issues.

16 The Hanford superfund site, as well as all the
17 superfund sites, are unnecessary problems. As a
18 matter of fact, the Department of Energy has had the
19 technology to clean up the sites for over six --
20 probably over 60 to 65 years. In this envelope is a
21 35-page article that I sent out earlier today to
22 activist sites and to some government officials that
23 shows that they have a type of borer machine called a
24 Subterrene, which is kept top secret. Lithium
25 powered, can bore seven to seven and a half miles per

1 day, create tunnels 40 feet in diameter with
2 automatic vitrification that could confine the
3 nuclear waste that they are now placing in unlined
4 trenches in the ground in deliberate ecoside and
5 genocide against the people of America and the
6 planet.

7 The idea of renewable energy is somewhat of a
8 travesty if we confine it only to solar and wind and
9 some of the other conventionally considered options.
10 Over 100 years ago Nikola Tesla came up with
11 zero-free and zero-point energy and was immediately
12 defunded by his funders, J.P. Morgan and John D.
13 Rockefeller. Because of this -- oh, and after his
14 death, mysteriously -- which mysteriously happened on
15 his way to have dinner with President Franklin D.
16 Roosevelt in 1944, all of his notebooks and works
17 were confiscated by the United States Government.
18 The Pentagon black budget, which has not only
19 confiscated it but weaponized and put it in private
20 hands of contractors where we have no access to any
21 proof of this because FOIA requests are not respected
22 by private corporations.

23 So, as to sacred sites, I think we need to
24 consider the planet a sacred site and extend that to
25 all that we do, including the need to deal with the

1 number one terrorist organization in the world that
2 is preventing this, which is the United States
3 government and its military.

4 Thank you, and good evening.

5 MR. WILSON: Hello. I'm just -- I can talk
6 loud. My name is Nick Wilson. I am a student at
7 Aloha High School, and I'm going to say something
8 that you guys will probably disagree with. As of
9 right now, I'm the only person here who is actually
10 in support of putting more nuclear waste at the site.
11 Yeah, I know. I've been listening to what all you
12 guys have been saying, and I understand your point of
13 view. You're saying we're from Oregon, a community,
14 and we need to keep that community safe and clean.
15 And I completely agree, but I kind of have a
16 different mind-set.

17 I think of us more as a country as a whole than
18 just Oregon as a community. We have this nuclear
19 waste and something has to be done with it. That's
20 not really a question. The question is what we
21 should do with it. And no one has really given a
22 good alternative other than send it somewhere else.
23 And as an Oregonian, that sounds great, but as an
24 American, that's just sad.

25 I don't see any reason why we can't -- I'm not

1 saying, by any means, we should take nuclear waste
2 and dump it in a ditch. That is even more sad. But
3 there is no reason we can't build containment
4 vessels, we can't actually line our trenches, or we
5 can't do other things to make sure it is kept safe
6 but still in Washington.

7 There is no really easy answer to this problem,
8 but just sending it somewhere else definitely is not
9 the answer at all. It's just sad. We're better than
10 that, and it's not like -- I know it's not great for
11 anything, but it's also not going to destroy
12 everything. People say they love our clean air and
13 beautiful trees. That's not going to go away. Just
14 because we have some waste buried upwind of us does
15 not really -- it is not going to change anything. It
16 won't be quite as good, but I think for the sake of
17 our country, we can handle it. But maybe that's just
18 me. Thank you for listening.

19 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Cherie Lambert
20 Holenstein and Sandy -- it looks like Polishuk. I
21 know that's wrong, but you know who you are. Cherie.

22 And can you all in the back be more respectful
23 of the speaker. If you're talking, step outside.
24 Please go ahead. Thanks.

25 MS. HOLENSTEIN: Thank you. Gerry said to give

1 20 minutes a month, and I'm going to ask more of you.
2 At the last Hanford hearing a couple months ago I
3 took a flier and duplicated a couple hundred of them.
4 I handed them out personally, and a lot of you folks
5 came tonight, and thank you.

6 Three weeks ago today I went to the Joint
7 Terrorism Task Force at City Hall, speaking against
8 it, of course, and I told them about the hearing. I
9 handed the major and the commissioners a handout for
10 this hearing. I was not told to stay on topic that
11 day, but yesterday I was at the city council water
12 budget hearing, and during my testimony I mentioned
13 Hanford here at 6:30 p.m., Double Tree Inn, across
14 the street from (inaudible), and Mayor Sam told me to
15 stay on topic. And I said I was, it's all relevant.

16 Mayor Sam did come tonight, so -- the other four
17 commissioners didn't. Anyway -- and my daughter is
18 here tonight. She's been at many of these hearings.
19 And on the very first day -- when she was a teacher,
20 she taught health at Jefferson, and she said, "Mom,
21 do you think can you get Greg Kafoury to come to my
22 class and talk about Trojan?"

23 I said, "Sure, give him a call, Honey." And
24 gave her the phone number. And Greg agreed. She
25 went to the office, of course, to check with the

1 administration and, well, that wasn't a health issue
2 she was told. But she stood her ground, and the
3 first day of speaking Greg came and talked about
4 Trojan, and she brought her students to several of
5 these hearings. And yes, they were bored, but, yes,
6 they learned something.

7 I don't see Julia here. She was sitting next to
8 me. But the whole point of history -- she actually
9 is back there. Turn around and see her. I met her
10 father in '78. Lloyd told me that there was an
11 initiative to not build any more nuclear power plants
12 in Portland -- in Oregon, rather. And so, anyway, I
13 called up the state senator at that time, Jan Wyers,
14 later a Multnomah County circuit court judge, and I
15 said, yes, I would like to circulate them. I had met
16 him before. I knew of him because I read the paper.

17 And he said, "How many do you want?"

18 And I said, "Oh, 30, 40 of them." I guess he
19 thought, well, maybe I better meet this woman who is
20 going to take 30 or 40 petitions. Anyway, so that is
21 where I met him. And Chuck Johnson, who spoke
22 earlier, Chuck was Jan Wyers' staff member. And in
23 1980, we were on the ballot in November, no new
24 nuclear power plant can be built in the state of
25 Oregon until there was a permanent waste depository

1 site. That was the issue. Jan was the chief
2 petitioner, and Oregonians voted that in, and that's
3 why there's no nuclear power plants built in the
4 state of Oregon.

5 MR. BROWN: You've got about 30 seconds.

6 MS. HOLENSTEIN: Okay. Go quickly. My message
7 is the same: Clean up the waste, clean up the waste,
8 no more brought in. And the 2004 decision to make
9 Hanford the nuclear dump site, no, no, no, to that.
10 Change that. And Harvey (inaudible) statement --
11 Gerry said, why work to remove the waste and clean up
12 tank leaks if the DOE is just going to add the same
13 amount of radioactivity to landfill which will
14 recontaminate the groundwater flowing to the Columbia
15 River?

16 I will leave you with a poem by Robert Louis
17 Stevenson. I'm sure many of you read it to your
18 children when they were little. Remember the last
19 statement? Recontaminate.

20 Robert Louis Stevenson: When I was down beside
21 the sea/a wooden spade they gave to me to dig the
22 sandy shores/my holes were empty like a cup/and every
23 hole the sea came up/until it could come no more.

24 Recontamination.

25 MR. BROWN: You are Sandy?

1 MS. POLISHUK: I am.

2 MR. BROWN: Can you spell your last name?

3 MS. POLISHUK: It's Polishuk. Sandy Polishuk,
4 and I want to say before I begin my testimony that I
5 was in touch with Congressman Earl Blumenauer's
6 office today, and he had hoped to be here. He is
7 certainly against bringing in the waste, and he said
8 he sent his apologies and his regrets, but he will
9 send in his comments so they will get in the record.

10 Just by chance today, total coincidence, I
11 happened to read that Washington and Oregon are
12 ranked number one and number two in the nation for
13 breast cancer incidence. That's a brand-new fact for
14 me. I was born in Seattle, grew up there, and except
15 for three years of my life, I've spent the rest of my
16 adult life here in Oregon. So I am a Northwesterner;
17 those two states.

18 I was diagnosed with breast cancer at 46, age
19 46. Back then, that was considered young. It no
20 longer is. Woman in their thirties are routinely
21 diagnosed with breast cancer. They never were
22 before. So something has changed. And many of us
23 feel pretty clearly that it's the environment. And
24 reading this number one and number two, I couldn't
25 help but think of Hanford and the contamination that

1 it has brought to our two states. I was the first of
2 my friends diagnosed, but definitely not the last,
3 and I've lost three, that I can think of off the top
4 of my head, to breast cancer in those ensuing years.

5 Just like Japan, this is earthquake country. We
6 do not want a Fukushima here. And the idea of
7 purposely bringing more, of relicensing a plant that
8 is up there for longer -- did you know that? Did you
9 know that originally it was licensed for 20 years and
10 now they want to -- before that license is even done,
11 they want to renew it. That is another thing we need
12 to be working against. But, you know, maybe you
13 can't have a tidal wave that far up the Columbia, but
14 you can certainly have an earthquake. An earthquake
15 would be a terrible disaster for Eastern Washington,
16 for the river, for the entire Northwest.

17 So like everyone, save one, who has testified, I
18 say the same thing. Clean up what's there and do not
19 bring any more. Find an appropriate, safe place for
20 that garbage that has been created and stop creating
21 it. In 1977 I happened to have a conversation with a
22 man who had been a nuclear engineer, and I was
23 arguing with him then about the fact that we were
24 creating this nuclear waste that we didn't know how
25 to deal with. And he assured me that it was not a

1 problem, that the technocrats were going to have it
2 fixed, the scientists, the physicists, they were
3 going to figure it out before it was a problem. It
4 is 34 years later, and it is still a problem. He is
5 still wrong in what he told me, and I'm not a
6 scientist. You don't have to be a scientist to know
7 how dangerous this stuff is, how --

8 MR. BROWN: I'm sorry. You're at your time
9 limit.

10 MS. POLISHUK: Okay. Thank you.

11 MR. BROWN: Our next speaker is Melba -- it
12 looks like Dlugonski. Okay. You have lovely
13 handwriting.

14 MS. DLUGONSKI: Melba Dlugonski, Southeast
15 Portland.

16 One of the things about coming at the end of
17 something like this, everybody has already said most
18 of the things that you were planning to say. And
19 while some redundancy is appropriate, we are short on
20 time. So maybe I will just bring up a couple of
21 things, and one was my vision of what I would
22 really -- a daydream of what I would like to have see
23 happen tonight.

24 The DOE would come in and say, you know, we
25 really have screwed up. We're very, very sorry, and

1 we'd like to make it up to you. We're going to use
2 the considerable influence of our agency and our
3 other agencies we'll bring on board and their
4 corporate sponsors, and we will try to make this
5 right by you.

6 The first thing we're going to do is see to it
7 that there are no nuclear power plants, that we shut
8 down nuclear weapons, that we stop using depleted
9 uranium to destroy peoples in other places.
10 Remembering with humility that this stuff is forever
11 and that this planet it is not just under assault
12 from this one thing. It happens to be the most
13 long-lived, but climate change and chemical pollution
14 and overpopulation all coming together at one time.

15 And to have a kind of humility as an agency to
16 see that you are a part of the whole. There are
17 many, many problems in the world, and it's going to
18 take an enormous responsibility on the parts of
19 individuals and groups of people to try to stop doing
20 business as usual. We need dramatic changes and
21 solutions.

22 I think the misuse of science is my other point.
23 A true scientist is a person who goes out and says,
24 you know, I really would like to understand the why
25 of things and the how of things, and I will do all

1 the work necessary to find out about this, but I'm
2 always asking you to prove me wrong. I'm always
3 looking for why I am wrong. Not why I'm right.

4 And have you heard that kind of science here
5 tonight? Thank you.

6 MR. BROWN: Thank you. We have Martha Shelley
7 next and then Joe Walsh.

8 MS. SHELLEY: Hi. I am Martha Shelley. I'm
9 with Code Pink Portland.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes. Right on.

11 MS. SHELLEY: I would like to say I support the
12 creation of a deep geological repository for existing
13 nuclear waste, and absolutely oppose the building of
14 additional nuclear power plants to create additional
15 nuclear waste. These gentlemen here say that a deep
16 repository was too expensive, it's going to cost two
17 or three billion dollars. This country spends \$120
18 billion every year on wars in the Middle East, and
19 has since -- what, ten years ago. 120 billion, but
20 we can't put a deep depository in this country for
21 the nuclear waste.

22 The DOE and the NRC are acting with unbelievable
23 arrogance. You talk about repositories to control
24 waste for 10,000 years. 10,000 years ago people were
25 just hunter, gatherers. Only 5,000 years ago the

1 pyramids were being built. This country, what, 400
2 years old, that Columbus, quote, "discovered"
3 America?

4 We're talking about plutonium. It's the most
5 poisonous substance on the planet. An ounce of it
6 released and disbursed evenly will kill every human
7 being on the planet, one ounce. Its half-life is
8 24,000 years. The amount released in Fukushima is
9 going to be dangerous for up to half a million years.
10 Half a million years ago, there were human beings on
11 the planet living in caves. It was paleolithic
12 times. It took until 10,000 years ago for human
13 beings to start building towns, to start moving away
14 from hunting and gathering into civilized areas.

15 The arrogance to think that you can plan for
16 10,000 years, that you're going to make us safe for
17 10,000 years, is unbelievable. The nuclear industry
18 seems to be willing to poison the entire planet for
19 the next half million years in order to reap
20 short-term profits for the psychopaths that we call
21 CEOs.

22 I don't believe any of your environmental impact
23 statements or charts or statistics. They're no more
24 reliable than the Tokyo Electric Power assurances
25 about the safety of Fukushima or any of the other

1 power plants over there. They're junk. Your agency
2 has been captured by the people it's supposed to
3 regulate, and if you guys had any conscious, you
4 would quit your jobs and start talking honestly about
5 what could be done about nuclear power.

6 MR. BROWN: Joe Walsh. Is Joe here?

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: He's disabled. He may have
8 gone home.

9 MR. BROWN: Okay. Janice Clark? Folks are
10 walking the wrong direction. Barbara LaMorticella.
11 And after Barbara, it looks like somebody's last name
12 may be Minnett or Mennett. I can't read the first
13 name, but go ahead.

14 MS. LaMORTICELLA: My name is Barbara
15 LaMorticella, and I'm from Portland. Hanford was
16 sited in 1943 in the rush to produce a nuclear
17 weapon. It was sited in ignorance. Today, after
18 Fukushima and Chernobyl, we can no longer plead
19 ignorance.

20 The Columbia River is the cradle of life in the
21 Northwest. Like the coast of Japan, the Columbia
22 River is geologically active. There were three small
23 earthquakes under Hanford in the last week. The plan
24 to almost double the amount of nuclear and chemical
25 waste stored there amounts to making the Northwest a

1 national nuclear sacrifice zone. According to the
2 Heart of America Northwest, over a million gallons of
3 liquid high-level nuclear waste has already leaked
4 from tanks at Hanford, and over 1.7 trillion gallons
5 of these wastes were dumped into the soil. The
6 contamination is spreading to the river faster than
7 the federal DOE claimed was possible.

8 Now, instead of cleaning up the site, your
9 proposal would make it permanent and almost double
10 the amount of waste stored there. Two truckloads of
11 radioactive waste would be shipped every day for 20
12 years over the highway and through Portland and
13 Spokane. And the Energy Northwest Nuclear Power
14 Plant on the Hanford site is being considered for
15 conversion to burn MOX fuel, mixed uranium and
16 plutonium.

17 This would solve a government problem. It would
18 be cheap fuel, because there are thousands of tons of
19 plutonium built up from our weapons production and
20 commercial nuclear reactors, and no one knows what to
21 do with it. The plan is for plutonium waste from
22 everywhere to be streaming on the highways to Hanford
23 where the plant, like plant number three at
24 Fukushima, would burn it.

25 Hanford would be the site where experiments in

1 plutonium disposal would be performed with the people
2 and animals of the Northwest as guinea pigs. At
3 Fukushima, plutonium has contaminated the soil and
4 has been released into the air and ocean. It is
5 radioactive for 240,000 years. One particle of
6 plutonium is enough to cause cancer and genetic
7 mutations. This means that one particle, in its
8 travels through time and space, can cause cancer,
9 another cancer, another cancer, another cancer, for
10 longer than humans have been on earth.

11 Energy Northwest was rated by the Institute of
12 Nuclear Power Operations, a group which is paid for
13 by the industry, as one of two nuclear power plants
14 in the country most in need of improvement in
15 leadership, human performance, and equipment
16 reliability. TEPBCO gambled with the life of the
17 ocean and the northern coast of Japan.

18 There were three earthquakes under Hanford in
19 the last week. After Fukushima there can be no more
20 blindness. There has been enough gambling. I ask
21 you to take those earthquakes as a sign to respect
22 nature and to take Hanford off the table as a
23 permanent waste repository and plutonium disposal
24 site. Thank you.

25 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

1 Again, I apologize on the last name, but again,
2 it looks like Minnett or something. Anyone?

3 (No response.)

4 Okay. This is Dvija Michael Bertish.

5 MR. BERTISH: There's a few of you left at
6 least. That's good. Dvija Michael Bertish, Rosemere
7 Neighborhood Association based in Vancouver,
8 Washington, abutting I-5, which is one of the
9 transportation corridors. So our neighborhood would
10 be directly affected. And our organization and those
11 of our supporters oppose this proposal.

12 Relative to the Environmental Impact Statement,
13 we ask that there be no pursuit of a Final
14 Environmental Impact Statement until the comments
15 that have been produced by all of the various public
16 forums be addressed as a systematic response summary
17 matrix and adjustments made to the Environmental
18 Impact Statement to discuss how those grievances
19 would be addressed in any final.

20 So no Record of Decision based on that. And we
21 would ask that, actually, the Environment Impact
22 Statement be back-pedaled and redone, because not
23 every alternative has been adequately outlined under
24 the guidelines of NEPA.

25 Personally, and representing the interests of

1 our organization and our fellow partners, we don't
2 believe that the U.S. Department of Energy nor the
3 regulatory commission of the United States can
4 adequately protect the public by creating another
5 repository that's shallow. We do not believe that
6 the justification for this, keeping this stream of
7 nuclear medicine or nuclear weapons that are
8 dispersed around the world and bringing them to one
9 place, would solve that problem.

10 That is not an adequate justification to create
11 a suppository. We believe that the U.S. Department
12 of Energy is disingenuous and that it has -- at the
13 last meeting, we provided comments, similar to what
14 the lady before me just spoke about, the MOX fuel
15 that was being readied for the Hanford generating
16 station. And the Department of Energy representative
17 said that had nothing to do with them and that it was
18 all Energy Northwest's doing. But you work in
19 partnership, and so we feel, based on that, that it's
20 not a trustworthy thing to say that we can agree that
21 you would be able to protect such a repository that
22 would multiply the degree of contamination at the
23 site.

24 I mirror the comments of most all of the people
25 that were here tonight, including elected officials

1 from both -- elected and appointed officials from
2 both Oregon and Washington who say, Don't bring the
3 stuff here. We agree.

4 And there was a gentleman who asked earlier
5 where the stuff was coming from and why couldn't it
6 be left where it was in terms of nuclear waste, and
7 it's my understanding -- and it's common knowledge --
8 that it's even being discussed that we would be
9 importing nuclear waste from Europe and that it would
10 travel through the United States, and that there
11 would be American corporations springing up that
12 would deal with the waste stream and transmute it and
13 say, Pay us and we'll take your waste off your hands
14 and we'll do dump it at Hanford. It's already moved
15 across the Great Lakes from Canada. There's a
16 company in Tennessee that wants to take it from
17 Germany, and we have no say in all this. And we
18 don't think it is appropriate.

19 Leave it where it's at. Make the people who
20 make the stuff responsible for it forever. Leave it
21 in place, make them deal with it, and we'll deal with
22 our own. Thank you.

23 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Our next speaker is
24 Carol Panfilio, and Ethan Scarl will be after Carol.

25 MS. PANFILIO: I'm from Vancouver, Washington.

1 The Department of Energy has a long history of
2 careless irresponsibility with regards to toxic and
3 hazardous waste disposal. What are the number of
4 lives that you feel are expendable through death or
5 illness in carrying hazardous loads of highly
6 radioactive waste on roads greatly populated in
7 Washington, Oregon, and the rest of the country?

8 I say no lives should be lost or illness given
9 with the negligent and unnecessary movement of
10 nuclear waste and extra storage of toxic materials.
11 Tesla, come back. Where are you?

12 MR. BROWN: Okay. Ethan is at the podium. John
13 Felton will follow you.

14 MR. SCARL: Very good. My name is Ethan Scarl.
15 I'm with Alliance for Democracy. I'm a physicist,
16 retired. You gentle people did not create this
17 nuclear waste, but you are charged with disposing of
18 it in some rational fashion. It's an immense and
19 impossibly impossible charge. There's been a lot of
20 talk about space and volume, numbers of truckloads.

21 There has not been much talk about time, how
22 long does this have to endure? And a reasonable
23 estimate, given the half lives of some of the
24 isotopes, is a hundred thousand years, which has been
25 mentioned before. That's 25 times the length of

1 written recorded history of the human race. What can
2 happen? How can we protect it? Has anybody actually
3 tried to deal with this incredible problem? And the
4 answer is, oddly, yes.

5 There is a model that's -- someone referred to
6 it earlier. Let me just ask for a show of hands.
7 Anyone here heard of Olkiluoto? Anyone? One or two
8 hands. It's amazing. That may be one of the most
9 important sites in the world. It's in Northern
10 Finland, and it's the repository under construction
11 for the disposal of all the waste from Finland only.
12 It's scheduled -- it's under construction. It's
13 scheduled to be finished in 2020. It's going to be
14 closed with the entrance bombed shut in the year
15 2100. It's intended to enclose the waste from one
16 small country for -- that is generated over 100
17 years, and it has to protect all life on the planet
18 from that waste for a hundred thousand years. And
19 they're talking about it seriously.

20 Now, the reason I know about this is because, by
21 coincidence, there is a movie showing in Portland
22 right now at the Living Room Theater at Southwest
23 10th and Stark called Into Eternity. It documents
24 that. It's a beautifully made movie. It's not
25 contentious in its atmosphere. It shows high-level

1 officials from Scandinavian countries trying to think
2 about what does it mean, a hundred thousand years?
3 How do you prevent human intrusion for cultures you
4 cannot possibly guess what they're going to be like?
5 What will they know? Will they have high technology?
6 Will they be digging with bows and arrows? Will
7 somebody with high technology dig a hole into this
8 thing, and then people who have no clue about what
9 radiation is will come after them?

10 There were debates of do we try to forget this?
11 Do we wipe this from our memory, do we make it
12 secret, or do we try to let people know? And the
13 legal decision by the legislature in Helsinki was
14 yes, we'll try to make our children know about it,
15 and their children and their children and their
16 children to know that this is a place you do not go,
17 and teach their children to remember to forget and to
18 never go there.

19 MR. BROWN: About 30 seconds left, please.

20 MR. SCARL: So I encourage you to go see that
21 thing. It's an amazing thing, and it's very well
22 done, pleasant. And my message to you is to say that
23 if you're really going to be serious about dealing
24 with this thing, it's an immense proposition. Look
25 what they're going through -- enormous construction,

1 half a kilometer down and many kilometers of
2 tunnel -- and try to extrapolate that from Finland to
3 the United States and see what that implies. If
4 we're going to be serious about it, there is a bit of
5 a model, and I encourage you to look at it.

6 MR. BROWN: Thank you. John Felton.

7 (No response.)

8 Paige Knight. And it looks like maybe Anita
9 Derry is after Paige.

10 MS. KNIGHT: On a light note, I have to thank
11 you for having the microphone up here so that we get
12 to talk to the audience as well. That's sort of a
13 rare thing in hearings in my (inaudible)
14 relationship.

15 I have a few comments. I'm trying not to be
16 redundant. And, actually, in my years of dealing
17 with all the proposals from the Department of Energy,
18 things have gotten -- I sort of reduced everything
19 down to what I consider simplicity, which is, I
20 think, really important. But before I start there, I
21 want to say something concerning the young man who
22 had the body-shaking courage to come up here and give
23 an opposite point of view of the rest of us. I
24 talked to him out in the hallway as he was hurriedly
25 and very shakily moving out of the meeting.

1 The sentiment that resonated with me from him is
2 that he didn't want to separate his Oregonian
3 citizenship from his American citizenship. And that
4 really goes to one of my points. The solutions that
5 are being made are not good solutions. And I've
6 heard a lot of you say let's go back to the drawing
7 board. I don't think people are capable right now of
8 thinking outside the box.

9 This waste, any of the wastes that are going to
10 be brought to us for consideration over the next
11 century, really, don't -- they shouldn't be moved
12 anywhere, and we need to come up with a new solution.
13 And the solution isn't at Hanford, but it's not
14 something I want to dump on other places too, because
15 it's not necessarily the right answer.

16 So going from there, I want to stress that the
17 amount of radioactivity and the severity of the
18 radionuclides involved in the load is far more
19 serious than the size of the area being considered at
20 Hanford. And I am partial to saying not at Hanford,
21 but I would also say not anywhere right now, because
22 I don't think we're thinking clearly about nuclear
23 waste. Hanford's mission in particular is cleanup.
24 Adding more waste, even after the start-up of the
25 waste treatment plant, is counterintuitive. The

1 plant will have some fits and starts. The funding is
2 never assured.

3 We in the Pacific Northwest have had our load of
4 dose and contamination. That's true for any site in
5 the country that has a nuclear site of any sort. As
6 the Oregonian aptly stated in today's editorial,
7 adding more waste means we'll never be done with
8 cleanup. We've been promised cleanup for -- since
9 1989. This mission, if accepted or enforced by the
10 powers that be, will continue forever, because we
11 will continue to create this and other wastes unless
12 we stop the creation and proliferation of nuclear
13 wastes of any sort; and that is through weapons
14 making, through power. And then we have to deal with
15 medical waste as well.

16 So those -- to me, that is simply it. We cannot
17 afford to keep doing this, and we don't have a
18 groundswell in this nation yet to prevent this, but
19 it starts here. It certainly has been a wonderful
20 showing tonight. I don't want to vilify either of
21 you. You're not even going to be cleaning up the
22 waste, are you? You're just sort of running the show
23 for people, and I thank you for how kindly you've
24 treated people tonight. So I leave you with that,
25 and we have a lot of work to do ahead of us, and we

1 need to pass this on to younger generations to deal
2 with. We need a nuclear guardianship to follow our
3 demise and death. Thank you.

4 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Theodora Tsongas
5 following Anita Derry, correct?

6 MS. DERRY: That's correct.

7 MR. BROWN: Good.

8 MR. SCARL: I'm from the Portland metro area,
9 and I'd like to thank the lady who's doing the
10 recording. I've been watching you for some time, and
11 I think it's -- it's so important that we each speak
12 out. I didn't come with anything prepared, and I'm
13 really glad to be at the end because I've learned a
14 lot tonight. And I feel some inspiration.

15 Last night I stayed up kind of late looking at
16 the Internet, mostly about Fukushima, and I asked my
17 dad tonight if he wanted to come. He's going to be
18 89 in July, and he said he wasn't up for it. And,
19 actually, since Fukushima happened, I've seen my dad
20 change radically.

21 He's always been a very well informed
22 individual, strong feelings about social justice. He
23 was a World War II pilot on a Bombardier. But he's
24 begun to withdraw. And all the magazines he gets --
25 they're all left, he's very progressive -- he's

1 pretty much not reading, and he's started to read
2 fiction, which he read as a young child. And he's
3 disheartened. So I try not to tell him too much
4 about what I think about things, because I'm a
5 pessimist. But I did tell him about the nuclear
6 meltdowns that are happening in Japan and massive
7 amounts of radioactive seawater that are dumped every
8 day, that there could be dire consequences that are
9 going to affect the planet.

10 So what I would like to tell the Department of
11 Energy is, this isn't about them or any of their
12 employees or any of the other agencies or our
13 government. It's really about the people of this
14 planet and all of the species. And I think that as
15 long as we are engaged with the view of
16 self-centeredness at the expense of all of us as one,
17 we're never going to get it right.

18 Now, I don't know if I'm going to be around in
19 10,000 years. I don't know what will be around in
20 10,000 years, but I think they're entitled to the
21 same opportunity that I was born in. And I came in
22 the early '50s. The other night I watched a show on
23 the atomic energy industry, Soviet, U.S. It was
24 pathetic, just pathetic. We are so shortsighted. So
25 my request to them is, don't bring it to Hanford,

1 don't take it anywhere. I'm really encouraged by
2 what they're doing in Finland. Please, please,
3 please talk to the Finns and quit producing the
4 stuff, because we know we can't contain it. We know
5 it's deadly to everything. And as an individual that
6 was born from Oregon -- my family moved west and came
7 here --

8 MR. BROWN: You've got about 30 seconds.

9 MS. DERRY: I don't have much left of my life,
10 but I'm willing to take on our government at this
11 point, because, really, they're not representing me
12 or anybody I know anymore. Corporations, we know
13 what's happening with that, we know what's happening
14 with our political system. And I think it's time
15 that all of us stand up and say enough is enough.
16 You need to stop what you're doing, change the way
17 we're interrelating with our planet and with other
18 people. And I think there's a lot of people in this
19 state and throughout the United States that are
20 willing to go out into the streets and take -- you
21 know, take action. So that's my message.

22 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

23 MS. DERRY: I'm really glad everybody showed up.

24 MR. BROWN: Is Theodora Tsongas here?

25 (No response.)

1 I have someone whose first name is Jamie, and
2 the last name might be Anderson.

3 (No response.)

4 John Nash?

5 (No response.)

6 You can say "here" if you're here. How about
7 Lisa Mance?

8 MS. MANCE: I'm here.

9 MR. BROWN: Terrific. And Dolores Huntada, if
10 she's here, she would be next.

11 MS. MANCE: I want to thank everybody that has
12 stuck around through this marathon. I appreciate it.
13 Thank you guys also for being so wonderful to
14 everybody tonight. You've been great.

15 So as far as Hanford, my stand on the issue,
16 clean it up first, and don't put any new waste there.
17 And we need to do more research into how we're going
18 to handle this waste in the first place, because it
19 sounds like a lot of this discussion is based around
20 the cost of the cleanup, the cost of where we're
21 putting it. It's much cheaper to dig a giant hole in
22 the earth and dump waste there than it is to dig
23 down, like the National Academy of Sciences
24 suggested, into the granite shield of North America.
25 That's going to cost more, yes. It's going to take a

1 while, yes, but it will likely be safer for the
2 people involved, and don't we owe it to the people
3 who are affected to do that?

4 So I'm a registered nurse, and I wanted to share
5 a quick story -- I apologize. I get emotional -- of
6 a child that I took care of who contracted a cancer,
7 preventable cancer, from toxins in the environment
8 where she lived. And she was adorable. She played.
9 She colored in books. She was great. She was a
10 really sweet child. And when the doctors told her
11 family that there was nothing they could do, it was
12 too rare of a cancer, too rare of a cancer for them
13 to do anything, she handled it better than I've seen
14 any adult handle a cancer diagnosis.

15 I watched her going from playing in her bed to
16 being on a ventilator and being unable to sustain her
17 own life. I held her mother's hand as she watched
18 her daughter take her last breath, and all of this
19 was completely preventable. It didn't have to
20 happen. Tell me, if this was your daughter, that you
21 wouldn't want to see due diligence done on this issue
22 so that we did the right thing and we protected our
23 community. Tell me, if this wasn't your daughter,
24 that you would want every penny spent to make sure
25 that this was done in a way that didn't threaten

1 people's lives.

2 So please, on behalf of the people that can be
3 affected, don't let this happen again. Protect our
4 children, protect us, and do what's right. Don't
5 dump any more waste at Hanford, and please clean up
6 the mess that you've already created. Thank you.

7 MR. BROWN: Dolores Hurtado.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: She left.

9 MR. BROWN: Okay. Hugh Delanty. Okay. And
10 then Linda Olson-Osterlund will be after Hugh.

11 MR. DELANTY: Thank you, sir. My name is Hugh
12 Delanty. I'm a retired U.S. civil servant, and I was
13 a natural resource planner. I worked for the United
14 States government, and I had plenty of chance over
15 the years to talk about this and all kinds of other
16 issues related to resource development. And I've
17 heard an awful lot and learned some new things
18 tonight that I hadn't really realized before, and I
19 appreciate being able to come to a place where I
20 could hear that.

21 One of the things that has really occurred to me
22 as I've listened, there's been talk about digging
23 these sites in the Canadian shield where nuclear
24 waste could be safely stored. I mean, now, as safely
25 as we can do, and it's not totally safe either. But

1 we could be doing that, but that seems to be not a
2 viable alternative because there's tremendous
3 political opposition.

4 And as a civil servant, I know what a real
5 obstacle it is to have a politician against you for
6 some darn thing. I mean, you know, it doesn't matter
7 if they're making sense or whether their stand makes
8 sense or anything else. And with due respect to our
9 friends here, I think they're kind of up against
10 that. They can't really tell all these Eastern
11 congressmen and senators about all this stuff.

12 But, you know, nuclear power is something where
13 the true costs of it are not being fairly accessed.
14 The people who are demanding nuclear power, they
15 should have to pay the true costs of it, and that
16 includes this two or three billion, or whatever it
17 is, to dig these holes. They're getting by without
18 paying for some of the stuff that they're doing. And
19 I don't think that's right. And I think our Congress
20 is really remiss by not acting out laws that will
21 fairly distribute all this.

22 And, you know, does anybody here besides me feel
23 like it is time that our politicians started getting
24 honest with us about, you know, the resources are
25 finite and the nuclear power, you know, it can't be

1 expanded indefinitely. Jeez, you know, unlimited
2 growth is the etiology of a cancer cell. I stole
3 that from Edward Abbey.

4 But I don't know. I guess there's a lot of
5 other things I can say, but I think the people that
6 are using nuclear power in the East, and all the
7 other people that want to dump all this stuff out
8 here, they have not been told the true costs of
9 nuclear power. So I am strongly in favor of stuff
10 being taken care of at the site. They're getting the
11 benefit of it, and they ought to pay for it, and we
12 should not pay for it. I am flatly and unalterably
13 against dumping more waste. I cannot believe that
14 that was ever selected as a site, because we're
15 putting waste into the ground right next to the
16 largest river in the American West. That's what
17 we've done.

18 By the way, I'm from Vancouver, Washington, but
19 isotopes come down the right side of the Columbia
20 River as well as the left too. Thank you.

21 MR. BROWN: Linda Olson-Osterlund?

22 (No response.)

23 John Gilbert?

24 (No response.)

25 Chris Kerch?

1 (No response.)

2 Nancy Newell?

3 MS. NEWELL: Is it my turn?

4 MR. BROWN: It is.

5 MS. NEWELL: Well, what do you know?

6 MR. BROWN: Without much warning.

7 MS. NEWELL: I guess, you know, we know a lot in
8 this part of the country. Oh boy, do we do our
9 homework. I am a survivor of the Three Mile Island
10 accident. How many people know about Three Mile
11 Island in the '70s? I am 63 years old, and I have
12 made it this far. I have been able to testify before
13 many committees and do a lot of activism, and it's a
14 pleasure to be refreshing these people's minds take
15 back our message, as this young woman said, we don't
16 need this anymore, we don't want anymore. You
17 haven't taken care of the problems at Hanford, you
18 haven't shown that it's solvable. Why do we keep
19 producing it?

20 I closed -- not only helped close Trojan Nuclear
21 Plant but also, as a result of Three Mile Island,
22 people got together, and where I lived on Long Island
23 they were building another massive project. And they
24 came in and said, you know, if you don't have this
25 plant, you won't have any lights on Long Island.

1 You'll be out of electricity, and you'll be dark and
2 cold. And we looked at all the guys in suits and
3 said "Okay."

4 So, you know, when it gets ludicrous, which this
5 is, how do you respond as a human being? Well, we
6 responded there, and it never opened. We never
7 opened this massive billion-dollar plant. Isn't that
8 a phenomenal accomplishment? So I think this will
9 happen here, because the wisdom of the people has so
10 carried through to everyone that the messages you're
11 going to get is that we're going to continue to fight
12 this and change this.

13 We were uninhabitable, what, how many millions
14 of years ago, because of the radiation that was on
15 this planet? We were given the life that we have,
16 the joy, the gifts, the beauty, the magnificence.
17 You've been in Oregon. You can see this is a
18 cherished state for everything that it offers. So
19 why in the world would we want to contaminate with
20 something that proved life can't keep surviving? I
21 mean, we've been given a gift. This is so odd and so
22 hard to comprehend. And how do you pass that message
23 on to your children except by saying, Enough.

24 And whoever convinced someone to start this
25 thing -- I don't know how it ever got started, but

1 we've got to stop it, and we're going to stop it
2 right here, right now, and you're going to take that
3 message back, and we're not going to see any more
4 discussion about more of this at Hanford. We're
5 going to try to solve the problems. I don't like to
6 use the word clean up. This stuff you don't clean
7 up. It's in existence. You hope to God you can at
8 least contain it in some way. Thank you.

9 MR. BROWN: I think it's Joe Uris.

10 (No response.)

11 Michael Crabbe?

12 (No response.)

13 Dirk Dunning?

14 MR. DUNNING: If I'm not mistaken, I think I'm
15 last. I'm Dirk Dunning. I'm an employee of the
16 State of Oregon, Department of Energy. I'm mostly
17 going to be speaking on my own behalf. There are no
18 prepared remarks. I first wanted to thank Arnie and
19 you and all of your crew for coming. It is immensely
20 important to us, and, as you can tell, it's important
21 to our citizenry. Silently in the back we have Mary
22 Beth Burandt. Thank you for coming. Thank you for
23 listening. She's the document manager for the Tank
24 Closure & Waste Management (inaudible) impact
25 statement, which is also being worked on. It is also

1 important that she is here representing that effort,
2 as well as hearing what all Oregonians have to say.

3 But mostly, thank you to all of you for coming.
4 My boss, unfortunately, had to leave. We're under
5 furlough this week. Tomorrow we're unemployed for
6 the day, and he timed out for the day and had to
7 leave. So the honor fell to me to listen to the end,
8 and I thank you very much, everybody who is here,
9 particularly the younger folks. We tried very hard
10 to get people out that are younger, and it's very
11 heartening to see so many tonight.

12 I won't have much to say in terms of comments
13 about the particular EIS because we are working on
14 comments and will be speaking on behalf of the state
15 representing all of you as best we can. So part of
16 what we are doing in a meeting like this is coming to
17 listen, so we can hear all the perspectives of
18 everyone, and we deeply appreciate that.

19 On my own behalf, just a couple of comments.
20 One, to recognize that this problem, like so many, at
21 Hanford and others is not a problem. It's a
22 predicament. And the distinction is that problems
23 can be solved. Predicaments have to be dealt with.
24 To the degree you can, you solve them, but you never
25 can completely. Hanford, given the best efforts

1 possible and as much money as we can spend, will not
2 be clean. The tank closure EIS and many other that
3 came before, and many that will come after it, show
4 that even with the best efforts, the levels far
5 exceed standards for vast times in the future. And
6 that brings me to my last comment.

7 I have been working for the state now for 18
8 years trying to ensure that Hanford is cleaned up as
9 best we can with whatever "cleanup" means in that
10 sense. I will be retired, most likely, before the
11 Waste Treatment Plant begins operation for vitrified
12 (inaudible) waste. To put this EIS and that in some
13 perspective, my grandfather was the number six badge
14 at the Hanford site. He came to Hanford in 1974, the
15 first crew from DuPont. His father, my grandfather,
16 came to the state of Washington and settled in the
17 Ellenburg Valley.

18 Actually, his grandfather brought him when he
19 was less than one year old. I'm a second generation
20 American. My grandfather came here before Washington
21 was a state. I can trace my line back through
22 Theophilus Dunning who arrived on this continent in
23 1642, and then further back into England, to the year
24 1238 and the (inaudible) line. That is 773 years
25 ago. We don't know who came before that.

1 There's much that we don't know, but we can also
2 trace back and we can see the first civilizations,
3 the big civilizations that we know nothing about at
4 seven to 10,000 years ago. We don't know anything
5 about these people. We can go back to the cave art
6 in Lascaux in France and some of the aboriginal art
7 at 60,000 years ago. That is not far enough to
8 protect this waste into the future. We need to be
9 very careful to think how can we do this to protect
10 it as long as it needs to be protected. And again,
11 thank you all.

12 MR. BROWN: Well, that concludes those who have
13 signed up to speak. I want to thank you for your
14 attendance. Is there a TV show called Survivor or
15 something like that? Anyway, it was a great turnout
16 tonight, terrific comments.

17 Just a reminder that the comment period for this
18 EIS, Draft EIS, remains open until June 27th. So if
19 you heard things from your friends and neighbors
20 tonight that you would like to elaborate on, pass on
21 to DOE, you have until the 27th to submit comments in
22 any form. So again, thanks for your attendance, and
23 we are adjourned.

24 (THE PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 9:48 P.M.)

25

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, Heather A. Summers, Certified Shorthand Reporter,
do hereby certify that I reported the foregoing
public meeting at the time and place mentioned in the
caption herein; that said presentation, together with
all public comments, was taken down by me in
stenotype and thereafter reduced to typewriting; and
that the foregoing transcript, Pages 1 to 130, both
inclusive, constitutes a full, true and accurate
record of said public meeting, and of all other
proceedings had during the taking of said meeting,
and of the whole thereof, to the best of my ability.

Witness my hand at Portland, Oregon, this 27th
day of May 2011.

Heather A. Summers

CSR No. 92-0245

RPR No. 801810