U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

AND

ARGONNE NATIONAL LABORATORIES

+ + + + +

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

ON

GREATER-THAN-CLASS C LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

MONDAY

AUGUST 27, 2007

6:00 P.M.

COMFORT INN & SUITES
COLUMBIA GORGE WEST
477 NW PHOENIX DRIVE
TROUTDALE, WASHINGTON 97060

CONTENTS

Public Comment Moderator:

Holmes Brown

Present for the Agency:

Christine Gelles, Director
Office of Disposal Operations
Office of Environmental Management
U.S. Department of Energy
Cloverleaf Building (EM-12)
1000 Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20585
(301) 903-1669

GEORGE DIXON, Senior Technical Advisor
GTCC EIS
Department of Energy

JOEL KRISTAL
Office of Disposal Operations
Department of Energy

JAMIE JOYCE, GTCC EIS Document Manager
Department of Energy

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(6:41 p.m.)

MR. BROWN: Good evening. Welcome to this public scoping meeting on the Proposed Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal of greater-than-class C low-level radioactive waste. The development of an environmental impact statement for this project by the Department of Energy's Office of Disposal Operations is required by the National Environmental Policy Act.

My name is Holmes Brown. I will serve as the facilitator for this evening's meeting. My role is to ensure that the meeting runs on schedule, and that everybody has an opportunity to speak. I'm not an employee of the Department of Energy nor an advocate for any party or position.

At the registration table, you should've received a green participant's packet. If not, please raise your hand, and we can bring one to you. It contains important information on the presentation and is a convenient place to take notes during the briefing that will follow in a few minutes.

So -- okay -- we've got one, two -- and we've -- okay -- we've got two more. Anybody else? Okay. All right. Fine. Good.

There are three purposes for tonight's meeting. First is to provide information on the content of the proposed environmental impact statement, or proposed EIS, and on the National Environmental Policy Act, also known as "NEPA," that governs the process. The second is to answer any questions on the proposed EIS and on NEPA. And third, to receive and record your formal comments on the proposed EIS. The agenda for tonight's meeting reflects these purposes.

We'll begin with a presentation by Ms. Christine Gelles regarding the Proposed Environmental Impact Statement for the disposal of greater-than-class C waste. Ms. Gelles is the Director of the Office of Disposal Operations, which is the DOE office charged with preparing the EIS.

To answer your questions, project staff will be available throughout the evening at the display of posters in back. They can discuss the proposed EIS, NEPA, the contents of the printed materials in the participant's packet, and also the contents of the DOE presentation.

Following Ms. Gelles's presentation, we will recess briefly so the public can follow up with any questions that may occur as a result of the

presentation. Once we reconvene, the court reporter will be available to receive your comments and suggestions regarding the scope of the proposed EIS. All your comments will be transcribed and made part of the permanent record.

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

MS. GELLES: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to the greater-than-class C low-level radioactive waste Environmental Impact Statement public scoping meeting. I will refer to the document throughout the presentation as the GTCC EIS. My name is Christine Gelles, and I am the Director of the Office of Disposal Operations, which is at the Department of Energy Headquarters within the Office of Environmental Management.

My office is the office with the statutory responsibility to develop the environmental impact statement to analyze disposal alternatives for commercial greater-than-class C low-level waste. We have been charged by Congress to do this and to take actions related to preparing this EIS. This NEPA process, which we are now in the public scoping

period, is a very important process. It's one where, without public input, we would not be able to proceed with a document that is comprehensive. And I'm very pleased for that reason to see you all here. This is the largest -- by far the largest attendance that we've had at any of the public scoping meetings to date. I think it's a real testament to your interest and commitment to ensuring that we had a quality document.

This meeting is your opportunity to present your comments, your concerns, your issues, your suggestions regarding the scope of the GTCC EIS as we have it currently proposed. The poster boards in the back provide you some information. The materials in your folder provide a little bit more detail. And again, we have brought the entire project team here so we can answer your questions throughout the evening.

All comments received through this process will be very carefully considered as we work through the process of analyzing and developing a disposal capability for greater-than-class C low-level waste.

The National Environmental Policy Act, referred to as "NEPA," requires that an environmental impact statement be prepared for any major federal

activity that has the potential to impact the quality of the environment. The Department has determined that the development of a GTCC disposal capability constitutes a major federal action, and therefore needs to be analyzed throughout an environmental impact statement. We are in the beginning stages of the NEPA process, with the primary focus at this time being the identification of the scope of the GTCC EIS, including proposed disposal alternatives, such as disposal locations and disposal methods.

The comments we receive here tonight will be considered in preparing a draft environmental impact statement. That draft environmental impact statement will then be made available for public comment, and the comments received on that draft document will be carefully considered as we work to prepare a final environmental impact statement.

As I will discuss later in this presentation, and probably repeat several times, before we can make a decision on ultimately the disposal solution for greater-than-class C low-level waste, the alternative or the alternatives to be implemented, DOE must first report to Congress on the alternatives that were considered and await their

action before implementing the record of decision or the preferred alternative.

Let me be clear. You can see that we have just started this process, and we have several years of careful analysis ahead of us and work ahead of us before we will be ready for implementation. And again, Congress will have a role in that implementation.

Before I get started with the slide presentation, I thought it would be helpful if I provide you with just a brief description of what greater-than-class C low-level waste is, and we'll get into it in a little more detail throughout the slides. GTCC low-level waste is generated from commercial activities, such as the production of electricity from nuclear reactors. It also is produced when radioactive sealed sources which are used in common everyday practice, such as the diagnosis of cancer, when they become disused or discarded, they may become greater-than-class C low-level waste.

The volume of greater-than-class C low-level waste is small compared to the other three classes of commercial low-level waste that is generated throughout the nation and regulated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Those classes are

classes A, B and C. And again, one of the poster boards in the back provides you with a description of those various classifications. But greater-than-class C low-level waste has a higher concentration of radioactivity, and therefore it requires special disposal considerations.

A copy of the presentation is in the green folders. You can follow along. Hopefully you'll have some room for making some notes or taking down questions that we can take during the recess. It will also be posted on the GTCC EIS website. That web address is on the next to last slide in the presentation, as well.

So let's get into the slides. Can you see this okay, or do I need to turn some lights down in the front? It's okay? Great. Thank you.

The publication of the Notice of Intent serves several purposes for the Department of Energy. It was issued on July 23rd, 2007, and then a correction was posted on July 31st to correct a printing error that occurred in the inventory table, which is a very important part of the Notice of Intent. A copy of both the original notice and the correction are included in the folder.

The Notice of Intent announced the Department of Energy's intent to prepare an environmental impact statement for disposal of greater-than-class C low-level waste. It also announced our intent to include DOE's greater-than-class C-like waste streams in the same document. It formally initiated the environmental impact statement process. It requested public comment on the proposed scope of the EIS and announced these public scoping meetings. It provided some summary information on the greater-than-class C low-level waste stream and the DOE greater-than-class C-like waste inventories, which together over the life cycle of generation that we're analyzing in this -- that we propose to analyze in this document total just over 5600 cubic meters.

I want to put that volume of waste in context -- not to minimize it -- because although it is a small volume, again, it has a significant amount of radioactivity. But 5600 cubic meters is less than the transuranic waste that was shipped to Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in Carlsbad, New Mexico this year alone. In fiscal year 2007 alone, we've shipped over 7,000 cubic meters of waste this year alone. Over 50,000 cubic meters of defense transuranic waste

has been shipped to Carlsbad, New Mexico since it opened back in '99.

The Notice of Intent identifies the purpose and need for action. It identifies the proposed action. And again, we'll go into these elements in some detail, because this is the proposed scope, and this is the very reason why we are here tonight is to invite and take your comment on these elements. It identifies the proposed disposal locations and the methods and the alternatives, the specific designs.

In response to the public comments that we received on the Advance Notice of Intent, which was published in May of 2005, and it identifies that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency will be participating in this document as a cooperating agency, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission as a commenting agency.

Purpose and need for action. The reason we are here is because NRC and agreement state licensees have generated, and will continue to generate, greater-than-class C low-level waste for which today there is no permitted disposal capability. Again, I want to be clear, we're talking over the life cycle about a relatively small volume of waste as we

propose it today. But some of it does exist today. And until we proceed with this EIS and ultimately select a disposal site, that waste stream has no disposal outlet.

DOE has a statutory responsibility for developing the disposal capability for this waste. And we'll talk about those specific statutory requirements in some detail. We also own and generate certain low-level waste and transuranic waste streams that have characteristics very similar to the commercial greater-than-class C waste, but which today we do not believe have a disposal pathway. We refer to this as DOE greater-than-class C-like waste. We will discuss the waste inventories and drivers in a little bit more detail in the slides to come.

There are three primary legislative drivers to developing a disposal capability for GTCC low-level waste and for doing this environmental impact statement. The first and most foundational is the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1985. It is this statute that gave specifically the Department of Energy the responsibility for developing the greater-than-class C low-level waste disposal capability. The National Environmental Policy Act -- or "NEPA" -- of 1969 requires federal

agencies, such as the Department of Energy, to consider the environmental impacts of our proposed action and alternatives to those actions in the decision-making process. It establishes the framework for public input, which is incredibly important to our evaluation.

Then more recently, the Energy Policy Act of 2005 gave us two specific requirements to move us along in this EIS process. It requires the Department to submit a report to estimate the cost and schedule for completing the EIS and reaching a record of decision. We did submit that report in July of 2006. That report is available on our DOE Greater-Than-Class C Project webpage. And again, you have that link in the slides.

It also requires the Department to submit that report on the alternative or alternatives considered through the EIS, including the other types of information that were previously required in a 1987 report to Congress required by the Low-Level Waste Policy Act Amendments of '85. And we must await Congress's action before we implement a record of decision. That report to Congress will be submitted after the final EIS is issued, and will be in large part a summation of the EIS identifying the specific

actions that might be required by Congress to facilitate implementation of a disposal solution. Again, what this means is that DOE will be unable to take action as a result of this document without the support and involvement of Congress.

So what is greater-than-class C low-level waste? Well, before you can understand greater-than-class C low-level waste, we have to talk about what low-level waste is. Unfortunately, the statutory and regulatory definitions are rather complicated, because it defines -- they define low-level waste by what it is not. Low-level waste is not high-level waste. High-level waste is produced from the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel. Low-level waste is not spent nuclear fuel, nor is it byproduct material. It is basically any other waste form that contains sufficient concentrations of radioactivity that it meets the classifications of the NRC regulations and requires isolation from the environment or within the environment for permanent disposal.

It comes in many forms -- clothing, equipment, tools, discarded household items, things like smoke detectors and exit signs. It also comes in the form of soil, water treatment residues, anything that's become contaminated with radioactive material.

It's generated from a wide variety of commercial and government activities, such as production of electricity, medical treatment and research.

As most of you probably know, Nuclear Regulatory Commission classifies low-level waste into four classes, A, B, C and greater-than-class C, or GTCC, based on the concentrations of specific short-lived and long-lived radionuclides. Greater-than-class C has the highest radionuclide concentration. It requires the most elaborate disposal mechanism of the four classes. A, B and C low-level waste can be disposed of in near-surface disposal facilities. Those are commercially available in private industry. One of the three commercial facilities is located in Richland, Washington, the U.S. Ecology facility.

The NRC requires that greater-than-class C low-level waste be disposed of in a geologic disposal facility, a geologic repository licensed by the NRC, unless alternative methods of disposal are proposed to the NRC and approved by the NRC. It is that exception that allows us to consider alternate disposal technologies, as well as geologic repository in this EIS.

The NRC disposal requirements also require certain stability and protection measures to prevent

inadvertent intrusion following disposal. And that applies for not just greater-than-class C, but also class A through C.

Greater-than-class C is low-level waste that exceeds the concentration limits of radionuclides defined by the NRC for class C low-level waste. Again, it's generated by the NRC and agreement state licensees throughout the United States. It can generally be divided into three waste types, and we'll talk about each of these three in some detail.

Activated metals. These are primarily generated in nuclear reactors during facility decommissioning. They consist of the components of the reactor, such as thermal shields, that have become radioactive through neutron absorption during reactor operations. This photo at the right is a picture of a radiation survey being conducted on an activated metal component from the decommissioning of a small research reactor. Currently, there are 104 operating nuclear reactors in the United States. Eighteen have been decommissioned. Some of those 18 have stored their greater-than-class C low-level waste generated through those decommissioning activities at their decommissioned reactor site alongside of the spent

nuclear fuel that is awaiting permanent disposal, as well, in another geologic repository.

Sealed sources. This is the second major waste stream within the greater-than-class C inventory. It's typically small, highly radioactive materials that are encapsulated in the closed metal container which provides the shielding from the radioactive material itself. These are used in common applications. They are found widely throughout the United States.

As we were preparing to publish letters of intent, we had a number of inquiries from various reporters. They said, you know, what site generates greater-than-class C low-level waste? What state has the most? And the truth is all states generate greater-than-class C low-level waste because sealed sources are so widely used throughout the medical industry, and the welling and logging industry, as well.

This picture here is a very small radiography source. There can be sealed sources that come in larger sizes, as well. Not all sealed sources are greater-than-class C. Many are class A, B or C, and can be disposed of in those existing commercial disposal facilities.

We do believe that one of the reasons that Congress included those specific report sections in the Energy Policy Act of 2005 is that there is a widely held concern that disused sealed sources can become a proliferation risk and could potentially fall into the hands of malevolent forces and be used to make dirty bombs. This is one of the reasons why the same statute, the Energy Policy Act, established an interagency task force, of which the Department of Energy was a member, to produce a report to the White House on the safety and security of disused radioactive sources.

Again, just to remind you, that where sealed sources do exist today -- and they do -- and they become disused, they do not have a disposal outlet if they qualify, if they have sufficient concentrations of radioactivity, that they must be managed as greater-than-class C waste.

The third waste stream within the commercial greater-than-class C low-level waste inventory is an "other" category. It basically is anything that is greater-than-class C low-level waste that is not an activated metal, is not a sealed source. It consists of contaminated equipment, debris, trash, the debris generated through the

decommissioning of radioactive facilities, nuclear facilities that are used for research. There are only a few commercial licensees that have generated or are projected to generate this category of greater-than-class C waste, this "other" type of GTCC. Most commercial greater-than-class C waste is either activated metals or sealed sources.

That brings us to the DOE greater-than-class C-like waste. And we acknowledge that this terminology can be confusing. The use of this term does not have the intent or effect of creating a new waste classification for radioactive waste generated by Department of Energy activities. DOE greater-than-class C-like waste is DOE low-level waste or transuranic waste that have characteristics similar to greater-than-class C low-level waste under the NRC classifications, and which may not have an identified disposal pathway today. It is owned by DOE. It is generated by DOE activities, even if those activities are conducted at a commercial facility.

The waste forms comprising this inventory are similar to the commercial greater-than-class C low-level waste forms -- activated metals, sealed sources, and other waste. The big difference here is that the vast majority of this DOE inventory falls

into that "other" category. Most of it is transuranic waste that may not qualify for disposal at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant because it was not derived from defense-related production activities.

Here's just a high-level summary of the waste inventories and a comparison of the commercial and the DOE contributors to the inventory. I want to again remind you, the total estimated stored and projected of greater-than-class C, both commercial and DOE, totals only 5600 cubic meters. But again, not to belittle that, that small volume could contain up to a 140 million curies of radioactivity.

DOE greater-than-class C-like waste makes up a little bit more than half of that total projected inventory. But the commercial contributors, the 2600 cubic meters that would come from the commercial, NRC and agreement state licensees, contains the majority of the activity.

We developed these estimates based on data calls and interviews and other sources of information, such as available databases and reports.

And I see there's a question back there, but we're going to do presentation and then questions. If you'll give us that patience, I appreciate it. Thank you.

We have a very detailed inventory report that is available on the website page that talks about the methodology for estimating both the commercial waste stream and the DOE greater-than-class C-like waste stream.

This is the proposed action of this environmental impact statement, to construct and operate a new facility or facilities, or use an existing facility, for the disposal of greater-than-class C low-level waste and the DOE greater-than-class C-like waste.

Again, this proposed action stems from a legislative requirement that DOE develop a disposal capability for the commercial low-level waste stream. We decided that we would also include DOE's waste streams that are very similar to that commercial waste because we have a responsibility for both the commercial and the DOE-generated waste streams, neither of which have a disposal path today. And we consider this to be a cost-effective solution because there is such a low volume of waste collectively between the two.

These are the proposed disposal alternatives. We are extremely interested in what you have to say about these alternatives and whether there

may be other alternatives that should be considered. The alternatives range from no action for current and future greater-than-class C low-level waste. Both the commercial and DOE-generated would be stored at designated locations consistent with ongoing practice.

Disposal in a geologic repository at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, which, again, is located in Carlsbad, New Mexico. Both the current and future GTCC low-level waste and DOE GTCC low-level waste would be disposed of at WIPP.

The third analyzes disposal in the geologic repository proposed at Yucca Mountain in Nevada.

Then the fourth and fifth alternative talk to the alternative disposal configurations, the use of a new enhanced near-surface disposal facility at one of the proposed locations, of which the Hanford site is among them, or disposal in a new intermediate-depth borehole facility. And again, we'll talk about each of these in a little bit more detail.

We do recognize that some of these alternatives could require changes to existing legislation or regulation. However, this alone is not a reason for eliminating an alternative from consideration within this EIS. Our NEPA guidance

requires that we evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives, notwithstanding those statutory and regulatory requirements or constraints that may exist today. But in the EIS analysis, we will carefully identify any statutory or regulatory limitations that do apply, and any changes that would be required for implementation.

As I previously mentioned, and will probably say at least two more times, DOE must await Congress' action before implementing whatever the preferred alternative or alternatives are that result from this EIS.

These are the three disposal methods we today propose to include in this EIS -- deep geologic repository, which, again, is the disposal methodology that Congress and the NRC assume would be required for commercial greater-than-class C low-level waste, and then two alternatives, intermediate-depth borehole and enhanced near-surface. If you have other approaches or ideas you'd like us to consider, tonight is your opportunity to tell us them. You will have other opportunities throughout the scoping process, the scoping period, which ends on September 21st.

Deep geologic disposal or geologic repository involves the placement of waste in mine

cavities deep beneath the earth's surface. It is the configuration employed at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in Carlsbad, New Mexico. This is a picture of contact handle transuranic waste, which was originated from defense activities that has been disposed in one of the panels or one of the rooms at WIPP. It's also the methodology proposed at Yucca Mountain. Although it's a different approach to geologic disposal, it is a deep geologic repository that is planned at Yucca Mountain.

Enhanced near-surface involves the placement of waste in engineered trenches or vaults or other similar structures within the upper 30 meters of the earth's crust. I'd like to mention again that the NRC regulations state that there may be some instances where greater-than-class C low-level waste would be acceptable for near-surface disposal with special processing or design. That is why this disposal methodology is proposed for inclusion in this EIS.

The photo here shows a concrete vault that is used for disposal of higher activity DOE low-level waste. This exists at a DOE site.

I should mention that the photo here and the conceptual drawings on the poster boards in the back of the room are intended to give you a general

idea of what this disposal methodology may entail. The specific design will be developed through the EIS, however, and there will be opportunity in the future to comment on those specific designs. These are really conceptual ideas at this point. We are very interested in any comments you might have in just these preliminary ideas. So please let us know if you have any enhancements that you would propose.

And then the third methodology is intermediate-depth borehole disposal. This is the placement of waste in an augured borehole deeper than the top 30 meters of the earth's crust. It would likely include additional barriers, such as drilling deflectors, enhanced engineered walls, backfill once the waste is emplaced.

This methodology has successfully been demonstrated in the U.S. and other countries. It is the disposal methodology that the international community is proposing to use for intermediate-level waste. In international waste classification systems, intermediate level waste would be comparable to what we in the U.S. call greater-than-class C low-level waste.

This photo here shows the installation of a borehole at a DOE site. Again, the poster board

shows a conceptual drawing of what our design might be, but the specific design will be developed through the course of developing the environmental impact statement. Again, any comments you might have on this disposal methodology, please certainly provide them to us.

And these are the proposed disposal locations. To tick off the top few, WIPP as a geologic repository that exists today and is in operation, and the proposed Yucca Mountain repository, again, those are obvious candidate sites because they are geologic repositories, which is the methodology that the NRC assumes is required for greater-than-class C low-level waste.

All of these other sites were identified through a difficult process, but it is the initial reasonable range of alternatives. These sites were selected based on mission compatibility, because these sites have current ongoing waste disposal operations as part of their ongoing mission, and the physical characteristics of the site imply that it's appropriate for low-level waste disposal to -- low-level waste disposal can safely be performed there.

The WIPP vicinity would be either land within the land withdrawal that houses the Waste

Isolation Pilot Plant today and is already under the jurisdiction of the Department of Energy, or it could be on government property within that general locale. And then to provide for the possible programmatic determination for us of a commercial facility, the Department intends to analyze a generic commercial facility in a human environment, and a generic commercial facility in an arid environment. The reason being, again, that greater-than-class C low-level waste is a commercially generated waste stream.

Commercial industry is providing the solution for the other classes of commercial low-level waste, and may very much be interested in providing the solution for this class of commercial low-level waste. However, when we asked industry if they were interested back in 2005, soon after publication of the Advance Notice of Intent, while a number of companies did come forward and express some interest, none had a specific facility with sufficient design or license developments such that it could be considered. That's why we're using generic possibilities. It is highly likely that future NEPA analysis would be required for implementation of those commercial alternatives.

DOE -- this is a very important point, and I apologize that -- it -- it's clear to me after the

first four scoping meetings that the intent of this slide is not coming through. So I'm going to just talk about it a little bit. We intend to evaluate each of the GTCC waste types, those subcategories that comprise the commercial streams -- activated metals, sealed sources, and the "other" -- both individually and in combination with each of the disposal alternatives, taking into consideration the rate at which those waste streams will be generated and the specific characteristics and volumes of each of those subtypes of waste. It is possible that the preferred alternative will involve a combination of facilities or designs for subsets -- various subsets of the waste streams.

Again, the EIS will analyze the statutory and regulatory requirements required for implementation of each alternative, and whether any modifications would be required to facilitate implementation.

This is a summary of the greater-than-class C EIS process -- the Advance Notice of Intent of 2005, the Notice of Intent of July of 2007. Actually, somebody asked me tonight what happened in those two years. What we spent the last two years doing was refining the waste inventory estimates. While there

was an initial inventory report back in 1987, a lot has changed in the commercial low-level waste world over the last 20 years. We found that with the extension in nuclear reactor licenses that the rate of generation for much of this greater-than-class C low-level waste has been delayed. So for that reason, we had to work closely with industry to refine those inventory estimates. We also worked through the policy considerations of deciding to include the DOE-generated waste forms, as well.

Publication of the Notice of Intent started the public scoping period. That's where we are today. This is the fifth of our public scoping meetings. Following the public scoping period, we will proceed with development of the environmental impact statement based in large part and informed by the comments received through the scoping process. That draft EIS will be published for public comments. We'll consider those comments as we move forward and develop the final EIS. Following publication of that final EIS, we will provide that required report to Congress -- again, required by the Energy Policy Act of 2005 -- and we will await Congress' action before implementing a record of decision.

The July 2006 report to Congress, again, that originally estimated the cost and schedule for this EIS is available on our web page. It did assume that we initiated the EIS process last year. We of course took more time to refine those inventory estimates. So we will revise that estimate of the schedule after the public scoping period, so that way we have a better sense of exactly how many alternative sites and exactly how many designs are going to move forward for inclusion in the EIS.

So, finally, a few final words about public participation. The NEPA process provides opportunities for public participation. It provides multiple opportunities, because that public input is critical to, again, the development of a document that is viable and can support an ultimate solution. You can participate tonight by providing oral comments or written comments on the scope of the EIS, including the proposed alternatives and the environmental issues you have, any concerns you have about the waste streams. You can also provide written comments after this meeting via fax, via the EIS website, or by mail. The public scoping process closes on September 21st.

You can stay informed throughout this process by visiting the GTCC EIS website at this

address. We have put a lot of work into that web page. It has a lot of historical information, a lot of ancillary information. It will be our primary mechanism for putting any new information out throughout this process. There is a written comment form in the folders in your handout material tonight. If you'd like to provide a written comment tonight, Holmes will go over the details on exactly how to do that after this recess.

This is our contact information for the federal employees who are part of our team. Again, I'm Christine. Jamie Joyce in the back of the room by the exit sign is the document manager. He is also the team lead for the Greater-Than-Class C Team back at Headquarters, and he's brought with him his team, Joel Kristal back there at the door, and George Dixon's over here, one of our precious chairs. We are supported by members of the Argonne National Laboratory and Sandia National Laboratories. I see Mary and Bruce are in the back, and John Cochran also in the back. We also have the pleasure to be joined by Jeanie Loving from our NEPA Office at Headquarters. Thank you, Jeanie, for coming out for this. She has a lot of experience with these sorts of documents, and we do rely upon her expertise. So please find any of

us during this recess if you have any questions. Again, Jamie will be your primary contact, but you can contact any of us. We very seriously are providing that information, so if you have a question, you can give us a call.

Thank you.

MR. BROWN: We're going to take a brief recess at this point to follow up any questions on the presentation or on the posters. When we reconvene, we will be ready to take your formal comments. So this will be quite brief, but you can ask any of the folks here in the back.

(Recess from 7:16 p.m., until 7:35 p.m.)

MR. BROWN: Let me review just a few ground rules for formal comments. Please step up to that microphone when your name is called. Introduce yourself, providing an organizational affiliation where appropriate. If you have a written version of your statement, please provide a copy to the court reporter when you've completed your statement. Also, please give the court reporter any attachments that you would like to be made part of the formal record. They will be labelled and entered.

Again, I explained that we have a number of people here. But I think that given the turnout

and the interest, that I would like to say that folks will have five minutes to speak. Again, if you don't take the full five minutes, I'm sure those who follow will appreciate it.

I was told last time that when we were on kind of a short supply that when I told people they had a minute left, that that was somewhat aggravating. So I have here a number four. So if you all will -- when you get to the four-minute mark, I'll just hold this up, letting you know that you've got a minute left to gracefully conclude your remarks.

Again, let me remind you that your comments, whether spoken, written, e-mailed, or whatever, all count the same. The folks who are going to be writing the draft environmental impact statement are not going to weight a spoken comment any more than one that's submitted at a later date in another form. So I'm hoping the five minutes will give you adequate time. And again, I apologize for being so short the last time we were here. There was a bridge closing at 10 o'clock at night that rather curtailed our time.

So that's by way of ground rules. Ms. Gelles will be serving as a hearing officer for the Department of Energy during the formal comment period. So let me begin by calling on Mary Gautreau from --

yes, the court reporter has begun and will be taking all this down. So, Mary Gautreau from Senator Wyden's office will start things off. She will be followed by Ken Niles from the State of Oregon.

(Pause.)

There are some chairs available here in front. So if people get tired of standing up, please come forward.

MS. GAUTREAU: Thank you. My name's Mary Gautreau. I'm from Senator Ron Wyden's office. Christine, I want to welcome you to Portland. Thank you for yours. The senator, of course, could not be here, but asked that I would read a statement, and will give you this one.

The Hanford Nuclear Reservation is already one of the most polluted places on the planet. It currently stores more high-level nuclear waste than any other site in the United States, and it is not safely managing all of the nuclear waste that it already has on-site today. And now the Department of Energy proposes to use Hanford as a national nuclear waste dump.

The bottom line is the Energy Department should not be adding more waste to Hanford when it isn't safely handling the waste that it already has

on-site. The Energy Department -- (applause) -- and its contractor have a long history of mismanagement and failures to protect public health and safety at Hanford over the past 20 years. A report by the contractor responsible for the Hanford Tank Farms, which stores 53 million gallons of highly radioactive and toxic waste, indicates that removal of all of these wastes just from the aging and leaking single-shell tanks would not be completed until the year 2032. Hanford is decades away from dealing with the waste that it already has on-site.

Just last month, Hanford had a spill of high-level nuclear waste while retrieving it from the single-shell tanks that endangered workers at the site. I have requested that the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board, an independent DOE safety oversight agency, investigate this spill, as well as the entire single-shell retrieval program. Given the long history of mismanagement of waste cleanup at Hanford, the Energy Department's proposal to bring more waste to Hanford is essentially a proposal to turn Hanford and the Northwest into a national sacrifice zone.

The waste under discussion today is the most radioactive in the low-level category. As many

of you know, I have long been concerned about DOE's history of unkept promises to clean up Hanford. It's time to address the current problems, and not add additional risk and dangers by adding huge volumes of additional nuclear waste to Hanford.

What is amazing to me is DOE has now been trying to clean up the nuclear waste environmental contamination half as long as the site was actually in operation, more than 20 years, with no end in sight. Instead, we're miles away from meeting those cleanup goals.

In March of this year, U.S. EPA issued a fine of more than a million dollars for the failure of DOE's contractor to properly manage the existing low-level waste disposal facility. How can this Department be seriously considering sending more of the same waste to Hanford?

In March of 2006, I requested the Inspector General conduct an investigation into the safety of the waste vitrification plant after a former employee of Bechtel raised concerns about the former employee's use of unproven and flawed control systems. In response to my request, the Inspector General issued a report that said -- and I quote, "The control system does not meet the stringent procedures, plans,

specifications for work practices associated with nuclear quality standards."

My point here is a simple one: DOE has not fulfilled the obligation to clean up Hanford. It is not clear when it will. But now DOE is proposing to bring more waste to Hanford. Hanford should have less nuclear waste, not more, and it should be cleaned up, not dumped upon.

So today I'm putting myself on record as being fiercely opposed to DOE's plans to dump more waste at Hanford. I will do everything within my power to keep it from happening.

Thank you. Senator Ron Wyden.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Okay. Ken Niles is next, and Natalie Trayer will follow.

MR. NILES: Good evening. I'm Ken Niles. I'm the Assistant Director for the Oregon Department of Energy. I'm providing comments on behalf of the State of Oregon.

I want to first of all thank the U.S. Department of Energy for conducting a scoping meeting in Western Oregon. Oregon and Oregonians have a long-standing interest in Hanford. We appreciate this

opportunity to provide our comments directly to you. And thank all of you for coming out one more time.

My agency will provide what I expect will be fairly lengthy written comments to the Department prior to your deadline that will outline the analysis that we expect to see in the environmental impact statement.

Since Hanford cleanup began in 1989, the federal government has so far spent more than $25 billion taxpayer dollars to try and clean up the extensive entry that occurred at Hanford during more than 40 years of plutonium production. There is not sufficient time for me to thoroughly explain the many cleanup challenges that still remain at Hanford now 18 years into cleanup. The recent spill of high-level waste at the S-Tank Farm is just the latest example of many examples over the years that demonstrate that DOE still is unable to manage the waste that they currently have at the Hanford site.

The State of Oregon opposes the idea of bringing greater-than-class C waste to Hanford for disposal. Hanford's groundwater and soil are already widely contaminated, and a great deal of money and effort is being expended to try and clean up these contaminants. Adding more waste to the subsurface,

especially waste that is highly radioactive and very long-lived, is contradictory to the cleanup effort that has come at such a premium price and that we all support.

I acknowledge that our position is seen by some as just another NIMBY. But there's a difference between saying "not in my back yard" and what we're saying, which is "no more in my back yard" -- (applause) -- especially given that our back yard is so horribly polluted already and poses a very real long-term threat to the Columbia River.

In preliminary comments we submitted two years ago, the Oregon Department of Energy commended DOE for beginning the process of determining a disposal path for greater-than-class C waste. Some of this waste does exist. More will be generated. There does need to be a disposal path identified.

However, we also strongly encouraged DOE to not consider near-surface disposal and to exclude from consideration any site still undergoing active cleanup. Both of these recommendations were ignored. The assumption, as Christine has mentioned, for many years has been that greater-than-class C waste would be disposed of in geologic disposal. We see no reason to change that.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Okay. Natalie is next. Is she here? She will be followed by Harvey Thorstead.

MS. TRAYER: Hello. My name is Natalie Trayer, and I'm the Field Organizer for Heart of America Northwest. My first question is this: There were hundreds of folks who came out to the solid waste EIS meetings who weren't notified about this meeting. Everyone who has commented and was at those meetings should've received notice of this one.

Secondly, it's apparent to me that the U.S. Department of Energy doesn't believe the old adage that less is more. As if we didn't have enough nuclear waste to take care of already, DOE, which runs the Hanford Nuclear Reservation and the nation's nuclear weapons complex, wants to check a different kind of extremely radioactive waste at Hanford for burial. They refer to this waste as greater-than-class C, as you've heard, and are proposing to dump this toxic waste in shallow landfills and relatively shallow boreholes above groundwater that's flowing directly next to the Columbia River.

There are a myriad of reasons why bringing more radioactive waste to Hanford is a bad idea. But

first and foremost, we obviously can't take care of what we already have. DOE is incapable of safely managing the waste that currently exists at the site. In case you didn't hear, and has been mentioned in comments before me, nearly 50 to 100 gallons of toxic waste erupted from a water line on July 27th. The cause of this leak is attributed mainly to an engineering blunder and lack of oversight.

On top of that, over one million gallons of radioactive waste has already leaked from tanks at Hanford, and that contamination, this will be spreading toward the Columbia River.

A vast amount of money and effort is being exhausted to try and clean up this site. To put it simply, adding more waste is incongruous with cleanup. For the safety of our communities, our families and future generations, we ask you to join us in saying no to this preposterous proposal to the import of more waste at Hanford.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Harvey Thorstead, are you here?

(No response.)

MR. BROWN: Okay. I'll get back to him.

(Pause for next speaker to set up.)

MR. DE BRULER: My name's Greg de Bruler, and I'm representing Columbia River Keeper. I've been doing this for -- well, for them for 18 years, and working on behalf of the river for a little over 20 years now.

Hey, Hanford, the river, hey, our favorite place here. Everybody remembers Hanford. If you don't remember Hanford, it's all about the river. The river flows this way. It comes all the way around, goes down there, goes out to the sea. Remember in 1962 it was the most radioactive river in the free world. This is where they're proposing to dump this stuff. Travel time from here is seven years. Well, depending on who you talk to, it could be here from 10 years to 100 years. Travel time this way, if the waste goes this way, it's 15 miles, it could be, eh, not this stuff, but 20 years to 500 years, depending on who you talk to.

Bottom line, what you put in the ground makes a big difference. Columbia River -- there's the N-reactor. Just think of all the waste sites. Nine nuclear reactors, waste everywhere, most contaminated site in North America. Look what happens when you dump the stuff in the ground. This is what they've

dumped in the ground to date. Check those things out. You know, some of you might know what it is, some of you might not know what it is. Bottom line, it's hazardous, toxic waste that's eventually going to hit the aquifer, that's eventually going to flow into the Columbia River -- not here in my lifetime, but what about the future?

They say this is safe disposal. They use the word "safe." That's not what we're here for. And the whole idea, this whole preposterous idea, is that it's disposal. What happened to the first part, which is remove, treat, and then dispose? "Treat" left. That went away. The "treat" is they're going to dump it in your back yard, and the "treat" is they're going to continue dumping it in your back yard. So they not only create more waste here that's going to migrate, but it's going to flow into the Columbia River sometime, not in our future, but in somebody else's future. That is -- it's just absolutely ludicrous. I told Gerry this is like being standing here in 1980-something that somebody proposed this.

They say deep geologic storage, that's what they've always planned for this. Now the reason why they don't want to do that is because that the science at Yucca Mountain was so bad, they realized

that didn't work. And now they want to do surface storage. Why? Because they don't have to drill big holes.

So this is really a disposal EIS. It's not a remove, treat and dispose, like you're required under the law by the EIS. That's what you're going to have, and you're going to have more of that all over the Hanford site. They're supposed to release it as being clean. Supposedly they're supposed to release it and give it back to the Native Americans and back to the public to use. It's never going to happen. Twenty years the Department of Energy -- 18 years -- has been cleaning up the mess. We have a delay in the vit. plant until 2019. Does anybody in this room in their right mind trust the Department of Energy's ever going to start the vit. plant?

MULTIPLE SIMULTANEOUS SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE: No.

MR. DE BRULER: So if you don't believe that the vit. plant's going to be started in 2019, we have 18 years of them telling us what they're going to do, but they haven't gotten to what they were supposed to be doing. And now they're coming here and they want to do surface disposal? Whoa. Wait. No. Stop. That's why we're at a truck stop, actually, so all the

truckers could come in here and talk about hauling hazardous materials and what it does to them and their lives.

According to the nation -- or the BEIR-7 panel, National Academy of Science, they went out and did an analysis of all the health stuff in the world. They wanted to find out, okay, everybody says low doses, no big deal. High doses, low doses, what is all this stuff? Bottom line, they went around the world, checked up all the studies, and they came up with one answer. There is no safe level of radiation, period.

Now, none of the EISs that have ever done and that will ever be done by the Department of Energy will accept that fact. They'll tell you in even their current baseline risk assessment for the Hanford breach that there is an acceptable dose. There is no acceptable dose. And they only look at cancer. They don't look at the diseases that are caused that don't have anything to do with cancer.

So we have a trust responsibility, the federal government does. The federal government has a trust responsibility that says they must protect the most maximally exposed individuals. This EIS better do that, because I'll tell you what, the other EISs

don't. They somewhat kind of get to it, but they don't.

Native Americans have a God-given right here, like we all do, but they've got a little special provision that says if they don't do it right and clean up Hanford, they're going to come back and file suits against you, and they will -- we, the taxpayers, will be paying for billions and billions of dollars of lost resources in damage. A hundred and eighty square miles of groundwater at Hanford has to be cleaned up. Take 90 -- not near in my lifetime.

The EPA has nine criteria. The nine criteria basically state, remove, treat and dispose. And when you finally get down to the bottom part is if you can't do with remove and treat, then you might find some waiver to do something different. Well, their idea right now is to, if you listen to 'em closely, is to short-track the process. This is a focused move, a disposal EIS, that wants you to take a journey down the road to where we don't have to put it deep in the ground, but what we're going to do is we're going to put it on the surface -- mhh -- ten feet under the ground.

What does it really mean? Hanford has what they call post- -- or pre-70 TRU waste,

transuranic waste. It's so hot that you wouldn't want to pick it up. You wouldn't want to handle it. The Department of Energy has been lucky in Savannah River and Oak Ridge where they've been able to leave this stuff in the ground. Anybody been to Savannah River or Oak Ridge? They have coffins that they put above ground, because when the groundwater gets too wet, it flows up and it moves the coffins out of the ground. Oh, well, wait a second here. We've got Oak Ridge and Savannah River as a proposed site. And they want to do near-surface disposal? Am I missing something here? Because I know that the process that they're steering us on is their disposal.

We have to change the process. We have to say to them, no, you can't do this. And by the way, you aren't going to stop 'em, because they're going to do the EIS. This is the minimum assessment modules determined by the CRCIA Team, Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment Team, which I was the chair at the last time when we finally closed out. The Department of Energy came back and said, when we do an assessment of impact, we will use these, all of these things, in every one of our analyses for every EIS ever done. That commit was done in 1997 and 1998. It's 2007, folks, and they haven't done it.

So I'm telling these people that you need to read CRCIA, the requirements documents. It's 120 pages long. Read through it, and if you cross all your T's and dot all your I's, then I might be happy somewhat with your EIS. I don't think you'll do it.

Look at this. Disposal sites -- a big river, a big river, lots of rain, lots of rain, lots of rain. Stuff floats to the surface. They have a wayside at Oak Ridge -- anyway, I've got a whole bunch of reports. You can read that stuff if you want. I analyzed all those sites.

Idaho, that's a good one. Let's dump it over in Idaho so it flows back into the Columbia River anyways. Oh, but let's dump it at Hanford, because it's going to hit the river anyways. Okay, Yucca Mountain, they're kind of dry, so maybe we can put it over there.

But the big thing is this: That's what they're going to do. They're going to put this stuff on the road. Somebody told me there were terrorists in the United States. That's what somebody told me. Somebody told me that terrorists could attack and create dirty bombs. This is the perfect dirty bomb. It's a perfect dirty bomb. And they want to ship this stuff all over the United States. Why don't they

treat it? Why don't they do separation? Why don't they figure out compaction? What about the new technologies that basically can stabilize some of this stuff so it's not radioactive? There are technologies out there. But believe you me, this EIS won't consider those.

This is what it's about: Protect the Columbia River. Protect the future. Stop U.S. DOE dead in their tracks. We have to stop the process.

And my suggestion tonight is this: It's time for the people of the United States and the Northwest to seriously consider a new process. The Department of Energy in the last 18 years has consistently shown us time and time and time and time again that it has failed to manage the cleanup of the Hanford site, beyond recognition. There is so much documentation that anybody in Congress who would be listening to this should say, Oh, my God, we've spent $25 billion, and we've gotten nowhere. There's nobody in their right mind that would put up with it anymore.

It's time to create a cleanup commission and move forward with a change for Hanford and the site. And I want the analysis not only done for Hanford as far as the CRCIA requirements. I want it done for every site in the nation, because as far as

I'm concerned, this isn't a battle just about Hanford. This is a battle for the protection of our water resources in this whole country. And you can't do it at Savannah River because you might have their hands tied in Savannah River because it's a "yes" society down there. And you might have 'em tied in Oak Ridge because they're fully into this production mode. But the bottom line, the people that aren't being paid are getting contaminated and dying because of their exposure at Hanford, at Rocky Flats, at Oak Ridge, at Savannah River, and it's time that we change the process.

So thank you for this opportunity to speak, and I hope you enjoyed my slide show.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Okay. Bill Mead. And Bob Hedlund will follow Bill.

MR. MEAD: My name is Bill Mead, and I am the Director of Public Safety and Resources Agency.

(Pause to adjust the microphone.)

MR. MEAD: My name is Bill Mead, and I'm the Director of Public Safety and Resources Agency in Portland, Oregon. I'm retired from federal law enforcement, and my first nuclear training class was in 1977.

I am against bringing new waste to Hanford, regardless of their source or composition. Hanford is already grossly contaminated, and must be cleaned up before additional waste is imported.

In 1984, for each pound of plutonium-239 that was produced at Hanford, we paid $276,000. We also generated 4,138,000 gallons of high-level liquid radioactive and chemical waste for each of the 2200 pounds of plutonium that we produced that year. That added 9 billion gallons of high-level liquid waste that we needed to safely contain for 225 generations.

In the late 1980s, the Department finally admitted that it had released 195 billion gallons of similar waste into Hanford soils during the previous 40 years of operations. That waste was just one of several dozen waste streams at Hanford.

In 1987, I was called to testify before a congressional subcommittee. Now, even though the topic was about converting WPPSS-1 reactor to a production reactor, the discussion rapidly expanded to include waste issues at Hanford. During that hearing, Hanford's manager bragged about the amount of waste that had been reclaimed in 1986.

During my testimony, I reported that even though the Department had worked on that project for

an entire year, the total for that year was less than had been produced during a single day of plutonium production, and that we were creating that waste for more than 42 years at that time. Again, this was only for a single waste stream of the dozens at Hanford.

Now, according to the Department's own published data, in 1984, Hanford produced a total of 1,376,000 curies of radiation. Of this, 1,000 curies were of TRUs were buried on-site, and another 10,000 pounds were dumped there. I'm not sure why they referred to that as "dumped." Again, this is only one of the 40 years of Hanford's history. The current proposal is for 140 million curies.

TRUs are extremely long-lived radionuclides and must be isolated essentially for eternity. Some of the wastes in the Department's proposal would include additional TRUs.

In 1998, I toured the Department's Mound site in Ohio, which had ended its weapons production function and was being cleaned up. At that time, the two managers I interviewed about their cleanup experience were concerned that a total of 2.3 curies of radiation that still existed in the grease pits of their elevators might delay returning the site to the city. Even so, before that tour, I had to view a

video and pass a radiologic health test. And then I had to participate in a follow-up survey several months later. I've toured Hanford several times over the past couple decades, and I've never been monitored during that time.

A single particle of plutonium is only 4/10ths of one micron in diameter. As a comparison, a normal backpacking filter filters down to one micron. So in other words, you could get two of these things side-by-side going through a filter.

Dr. John Gofman states that the inhalation of that amount will inevitably cause cancer, and the risk to smokers increased by a ratio of 20-to-1. We just saw a picture up here of a plutonium particle in the lung tissue. That was what that little star was.

Typical reactor grade plutonium-239 oxide is eight to ten times more toxic than normal plutonium-239. Plutonium is so lethal in its exposure that in Japan the acceptable amount is 460,000 times smaller than for uranium-238.

MR. BROWN: You're at five minutes now.

MR. MEAD: I'm on my last page.

The type of plutonium at Hanford is sometimes referred to as "dry plutonium" because it travels for longer distances than does normal

plutonium. We ended production there 20 years ago, but it's still grossly contaminated. As an example, nearly 40 years after Hanford's plutonium nuked Nagasaki, the soil one kilometer away from where the bomb exploded showed 5500 picocuries per square meter. None of us would want to live in that type of contamination. But at Hanford, the same time, the soil readings one mile from Purex's discharge stack showed 6600 picocuries. Hanford's soil was 20 percent more contaminated at distances 1.6 times farther away than Nagasaki.

Okay. To summarize, the Department's history of not being honest with the public, regardless of their statements, the Department will have already focused on a preferred option. It will run multiple projects simultaneously to achieve their desired goals.

In 1987, it wanted to modify an abandoned reactor, even though its own peer review committee strongly recommended against that project due to safety concerns. The Department's continued attempts to restart the FFTF reactor are legendary, even though the Department knew the reactor was not needed, was not cost-effective, and would be hazardous.

The Department has been trying to remediate some wastes that were created at Hanford in the 1940s and 1950s. But it has never completed a cleanup project on time or within the projected budget. In fact, even after working on these issues for decades, the Department still cannot manage the wastes that already exist on-site.

The Department is responsible for the actions of its contractors, and in this regard, it has been criminally negligent. They recently had yet another spill out there because the workers used the wrong type of hose to drain a waste tank. The hose failed, but the workers did not notice it for several hours, and then delayed in making the required notifications of the accident.

It is time for the Department to prove it is competent and able to clean up what is already at Hanford. I object to Hanford's inclusion as a potential site for wastes that were not created at Hanford, and I ask the Department to strike Hanford from the list of candidates for this repository.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Bob Hedlund is next. Particularly if you have printed comments, if you can

summarize them and try to stay within the five-minute limit. My number four doesn't seem to be quite as compelling viewing as people's own comments. So anyway, glance over here every now and then.

Okay. Bob Hedlund is -- is Harvey Thorstead back?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No, he left.

MR. BROWN: Oh, he did. Okay. And then Cherie Lambert-Holenstein will follow Bob. Bob, please.

MR. HEDLUND: Yeah, my name is Bob Hedlund.

To begin with, I don't think we ought to put anything else up at Hanford until we go ahead and, like Greg says, clean what we have up there already -- clean it up. But, you know, I've been involved in the nuclear industry. I started down at Trojan in the late '60s, early '70s, when we were excavating stuff. I worked for Catalytic Hoffman, (unintelligible) and Becker, you know, all the different companies -- worked with Bechtel and those people. You know, the majority of workers are, you know, hardworking people, just like everybody in this room. They deserve a fair break.

But, you know, in 1980, when the mountain blew up, I was down there. I was in the spent fuel area. There was radioactive asbestos all over the place. Also, we had a leak in the basement with radioactive water and some other stuff. I worked in some of the hottest spots of the plant. My pick went off the scale four days in a row there and stuff.

When I left Trojan down there, I was sick. I coughed up blood for years. My stomach bled. My hair fell out. All my teeth fell out, and we had to replace every cavity in there. You know, I've had two cancer operations on my left leg. The bones hurt. You know, a year ago or six months ago or something, I quit breathing. I breathed so hard I sucked my whole chest in. My sternum's stickin' out.

I don't know if that was from the Trojan down there, the nuclear waste, or I don't know if it was from the five superfund sites I dug through down on Front Avenue that they knew about and didn't tell us about. You know, we lost a couple of kids, four of my friends that were on the job. You know, you bring that crap home on your clothes, and it gets in the atmosphere.

You know, it's shock and awe crap over in Baghdad, hell, what did they do? They went in there

and bombed it. Right after that, they had a big storm. You know what happened? Five and a half weeks that depleted uranium came over and sat over the United States. It rained down. Every time it rained, it came down on us.

You know, we got more diabetes from the Second World War tests. There's maps that show where the wind went and stuff. You know, I told 'em -- I filmed every meetings for the last eight years. I told 'em eight years ago, you know, we needed to quit producing this nuclear junk and start cleaning it up. We're all going to be dead.

One in 50 Indian kids up around Hanford are dying of leukemia. Out of the 28 families at the perimeter of Hanford, all 28 of 'em had cancer. The kids are born with no eyes, no brains, you know. Out of 200 calves one year, they destroyed 80 of 'em because they had extra legs or heads and that.

You know, in '57, I was working over there in an area where they were dumping the stuff on us on purpose just to test -- that was GE -- to see what effects it had on the people. You know, I was working behind a bailer when I was in grade school, you know, breathing that junk all day long. It's a wonder I made it this long. The only reason I did is because I

went with alternative medicine. The regular doctor, all they do is cover it up. You know, you get sick, hell, I paid my own doctor bills. Hanford didn't pay 'em. Trojan didn't pay 'em. You know, the state didn't pay any of my bills.

Well, anyway, you get the point. I want the damn thing stopped. We don't need the 70,000 to 100,000 trucks running in the United States carrying this stuff. We've got 38 canisters sitting down there at Trojan we don't know what to do with. A friend of mine decommissioned that down there. Where we ran into the radiated water in the basement where I was working up to my knees, they had to destroy four foot of concrete. It went down through there, you know, alpha, beta and gamma radiation. You don't want to get the junk in your lungs, I'll tell you, you're going to have a hard time breathing.

That's all I got to say.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Randall Streets will follow Cherie.

MS. LAMBERT-HOLENSTEIN: Good evening. My name is Cherie Lambert-Holenstein, and I thank all of you for coming, and in respect to you, I will be very brief.

On or about the presentation of slide number 16, you read the word "defense." I do not see that word on this slide. The history of Hanford is toxic, and toxic has been the use of euphemisms. The word "defense" should be replaced with "war, invasion, occupation." It has little to do with defense. I would suggest in the future you have better word usage.

You use the public tonight by inviting public questions, and you did not plan to record that. That is manipulation of the public, purely and simply, and I suggest that it was used so that you would lessen public testimony.

The issue tonight is -- let's see -- what's the -- greater-than-class C level radioactive waste. The acronym is GTCC LLW. Why is the word "radioactive" left out of the acronym?

It's greater-than-class C level radioactive waste, and in parentheses it's GTCC LLW. And all throughout here it's GTCC LLW, where "radioactive" is omitted. My message here is very simple. That's eight words. Do not bring more waste to Hanford. And thank you all for coming. Thank you very much again.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Okay. Randall Streets.

(No response.)

MR. BROWN: Dr. Joyce Young. And Keith Harding will follow Dr. Young.

DR. YOUNG: My comments have to take a little bit of a health -- not a disease perspective, but a health perspective. I'm Dr. Joyce Young, a naturopathic physician with a specialty in environmental medicine, from Portland, Oregon. I'm in private practice.

I came here ten years ago with virtually no knowledge of Hanford and its health effects. I've been totally appalled about the lack of health effects information/epidemiology that has been done on the present radioactive leaking waste. How much is really going into the air? Nobody seems to really talk about it that it's going into the ground, it's going into the water. What's going into the air?

The down-winders, quote/unquote, of Hanford are usually considered to be the folks east of Hanford. The reality of the situation, according to the National Weather Service in Portland, is that the Columbia River Gorge drains all the air from eastern Washington and eastern Oregon into the Willamette River Valley, i.e., air moves like water, downstream.

This means that the people of Portland, Oregon and Vancouver, Washington are the true down-winders. We're talking millions of people in the Willamette River Valley. There are no air epidemiological studies on the present-day leakage on down-winders and health of down-winders, especially in conjunction with the 9500 pesticides registered for use in Oregon, and the roughly ton of mercury -- that's 2,000 pounds -- from the eastern Oregon cement plant, and the several hundred pounds of mercury -- airborne mercury from the coal-fired power plant, and the save nerve gas -- quote/unquote, safe -- nerve gas burning at the Umatilla (ph) Nerve Gas Depot.

All of this health surveillance incompetence needs to be taken into account with the grim reaper health statistics of the Oregon and Washington Pacific Northwest -- what I call the paradox. If the Pacific Northwest is such a great place to live, then what are Oregon and Washington compared to all the rest of the country, all the rest of the U.S.?

One, Oregon is number two in autism.

Number two, Oregon is number two in breast cancer, and Washington is number one.

Three, Oregon and Washington are considered to have the highest amount of multiple sclerosis in the U.S.

Number four, Oregon and Washington have just joined the stroke belt of the Southeast United States. They're number six and nine in the country in stroke mortality. That's stroke death.

Five, Oregon is 24 percent above the national average in malignant melanoma skin cancer, even though Oregon is known for its cloud cover. The Oregonian says, to quote the front page of the paper, "The dark side of the sun," Dr. Oleg Johanssen of the Carolinska (ph) Institute of Sweden says in a 2006 paper entitled "Malignant Melanoma Skin Cancer - it's not the sun!" It's chemicals and radiation, some kind of a combination.

How much has this geologically unstable northwest toxic stew at Hanford contributing to these grim Pacific Northwest health statistics? It's anybody's guess, because it's a mixture. All the people of Oregon and Washington need to have some answers before more high-level radioactive waste is added to this toxic soup.

Thanks.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Keith Harding, and then Gerry Pollet.

MR. HARDING: Hi. I'm Keith Harding from the upper Hood River Valley, oh, about 50 miles upriver from here, and an hour or so downriver from Hanford. I have two beautiful young adult kids who are in the room here. They've been attending these meetings for the last 18 years in Hood River and Portland.

In this day and age, when we are programmed daily by the mass media, working for who knows who, to believe that there's a terrorist behind every bush in the country -- (laughter) -- terrorism and transportation of this waste material is one of my concerns, and then stockpiling yet more of this stuff in this gorgeous bioregion here.

I started into college very soon after NEPA 1969 was instituted. Coming from an instinctually ecological perspective from birth really, in a Republic family even, New Hampshire, I was very glad that NEPA came into existence. In college, we had great hopes for it. Then working for 20 years in government, I saw the ups and downs of NEPA. And my sense of it now is that it has been

extremely corrupted by the political mission that is fed down to the agencies to work with it.

It seems to me the environment -- the human environment that we live in is that agency people very quickly get coopted by that political mission and working towards retirement. The public sees a very different final product through NEPA than what goes on back in the agency offices and whatnot. We get sanitized information, a lot of doublespeak and whatnot. In my background of forestry, a clear-cut is now called a regeneration cut. Well, it's a darn lie. Or killing citizens is called collateral damage in a war.

So it seems to me one big challenge that we have in these agencies is for them to earn the public trust. Many much more specific speakers before me spoke specifically to Hanford and the whole nuclear realm, to this issue of earning the public trust. The track record with DOE and other agencies is not good.

I have talked with retired friends that have worked in the industry, and they tell me that a lot of things that are running up and down the roads all the time really create a much more imminent threat than these things that are intended to transport on

the road. The obvious thing is, why add to it, the dangers on the road? Yeah, there's plenty.

Let's see. In the end, it will be ecologists, not the bookkeepers of industry, who give the final accounting of humanity on this planet. And I do have a suggestion of a place to check out for storing this material. It's on a ranch in Texas. I heard -- (applause) -- I heard that the owner of that ranch recently bought some 600,000 acres in Paraguay. What the heck is that about?

I'll quit so that more can get up here. Thanks a lot.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Okay. Gerry Pollet, and it's Angela Crowley, and I have a hyphenated name, and I can't make out the last, but you know who you are, so you'll be next. Gerry.

MR. POLLET: I'm Gerry Pollet with Heart of America Northwest. Folks, thank you very much for coming out here tonight. Together we can stop this insane proposal. We've done it before; we'll do it again. But it takes you coming out to do it, even when the Energy Department doesn't want you to be here, especially when the Energy Department doesn't want you to be here. And they don't.

We're going to go through a few numbers and a few letters in alphabet soup. First, let's stop and say Einstein asked people to remember what the definition of insanity is. Right? Insanity, for those of you who don't know the quote from Einstein, insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result. So, what do you call it if you dug a borehole above the groundwater that flows into the Columbia River, and inserted highly radioactive waste into the bottom of the borehole? And if you don't expect the borehole to leak and contaminate the river, then you're insane, because we've done it before, and our problem is that the Energy Department is fighting us tooth and nail trying to evade cleaning it up.

We've dug boreholes at Hanford -- not we -- the weapon-makers -- and said, trust us. And we'd be insane if we did.

Two hundred people were mailed notice of this hearing tonight by the Energy Department nationwide for all their hearings. Took a little teeth-pulling tonight to get to how large their mailing list was. I think that is more than dismal. It is shameful. Come on, I think we know that thousands of people commented on the Hanford solid

waste disposal environmental impact statement. We had hundreds of people attend those hearings in Portland. Oh, in Portland. The Energy Department didn't want to hold the hearing in Portland either tonight, did they?

Let's insist that they hold the hearing on the draft EIS in Portland and one in Hood River.

(Applause.)

Please make sure the applause is noted in the record.

MR. BROWN: It's also not deducted from your time.

MR. POLLET: Thank you.

Three thousand people commented. Every one of those people were commenting on a closely related proposal to bury low-level and mixed waste at Hanford, including some of the same -- very same wastes that the Energy Department is attempting to rename and put in here as greater-than-class C-like. It's highly radioactive plutonium waste. They called it then remote handled transuranic. That was a mouthful. Didn't think that they would come up with a worse name to try to dissuade the public from commenting, but they did, calling it greater-than-class C-like. But it's the same highly radioactive plutonium wastes that they wanted to bring to Hanford.

Two court decisions said you can't without studying the full impacts and the impacts of all the other similar wastes that you want to bring to Hanford.

Instead what we have is a continued effort to rename and piecemeal. "Ten" -- write down ten -- -- "up to ten potential latent cancer fatalities during routine transport." That bureaucratese for the number of people who will die during routine, accident-free, terrorist-attack-free, trucking of the wastes proposed in the last go-round to Hanford under the solid waste EIS, including some of these wastes.

Now write down "50." Fifty is the number of fatal cancers that those same wastes would actually kill when you include children and use the National Academy of Science's latest dose conversion numbers. Yes, believe it or not, your federal government decided in studying the risks of trucking highly radioactive waste to Hanford to leave out our children. Like I said, it's adult latent cancer fatalities they measured. I guess they don't give a damn.

You have to ask the individuals who are in charge of the document, what were you thinking when you made that decision, when you decided to write that

and leave out the study of children? And did you think you could get away with it?

We insist that this document include the risks to children for not only trucking the waste, but for drinking the water and breathing the air in 10 years, 50 years, and 100 and 1,000 years, and include the risks as the National Academy of Sciences, paid for with your tax dollars, including from the Energy Department, ironically, said in the biological effects of ionizing radiation -- I'm saying this just for the record -- report number seven issued in June 2005 -- use the latest National Academy data on what is the effect of a dose on a child and an adult instead of trying to use 20-year-old data to say that you have fewer cancers. Because when we include children and the new data, it's 50 people die of cancer from routine transport of this waste to Hanford.

But what happens if at the intersection of I-205 and 84, the Energy Department's truck with mixed radioactive waste, including plutonium, had an accident, a predictable accident with fire, or a terrorist attacked it at that location? The Energy Department didn't study this. So we hired independent nuclear physicists to run the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's own models studying what would happen

with a single truckload. So write down "340" -- 340 square miles of Portland would be contaminated, requiring evacuation and unprecedented effort to try to clean it up to make it liveable again -- 340 square miles. It's never been done.

Write down "1,400." That's the number of cancer fatalities from that predictable attack and running their own computer model -- 1,400.

Now let's think about -- the Energy Department said we've got 5,600 cubic meters of this waste to send to Hanford possibly. Are we really looking at anywhere else? Well, it's illegal to send it to WIPP. And the State of New Mexico's not about to roll over and make it legal. And Congress isn't about to. And Yucca Mountain's never going to open. So we're looking at all of a sudden near-surface disposal, which is insanity. Tried it. Done that. Been there. Done it. They buried greater-than-class C-like waste in the soil at Hanford. It's contaminating the groundwater today.

And look at the other sites. Idaho has a legal agreement that the Energy Department is suing to void, but it's sticking. And it says you have to remove all similar wastes from the soil in Idaho. They're not going to ship it there. We have to win a

legal battle to get the same thing into the Hanford cleanup agreement. And we have to uphold the mission of 297 passed by Washington voters to try to keep any of this waste that has chemicals in it out.

Five thousand six hundred cubic meters is just the tip of the iceberg. In fact, as the State of Nevada wrote several years ago, the Department of Energy has 2.6 million cubic feet of similar wastes in existence today which it is looking for a place to send, calling it "special case waste," "denotes DOE waste having characteristics similar to those of greater-than-class C waste that generally lack firm disposal plans."

So they're looking for a place, and they're trying to piecemeal it. And we insist that you put it all into one impact study, including all the wastes already at Hanford and everything else you want to send there in one study, and show us how many people you want to kill, and how much contamination you're going to put into the groundwater and flow into the Columbia River. It's not going to take hundreds of years.

How much cesium-137 is going to be in it from your GNEP proposal to truck high-level waste to Hanford for reprocessing? The answer given tonight

was either disingenuous or a deliberate attempt to evade the law. The law says all related proposals have to be disclosed to the public and their potential impacts considered in one environmental impact statement. Don't give us, Oh, we don't know which facilities we'll use for GNEP. You've chosen facilities, you're doing an EIS, and you're piecemealing it. You have to put it all into one document, have one round of public hearings, and tell the public at one time, when you want to ship all that high-level waste to Hanford, plus the greater-than-class C-like waste, and all the remote handled transuranic plutonium waste, where's it going to go, and what are the impacts, and how many people die?

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Okay. Angela is next.

MS. CROWLEY-KUCH: It's Crowley-Kuch.

MR. BROWN: Kuch? Okay. Thanks. And Ruth Curpiz will follow you. Thanks.

MS. CROWLEY-KUCH: I'm Angela Crowley-Kuch. I'm the Executive Director of the Oregon Chapter of Physicians for Social Responsibility.

One of the problems I see with this environmental impact statement is one of the problems

that represents our whole nuclear energy and nuclear weapons industry. We're not looking far enough ahead into the future. Not only are we not looking at the waste that will be generated with GNEP program, which, as we heard earlier, is the majority of the waste coming from the DOE weapons facilities, but we're also only looking out until 2062. That's as far as the projections for this disposal are going. I might not even have grandchildren by that time.

Are we really looking far enough into the future when we're talking about radioactive waste that will be around for millions of years? The EIS should incorporate all current plans for new weapons and new power plants, all the new waste that could possibly be classified should be included, all types and all amounts.

Secondly, there's one alternative that was not included, and it needs to be included in the EIS. That's called the hardened on-site storage, or HOSS. When you have hardened on-site storage, there's no need for transportation. It stays at the site. We don't want to put anyone at risk from transporting nuclear waste. We don't want to put Oregonians at risk, Washingtonians, people in New Mexico. There's

no need for any of us to be at risk from transportation.

So in the EIS there needs to be an assessment of HOSS. They need to be resistant to attacks, including explosive and planes, and those are not usually included in the risk assessments. They also need to look at specific sites for these studies, not an arid site, and a humid site. All these sites are different. The water tables are different. The rivers are different. We need a specific study for every individual site looking at all possible scenarios, types of waste and amounts of waste.

There are a few other things that I'd like to see included. The first is there needs to be funding for the Washington Department of Ecology to monitor this waste independently to see the levels and check if anything is leaking. There also needs to be funding for the Oregon Department of Energy to review and comment on any transportation issues should the HOSS alternative not be chosen.

Speaking of transportation, all routes and methods need a projected cost. And in addition to that, we need to have the estimates of the public health costs, which are not always included, in addition to accident projections.

Finally, as has been mentioned many times before, we need a specific definition for what this other miscellaneous DOE GTCC-like waste is. It's not appropriate to have an environmental impact statement when we don't know exactly what we're talking about. So I'd ask that all these things be included. And please look far into the future. We'll be dealing with this waste for a long time. And if I have grandchildren, I don't want them to be sitting at these meetings like I have for the past four years.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Ruth Curpiz.

(Pause.)

And following Ruth will be Catherine Thomasson.

MS. CURPIZ: Hello. When I came tonight, I signed up to speak, but I was going to say something else. But I don't know that I had an epiphany, but somehow I'm reminded of shock and awe and going into Iraq. Nothing was ever prepared correctly. The same thing, I think, is happening in regard to the Trojan -- or to the Hanford. I was opposed to Trojan, and then opposed to Hanford.

We're being massaged with a lot of statistics that I think -- but -- but I don't believe anything. I think this is a bunch of working over our minds to make us think that something is being done. But I don't think they know what the hell is -- that they're doing. And I think that we just have to stop -- not -- certainly not transport this stuff. But we need to absolutely do a better job of getting the word out to people and planning and maybe changing who's doing when.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

Okay. Paige Knight will follow Catherine.

DR. THOMASSON: Hello. My name is Dr. Catherine Thomasson. I'm the President of Physicians for Social Responsibility nationally.

I'm concerned about the whole United States, and of course the whole earth, with these wastes that are going on internationally. I think it's very important, of course, to know exactly what the waste is, listing type and sites by state, by radioactivity amount, and volume, to better assess and plan for the site issues that are variable from site to site, and the transportation risks involved in each.

I feel that it's very important to have a very clear and defined listing of the waste streams, and for the DOE activities that create this waste, so we know where the waste is going to be coming from in the future. It's also very important to accurately characterize the new sources of this waste, as was stated before in terms of its future projection.

I think it would be fabulous if the EIS included a possibility that there wasn't going to be any more generation of nuclear waste, either in any nuclear power plant or any additional nuclear weapon, and that -- (applause) -- the savings from that would help fund adequate -- to me, storage is identical to disposal -- so adequate containment of this waste.

Obviously, as I mentioned with my question, I haven't been able to find -- and I'm sorry that you guys don't know any other country that is doing any better job than we are in terms of storing, which is equal to disposing, of this waste. It's very, very important to realize that the only current option that we have, which is the no-action option, is to store it on-site. Well, every site is not going to be able to store it on-site. So there is going to be some transportation risks involved with that action. But it needs to be in a manner that can be continually

monitored, and the monitoring plans obviously need to go out for centuries.

We need to have it hardened. We need to have it safe from a variety of attacks that haven't been assessed or even paid for up until this point, and aren't in the budget to be paid for. But obviously some of the sites are going to need to be combined, and my recommendation is for an eval- -- further evaluation and development of the no-action option, because storage and monitoring is essential.

If you were to go beyond the storage in hardened facilities on-site in a variety of sites around the country, and go to near-surface level or intermediate level, it would have to be absolutely crystal clear what kind of monitoring is going to be done. There isn't any adequate research done on this. And it's pretty amazing that no research has been done, since this was legislated over 20 years ago, to tell us what kind of waste storage, which is, again, identical to disposal, that we could potentially have.

So, obviously, we need to work through this EIS, through any other process we possibly can, to demand new geologic deep storage that is safe from groundwater and safe from geologic activity. Yucca Mountain isn't happening, and we need another site.

We need another site because it's legislated. We need another site because that is the best way potentially to dispose, really to store.

The last thing I'd like to say is that I think it is worth looking at the other technologies in terms of how to decrease the volume of these high radioactive sources and encourage the places that are creating them that there are alternative technologies developed so that we're not continuing to create this kind of mess.

I thank you for your time. I know that there's a lot of scientific information in this room and expertise, and I know that you all are doing your job, and I want to thank you so much for being here. I truly do -- I mean, for us to be knowledgeable about this is very, very difficult. I work on many different issues, obviously. But to hear question-and-answer is really helpful for us, because we don't always know what questions we should be asking. So thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Paige Knight. Karen Harding will be next.

MS. KNIGHT: Speaking. I'm Paige Knight, the President of Hanford Watch in Portland. We've

been around for 14 or 15 years now. And I think I've been doing Hanford almost as long as I've been in my current teaching job, a long time.

Therein lies for me one of the most important things, as I really am concerned about the children and future generations. I'm leaving my students and my own children and perhaps grandchildren with a terrible legacy. That's one of the reasons I've worked on this as much as I do.

I'm going to address a couple of words first, and then just go through my points. And I'll try not to be too repetitious of things that people have said, although I think it's important that you hear people working on the same themes.

We call this waste "orphaned," which I find quite fascinating. Also, at Hanford, we talk about cribs where waste goes. I mean, we have all these baby analogies. You know, it really bothers me. I think it's a real commentary over the many years on how we look at each other, and look at our children, and look at the world. So I look at "orphaned" and say, you know, all waste should stay at its home if at all possible. You know, every orphan should stay at its own home. We don't want orphans. So just a

little bit of humor there, but there's also some seriousness in that comment.

The other thing that I want to comment on in sort of that vein is, it was mentioned tonight, and it's mentioned in the literature, that the volume of this greater-than-class C radioactive waste is small compared to all the other waste at Hanford. "Small" is relative. We're talking curies, and we're talking about adding to waste to waste to waste, and we have no good solutions, and some terrible problems at a place like Hanford. And we're not the only ones in the complex that are on that wonderful list that has problems.

This is just one of DOE's proposals to bring waste to Hanford from all over the complex and country. We're right now waiting for another environmental impact statement to come out that was a redo of the solid waste impact statement that Gerry and others have mentioned that hundreds and hundreds of people showed up to speak out about several years ago. That EIS is looking at bringing waste in from everywhere. It went back to the drawing board because the logic of it and the data in it was so incredibly flawed. We cannot afford to have flawed logic in any of these documents -- and in the thinking. This is

all about critical thinking. And I think we have a real chasm or a real black hole in our country of people who are really critically thinking through these issues.

Hanford has no treatment yet. Let's think about this. We have no treatment capability right now for the 54 million gallons, plus other waste, all of which will leak into the Columbia River and the groundwater. That also has been mentioned. The Columbia River is our lifeblood. It is the lifeblood of our area. We cannot continue to kill our rivers.

We also need -- and I mentioned this in my question earlier -- a comprehensive document that must include the synergistic or cumulative impacts of the waste from all these EISs. That's been mentioned a few times, so I won't belabor that one. But we need to include all current documents, which Gerry says is the law, into this document.

The other thing, in this little handout where each site is described, I want to say your description of waste management activities at Hanford -- and now this is a quote from this little article -- "include treatment and disposal of low-level waste on-site and processing of transuranic waste which is being stored at WIPP." We don't have

treatment. We don't have this kind of activity going on on-site. It is projected, but again, it's been mentioned, if we're lucky, we're going to have a treatment plant by 2019. And there's a really good chance we won't have it by then. So these projections are -- you know, they're based on pending things, and Yucca Mountain is one of those pending things that's been in process for over 20 years. It is millions, if not billions, of dollars by now in cost overruns, and we are nowhere, because it's not a great geological repository. It happens to be, from my studies, a great earthquake-prone area. I'm not too excited about waste being stored there.

So the logic of picking Hanford -- and maybe some of the other sites, too, but my knowledge is about Hanford -- as a disposal site for this greater-than-class C radioactive waste is being predicated upon solutions and processes that are still a dream at Hanford. We haven't met our dream yet, and our dream is cleanup.

DOE -- let me see -- Hanford is also currently not being safely managed. That's been mentioned time and time again. There's truth galore on that one, and I think Ron Wyden's representative tonight covered that pretty well.

Finally, DOE needs to give a true projection of all the wastes over time, since it looks like there will be a steady stream. Catherine just mentioned this in her thing. I don't see this kind of waste ending unless we start looking at policies where we don't create this kind of waste anymore or we create it minimally.

So we've got some real policy-type issues and rethinking to do in this country about this. Other countries are no further ahead in this. Absolutely they're not. So we're in a real tight place here. And if you are really concerned about your children and your grandchildren, you will send some comments in by e-mail, or, you know, the little handout here. The more, the better. They have to address them.

I just think it's amazing that all of these people here have turned out tonight. I love that you have come and given your time again. I also really appreciate that the meeting was held here. And I would request that meetings do be held in Portland and Hood River for the draft EIS that comes out on this, because I'm sure one will -- who knows when -- and that many, many more people are contacted, and you get that list through the tank waste closure and

management EIS. I mean, there's a huge list there -- 3,000 people -- and those people are interested in this. They know that no solutions have come. They know that there's no -- you know, that there's, I guess I would say, a big tomorrow with no answers.

So thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HARDING: My name is Karen Harding. I would appreciate being able to speak from the Hood River area. We had to plan a day, because we don't like to waste gas, just driving in to a meeting. And so our whole day was Portland errands. And we had quite a few discussions in the car, my 21-year-old and my 18-year-old, who have been coming for at least 15, 16 years. Why do we have to do this again? It's like, it doesn't do any good, they don't listen. And it's like, yes, yes.

I have over the years released the thought that it does any good. But I guess my answer for now is that if you just come and listen to the combined wisdom of people who are truly grappling from their various disciplines, you have a tribal consciousness and answer, at least a wisdom of thinking, and you can compare it to the agencies who are trying, hopefully,

to do the best they can, but are not looking necessarily at the larger picture. And I'm very glad you're here, and thank you for doing that all these years.

Thank you for all the people who speak out with the facts and figures. I don't have all those at my command. I do child care, and so, obviously, children are the issue. We need to be considering many generations farther into the future than this EIS appears to be looking at.

So I am opposed to making Hanford a national sacrifice zone. I would like all the facts and figures put into this EIS that represent the numbers of deaths that are potential, the amount of money that's potential. It needs to be a much larger scope, because the problem's a much larger scope.

I would rather not have it trucked all over the country. If there's a way to solidify it on-site, I would be ecstatic about that. And we need to be putting that money into that.

I definitely agree that we need a congressional mandate to have an outside commission be in charge of this. It's not been working, as we are well aware, to have the people who are generating it

being paid to clean it up. It doesn't seem to be working.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: And Liz Gilbert will follow Shannon.

MS. PALERMO: Hello. My name is Shannon Palermo. I came here with some friends from Portland because my roommate, Lizzy, told me that this was going on, and it really concerned me. We drove here to urge the Department of Energy to take the Hanford location off its list of potential sites for the disposal of radioactive waste. I also want to say thank you so much to all the people that came here today, and also do all of the work, because it's hard work going up against the Department of Energy and all the powers that be. And you don't get paid for it necessarily. I just am really, really thankful for the physicians, for everybody that's come and spoke today.

Our concerns are as follows. The delicate habitat of the Columbia River is an important part of many ecosystems. The possibility of Energy sending even more nuclear waste to Hanford will compromise the river. To consider disposing of even more waste in

such a sensitive area seems short-sighted, given the proximity of such a lovely river. The river's ability to spread any leak contamination concerns us.

Public opinion continues to show that we want to clean up Hanford and not increase the risk for further pollution. In the case of leaked nuclear waste, which, as mentioned, has already happened, and therefore I do not feel confident in putting more into the ground. Radiation would directly affect our community. Communities feel the effects of radiation in many ways, including an increase in birth defects, cancer, infertility, and other tragic medical conditions.

Finally, we are sick and tired of not feeling safe to swim and recreate in the Columbia River when it's right there tempting us every summer.

Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Chuck Johnson will follow.

MS. GILBERT: I'm Liz Gilbert. I'm here because I read an article in The Oregonian . I really haven't been active about this before. I really felt driven to come here tonight and do what I can.

We're talking a lot about children. I personally will never have children because my ultimate motherly instinct tells me to not bear a child into an apocalyptic world. I guess what I'm saying is that I don't necessarily believe that we will all survive. You know, it may be five years before we're wiped out completely. But what will live on are animals and plants and soils and rivers that deserve respect and need honoring.

I am so sad, and I want to ask you personally to reach deep inside of your human self and ask yourself if it feels right to do this. Because it's wrong. And I know that something needs to be done with it, but please don't put it here next to the Columbia River. This is our home. We'll do whatever we can to protect it, and we will not allow it.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Okay. Chuck Johnson, and then Tiago Denczuk will follow you.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. I'm Chuck Johnson. I'm a Board Member of Columbia Riverkeeper. Just for the record, I actually haven't checked this out with Columbia Riverkeeper yet, but I personally favor the option number one, the no option. Although, actually, I do think that the suggestion by the

representative of Physicians for Social Responsibility for hardened on-site storage is probably a more responsible way of dealing with it.

I do think, obviously, these wastes need to be protected and kept close to where they were generated to reduce the transportation costs and risks. I don't think that we're served well by a shell game of moving wastes around the country. These wastes -- I asked earlier in the question period about where these wastes were coming from, and specifically whether they were coming from the West Valley Reprocessing Facility that's been shut down for many years. It's highly contaminated. And the answer was that the current projected waste primarily comes from that site. I just question as to whether or not it makes a lot of sense to take waste from one highly contaminated site and move it to another highly contaminated site.

I've been to West Valley, and I feel bad for the people who live in that area. They've got a creek going through the West Valley site. There are people who are downstream of that creek who want to have that waste moved. I can be sympathetic to that. There is an Indian tribe, the Seneca Band of Iroquois Nation, that live in that area and have part of their

reservation that are downstream of that creek. But I wouldn't want to put my waste in their land, and I don't think they would really want to send their waste to us either.

Particularly I think it's -- we really are -- I don't really think we're ever going to psychologically get a grip on what to do with this waste properly, as long as we're still hellbent on generating more of it. I really think that's the key -- (applause) -- because as long as there's this financial imperative to create more waste, and this political imperative to create more waste, then whatever solution is come up with is going to be the most -- the easiest but certainly not the best solution to what to do with it ultimately.

So I think we need to have a national consensus. And I think we're actually -- the funny thing is, this administration is crumbling in so many ways right now. This global nuclear energy project is going to flop and fall on its face -- thank God. When it does, maybe we can finally have some sanity in our energy policy and make a decision to end this nuclear craziness. There's some other things that cost a lot less money -- conserve energy, build wind generators -- although they can be fatal, too, as we

saw today. That's -- you know, nothing's completely risk-free, but nothing compared to the hazards of long-lived radionuclides.

So when we get to that point, then I think we can have a rational discussion about what to do with this stuff, and a scientific decision that isn't based on expediency, and the least cost, quickest option. We will figure out what to do with it at that point. But until then, I favor option one, and I favor option one as my default position on just about any generation of radioactive material. Keep it where it's generated, and put the heat on the people in that place to stop generating it and figure out some other way of doing -- generating energy or doing whatever other activity it is that we think we want to do with radioactive materials.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Okay. I think Les Davenport will be next.

MR. DENCZUK: My name is Tiago. I came from Portland. I'm (unintelligible). I -- actually, I just would like to just bring forth some feelings that many people here express, and we agree -- arguments -- I would just like -- are just going to

reenforce my personal feelings about the same issues. I think the argument's represented pretty well, so I'm not going to extend myself on that.

Mainly I feel really outraged to have to be here today telling the Department of Energy that this proposal is preposterous, is offensive. There's a group of people here that obviously have been working on caring of communities in many different levels and preserving in spiritual level, ecological, medical. Having to come here to just say, get out here, don't come with more trash to our back yard, is taking all this energy that's being focused on fixing a problem that started decades ago, and have not been fixed.

I think that the feeling of DOE not being trustworthy is like no one can trust any project that comes from this agency that already prove itself incompetent and has no evasament (sic/ph) on really cleaning our sides, on really fixing the error that committed in the past, and has a lot of evasaments (sic/ph) in cheap demonstrations like PowerPoint presentations or PR movements. But when it comes to actually planning on coming up with real solutions, there's nothing. And then coming to ask to dump even more trash on a broken trash can that is already

leaking and destroying our environment is just so offensive.

I say no. We're not stupid. We're not going to just accept that. Yeah, get out of here.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Okay. Dona Hippert will follow you. It's Wes, is it?

MR. DAVENPORT: Les Davenport.

MR. BROWN: Les. Okay.

MR. DAVENPORT: I'm a consultant to Washington Closure Hanford as their Criticality Safety Engineer, even though I live in Battleground, Washington, just about 15 miles north of here. I have been the -- I have led the Nuclear Criticality Safety Programs since 1985 at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Bechtel Hanford, Incorporated, and Bechtel's successor, the Washington Closure Hanford.

My conclusion is that we really shouldn't add the greater-than-class C waste to sites that are currently under going cleanup or where the water table is high. That would eliminate four sites that I can think of, including Savannah River, Oak Ridge, where the water table is high, Hanford, where undergoing cleanup, and hopefully will be nearly through with most of the cleanup except the vitrification project

before -- in fact, quite a bit before -- the last of the greater-than-class C waste is generated.

However, these wastes have to go somewhere. They don't have a disposal path for many of them at the current time. But my personal preference is the geologic repository. That will remain true throughout the period when they're generated. However, that means that we have problems with our national Congress, because they're the ones that have put limits on WIPP, the Waste Isolation Project -- Pilot Project in New Mexico, and also Yucca Mountain, if it ever gets started. Neither one is large enough to take care of all the wastes that have been generated and are designated for those two sites.

We have a national problem. We have a political problem. If you can do anything with your congresspeople, please consider that.

Also, it was Congress -- yes, our national Congress -- that shot down the Basalt Waste Isolation Project that was at Hanford, and the basalt disposal at Deaf Smith, Texas. They wanted to spend all the money on Yucca Mountain so they could hurry up the project. Didn't seem to work, did it?

We all accept some risks in our life. When we understand them, that's okay. Some people

smoke cigarettes. I don't. Most people drive cars. There are a lot of other things that are risky, including just living. But radiation is one of the unknowns in our life for many people. It's because of this unknown quantity, and not being able to see it, that makes many people very hesitant to accept radiation risks.

However, we are in a radioactive environment. It's natural. Potassium-40 is in our bodies and everywhere throughout the earth. You've heard about radiation from radon in your basements. that comes out of the earth. Don't forget life-saving medical radioactivity. It's necessary. There is radiation from nuclear power and isotope production, but that's less than is emitted by our coal-fired electric generating plants.

We're also in a chemically filled environment. They don't ever decay. They don't go away. But because radioactive material, which is relatively unknown, decays, we can talk about that and be scared.

Kind of in summary of what's going on at Hanford, it is being successfully cleaned up in many ways. And I'm not including the vit. plant and the tank waste. They're going to be a long, long, long-

term problem. There are five reactors that have been cocooned. N-Reactor's in process. B-Reactor may become a museum. We'll have to wait until people decide on that one.

Only spent nuclear fuel has been moved away from the Columbia River. It's put into dry storage in the central plateau. All liquid waste disposal to the ground was stopped quite a number of years ago, and some low-level waste, contrary to the comments earlier, has been sent to a contractor near Hanford, at Richland, and is put into a more stable form, and then returned for storage at the Central Waste Complex at Hanford until it can be properly disposed.

Many solid waste sites have been cleaned up to their ROD requirements. That's a record of decision, which is the final decision by the regulators and the public as to what happens. That includes the hundred-F (ph) sites -- hundred-F reactor of solid burial grounds are pretty much all taken care of down to the requirements.

Hundreds of buildings have been removed and debris has been shipped to ERDF. That's the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility in Two West Area, where it goes into a lined below-ground

facility that meets CERCLA requirements. Hundreds of buildings have been removed, and that includes almost the entire north half of the 300 Area. If you've been out there recently, there's hardly a building there, two that I can think of. One's a power plant -- never had any radioactivity in it. Well, the coal, but that's something else again. They're down to the floor slabs, and now they're starting cleanup of the underground waste.

The last thing that I want to mention is that transuranic waste is being successfully shipped from Hanford to the Waste Isolation Pilot Project in New Mexico. Success is happening at Hanford. Don't say no.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

Dona Hippert, and Lloyd K. from Don't Waste Oregon.

MS. HIPPERT: Thanks to the Department of Energy for holding these hearings, and to everybody for coming out and speaking at them. My name is Dona Hippert. That's D-o-n-a, with one "N" for the benefit of whomever is given the lovely task of transcribing these testimonies of ours.

I'll likely be submitting detailed written comments on behalf of the Northwest Environmental Defense Center and Oregon Toxics Alliance. We'll give you a copy of these written comments attached to that.

These are two groups of which I'm a board member, and both of whom are very concerned about the current situation at Hanford, and with any scenario that will increase and compound the problem that exists there now.

But tonight I speak to you on the subject of trust and obligation. I'm astounded that there's even consideration of the idea of bringing more waste of any kind to Hanford Reservation. I shouldn't be by now, but I still am. Considering all the problems and mishaps that have happened at Hanford in the process of cleaning up the waste that's already there, for instance, the waste leak last month, it's simply incomprehensible that the Department of Energy would want to bring in more waste.

The most frightening example -- oh, when one looks beyond Hanford, the situation gets even worse. The safety record of the DOE gets even worse. The most frightening example is found in the DOE Inspector General's own report that came out in March of this year describing the inability to locate at

least 14 computers that held highly sensitive and classified information. Six other computers were missing, but they weren't sure what the information was that was on those. And the state of DOE recordkeeping was so abysmal that the Inspector General's Office had to resort to, in their words, extraordinary means to locate an additional 125 computers.

Now, in conjunction with this process, we have the soon-to-be infamous slide 19 where they're showing a Hanford situation as an example of something that's already working, and it's actually something that's not working at Hanford.

If parents were to exhibit the same sort of neglect and incompetence that the DOE has exhibited at Hanford and in its other operations, the state would long ago have stepped in and removed their children. And now the DOE is talking about adopting more children, and ones that are difficult to manage at that. And when I wrote these comments, I wasn't aware of the term "orphaned waste," but it seems to fit in and dovetail quite nicely with this.

This analogy of incompetent parenting is not as far-fetched as it may seem in that our resources, including our lands, waters and airsheds

are a public trust, and we the people are the beneficiaries of that trust. Although DOE may not be the agency in charge of directly managing these resources, DOE is charged with protecting the trust of the public health and safety. As public servants, DOE officials at the very least have the obligation not to act in a manner that damages our resources and violates that public trust.

In the case of Hanford, where DOE actions are already contaminating the Columbia River and the groundwater in the Hanford vicinity, the DOE should do nothing that by any chance would compound that contamination. Please do not bring this GTCC waste or any other waste to Hanford.

Thank you all very much for your attendance.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Okay. How's that spelled? If you can spell that for the court reporter. Thanks.

MR. MARBET: My name is Lloyd K. Marbet, M-a-r-b-e-t. I am here representing a group called Don't Waste Oregon, which many of you know has been in existence for some time addressing various problems of the nuclear fuel cycle, as well as the Executive Director of the Oregon Conservancy Foundation.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide testimony. I must say it's an honor to hear the testimony that's been given thus far by all of you. I too very much appreciate the fact that we seem to retain ourselves as a community of concern, willing to come time and time again to try and provide some wisdom in this process.

I also appreciate the fact that you've changed the way in which you're holding these meetings. I talked to you about that at the last meeting, and I very much recognize that you've done that, and I want to give you that recognition.

MR. BROWN: Sure. Thanks.

MR. MARBET: This is the second public scoping meeting on a proposed EIS involving Hanford. It seems now that they're happening about every six months. I'm worried about what's going to come up in February. It seems to me that if you're going to do this scoping process -- and there seems to be now redundant -- or to some degree a redundant analysis of specific locations, then the efforts definitely should have communication between them, and the results be combined, because I'm very worried that we're not seeing the bigger picture here. There's -- I think a lot of people have spoken to that.

I would also like to ask that Congress and the U.S. Department of Energy stop presenting us a fait accompli, which goes, some waste already produced, more waste coming. Chuck spoke to this eloquently, and I can't really say it better. I think we have reached a point in time in which we have to disengage ourselves from this technology and create the world that we've all been striving for. Going in this direction in which we allow ourselves to constantly be presented this "more is coming" justification is wrong and needs to be stopped.

If you proceed with this scoping process, then I ask that it include the following:

First, an examination of the need for further waste production, exploring all alternatives which obviate that need. I'd like to see that kind of analysis put forward.

Secondly, the EIS should provide an analysis of new stabilization technologies. We want to be clear that we're in the present when we're examining what's available out there and how they impact the justification for this proposal.

Third, Hanford and other existing USDOE locations are being considered because of their past disposal operations. They're being considered a part

of this review process. All of these sites should be analyzed based on a comparison of the problems and successes of their respective operations. I think we need to look back and see where we've come from, and that should be a part of that scoping process. Again, evaluating how the success of various disposal operations have been can greatly impact what you're going to find in the future.

Furthermore, I'm concerned with the distinction that's being made between disposal methods; more specifically, geologic versus surface disposal. And I might add here, by the way, that I don't think we would have this comparison happening to us if there wasn't this underlying justification that we're going to have more nuclear waste produced, because I think this is the formula for cutting corners in the future. Apparently, these wastes fall under different regulations, government versus commercial waste. Yet, safe surface disposal is being considered without specifically identifying the underlying justification for using this disposal method at all. It seems to me that we need to know where that's coming from.

The EIS should reveal this justification with measurable criteria. And in doing so, it should

consider what the impacts are between geologic and surface disposal if there is a breach of containment, which is the obvious thing that you're trying to prevent. The EIS should also examine the impact of terrorist activities between all disposal methods, which I've not heard much, and I think that definitely should be examined.

The EIS should examine the impact of the disposal of new waste on existing cleanup operations. There's so many people that have eloquently spoken to this this evening, and obviously I stand with them in pointing out the obvious, which is that we should not put anything more at Hanford until we clean up what we've already done.

Finally, transportation of waste between all sites should be examined with the risk involved for each location. I testified at the last scoping public meeting, and I concluded with what I'm going to paraphrase for this meeting in that testimony. We have lost faith in the U.S. Department of Energy's ability to find wisdom in the scoping process. But we have not lost faith in the hearts and minds of those who are no longer willing to put up with the faustian bargain you present us. I again suggest that you carefully consider the idea of siting more nuclear

waste installations in the Pacific Northwest. Out here, we are not willing to settle for anything less than full accountability. We are only interested in building a world that is based on peace and justice, sweeping nothing under the rug, cleaning up, and putting a stop to these kinds of proposals.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. CHUDY: My name is Catherine Chudy, and I live in Washington and I work in Oregon. I'm also the daughter of Stanley Chudy, who worked as a rigging foreman for Union Carbide, a site for the Manhattan Project as it developed the atomic capability that destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki. There were 50 acres involved in the Manhattan Project in Tanawanda, New York. It was a secret, bolted, locked place. When the war ended, they unlocked and unbolted that place, and my dad walked those grounds for more than 30 years. He didn't understand the risks. Someone earlier said that if we understand the risks, then we can proceed.

Years after he retired, they condemned the building his office was in. That was the infirmary for the Manhattan Project. They carted away tons of contaminated soil -- I don't know where -- and they

erected barriers and hoops for those workers if they could prove direct damage in the form of cancer. My dad is a survivor. He has unexplained neuropathy and legs he can barely stand on at 89 years old. But as his daughter, I struggle to understand and know a lot more than he did about such risks.

Hanford on this list is a bad idea, beyond assumptions, beyond mission compatibility, and beyond reasonable alternatives. When will they ever learn? When will the Department of Energy recognize that the only compatible mission, the only reasonable alternative, is to clean up, and not enhance, the dreadful toxicity at Hanford. This is Alice through the looking glass, and the Mad Hatter is twisting the language on us once again. There are no imaginable physical alternatives -- no imaginable physical characteristics or mission compatibility that begins to justify Hanford being on this unfortunate list.

My friend David Hupp (ph) asked that I convey his comment on the transportation risk implicit in this process. He reminds us that a few years ago children collected hot cars. Well, creating hot trucks is a childish solution to a serious problem. We should be beyond such childish solutions. But I fear that, as always with the Department of Energy,

viable answers to serious problems are still blowing in the wind.

I am a mental health therapist, and I see insanity every day. I appreciate being one of the voices speaking out tonight against this insanity. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Louisa Hamachek is next. She will be followed by Rachel Pecore.

MS. HAMACHEK: I'm Louisa Hamachek of the Wild Eugenians for a Safe Columbia River.

We of WESCR say no to the DOE proposal to this current consideration for considering Hanford as a site for the low-level solid nuclear waste to be added to the already existing waste at Hanford. We want no more waste to be brought to Hanford with any level of radioactivity. We want no trucks of radioactive materials passing through our town of Eugene on I-5. We'll track them from Livermore Labs and the San Diego Navy Base and other sites that might use I-5 to make their way to Hanford. And we'll try to prevent them from endangering our Valley of the Willamette.

We in Eugene, who are stewards of the upper Willamette Valley, which is a tributary of the

Columbia River, do not want to risk spillage and radioactive harm to the inhabitants and their habitats, harm to innocent children, citizens and animals. We trust that our federal government is working to protect us, and we hope for that. We say no to the proposed transport of radioactive waste to Hanford through our area. We of WESCR recognize ourselves as part of the biological category of animals, and as humans are subject to the damaging effects of radiation, cancer and mutations or birth defects, that all animals are. The plant's genetic material is also changed by ionizing radiation. It leads to a diminishment of the health of our entire region, and that's not fair.

We of WESCR want the entire Columbia River watershed basin to be free of damaging toxic chemicals and radiation, and insist that the Department of Energy immediately prevent any further leaks of toxics and radioactive liquids into the Columbia.

We want to have monthly reports of the levels of radiation in the river from Hanford to be on a website available to everyone, not to have blocked websites from the Department of Energy that have information not available to us, that lists a category

of information, and we can't find any information under that category. That's not fair.

We want to have the Department of Energy removed from the responsibility of cleaning up Hanford, and to have that responsibility transferred to a triad of the State of Washington, the State of Oregon and the Federal Environmental Protection Agency, and to have the Department of Energy foot the bill, pay for it. You made the mess, and you have to pay for it. But you're not showing any resolve to actually keep us safe. So we as citizens ask for a different federal agency to take over. We want the Department of Energy -- let's see -- to have this transaction -- the transfer of responsibility to be commenced by 2008. By the end of 2008, we want the EPA to be given the task and to work with Washington and Oregon.

Furthermore, according to the book The Atomic Farm Girl by Terry Hein (ph), in the fall of 1946, General Electric took over the administration of the Hanford Reservation. They built and ran five new plutonium production reactors, two chemical reprocessing plants, and 81 underground waste storage tanks. These produced the nuclear liquid -- the liquid nuclear waste that we are concerned about right

now. The Cold War bomb production and pollution began in 1949 when the Russians tested their own atomic bomb, and the frenzy at Hanford began with a desperateness to produce bombs, which led to dumping of the liquids into the nearby available dirt, which is now going out into the river. And that's not fair. There might've been a desperation, but we presently are having to deal with the mess.

We at WESCR hold General Electric responsible for the present remaining nuclear waste leaking into the Columbia River at this time. They profited enough, and we call for an international boycott of all General Electric products until the radioactive and toxic leaks into the Columbia River has been abated and verified by that triad of the States of Washington and Oregon and the federal EPA, as well as the United Nations, because that river does not stop in Portland. It keeps going on out to the ocean, and the salmon -- perhaps some of those wild Alaska salmon, they spawned at the Hanford breach possibly where the radioactive liquids are bubbling right up in the base of the river where they're spawning, and this is an international abuse, and it should be brought to the United Nations, and they

should verify, as well, that Hanford has stopped leaking.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Okay. Rachel Pecore. Daniel Swink will be next.

MS. PECORE: Hi. My name's Rachel Pecore, R-a-c-h-e-l, P-e-c-o-r-e. I work as a water quality scientist for Columbia Riverkeeper.

On that back panel there explaining greater-than-class C waste, I'm going to quote, "Most hazardous of low-level radioactivity waste/dangerous to inadvertent intruders beyond 500 years. Must be disposed in geologic repository unless alternative method proposed by DOE and NRC." The mandate is clear; the study must include how all waste will be protected from inadvertent intruders beyond 500 years, at the least.

Please consider all worst-case scenarios, including earthquakes at 9.0, rising sea levels, other climate change predictions, volcanic eruptions, not to mention what's already been -- well, I will mention what's already been mentioned -- hazards to children, health hazards and the risks of transporting these things on our roads.

There's a lot I don't understand about Hanford, and appreciate coming to these hearings to learn more. I appreciate everyone who's here. I learn from all of you. Hanford's an extremely complex site. However, I don't understand how radioactive waste could possibly be transported or disposed of or stored before the vitrification plant is finished. Finish the vit. plant, and then come talk to us.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Okay. Daniel Swink.

MR. SWINK: Hi. My name's Daniel Swink. I'm a resident of Vancouver, Washington, and also a volunteer for Columbia Riverkeepers for water quality monitoring of the Columbia River.

I think most of my concerns have been well-expressed tonight. But one of the things that's foremost on my mind has already been indicated is that I don't see how the Department of Energy can even consider bringing more waste in when you already have plumes of toxic radioactive waste seeping towards the river, and has already been discoveries of radioactivity that's already reached the river, even though most media does not -- has not brought that forward.

This river basin serves an area the size of France. That alone has so many repercussions just from the river standpoint alone, not to mention the airway and the transportations of vehicles and all the other considerations that people have mentioned. So as the one woman that mentioned before me has indicated, this has repercussions that go international because the river does flow into the ocean. We're only just beginning to study the impacts. It's one of our most recent contributing pollution sources into the river. If it wasn't for a lot of volunteers that are out there right now that are trying to gather data on what this all means as the full extent of impact, there wouldn't be hardly anything going down about this.

I just want to make it clear that I'm definitely opposed to bringing more waste in until we take responsibility for cleaning up what's already there. It's already been proven that we have a long ways to go, and it's been a slow road getting there. We need to get this waste contained that's already there before we even consider bringing in an ounce more.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: That concludes the list of folks who had signed up to speak. So let me ask if there's anybody who has not spoken yet. I've got a couple volunteers of folks that have already said. But let me first ask if there's anybody who hasn't said anything up to this point who would like to speak at this point.

Okay. We have one person in back. If you'll identify yourself for the court reporter, and if there's an organizational affiliation, you can say that, too. Thanks.

MR. HAMMOND: Hi. My name is Terry Hammond. I was born in Portland. So if I have a right to fight for anyplace on earth, I guess this is it.

I just want to take the national government as a model for my response anyway, and that is that we will resist your bringing weapons of mass destruction to threaten us, and we will hold your leaders personally responsible. We will use whatever means are necessary to stop you. As been said, all options are on the table.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who hasn't spoken yet who'd like to add something? I think you wanted to add something. Oh, I'm sorry. Wait. We do -- sure.

MS. EARNERT: My name is Carol Earnert. I'm the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, nationally, internationally and locally. I wasn't planning to speak, and I'll speak very briefly. But I second virtually everything that's been said by those in the audience tonight. I think you're great. I think you're critical thinkers. I think you really care about human beings and our future. I really feel for the young women who were sitting in the front, because a lot of our kids have got the same feeling that this is an apocalyptic time and a very dangerous time.

So I just want to say that I think the DOE should consider as an alternative looking at what Henry Kissinger had said, and George Schultz, and Sam Nunn; it's time to start talking about evolution of nuclear weapons. And a lot of other people are saying it's time to look for something besides nuclear power. We've made a mistake in following this, and we've got to recognize it. And we've all got to work together with each other in love and caring and truthfulness, and caring for those who've made the mistake, and

those who have been shouting out against it. We've got to turn around.

We've got treaties already that we can support. We have other nations begging us to come back to sanity. Let's help our government turn around and start being a little civilized instead of acting like the world's barbarians and butchers.

(Applause.)

MR. DAVENPORT: Again, I'm Les Davenport. I'm a subcontractor to Washington Closure Hanford.

Two points that I missed during my presentation. Semi-permanent storage on-site of some waste is not practical. That includes medical waste, the unneeded radioactive sources out in the commercial world and some other places, and reactor internals from permanently closed reactors. Hardening these sites just is not cost-effective. It is too expensive. If you look at the cost of hardening the 104 reactors that we have currently, it's a tremendous expense. Even at Hanford, guarding the plutonium that remains there in the two-thirty-four-five facility is around two million dollars a year, if I remember correctly. That's a lot of money for security that doesn't go into cleanup.

Secondly, you have to realize that 20 percent of our electricity in the United States comes from nuclear power. If you're so anxious to close 104 nuclear reactors, what do you plan to provide your electricity?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Solar.

MR. DAVENPORT: Good. Solar is excellent. So is wind power. But if you consider the amount that they contribute, the cost of developing such facilities, and getting them in place, that's a lot of money. It is being done. It needs to be done. But there is one other thing about solar and wind power. They are not continuous. When the sun doesn't shine, when the wind doesn't blow, it does not make electricity. You need base load plants.

MR. BROWN: Can I interrupt for just a moment? We're 45 minutes overtime. If we start debating U.S. energy policy, we're going to be here a long time. People can submit comments through September 21st. So if you have something to add that's relevant to this issue, and if you're considerate of our very patient audience, if you've got just one thing to add -- all right.

MR. DAVENPORT: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: You're welcome.

MR. HEDLUND: For those of you don't know, we have Operation Topoff from October 15th to the 24th. This is a mock nuclear attack or dirty bomb in Portland. We're the only ones who's going to have this. It's a national thing and involves the National Guard, involves all the agencies. It's part of Homeland Security deal. I just hope it's not another false flag 9/11.

MR. BROWN: Thanks very much.

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Okay. This concludes our meeting. I'd like to thank everybody who made comments. Again, I'll remind you that you may submit comments in a variety of forms through the 21st. Again, thanks for turning out and remaining here and listening to everybody. We are adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at 9:48 p.m.)