

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

+ + + + +

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING  
FOR THE GREATER-THAN-CLASS C  
LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

+ + + + +

PASCO, WASHINGTON

+ + + + +

Tuesday,  
August 28, 2007

+ + + + +

Red Lion Hotel  
Silver Room  
2525 North 20th Avenue  
Pasco, Washington

The above-entitled meeting was conducted at 7:00  
p.m.

BEFORE:  
HOLMES BROWN, Facilitator

## ALSO PRESENT:

CHRISTINE GELLES, Director  
Office of Disposal Operations (EM-12)  
Department of Energy

JAMES JOYCE, GTCC EIS Document Manager  
Department of Energy

GEORGE DIXON, Senior Technical Advisor  
GTCC EIS  
Department of Energy

JOEL KRISTAL  
Office of Disposal Operations  
Department of Energy

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

C O N T E N T S

SPEAKER	Page
Christine Gelles Director, DOE Office of Disposal Operations	6
Q&A Session	30
Public Comment:	
Ron Skinnarland State of Washington Department of Ecology	35
Gene Kinsey	40
Faye Vlieger	41
Tom Larsen Pasco City Council	45
Todd Martin	45
Gerald Pollet	46
Bob Smith	51

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 MR. BROWN: If folks will take their  
3 seats, we'll get started with this evening's meeting.  
4 Thanks.

5 Good evening. Welcome to this public  
6 scoping meeting on the Proposed Environmental Impact  
7 Statement for the disposal of greater-than-class C  
8 radioactive waste.

9 The development of an environmental impact  
10 statement for this project by the Department of  
11 Energy's Office of Disposal Operations is required by  
12 the National Environmental Policy Act.

13 My name is Holmes Brown. I will serve as  
14 the facilitator for this evening's meeting. My role  
15 is to make sure that the meeting runs on schedule and  
16 that everybody has an opportunity to speak.

17 I'm not an employee of the Department of  
18 Energy, or an advocate for any party or position.

19 At the registration table, you should have  
20 received a green participant's packet. If you have  
21 not received one, please raise your hand and staff can  
22 provide you with one. The packet looks like this and  
23 I guess we've got--we had one up here too, and then  
24 was there in the back row too? Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           This packet contains important information  
2 and even a copy of the slides of the presentation to  
3 follow, and there's a convenient place to take notes  
4 during the briefing.

5           There are three purposes for tonight's  
6 meeting. First, to provide information on the  
7 proposed environmental impact statement or EIS, and on  
8 the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, that  
9 governs the process. Second, to answer your questions  
10 on the proposed EIS and NEPA.

11           And third, to receive and record your  
12 formal comments on the scope of the proposed EIS.

13           The agenda for tonight's meeting reflects  
14 these purposes. We will begin with a presentation by  
15 Ms. Christine Gelles regarding the Proposed  
16 Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal of  
17 greater-than-class C waste.

18           Ms. Gelles is the director of the Office  
19 of Disposal Operations, which is the DOE office  
20 charged with preparing the EIS.

21           To answer your questions, project staff  
22 will be available throughout the evening at the  
23 display posters over here. They can discuss the  
24 proposed EIS and the NEPA process, the contents of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 printed materials in your packet, and the contents of  
2 the DOE presentation.

3           Once we convene, the court reporter will  
4 be available to receive your comments and suggestions  
5 regarding the scope of the proposed EIS for greater-  
6 than-class C waste. All of your comments will be  
7 transcribed and made part of the permanent record.

8           We'll begin with the presentation by Ms.  
9 Christine Gelles. She will discuss the background of  
10 the project and the purpose and basic elements of the  
11 proposed EIS.

12           MS. GELLES: Thanks, Holmes.

13           Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, and  
14 welcome to the greater-than-class C low-level  
15 radioactive waste Environmental Impact Statement  
16 public scoping meeting.

17           I will refer to the document throughout my  
18 presentation as the GTCC EIS.

19           I am Christine Gelles. I do direct the  
20 Office of Disposal Operations. That's within the  
21 Office of Environmental Management which is the  
22 program charged with cleaning up the Hanford site  
23 within the Department of Energy at DOE headquarters.

24           The Department was charged, is charged by  
25 Congress to develop a disposal capability for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 commercial greater-than-class C low-level radioactive  
2 waste, again, we refer to that as GTCC low-level  
3 waste, and to take actions related to the preparation  
4 of an environmental impact statement.

5 I am pleased to be here and thank you very  
6 much for coming out to discuss the document with us  
7 tonight. This meeting is your first opportunity to  
8 present your comments, concerns, issues and  
9 suggestions regarding the proposed scope of the EIS.

10 Your involvement and input is very  
11 important to us and we will be taking careful note of  
12 what you say here tonight. All comments received  
13 through this process will be very carefully considered  
14 as we work through the process of analyzing and  
15 domestic violence a disposal capability for GTCC low-  
16 level waste.

17 The National Environmental Policy Act,  
18 referred to as NEPA, requires that an environmental  
19 impact statement be developed for any major federal  
20 action that has the potential to impact the quality of  
21 the environment, and the Department has determined  
22 that developing a disposal capability for GTCC low-  
23 level waste is a major federal action and therefore  
24 needs to be the subject of an EIS.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           We are in just the beginning stages of the  
2 NEPA process, with the primary focus at this time  
3 being the identification of the scope of the EIS,  
4 including the alternatives that will be considered and  
5 the potential disposal locations and methods.

6           The comments we receive here tonight, and  
7 throughout the public scoping period, which continues  
8 through September 21st, will be considered as we  
9 develop a draft environmental impact statement. We  
10 will then make that draft document available for  
11 public comment, and any comments received on it will  
12 be considered carefully as we move towards the final  
13 version of that document, and, ultimately, a record of  
14 decision.

15           As I will discuss later, before we make a  
16 decision as a result of this analysis, this EIS, we  
17 must report to Congress on the alternative or  
18 alternatives considered, and what is recommended, and  
19 await their action before implementing the record of  
20 decision.

21           So you can see, we are at the very early  
22 stages of the process, and we have several years of  
23 analysis ahead of us, and work before us, before we  
24 will be implementing any action.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1           Even after Congress' action as a result of  
2 that report, which will be based on our final EIS,  
3 there will be additional activities required prior to  
4 implementation, which may include licensing by a third  
5 party such as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

6           Now before I get into the slide  
7 presentation, which provides a fair amount of detail  
8 on many elements of the proposed scope of the EIS, I  
9 thought it would be helpful if we just talk at a  
10 summary level about what greater-than-class C low-  
11 level waste is.

12           It is generated from commercial activity  
13 such as the production of electricity via nuclear  
14 reactors. It's also produced when radioactive sealed  
15 sources become discarded and are unused. Those sealed  
16 sources are used in common everyday practice, an  
17 important function such as the diagnosis and treatment  
18 of cancer.

19           The volume of greater-than-class C low-  
20 level waste, both today and projected, is small  
21 compared to the other volumes, the volumes of other  
22 commercial low-level radioactive waste streams. We'll  
23 talk, in some detail, about how the NRC classifies  
24 low-level waste in the slides to come.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           But greater-than-class C low-level waste  
2 has higher radioactive activity and therefore requires  
3 special disposal considerations under the Nuclear  
4 Regulatory Commission regulations, and that's why the  
5 Department of Energy, the Federal Government, is  
6 chartered with doing this EIS.

7           There is a copy of my presentation in the  
8 handouts, in the folders, if you want to follow along.  
9 It also has some important reference information  
10 related to our greater-than-class C EIS Web site.

11           Let's get started. The Notice of Intent  
12 was published on July 23rd of this year, 2007, and  
13 about a week later, a correction appeared in the  
14 Federal Register because there was a printing error  
15 that occurred in the inventory table, which is a  
16 pretty critical piece of the information within the  
17 Notice of Intent. We do apologize for that  
18 unfortunate event.

19           The publication of the Notice of Intent  
20 served several purposes for the Department. It  
21 announced our intent to prepare an EIS. It also  
22 announced our intent to analyze the DOE greater-than-  
23 class C like inventory as well as the commercial  
24 greater-than-class C waste, and again, we'll get into

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 what comprises that waste stream in some detail, here,  
2 in a few moments.

3 The Notice of Intent formally initiated  
4 the EIS process. It requested the public's comment on  
5 the proposed scope and announced these public scoping  
6 meetings. It also provided information on the waste  
7 forecast, what's in storage today and what is  
8 projected to be generated, both from the commercial  
9 licensees and the DOE waste streams.

10 It estimates that the total currently  
11 stored and projected inventory is a total inventory of  
12 5,600 cubic meters of waste, which will be generated  
13 over the next six decades.

14 It identified the purpose and need for the  
15 EIS. It identified the proposed action. It  
16 identified the proposed disposal alternatives,  
17 including the differing methods and the possible  
18 disposal locations.

19 It responded to the public comments that  
20 we received on the Advance Notice of Intent which was  
21 published in May of 2005.

22 MR. BROWN: It wasn't for you, Christine.

23 MS. GELLES: Thank you very much. I was  
24 worried. I was worried. I turned off my cell phones  
25 and they always find me.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           It also identified that the USEPA will be  
2 participating as a cooperating agency in this EIS, and  
3 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission as a commenting  
4 agency.

5           The purpose and need for the action. It  
6 is derived from the fact that the NRC and agreement  
7 state licensees generated greater-than-class C low-  
8 level waste. Some of this waste exists today and  
9 until we complete this environmental impact statement  
10 and move towards implementation of a solution, that  
11 waste has no outlet.

12           DOE has that statutory responsibility to  
13 develop this EIS and ultimately develop the disposal  
14 capability, and we also own and generate certain low-  
15 level waste and transuranic waste streams that have  
16 very similar characteristics to the commercial  
17 greater-than-class C low-level waste streams, and  
18 which today, we do not believe have a disposal path.  
19 We refer to those waste streams as DOE greater-than-  
20 class C-like waste.

21           There are three primary legislative  
22 drivers for us to perform this environmental impact  
23 statement. The first, the original, is the Low Level  
24 Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1985. It is this  
25 statute that assigned the Federal Government the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 responsibility for developing the GTCC Low-Level Waste  
2 disposal capability. The National Environmental  
3 Policy Act of 1969 is what establishes the framework.  
4 It creates the requirement for federal agencies to  
5 consider the environmental impacts of our proposed  
6 actions, and alternatives to those proposed actions.  
7 It also establishes the framework for the public's  
8 input to that process.

9 And more recently, the Energy Policy Act  
10 of 2005 included two specific report requirements  
11 related to the GTCC Low-Level Waste EIS.

12 The first was that we provide, I think  
13 within 180 days of the enactment of this statute, a  
14 report to Congress estimating the cost and schedule to  
15 develop this environmental impact statement.

16 We did submit that report in July of 2006.  
17 It is available on our greater-than-class C EIS  
18 Project Web page.

19 The second requirement is the one I  
20 previously mentioned. It is that we report to  
21 Congress on the alternative or alternatives evaluated  
22 through the EIS. There are a number of other  
23 reporting elements that are specified in this specific  
24 report requirement, that are intended to update  
25 Congress on the information that was originally

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 included in a 1987 report required by the Low-Level  
2 Waste Policy Act amendments.

3 A lot of time has passed and there is a  
4 real need to update many of those data fields. But  
5 most importantly, this section of the Energy Policy  
6 Act requires us to await Congress's action before  
7 implementing a record of decision.

8 There are many people who've probably been  
9 involved with other NEPA documents, but this is the  
10 first time I'm aware that Congress has, in statute,  
11 inserted themselves into the NEPA process. It's a  
12 pretty significant precedent.

13 What this does mean is that we will be  
14 unable to take any action, unable to move forward in  
15 implementation for disposal of commercial greater-  
16 than-class C low-level waste without their support,  
17 and you'll hear me reinforce that.

18 So what is low-level waste? What is  
19 greater-than-class C low-level waste? It is one of  
20 the four classifications of low-level waste,  
21 commercial low-level waste that's defined by the  
22 regulatory commissions' regulations. It is the most  
23 radioactive of the four classes.

24 Low-level waste includes items that become  
25 contaminated through exposure to radioactive, or have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 become contaminated with radioactive material just  
2 through the generation of nuclear power.

3 It comes in many forms--clothing,  
4 equipment and tools, household items, everyday items,  
5 once they're disposed of. It also comes in the form  
6 of soil, building debris, water treatment residues,  
7 anything that becomes contaminated with radiation.

8 It is generated literally throughout the United  
9 States.

10 There is a little more information about  
11 the four classifications of low-level waste under the  
12 NRC regulations. Class A, B, and C low-level waste  
13 can be disposed of today in existing commercial near-  
14 surface disposal facilities.

15 The NRC regulations assume that greater-  
16 than-class C, which is the highest classification of  
17 low-level waste, it contains the highest  
18 concentrations of radioactivity, they assume it's not  
19 appropriate for near-surface disposal, in fact, that  
20 deep geologic disposal may be required.

21 Although the regs at the same time provide  
22 for the possibility of an alternate disposal  
23 methodology, if it is proposed to the NRC and  
24 ultimately approved by the NRC, and that is the reason  
25 why we have a range of disposal methods that we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 propose to analyze in this environmental impact  
2 statement.

3 Greater-than-class C low-level waste is  
4 low-level waste generated commercially, that has  
5 sufficient concentrations of radioactivity, that it  
6 exceeds the limits established for Class C waste.  
7 Again, it's generated throughout the United States,  
8 the medical industry through the power industry,  
9 through common industrial practices.

10 It can generally be grouped into three  
11 waste types--activated metals, sealed sources, and an  
12 "other" category. But there are very significant  
13 differences among these waste types or these sub waste  
14 streams that we will talk about.

15 Activated metals are primarily generated  
16 in nuclear reactors during facility decommissioning.  
17 They consist of the actual components of the reactor  
18 that become radioactive through neutron absorption  
19 that occurred during the reactor operations.

20 Then here is a picture of a radiation  
21 survey being taken on a component at a small research  
22 reactor that is being decommissioned. I'll remind you  
23 that there are 104 operating nuclear reactors in the  
24 U.S. today. Eighteen have already been  
25 decommissioned. A number of those already

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 decommissioned do store greater-than-class C low-level  
2 waste that was generated as a result of their  
3 decommissioning.

4 Much of the activated metal may require  
5 handling as a remote-handled waste because of its  
6 radioactivity. Sealed sources. They typically are  
7 very small, highly radioactive materials that are  
8 encapsulated in some sort of metal shielding.

9 They're used for sterilizing medical  
10 products, assisting in the diagnosis and treatment of  
11 cancer, non-invasive surgery, and a bunch of  
12 industrial purposes such as well logging.

13 Sources are found, again, throughout the  
14 United States, but not all sealed sources are greater-  
15 than-class C. Many can be safely managed and disposed  
16 today as Class A, B, or C low-level waste. The ones  
17 we are addressing here, that are included in our  
18 inventory estimate, are those that meet the definition  
19 of greater-than-class C, those that could not be  
20 disposed of in existing near-surface disposal  
21 facilities that exist in commercial industry.

22 And the "other" waste category. This  
23 includes any commercially generated, greater-than-  
24 class C low-level waste that is not an activated metal  
25 or is not a sealed source.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   It would consist of contaminated  
2 equipment, debris, trash, decontamination and  
3 decommissioning waste that results from the cleanup of  
4 research facilities, industrial facilities that  
5 utilized radioactive material.

6                   We expect that there are only a few  
7 commercial licensees that have or will generate this  
8 category of greater-than-class C low-level waste. The  
9 majority of the commercial inventory estimate is  
10 activated metals or future sealed sources, once they  
11 become disused.

12                   DOE greater-than-class C-like waste is a  
13 term that we use to describe the population of DOE-  
14 generated waste that had very similar characteristics  
15 to commercial greater-than-class C waste, but which  
16 today do not have a disposal path. It's comprised of  
17 DOE-generated low-level waste or transuranic waste.  
18 It is owned by DOE, generated by our facilities. It  
19 may be generated by our activities that are performed  
20 in commercial facilities.

21                   The waste forms would be similar to the  
22 sub waste streams that are in the commercial  
23 inventory--activated metals, sealed sources and  
24 "other," but the distribution of the potential waste  
25 volume is very different in this DOE inventory.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           The DOE waste stream is largely comprised  
2 of the "other" category, that transuranic waste that  
3 is not activated metal and is not a sealed source.

4           The use of this term does not create a new  
5 waste classification. It does not mean that the NRC  
6 waste classifications apply to this waste stream. It  
7 is really a descriptive term. This is a summary  
8 comparison of the waste inventories, and we just want  
9 to remind you that the projected, both currently  
10 stored and projected-to-be generated inventory of both  
11 the commercial greater-than-class C waste and the DOE  
12 greater-than-class C-like waste totals 5,600 cubic  
13 meters.

14           Relative to the volumes of waste that the  
15 Department of Energy manages on a yearly basis, this  
16 is a small volume, but it does contain a significant  
17 amount of radioactivity, as much as 140 million curies  
18 of radioactivity. In volume terms, more than half of  
19 the projected inventory is DOE greater-than-class C-  
20 like waste but that contains just 31 million curies of  
21 the total hundred and forty. 2600 cubic meters of the  
22 projected inventory would be commercially generated,  
23 containing 110 million of the 140 million curies.

24           Most of the activated metals that comprise  
25 the commercial stream will not be generated for a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 number of decades because the existing nuclear  
2 reactors are going through a process of license  
3 extension, so their whole decommissioning is going to  
4 be pushed out for two to three decades.

5 So the majority of that activated  
6 contributor to the commercial stream is not to be  
7 generated until about 2035.

8 The volume of greater-than-class C and  
9 greater-than-class C-like, this 5600 cubic meter  
10 estimate, makes up less than 1/10th of one percent of  
11 the total estimated volume of commercial Class A, B,  
12 and C low-level waste that will be generated in the  
13 same time.

14 But, again, to put this in context,  
15 although the volume is small, that small volume  
16 contains seven times greater radioactivity than the  
17 Class A, B, and C combined over that same time period.

18 A little bit about how we develop these  
19 estimates. We develop them through interviews,  
20 through reviews of historical records, through data  
21 calls just to various industry members, and other  
22 sources of information such as databases that are kept  
23 by the NRC and by the Department of Energy.

24 If they are summarized in the inventory  
25 report, which can be found on our DOE greater-than-

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 class C Project Web page, has a very long title, but  
2 it does describe, in some detail, the precise  
3 methodologies used for estimating each of these sub  
4 waste streams. It gives you more information on these  
5 sites that contribute to the DOE greater-than-class C-  
6 like inventory.

7           And what I would like to emphasize here  
8 tonight, because we've received a number of questions  
9 throughout the previous scoping meetings, is that this  
10 is an estimate for specific waste streams. It is not  
11 an open-ended estimate derived for bounding purposes,  
12 that could accommodate future waste streams that we  
13 don't even know will be generated.

14           Like it does not include every possible  
15 waste stream that would be generated by future  
16 Department of Energy programs.

17           There are a lot of specific program waste  
18 streams that are excluded from this inventory  
19 estimate, and we have the actual authors of this  
20 report here in the room with us, the contributors to  
21 the report, so if you have specific questions about  
22 what are in these estimates, please define them during  
23 the recess.

24           So moving on to our proposed action. The  
25 proposed action is to construct and operate a new

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 facility or facilities, or use an existing facility  
2 for the disposal of both the commercial greater-than-  
3 class C low-level waste and the DOE-like greater-than-  
4 class C waste.

5           Again, I want to remind you that this  
6 proposed action stems from our legislative driver that  
7 we received from Congress to proceed with development  
8 of this environmental impact statement and development  
9 of a greater-than-class C low-level waste disposal  
10 capability.

11           This is the range of proposed disposal  
12 alternatives we hope to include in the environmental  
13 impact statement.

14           We're very, very interested in what you  
15 think of these alternatives, and I want to assure you  
16 that at this point in the process, this early stage in  
17 the process, all of these alternatives have equal  
18 likelihood. I mean, we just don't know what the  
19 results of the analysis will point to, and I say that  
20 particularly in the case of the "no action"  
21 alternative. Often that is viewed as sort of a  
22 baseline against which we're going to measure the  
23 impacts of everything.

24           But it is quite possible, that because of  
25 the generation rates of these waste streams, that a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 "no action" alternative would be the preferred  
2 alternative.

3 So we range from no action, which again  
4 would entail the current and future-generated DOE  
5 greater-than-class C-like waste and the commercial  
6 greater-than-class C-like waste to be stored at  
7 designated locations, in perpetuity, consistent with  
8 ongoing regulations and practices.

9 The second alternative is disposal in a  
10 deep geologic repository at the Waste Isolation Pilot  
11 Plant in Carlsbad, New Mexico, that would entail both  
12 the commercial greater-than-class C and the DOE  
13 greater-than-class C-like wastes.

14 The third is disposal in a deep geologic  
15 repository at Yucca Mountain, which is the proposed  
16 site for the geologic repository for high-level waste  
17 and spent nuclear fuel.

18 And the fourth and fifth are the  
19 alternatives that are associated with our two  
20 disposal, alternate disposal methodologies. Enhanced  
21 near surface disposal, a new facility, and  
22 intermediate depth borehole disposal, and we intend to  
23 analyze each of those disposal methods at a number of  
24 existing DOE facilities as well as a commercial, a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 generic commercial facility to be sited in a human  
2 environment and an arid environment.

3 We'll talk, in some detail, about what led  
4 us to select the sites that are the proposed  
5 locations, that we'll talk about here tonight, and  
6 among them is Hanford. But before I go to those  
7 details, let me just explain that we do acknowledge  
8 that there are certain regulatory and legislative  
9 drivers, or I'm sorry, constraints for a number of  
10 these alternatives, and we realize that those are very  
11 real constraints. The fact that those constraints  
12 exist, though, that alone is not a reason for us to  
13 exclude them from this list of alternatives for  
14 analysis in the environmental impact statement.

15 Through the course of developing the  
16 environmental impact statement, we will analyze  
17 carefully what those constraints are, and what  
18 regulatory or legislative changes that would be  
19 required, in order to implement the alternative, if it  
20 were ultimately selected.

21 I'll talk a little bit more about each of  
22 the disposal methods. Deep geologic is the placement  
23 of waste in mine cavities deep beneath the Earth's  
24 surface. It is the configuration or the design  
25 employed at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 disposal of defense transuranic waste. It is the safe  
2 disposal method planned for Yucca Mountain for spent  
3 fuel and high-level waste.

4 Enhanced near-surface disposal. This  
5 entails placing waste in engineered structures,  
6 vaults, trenches, or other similar structures, within  
7 the upper 30 meter of the Earth's crust.

8 This picture, here, is an existent DOE  
9 disposal facility. I understand it's a picture of a  
10 Hanford facility, although our archives told us  
11 otherwise. It is here just to give you an example, a  
12 visual idea of what an enhanced near-surface disposal  
13 facility may look like. "May look like" is maybe an  
14 important word. We have an alternate design approach  
15 on the poster board. The truth is we are at the early  
16 stages of the process.

17 The exact design of this facility will be  
18 developed through the course of developing the EIS.  
19 If you have any ideas, any suggestions, any comments  
20 on these conceptual ideas, we do invite them tonight.

21 Intermediate depth borehole disposal is  
22 the placement of waste in augured boreholes that are  
23 deeper than the top 30 meters of the Earth's crust.

24 It's likely that this design approach  
25 would also involve other engineered elements such as

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 drilling deflectors to prevent unintended, intrusive  
2 drilling in the future, after the disposal borehole is  
3 closed. This has successfully been demonstrated in  
4 the United States at a DOE site. It has also been  
5 demonstrated in other countries.

6 It is the disposal approach that many  
7 foreign nations are considering for intermediate level  
8 waste, which is, in international waste classification  
9 terms, the waste stream that would be comparable to  
10 what we're talking about here tonight, the commercial,  
11 greater-than-class C low-level waste.

12 This picture actually shows the  
13 installation of a borehole at a DOE site.

14 Again, we have a conceptual alternative on  
15 the poster board and we do invite your comments on  
16 these ideas.

17 These are the proposed locations we intend  
18 to analyze within the EIS. We'll talk about the  
19 geologic repositories first, and as I mentioned, the  
20 Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, the only operating  
21 geologic disposal facility in the U.S., in the world  
22 as far as I know, although there are a couple others  
23 that are progressing, and the proposed Yucca Mountain  
24 repository in Nevada.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           WIPP vicinity involves the actual land  
2 withdrawal area on which the Waste Isolation Pilot  
3 Plant is sited today, or land just outside that land  
4 withdrawal area, that is still within that geographic  
5 location of the WIPP facility. All of the other  
6 sites, Idaho, Los Alamos, Nevada, Savannah River, Oak  
7 Ridge, Hanford, and the generic commercial sites, are  
8 the proposed locations at which we will analyze the  
9 two alternate disposal methods, the enhanced near  
10 surface disposal and the intermediate depth borehole  
11 disposal.

12           And we're very interested in your comments  
13 on this proposed list of disposal locations. We  
14 selected these sites. The geologic repositories, so  
15 they are obvious, again because the NRC regulations  
16 assume that greater-than-class C low-level waste  
17 requires deep geologic disposal. So they were obvious  
18 candidates for us.

19           The other sites were identified based on  
20 the criteria we identified over the last year, because  
21 they're existing, ongoing low-level waste disposal  
22 operations, and because there's an existing  
23 infrastructure at this site. Together, we term that  
24 mission compatibility.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           The NEPA regs do require us to consider a  
2 reasonable range of alternatives, and because these  
3 sites have those sorts of low-level waste waste  
4 operations, they fell within what was defined as a  
5 reasonable range of alternatives and could not be  
6 excluded prior to the actual analysis of the  
7 environmental impact statement, proving that they are  
8 not appropriate for this sort of disposal solution.

9           We do intend to evaluate each of the  
10 greater-than-class C waste types, individually, and in  
11 combination with each of the disposal alternatives,  
12 taking into consideration the specific waste  
13 characteristics of each of the sub streams, the  
14 volumes of each of the sub streams, and the rate at  
15 which those waste streams will be generated.

16           It is conceivable that the recommendations  
17 ultimately resulting from this EIS, and which may  
18 ultimately be employed, may entail a combination of  
19 facilities, just a phased approach, over time. We do  
20 want this environmental impact statement to give us  
21 that programmatic basis for making the right decisions  
22 for the right sub streams of waste as those wastes are  
23 generated and require disposal.

24           This summarizes the greater-than-class C  
25 EIS process. It began with the Advance Notice of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Intent. That's not a required step in the NEPA  
2 process, but we normally try and do it, when we know  
3 that we are going to proceed, and we published this  
4 Advance Notice of Intent soon after the Department  
5 decided that it would be the Office of Environmental  
6 Management that would proceed with the environmental  
7 impact statement. That was in May of 2005.

8 Then the Notice of Intent is a very  
9 important step in the process because it formally  
10 starts the EIS process. It was published last month,  
11 July 2007.

12 During the two years that transpired  
13 between the advanced notice and the formal notice,  
14 what we were doing was refining these waste inventory  
15 estimates, producing that inventory report, and  
16 working through the policy issues and decisions that  
17 led us to the decision to include the DOE greater-  
18 than-class C-like waste as well.

19 We are now in the public scoping process,  
20 you are here, and the next step is the draft EIS,  
21 which will be published for public review and comment,  
22 followed by the final EIS, and then that report to  
23 Congress on disposal alternatives, and then we await  
24 their action, and it's hard to estimate how quickly  
25 they will act. We just don't know.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Following their action, we will issue a  
2 record of decision and then there are all those  
3 implementation steps which, again, may entail the  
4 licensing of the facility or facilities by a third  
5 party.

6           The July 2006 report to Congress that I  
7 mentioned, that first report requirement of the Energy  
8 Policy Act of 2005, is available on the Web page.

9           It did estimate the cost and schedule of  
10 this EIS but it also anticipated that we would start  
11 the EIS process a year ago

12           So after the public scoping period is  
13 complete, and we have a sense of how many comments  
14 we've received, we worked through those comments and  
15 we decide exactly what the disposal alternatives are,  
16 and the scope is set for the EIS, we'll be able to  
17 estimate an improved updated cost and schedule, and I  
18 think we'll do that probably around the start of the  
19 calendar year, and that calendar appears on the DOE  
20 Web page, if you click on the NEPA links. There is a  
21 place where you can see that detailed cost and  
22 schedule estimate.

23           So this brings us to public participation  
24 and why we're here tonight. The NEPA process does  
25 provide several opportunities to give input to the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 process, to the development of an EIS. Tonight, you  
2 can provide your oral or written comments, and we do  
3 welcome those, and again, we're really focused on  
4 getting your comments on the scope. The proposed  
5 scope is the volume, the disposal methods, and the  
6 potential disposal locations.

7 This is what we intend, to move forward  
8 and actually analyze in the EIS. You can also provide  
9 written comments after the scoping meetings, but  
10 during the scoping process, via the Web site, by mail  
11 or by fax. We have some contact information for you  
12 here. Here's our Web site. We do hope that you go to  
13 that Web site. There's a lot of historical  
14 information there, supplementary information.

15 We put a lot of effort into it and we will  
16 continue to use it and update it throughout the  
17 process.

18 There's a written comment form in the  
19 folder, if you wish to provide that written comment  
20 tonight, and Holmes will go through the exact  
21 mechanics of how to do that here.

22 And these are points of contact. Again,  
23 I'm Christine, you're welcome to send me an e-mail.  
24 Jamie Joyce, though, is the document manager and my  
25 greater-than-class C project team manager. Thanks,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Jamie. He is your primary point of contact. Again,  
2 the Web page is a great way to get at him, as well as  
3 all of us. We talk on a very regular basis.

4 We're also joined here tonight by George  
5 Dixon, another member of our federal team. Joel  
6 Kristal is at the door. We have other very important  
7 members of our team, our Sandia National Laboratories  
8 and the Argonne National lab. We have John Cochran  
9 from Sandia, Bruce in the back, Biber--did I say it  
10 right? I didn't. Bruce is from Argonne. And Mary  
11 Picel is from Argonne. Is that everybody? Oh. And  
12 Jeanie Loving, here, from our headquarters, NEPA  
13 office. Thank you for joining us. Okay.

14 That concludes my statements but we look  
15 forward to answering any questions you have.

16 MR. BROWN: DOE has a number of experts in  
17 a variety of the issues involved in this environmental  
18 impact statement. What I'd like to suggest is that we  
19 take a brief break for folks to pose questions, either  
20 on the presentation or on any materials, or the  
21 posters over here, and when we recess, we will be  
22 prepared to take your formal comment. So track down  
23 anybody that you would like to talk to.

24 (Whereupon a short recess was taken)

25 MR. BROWN: Okay. I think we're just about

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 ready to move on to public comment. I actually need  
2 to get the sign-up sheet.

3 MS. GELLES: Do you want a two minute  
4 recess, or are you okay?

5 MR. BROWN: I'm fine. I think it should  
6 just take a minute to get it up here and we'll get  
7 started.

8 While we're getting the sheet, I'll just  
9 go through a couple of quick ground rules.

10 It's now time to receive your formal  
11 comments on the scope of the proposed EIS. This is  
12 your opportunity to let DOE know what you would like  
13 to see addressed in the draft document.

14 The court reporter will transcribe your  
15 statements. Let me review a few ground rules for  
16 formal comment. Please step up to the microphone over  
17 there when your name is called, providing the name and  
18 an organizational affiliation, where appropriate.

19 If you have a written version of your  
20 statement, please hand it to the court reporter after  
21 you've completed your statement. Also, if you have  
22 any additional materials that you would like to see  
23 included in the formal record, you may present those  
24 to the court reporter at the same time. They will be  
25 labeled and included in the permanent record.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I'll call two names at a time. The first  
2 of the speaker, the second of the person to follow.

3 In view of the number of people that have  
4 indicated an interest in speaking tonight, I think  
5 what I'll ask is that people confine their original  
6 statement to five minutes. We have plenty of time but  
7 just for variety's sake, maybe you can start with five  
8 minutes, and if you would like to come back and  
9 complete your comments after other folks have spoken,  
10 that'll be fine.

11 I instituted a system last night, since  
12 some folks don't like to be interrupted and told how  
13 much time they have remaining, I came up with a big  
14 number four, which I'll hold up when you're at the  
15 four minute mark, which will indicate you have a  
16 minute remaining. I did notice last night, that  
17 people seemed far more interested in their own  
18 comments than in my four over here, so I may ask, if  
19 you'll glance this way occasionally and see how you're  
20 doing.

21 But, anyway, things went I think very well  
22 last night. So we'll plan on that.

23 So let me start with our first speaker,  
24 Ron Skinnarland. Is he here or is somebody going to  
25 be reading a statement on behalf?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SKINNARLAND: I'm here.

2 MR. BROWN: You're good. Fine. Welcome.  
3 And again if you'll--you can hop up, or whatever. I  
4 apologize a bit for this elevated platform. Normally,  
5 we have our podium down at ground level but this was  
6 set up before we got here. But at least now the  
7 public has a chance to speak at a similar elevation.  
8 So welcome, and Gene Kinsey, I guess, is scheduled to  
9 follow you. Please.

10 MR. SKINNARLAND: Thank you. My name is  
11 Ron Skinnarland, S-k-i-n-n-a-r-l-a-n-d, and I gave a  
12 copy of our comments to the person at the front door.

13 We want to thank you for a chance to  
14 comment on the EIS, and I'll just start with the  
15 bottom line. We have copies of our comments here.  
16 I've given them to a number of people in the room  
17 already but we have some more, if anybody else is  
18 interested in looking at them.

19 I think our main concern is Hanford's a  
20 big cleanup, it's a long-term cleanup, we have a lot  
21 of issues to deal with, issues like off-site wastes  
22 that periodically, you know, caused a lot of interest  
23 and concern at the site, and I think kind of where  
24 we're starting off is this waste is defined as being  
25 waste that's a long-term threat. It might a threat to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 an intruder, would be a threat, you know, to the  
2 environment over the long term.

3 It's supposed to go to a repository,  
4 unless NRC makes a decision not to put it in a  
5 repository. So I think our, you know, underlying  
6 question is why are we looking at other alternatives  
7 here, and I think you've already heard some of those  
8 concerns from--at the meeting in Oregon and you'll be  
9 probably hearing some of those tonight too.

10 So basically our general point is the  
11 greater-than-class C waste is a long-term threat to  
12 human health, the environment, and given the current  
13 status of the Hanford cleanup, and the amount of waste  
14 that's going to remain at Hanford, forever, that  
15 adding greater-than-class C waste is not acceptable to  
16 the State of Washington.

17 But just some of the underlying concerns  
18 we have is we're already working on that Tank Closure  
19 and Waste Management EIS at Hanford. We have been  
20 working with the Department of Energy on that.  
21 There's a lot of expectations about what that EIS is  
22 supposed to show.

23 The thing that people are most interested  
24 in is what is the total effect of the cleanup we're  
25 going to do. Like when we do the cleanup, we can get

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the waste we can out of the tanks, clean up the soil  
2 sites we can, treat the waste, dispose of it, ship off  
3 transuranic waste, ship off high-level waste. What's  
4 the long-term risk here?

5 And, you know, we still don't have an  
6 answer to that question yet. So the EIS, in addition  
7 to making decisions on tank closure and making  
8 decisions on disposal waste at Hanford, and bringing a  
9 small amount of low level and mixed low-level waste,  
10 not greater-than-class C waste at Hanford, we're still  
11 waiting for people to see that, and our stakeholders  
12 are very concerned it's inadequate, cumulative impact,  
13 and adding the greater-than-class C waste is another  
14 factor.

15 There are questions of timing. So the  
16 timing for our EIS, I think we're still waiting to  
17 hear a little bit more about what the schedule is, but  
18 we're hoping next year to have a draft of our Tank  
19 Closure and Waste Management EIS, and then, in order  
20 to put all these together, whenever the greater-than-  
21 class C waste comes out, we would need to add it in  
22 and do supplemental analysis.

23 So I think in addition to just the general  
24 value that, you know, this, the alternative of  
25 disposing at Hanford in shallow landfill, enhanced or

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 not, or in a borehole, you know, just doesn't make,  
2 you know, practical or technical sense to us.

3 There are the problems of, you know, it  
4 potentially creates a delay or extension in the  
5 process for figuring out where we are, and making  
6 cleanup decisions on the Hanford waste we already  
7 have, and we're trying to deal with.

8 So that's one concern is, you know, how do  
9 you integrate the tank closure EIS with this EIS, so  
10 that the public and the decision makers can have a  
11 good cumulative impact, that lets you make good  
12 choices about what we're going to here at the Hanford  
13 cleanup.

14 Then, in addition, there are values like,  
15 you know, the state does have an issue of an off-site  
16 waste. It was invalidated by a federal court but  
17 still on appeal, so, you know, it was voted on by 70  
18 percent of the voters in the state, and represents a,  
19 I think pretty basic value about getting on with  
20 Hanford cleanup. I think that's one of our concerns  
21 here.

22 And just to reiterate that a little bit,  
23 you know, we're still in negotiations right now over  
24 the overall Hanford cleanup schedule. We haven't  
25 concluded those negotiations but we're ten years away

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 from having any tank treatment for the 53 million  
2 gallons of waste that's at the Hanford site.

3 And estimates vary. But there's a million  
4 gallons of waste, or so, of that high-level waste, has  
5 leaked in the past in the environment. There's no,  
6 you know, there's no approved plan for getting that  
7 waste out. So that represents a long-term threat.

8 Because of the past disposal of liquid  
9 wastes and waste that's been put in burial grounds in  
10 the tanks, most of it's liquid waste, but there's  
11 about 80 square miles of groundwater that's above  
12 drinking water standards for a number of radioactive  
13 and chemical contaminants at Hanford, and we started  
14 working on some of those things but we're years away  
15 from finishing those, and the cleanup at Hanford right  
16 now, under the best circumstances, you know, based on  
17 what the DOE baseline and current congressional  
18 funding levels, is going to take 40 years, or more.  
19 So I think it just--you know, to consider bringing  
20 this waste which, you know, is safer for everybody in  
21 a repository, I think just seems like a bad thing to  
22 be spending time on.

23 So I guess in an effort to try to be  
24 positive and suggest a thing or two I think we think  
25 the focus should be on looking at finding a repository

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for waste like this, that are a threat over the long  
2 term, and we think that's where this EIS should  
3 concentrate. That's basically our comment.

4 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much.

5 Gene Kinsey is next, and Faye Vlieger will  
6 follow him. Let me also mention that Christine Gelles  
7 is the DOE hearing officer and is seated right in front  
8 of the podium. So welcome.

9 MR. KINSEY: I'm Gene Kinsey. I'm not a  
10 polished speaker or anything. I'm just me. But I have  
11 opinions, just like everybody else, and in my opinion,  
12 the Hanford reservation is a safe place in the world to  
13 store, as any place in the world to store nuclear  
14 waste.

15 From what we know now and understand about  
16 nuclear issues, we might do some things differently  
17 than we have in the past, but that's 20/20 hindsight.

18 Also, it's my opinion that some of the  
19 concerned people from Oregon, who are extremely  
20 negative about Hanford, are filled with fear and  
21 superstition instead of real knowledge about nuclear  
22 and radioactive issues.

23 I believe that Oregon citizens down the  
24 Columbia River from Hanford, if they really understood  
25 the truth, would have more to fear from the discharges

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 from the backside of their local squirrels and pigeons  
2 and mushrooms growing in their backyards than any  
3 microscopic anything that would come from the Hanford  
4 reservation and get into the Columbia River.

5 I also would like to, at this time,  
6 commend the DOE for the job they're doing, for the  
7 problems they go through, the people that they work  
8 with, the people that work for them, they're imperfect  
9 and so is their equipment. It has a tendency to break  
10 down, and mistakes are made. But they are doing what  
11 they need to do, and as far as I'm concerned, they're  
12 doing the right thing. Thank you.

13 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

14 Faye. And you'll be followed by Tom  
15 Larsen.

16 MS. VLIEGER: Good evening. I live here  
17 in Kennewick, I'm not from Oregon, although I did pass  
18 through Oregon while in the military. I do not  
19 represent anyone from Oregon. I represent my own  
20 opinions as a former Hanford worker.

21 In my opinion, no more waste should be  
22 added to a problem that we haven't been able to fix  
23 already. The waste at Hanford still has not been  
24 characterized. There is no public document that DOE  
25 will release to any other agency, or to any of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 government-regulated programs that are trying to aid  
2 the workers that still don't know what is killing them.

3 The waste that is here is compounded by a  
4 number of years of error in the manner in which it has  
5 been handled. The DOE track record in making those  
6 errors public--well, let's just say the slower the  
7 report comes out, the more significance it has.

8 It's inversely proportional to how  
9 significant it is as to how quickly DOE will answer the  
10 question.

11 Well, I have thought that this is a  
12 difficult situation, that we are going to have nuclear  
13 power with us for the rest of our lives, and we will  
14 have to contend with the issues. Dumping it here is  
15 not the answer. DOE has not acted to preserve the  
16 public trust, nor to preserve the safety of the workers  
17 at the site.

18 If you wanted to work at this site because  
19 you thought that bringing this material into the site  
20 would increase our economic potential, I welcome you to  
21 apply for a job at Hanford, where it's been documented  
22 that more than 10 percent of the injuries are never  
23 recorded, and those are the most dangerous injuries.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           If you think that doesn't happen, you're  
2 looking at a person whose injury was never reported,  
3 and I still haven't been told what I was exposed to.

4           This isn't the Cold War, the time has  
5 passed for secrecy, and I don't think bringing more of  
6 this highly radioactive waste to the site is going to  
7 improve the conditions at Hanford.

8           If Hanford is so safe, and we are doing  
9 everything correctly, then why do we have a Class A  
10 accident under investigation at this time for tank  
11 waste. We're talking waste that was generated 40-plus  
12 years ago and we still can't handle that.

13           DOE turns a blind eye to contractors that  
14 do work here. So to enable them to have oversight over  
15 highly radioactive waste, yet again, when they turn a  
16 blind eye to malfeasance, and, unfortunately, errors  
17 that happen on the site, is unconscionable.

18           The philosophy that DOE still projects,  
19 that as part of their credo for injuries, that unless  
20 three or more workers are injured, there will be no  
21 formal accident investigation, is old school, old  
22 world, and wrong.

23           So we want to bring more waste here. We  
24 want to increase, exponentially, the hazard. It's  
25 unconscionable. We're not doing a service for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 ourselves, our children, our grandchildren, or  
2 posterity. The situation at Hanford is already out of  
3 control. There is no answer. They cannot control the  
4 contractors, they cannot manage a contract, look at the  
5 gasification plant and how screwy that's gone. The  
6 tank waste is not managed. And injuries continue.

7 Near surface disposal or enhanced near  
8 surface disposal for this type of waste is ludicrous.  
9 If it's that hazardous, why are we putting it near the  
10 groundwater supplies?

11 Hanford does not have a safety record that  
12 has enabled us to have a warm fuzzy feeling for them,  
13 and I do not believe that they have promoted public  
14 trust. This has been apparent in a number recent DOE  
15 IG investigations for the public and the workers at the  
16 site.

17 I look forward to more of your  
18 investigation into this, and I sincerely hope that none  
19 of it ends up here. Thank you.

20 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

21 MS. VLIEGER: My name is Faye Vlieger.  
22 That's F like Frank, a-y-e. The last name is V like  
23 victory, l-i-e-g-e-r.

24 MR. BROWN: Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Tom Larsen is next, and Todd Martin will  
2 follow Tom.

3 MR. LARSEN: Tom Larsen, Pasco City  
4 Council. I came to learn, not to lecture. Thank you.

5 MR. BROWN: Well, thank you. I think  
6 that's a record for our hearings. Okay, Todd, are you-  
7 -didn't give you much warning, did we?

8 MR. MARTIN: That's all right.

9 MR. BROWN: Okay.

10 MR. MARTIN: You gave me less warning than  
11 you think, actually.

12 MR. BROWN: I see.

13 MR. MARTIN: My name's Todd Martin, M-a-r-  
14 t-i-n, and I thought I was signing up to say I was  
15 here, not that I was going to offer comments, but if  
16 you ask I'll talk.

17 MR. BROWN: All right.

18 MR. MARTIN: I don't think Hanford should  
19 be considered in the scope of this EIS for disposal of  
20 greater-than-class C waste, but not because of any  
21 argument about the technical fitness of the site, or  
22 whether it's a good place to bury radioactive waste.

23 My personal concern is the Hanford  
24 communities, and by that I mean all of us in the  
25 Northwest, our ability to create and maintain cleanup

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 momentum. And I cannot imagine a scenario in which  
2 this EIS could select Hanford and then could have a  
3 relationship with the Tank Closure and Waste Management  
4 EIS, that is critical to maintaining that--creating and  
5 maintaining momentum, that would be productive, and  
6 because of that, I don't think that Hanford should be  
7 considered within the scope of this EIS. That's it.

8 MR. BROWN: Well, you're a great  
9 extemporaneous speaker, so next meeting that you're at,  
10 I'll call on you again.

11 Okay. Gerald Pollet is our next speaker.

12 MR. POLLET: I'm going to take a couple  
13 minutes longer than Tom and Todd.

14 MR. BROWN: Okay. Well, I think the other  
15 people surrendered time to the distinguished gentleman  
16 from so and so. So please proceed.

17 MR. POLLET: Gerry Pollet, representing  
18 the heart of the American Northwest. P-o-l-l-e-t.  
19 Gerry with a G.

20 The solution is not on the table tonight,  
21 unfortunately. The solution is very clearly that the  
22 nation needs a deep geologic repository, not only for  
23 the 5,600 cubic meters under discussion, but for the  
24 tens of thousands, nay, hundreds of thousands of cubic  
25 meters of waste from the Energy Department complex,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that are similar, closely related, should be in the  
2 same EIS, and for which the Energy Department has no  
3 plan to remove them from the soil at Hanford and other  
4 sites, or to dispose of them anywhere responsibly.

5 Unfortunately, the reasonable alternative  
6 that should be on the table is an independent agency to  
7 site, with a scientific study, and appropriate deep  
8 geologic repository in the most appropriate, stable  
9 geologic formations.

10 The Energy Department has failed to do  
11 that at Yucca Mountain. They've lost the credibility  
12 and trust of the American public, and Congress, in  
13 doing it at Yucca Mountain, and an independent agency  
14 is a reasonable alternative that should be studied at  
15 this point in time.

16 Let's just look at Hanford. 152,800 cubic  
17 meters. That's a lot. 5,600 cubic meters. We're told  
18 that's just a little bit.

19 152,800 cubic meters is the quantity of  
20 transuranic wastes estimated to be in the soil at  
21 Hanford, which the Energy Department has no plan to  
22 ever retrieve. What is the entire capacity of the WIPP  
23 repository? 176,000 cubic meters.

24 We need another repository. We need to  
25 remove this waste from Hanford's soil. Greater-than-

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 class C wastes were disposed in Hanford soil, directly  
2 in Hanford soil, in unlined ditches. Let's do away  
3 with all this other verbiage, trying to "pretty up" the  
4 words. An unlined ditch is an unlined ditch, and  
5 greater-than-class C waste was disposed of in unlined  
6 ditches from other DOE sites, not just 50 years ago, 40  
7 years ago, 30 years ago. Not just the mistake 20 years  
8 ago. But, oh, in 2003. That's irresponsible.

9 Now it is time, long past due, to commit  
10 to retrieving the transuranic wastes, and similar long-  
11 lived and highly radioactive wastes from Hanford soil,  
12 and the soil at INEL, instead of fighting the State of  
13 Idaho's agreement, and trying to overturn that  
14 agreement signed by the Energy Department to retrieve  
15 transuranic waste from Idaho's soil, all of which  
16 should be retrieved, treated and disposed in a deep  
17 geologic repository, and all those materials need to be  
18 part of one EIS, looking at where we should dispose of  
19 it, how we should dispose of it, how it should be  
20 treated, and how do we reduce further production  
21 responsibly.

22 Since the NEPA officer is here, you're  
23 well aware that the precedents are well-established,  
24 that the question of reducing waste is within the scope  
25 of any EIS relating to the disposing of waste.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1           The most common sense way to reduce your  
2 environmental impacts is to reduce generation of waste,  
3 and it is required of you to include discussions of  
4 how, with specific actions that will be taken by the  
5 Energy Department to reduce waste. Much of the waste  
6 proposed to be disposed of in this EIS is future  
7 generation waste. It can be reduced, and it must be.

8           M is for mixed waste. This notice "flies  
9 in the face" of the Energy Department's other NEPA  
10 documents, acknowledging that almost all remote-handled  
11 transuranic waste, and similar special case wastes, in  
12 your parlance, are presumed mixed waste because we  
13 don't know and cannot characterize their hazardous  
14 waste component.

15           The Energy Department has no capability  
16 here, at Hanford, to characterize the chemical  
17 component of remote-handled transuranic or greater-  
18 than-class C waste; has not across the nation. Nothing  
19 has changed since a federal court ruled that these  
20 wastes were mixed wastes, and since the Department  
21 itself, in its waste management PEIS acknowledged that  
22 they were all necessarily required to be viewed as  
23 mixed waste.

24           We'd like to point out that the Federal  
25 Facility Compliance Act gives each state the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 responsibility and the authority to disapprove of DOE's  
2 plans for storage, treatment or disposal of mixed  
3 wastes, which has been excluded from your discussion.

4 As the State of Washington has laid out  
5 tonight, adding to the near surface at Hanford, a great  
6 deal of additional impact, when you don't know what the  
7 existing impacts are of the wastes that are already in  
8 the soil, makes no sense.

9 Those are the best of grounds for the  
10 state disapproving such plans. Along with the failure  
11 of the Energy Department to have any plan in place to  
12 remove, and dispose of the waste that's already in the  
13 soil, and threatening our groundwater and our precious  
14 Columbia River.

15 Last night, I asked do we know what the  
16 definition is of insanity. As Einstein said: Insanity  
17 is doing the same thing over and over, over again, and  
18 expecting a different result. At Hanford, we have  
19 tried borehole disposal, and now the state and the  
20 public and the tribes are fighting to get the Energy  
21 Department to remove the wastes from those boreholes  
22 with remote-handled transuranic waste and greater-than-  
23 class C wastes, which are spreading contamination.

24 If you can't remove that waste, if you  
25 can't dispose of that properly, what makes you think

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that you're going to get a different result when you do  
2 it again?

3 It's time to just acknowledge that the  
4 Department of Energy should commit to cleaning up  
5 Hanford, before it tries to keep disposing of more  
6 waste, when it can't do what it's supposed to do  
7 already. Thank you.

8 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much.

9 That concludes the list of folks who  
10 signed up to speak ahead of time, so I'd like to ask,  
11 at this point, if there's anyone else in the audience  
12 who would like to comment on the presentations, of the  
13 items you've seen on the posters, respond to any of the  
14 other folks who have spoken. Again, this is your  
15 opportunity to let DOE know what you'd like to see. We  
16 have--yes, sir. Please come forward and if you can  
17 give your name for the court reporter.

18 MR. SMITH: My name is Bob Smith. That's  
19 too common. It's Robert Lee Smith. I'm Bob Smith. I  
20 worked out on the Hanford Project, the DOE part, for  
21 about 35 years, and another five years for commercial  
22 operatives near the Hanford project.

23 And I have great respect for people who  
24 have given their opinion, that's anti-Hanford. But  
25 being in the field of radiation protection for 40

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 years, overall, and I've been on a lot of these jobs  
2 where you are dealing with waste, and protection of it,  
3 I feel that Hanford is really a safe place to bury this  
4 waste.

5 Sure, they've made mistakes in the past,  
6 we all make mistakes, but we learn from them too. So I  
7 really don't think that you need to throw insults at  
8 DOE, and the people, the way they've acted in the past,  
9 because in the field of atomic energy program, you have  
10 to spend a little bit of time while you're doing this  
11 to learn more about it. So I have a great respect in  
12 their ability to handle this waste, now and in the  
13 future. That's all.

14 MR. BROWN: All right. Thanks, Bob.

15 Anyone else who'd like to add comments at  
16 this time?

17 [No response]

18 MR. BROWN: Okay. We are scheduled to  
19 remain in session through 9:00 o'clock to take  
20 comments. What we'll do is simply recess at this  
21 point. Again, if folks would like to ask further  
22 questions, talk to people, and if at any point before  
23 9:00 o'clock, you would like to add any further  
24 comments, just see me, we'll reconvene, the court

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reporter is here, DOE is here, and we'll take comments  
2 through 9:00 o'clock.

3 But at this point, we'll recess, and  
4 again, thanks for all turning out, and paying such  
5 close attention.

6 [A recess was taken from 8:11 p.m. to 9:00  
7 p.m.]

8 MR. BROWN: The time is now 9:00 o'clock,  
9 and I am reconvening this scoping meeting on the  
10 greater-than-class C Environmental Impact Statement,  
11 asking if any other member of the public wishes to make  
12 a public comment.

13 [No response]

14 MR. BROWN: Noting that no member of the  
15 public expresses an interest, we are now officially  
16 adjourned. Thanks very much.

17 [Whereupon, at 9:00 o'clock p.m., the  
18 meeting was adjourned.]

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701