

START

0036065

84

1

1

2

3

HANFORD TANK WASTE REMEDIATION SYSTEM

4

5

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

6

7

8

9

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

10

11

12

13

FEBRUARY 22, 1994

14

15

THE MOUNTAINEER'S

16

17

300 THIRD AVENUE WEST

18

19

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

20

21

22

BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES
Certified Shorthand Reporters
P. O. Box 5999
Kennewick, Washington 99336
(509) 735-2400 - (800) 358-2345

23

24

25



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PANEL MEMBERS:

GEOFFREY TALLENT
State of Washington
Department of Ecology
P. O. Box 47600
Olympia, WA 98504-7600

DONALD H. ALEXANDER, PH.D.
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550, MS R3-73
Richland, WA 99352

MODERATOR:

ALINDA PAGE
Triangle Associates
Seattle, WA



9413208.0014

9413205.005

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SPEAKERS:

ALINDA PAGE	4
GEOFF TALLENT	10
DONALD ALEXANDER	18
ALINDA PAGE	26
HILARY HARDING	30
KIP WILSON	33
ALINDA PAGE	40
GEOFF TALLENT	46
DON ALEXANDER	53
ALINDA PAGE	62
GORDON SMITH	66
GERALD POLLET	68
TODD MARTIN	75
GERALD POLLET	80

1 MS. ALINDA PAGE: Good afternoon.

2 I would like to formally commence today's public
3 meeting. Welcome on behalf of the U.S.

4 Department of Energy and the Washington State
5 Department of Ecology all of you who have come
6 today.

7 Today's scoping meeting is officially
8 designated as the Seattle public scoping meeting
9 for the two proposed Environmental Impact
10 Statements at the Hanford Site, Richland,
11 Washington.

12 One EIS will address the proposed
13 Tank Waste Remediation System activities, and the
14 second will address the proposed construction of
15 six new safety tanks for the storage of
16 high-level radioactive waste as an interim action
17 to the Tank Waste Remediation System Environ-
18 mental Impact Statement.

19 The meeting is being held on the 22nd
20 day of February, 1994, at the Mountaineer's
21 Building in Seattle, Washington, and we are
22 commencing at 1:00 p.m.

23 Today's meeting is the fourth of five
24 being held in Washington and Oregon during the
25 month of February.

943200.006

1 Today's schedule calls for an
2 afternoon session to last until 4:30 p.m., at
3 which time we will recess for a dinner break.
4 The evening session will commence at 6:30 p.m.
5 with a repeat of the opening remarks and a review
6 of the meeting's procedures. Tonight's meeting
7 is scheduled to adjourn at 10:00 p.m.

8 My name is Alinda Page, and I am a
9 professional facilitator with Triangle Associates
10 from Seattle, Washington.

11 I have been asked by the Department
12 of Energy and the Washington State Department of
13 Ecology to conduct this scoping meeting to ensure
14 that all individuals and organizations here today
15 who wish to comment on the scope of the upcoming
16 Environmental Impact Statements have a fair and
17 equal opportunity to do so, in keeping with both
18 the letter and the spirit of the National
19 Environmental Policy Act and the Washington State
20 Environmental Policy Act.

21 The National Environmental Policy
22 Act of 1969, commonly referred to as NEPA,
23 requires that any federal agency proposing an
24 action that might have impacts on the environment
25 evaluate all reasonable alternatives and their

947209-007

1 potential environmental impacts before taking
2 such action.

3 When the projected environmental
4 impacts might be considered significant, an
5 Environmental Impact Statement must be
6 prepared.

7 NEPA also requires that the public
8 be provided opportunities to comment during
9 preparation of the Environmental Impact
10 Statement.

11 The Washington State Environmental
12 Policy Act, commonly referred to as SEPA, is very
13 similar to NEPA in its intent and purpose. Like
14 NEPA, SEPA requires any state agency proposing an
15 action that might have impacts on the environment
16 to evaluate all reasonable alternatives and their
17 potential environmental impacts before taking
18 action.

19 The potential Washington State action
20 in the remediation of the high-level tank wastes
21 and the construction of the six new safety tanks
22 would be the issuance of required Washington
23 State environmental permits and authorizations,
24 if the determination is made to proceed with the
25 proposed action.

9413208-0018

1 As with NEPA, when the projected
2 environmental impact might be considered
3 significant, an Environmental Impact Statement
4 must be prepared. SEPA also requires that the
5 public be provided opportunities to comment
6 during the preparation of the Washington State
7 Environmental Impact Statement.

8 Because the National Environmental
9 Policy Act and the Washington State
10 Environmental Policy Act are very comparable in
11 their purpose, intent and procedures, the State
12 of Washington Department of Ecology and the
13 United States Department of Energy have decided
14 to prepare one Environmental Impact Statement for
15 each of the two proposed actions addressing the
16 requirements of both SEPA and NEPA in a single
17 document.

18 That is, a single EIS will address
19 the Tank Waste Remediation issues, and a single,
20 yet different EIS, will address the proposed
21 construction of the six new safety tanks.

22 On Friday, January 28th, 1994, the
23 U.S. Department of Energy published a Notice of
24 Intent in the Federal Register announcing its
25 intent to prepare these two Environmental Impact

1 Statements.

2 One EIS, as I said, will address
3 the proposed Tank Waste Remediation System
4 activities, and the second will address the
5 proposed construction of six new safety tanks
6 for the storage of high-level radioactive waste
7 as an interim action to the Tank Waste
8 Remediation System Environmental Impact
9 Statement.

10 On the same date, January 28th, 1994,
11 the Washington State Department of Ecology
12 determined that a SEPA EIS was required for these
13 two projects.

14 The purpose then of this scoping
15 meeting is to have each of you have an
16 opportunity to identify for the record the
17 significant issues that you believe should be
18 considered by the United States Department of
19 Energy and the Washington State Department of
20 Ecology in the preparation of these two
21 Environmental Impact Statements.

22 The format for today's meeting has
23 been designed to give as many people as
24 possible the opportunity to participate,
25 including those who do not wish to make formal

1 comments.

2 We will take formal comments in this
3 room throughout the time scheduled for today's
4 meeting.

5 Concurrently, there is an informal
6 information available through various members the
7 U.S. Department of Energy and the Washington
8 State Department of Ecology.

9 A verbatim transcript of this
10 meeting will be made with all oral comments
11 received contained in the transcript. And a
12 transcript will also be made of the other four
13 scoping meetings. It will be included in the
14 United States Department of Energy and Washington
15 State Department of Ecology's record of these
16 proceedings. The Department of Energy and the
17 Department of Ecology will make the transcripts
18 from all five of the scoping meetings available
19 at information locations throughout Washington
20 and Oregon as soon possible.

21 After they have reviewed all of the
22 formal comments received at the scoping meetings
23 and the written comments that are submitted
24 during the scoping period, the two Departments
25 will then jointly prepare two Draft Environmental

9413208-0021

1 Impact Statements.

2 When each Draft EIS is available, the
3 public will once again have the opportunity to
4 participate in this effort by submitting comments
5 on the Draft EISs. The two Draft Environmental
6 Impact Statements will be prepared on different
7 schedules.

8 The Draft EIS for the six new
9 safety tanks is scheduled to be available later
10 this year. The Draft EIS for the tank waste
11 remediation program is scheduled to be available
12 in 1995.

13 At this time I would like to
14 introduce Mr. Geoff Tallent of the
15 Washington State Department of Ecology who will
16 make a brief presentation about the compatibility
17 of the NEPA and SEPA processes. He will be
18 followed by Dr. Donald Alexander of the
19 Department of Energy's Richland Field Office Tank
20 Waste Remediation System Program Office. Dr.
21 Alexander will make a brief presentation on the
22 proposed six new safety tanks and the tank waste
23 remediation system program. Thank you.

24 Mr. Tallent?

25 MR. GEOFF TALLENT: Good evening.

9413208.002

1 My name is Geoff Tallent with the Washington
2 State Department of Ecology.

3 The United States Department of
4 Energy, which I have referred to as USDOE, and
5 the Washington State Department of Ecology, or
6 Ecology, are using an innovative approach to
7 review the environmental impacts to the TWRS
8 program by combining the requirements of NEPA and
9 SEPA. The two agencies expect ourselves and the
10 public to realize several benefits from combining
11 these processes.

12 The USDOE and Ecology have prepared a
13 Memorandum of Understanding between the two
14 agencies will which allow us to streamline the
15 NEPA-SEPA compliance process;

16 Allow for a joint NEPA-SEPA decision
17 document;

18 Accelerate the process by
19 consolidating meetings, mandatory processes and
20 documents;

21 And to provide a mechanism to
22 expedite the resolution of comments and issues.

23 Benefits of combining the NEPA and
24 SEPA process are as follows:

25 First, combining streamlines the

9413208.0023

1 environmental review. Instead of taking a
2 separate fragmented and sequential approach,
3 Ecology and USDOE are anticipating folding their
4 NEPA and SEPA requirements together and meeting
5 them all upfront.

6 This will avoid duplicative and time
7 consuming public reviews in the future.

8 Second, NEPA and SEPA are very similar
9 in intent as well as process. The Washington
10 State law was modeled after the federal law and
11 has no differences which would prevent the two
12 processes from being combined.

13 In fact, both laws encourage the
14 integration with their counterparts. Ecology
15 and USDOE believe that the combined effort will
16 result in a better process for environmental
17 review.

18 Third, in combining the documents,
19 the two agencies expect to be able to save time
20 and money. The two processes each require
21 extensive public involvement, careful study and
22 the preparation of several documents. By only
23 doing these once, we will clearly realize a
24 savings.

25 Fourth, by working as equal

9413208.0024

1 partners, Ecology and USDOE must agree on
2 everything in the EISs. The two agencies will
3 eliminate the possibility of debating over
4 conflicting directions later on, and instead
5 will identify and resolve differences early and
6 cooperatively.

7 Finally, and most importantly,
8 nothing is lost in this combined effort. Ecology
9 and USDOE will continue to maintain full
10 independent authority over their respective
11 requirements.

12 This means both NEPA and SEPA must
13 be completely followed to the satisfaction of
14 each agency. Additionally, no part of either
15 NEPA or SEPA will be sacrificed in these EISs.
16 Any information or opportunity for review or
17 comment that NEPA or SEPA requires will be part
18 of the combined process.

19 Now I will take you through what you
20 will see in both of the EIS's.

21 The statement of purpose and need for
22 action will explain the problem for which the
23 proposed actions are being studied. In these
24 cases, the purpose is the need to resolve tank
25 safety issues.

9413208.0025

1 The description of alternatives
2 will describe the actions the agency is
3 proposed to take and compare those actions with
4 alternative means to resolve tank safety
5 issues.

6 For these EISs, the preferred
7 alternative will follow the processes laid out in
8 the Tri-Party Agreement. Other alternatives will
9 also be examined.

10 One reason why we are here is to
11 find out from you what alternatives we should
12 look at.

13 Finally, the no action alternative is
14 required by both NEPA and SEPA as a way of
15 comparing the other alternatives to continuing
16 the present situation.

17 The EIS will also describe the
18 environment which will be affected by all of the
19 alternatives. In these cases it will be a
20 description of the areas at the Hanford Site
21 where the TWRS activities would take place and
22 any parts of the environment beyond the Hanford
23 Site that may be impacted.

24 In describing the environment, the
25 EISs will look at three aspects.

913208 0026
913208 0026

1 First, the human environment, which
2 looks at such things as potentially impacted
3 populations and areas of historical significance.

4 Second, the biological environment,
5 which looks at such things as potentially
6 impacted plant and animal species.

7 And third, the physical environment,
8 which will describe such areas as geology and
9 ground and surface waters.

10 The third parts of the two EISs
11 will examine the environmental impacts of the
12 proposed action and alternatives. This will
13 look at impacts to the human environment, such as
14 impacts on jobs and the disturbance of historic
15 areas.

16 It will also look at potential
17 health risks from such things as radioactive
18 releases to both Hanford workers and the off-Site
19 public.

20 The impacts section will thirdly look
21 at possible impacts to the ecosystem, such as
22 endangering plant or animal species or
23 interfering with migrations.

24 Finally, the EISs will exam methods
25 for mitigating or reducing the impacts of the

9443200.0027

1 proposals and alternatives. These might include
2 such things as additional pollution control
3 devices, restoration of habitat, or changes in
4 the locations of buildings.

5 As with the alternatives, we are
6 here to hear your comments on what the analysis
7 of impacts to the environment should include,
8 and what possible mitigation measures should be
9 considered.

10 To conclude my presentation, I will
11 take you through the proposed schedule for the
12 two EISs.

13 First, a Notice of Intent to prepare
14 the EISs was published in the Federal Register
15 and corresponding Washington State SEPA register
16 on January 28th. Those notices began the scoping
17 process for which we are holding this meeting.
18 Comments on the scope of either EIS will be due
19 March 15th.

20 At that time the path of the two EISs
21 will split. For the New Tanks EIS, an
22 Implementation Plan should be prepared by the two
23 agencies by April 15th. The Implementation Plan
24 will lay out the schedule for completion and
25 scope of the New Tanks EIS.

1 The Draft EIS will follow in June at
2 which time there will be a 45 day public review
3 and comment period. After that, the two agencies
4 expect to have a Final EIS out by August of this
5 year and a final decision by September.

6 The TWRS EIS Implementation Plan will
7 be ready by June of this year, but will take
8 until August of next year to assemble all of the
9 information for the Draft EIS.

10 After a 45 day comment period, a
11 final TWRS EIS should be ready by April of
12 1996, with a final decision by May of that
13 year.

14 The two agencies hope, as a result of
15 this combined process, to accelerate the TWRS EIS
16 schedule. If that is successful, a TWRS final
17 decision could be made as soon as June of 1995.

18 This concludes my portion of the
19 presentation. If you have any questions about
20 SEPA or NEPA, or the processes the two agencies
21 intend to use in preparing these EISs, please
22 give me a call at 206-407-7112, or talk to our
23 Ecology representative, who is out and available
24 to receive questions.

25 Next will be Don Alexander of the

600902416

1 Department of Energy, to describe the proposed
2 Tank Waste Remediation System and the New Double
3 Shelled tanks. Thank you.

4 DR. DON ALEXANDER: Thank you,
5 Geoff, and good evening.

6 With an urgency in the 1940s to give
7 the United States a weapons advantage, many of
8 the actions were taken without consideration for
9 the environment and they were unregulated with
10 respect to the environment.

11 The massive legacy of those actions
12 resulted in waste stored in 177 tanks, 67 of
13 which are considered to be leaking, and others
14 which have potential for leaking.

15 The National Environmental Policy
16 Act was enacted in 1969 to assure that in the
17 future any major federal proposed actions, such
18 as a major construction project, especially those
19 involving radioactive wastes, be analytically
20 evaluated.

21 NEPA requires that the federal agency
22 complete three types of analyses and weigh these
23 in its decision-making process.

24 The first is an analysis of the
25 environmental impacts of the proposed action.

9413208.0033

1 The second is an analysis for impacts
2 of alternative design solutions to the proposed
3 action.

4 And, finally, the proposed and
5 alternative actions are to be compared to the
6 environmental implications of taking no action.

7 The alternatives under discussion
8 today have been presented to you in public
9 meetings over the past year involving the
10 Tri-Party Agreement. It was in that process that
11 some were dismissed. Grout was a notable
12 alternative among those dismissed.

13 Although the DOE had alternatives
14 as announced in the HDW EIS as late as 1988,
15 the TPA process was essential in aiding the
16 Department in formulating the current proposed
17 actions.

18 Once the Tri-Party Agreement was
19 signed on January 25th of this year, the Notice
20 of Intent was immediately issued with the
21 proposed actions on January 28th.

22 In the next few moments I will give
23 you an overview of the two proposed actions to
24 be discussed in the meeting today, and I will
25 tell you how you can contribute to this part of

9413208.0031

1 the process.

2 DOE and Ecology are recommending two
3 proposed actions.

4 First, to construct six new waste
5 storage tanks, and second, to retrieve, treat,
6 immobilize, store and dispose of radioactive
7 waste from 177 storage tanks.

8 The agencies request comments and
9 recommendations from you for:

10 Alternatives to be analyzed; and

11 Additional environmental issues that
12 we should consider.

13 The proposed facilities are to be
14 constructed in the 200 Areas, the area where I
15 work.

16 The two proposed actions are:

17 First, to immediately remove
18 radioactive waste contents from tanks with
19 dangerous emissions of ignitable gas to safer
20 storage, as shown on the left part of the
21 slide;

22 And second, to permanently retrieve,
23 treat, immobilize and safely store all tank
24 wastes on an interim basis, until a permanent
25 repository is available.

1 Next slide, please. The two
2 preferred alternatives are embodied in the newly
3 signed Tri-Party Agreement and are being
4 implemented as we speak.

5 NEPA and SEPA will evaluate the
6 preferred and reasonable alternatives and assess
7 potential environmental consequences.

8 Environmental consequences will be
9 considered with safety concerns, costs,
10 schedules, and public review.

11 If the environmental consequences
12 outweigh other considerations, then the DOE,
13 Ecology, and the EPA could revise specific
14 milestones, but not the end date of the TPA
15 2028.

16 DOE and Ecology are committed to full
17 compliance with the TPA.

18 In the Tri-Party Agreement we agree
19 to build six tanks to eliminate immediate safety
20 concerns.

21 This is a schematic of a proposed
22 tank with modern safety controls, including mixer
23 and retrieval pumps to reduce gas build-up,
24 liquid and gas sampling systems, improved
25 ventilation systems, and improved tank integrity

9413208.0033

1 monitoring.

2 For this proposed action, then, the
3 Tri-Party Agreement defines that we would
4 construct six new tanks.

5 We are required by law to evaluate
6 other alternatives, as Geoff and I have both
7 said, to assure that we have adequately
8 considered environmental impacts. One potential
9 alternative is to construct fewer tanks, and rely
10 on other methods to mitigate safety issues.

11 If we were to choose no action, we
12 would not mitigate or resolve safety issues. As
13 I said earlier, this alternative is required by
14 law.

15 We would like to receive your oral or
16 written comments on other alternatives to this
17 proposed action.

18 This is a schematic of the two tanks
19 and the supporting facilities proposed for the
20 200 West Area. A similar conceptual design has
21 been prepared for the four tanks that would be
22 found in the eastern area. Notice that the costs
23 of this construction involve not only the tanks
24 themselves but the necessary support facilities
25 that support them.

1 Next slide. Now I would like to
2 give you an overview of the second proposed
3 action.

4 In this action we upgrade our current
5 storage for safety reasons, we retrieve from the
6 177 tanks, treat, immobilize, store and safely
7 dispose of all of the waste.

8 Next slide, please. We are
9 required by law to evaluate the consequences of
10 leaving the wastes where they are so we can
11 determine the benefit of taking the proposed
12 action. We have agreed with the State and EPA
13 to retrieve all of the waste by sluicing,
14 provide minimum pretreatment of wastes, vitrify
15 high-level wastes, and vitrify low-level
16 wastes.

17 Although we prefer to retrieve waste
18 by hydraulic sluicing, we have also identified
19 two additional alternatives for comparison of
20 environmental impacts; pneumatic retrieval, and
21 mechanical retrieval.

22 We prefer minimal pretreatment, but
23 we also recognize two additional alternatives
24 for comparing environmental impacts. These
25 include no pretreatment, and extensive

9413208-0035

1 pretreatment.

2 For immobilization of high-level
3 waste we agree to vitrification.

4 Calcination is an alternative for
5 comparison of environmental impacts.

6 And for low activity wastes, we
7 prefer vitrification, but we will consider other
8 solid waste forms, again, for comparison of
9 environmental impacts.

10 We request that you provide other
11 alternatives through oral or written comments
12 before March 15th.

13 Environmental issues need to be
14 evaluated for the proposed action as required by
15 NEPA, and SEPA, including:

16 Effects of releases on the public
17 and on-site workers from operations and
18 accidents;

19 The effects on air and water quality,
20 and other environmental consequences from
21 operations and accidents;

22 Effects on endangered species,
23 archaeological, and historical sites;

24 Unavoidable environmental impacts;

25 Cumulative effects of all of the

1 above;

2 Effects from transportation;

3 Effects of future decommissioning

4 decisions;

5 Socio-economic impacts on the

6 surrounding communities, like the one that I live

7 in;

8 Short-term use of the environment

9 versus long-term productivity;

10 Pollution prevention and waste

11 minimization;

12 Unavoidable adverse environmental

13 impacts;

14 Irretrievable and irreversible

15 commitments of resources.

16 And, again, we request that you

17 provide other alternatives through oral or

18 written comments before March 15th.

19 Next slide. In summary, then, the

20 DOE and Ecology are recommending two proposed

21 actions.

22 Construct six new storage tanks.

23 And, secondly, retrieve, treat,

24 immobilize, store, and dispose of the waste from

25 177 storage tanks.

9413208.0037

1 The agencies are requesting comments
2 and recommendations from you for alternatives to
3 be analyzed and additional environmental issues
4 to be considered.

5 Thank you.

6 MS. ALINDA PAGE: Thank you. Mr.

7 Tallent and Dr. Alexander will be sitting up here
8 during the remainder of the meeting, listening to
9 your comments.

10 Because this is a formal scoping
11 hearing, they will not be engaging with you in
12 conversation, except to ask clarifying questions
13 to make sure that they understand the purpose of
14 your comments.

15 If you do have questions that you
16 wish to ask, there are people from the two
17 Departments as well as Westinghouse in a room
18 right outside this door that are available to
19 talk with you about the procedures and their
20 intentions related to the Environmental Impact
21 Statements.

22 You do need to be aware, however,
23 that only the comments that you make here at
24 the microphone are going to be transcribed by
25 the court reporter and included in the transcript

1 which will constitute the record for this
2 meeting.

3 Therefore, if you address any issues
4 during any informal conversations that you want
5 considered in the Draft EIS, you need to come
6 forward to the mike and repeat those issues and
7 concerns in this formal process.

8 I encourage those of you who will
9 be speaking today to provide me with written
10 versions of your oral comments. If you have a
11 transcript of your oral comments or if you have
12 prepared a written document that you would like
13 that will supplement your oral comments, please
14 give it to me and we will enter it into the
15 record. Documents submitted today are formally
16 accepted into the record for the meeting and will
17 be given the same consideration as the oral
18 comments that are heard.

19 If you are not ready to make comments
20 orally or you are uncomfortable getting up in
21 front of people to speak, there is a comment form
22 that's been prepared and is available for you in
23 the back of the room. You may also submit
24 comments on any kind of form that you have
25 available. The names of Mr. Tallent and Dr.

1 Alexander are on that form also at the
2 registration desk and the address to which you
3 must mail the comments.

4 Written comments must be postmarked
5 by March 15th, 1994, to assure their use in the
6 preparation of the Environmental Impact
7 Statements. Comments received after that date
8 will be accommodated as practical.

9 Written comments will be given the
10 same level of consideration by the Department of
11 Energy and Ecology as formal comments that are
12 received at the scoping meeting.

13 Now I would like to take just a
14 moment or two to go over the procedures that we
15 will be using for the oral comments for today's
16 meeting.

17 We have pre-registered speakers,
18 people who signed up in advance of this meeting
19 to speak, and indicated a time at which they
20 wished to be called on. So as close as possible
21 to those requested times, I will call on the
22 pre-registered speakers.

23 In addition, some of you have
24 probably signed up to speak as you got here
25 today. And I'll call on those of you who signed

1 up today in the order in which you signed up. If
2 you are out of the room and missed the call,
3 don't worry, we'll call you again, until you
4 finally get a chance to talk.

5 The people who wish to comment today
6 will be given five minutes each. And I have a
7 stop watch and I'll be jumping up and down in
8 front of you if you go over the five minute
9 period. Organizations, people who are
10 representing organizations and are the official
11 representative of an organization, will be given
12 ten minutes. So it's important that you indicate
13 that you are official spokespeople for
14 organizations and you expect to speak for ten
15 minutes, if that's your circumstance.

16 I will not limit the comment of any
17 -- the content of any of the statements that you
18 make today, but I would like to ask you to keep
19 your comments to the scoping of these two
20 Environmental Impact Statements.

21 And, finally, I want to introduce
22 our court reporter, Bill Bridges, who is
23 transcribing verbatim the formal comment portion
24 of today's meeting. In order to help him prepare
25 a complete and accurate record, I would like to

1 ask that you come forward to this mike, before
2 you begin your comments, that you say your name
3 and that you give your address. It would help
4 also if you would spell your name and be quite
5 clear about your mailing address.

6 We'll now begin the formal comment
7 period for today's meeting, and ask if there is
8 anyone in the audience who would like to comment
9 at this point. Okay. Would you like to say
10 anything at this point formally?

11 So what we will do is recess this and
12 you can ask all your questions, and then when you
13 are ready to make formal comments, we will
14 reconvene the formal portion of the meeting and
15 we will go on the record.

16 So this meeting is then recessed
17 until there is someone who wishes to make a
18 formal comment.

19 (Recessed).

20 MS. ALINDA PAGE: We are going to
21 reopen the meeting. We will hear first from
22 Hilary Harding and then from Kip Wilson.

23 MS. HILARY HARDING: Okay. My
24 name is Hilary, H-i-l-a-r-y, Harding,
25 H-a-r-d-i-n-g, I am really tired of the Hillary

9413208.0012

1 Clinton spellings, that's not mine, and I am with
2 Heart of Northwest but not officially
3 representing them. I will leave that for Jerry
4 tonight. Address 1305 Fourth Avenue, Suite 208,
5 Seattle, Washington, 98101.

6 I am a little dismayed that I am
7 standing here needing to raise the issue of grout
8 in yet another public hearing.

9 As I recall, it was in response to
10 public comment, mine included, during Tri-Party
11 Agreement renegotiations, that the grout
12 alternative was dropped from consideration as a
13 viable alternative for stabilizing low-level
14 waste.

15 Yet in the Notice of Intent for this
16 EIS on page 15, I think, it states very clearly
17 DOE would maintain and standby condition the
18 capability to restart the grout facility if its
19 operation is necessary before new double-shelled
20 tanks are available to provide tank space to
21 resolve safety issues.

22 And the Notice of Intent mentions
23 glass, cullitt, and sulfur cement and cement
24 polymer based grout as alternatives for low
25 activity waste stabilization.

9413209.0043

1 I was amazed. Have you forgotten
2 so quickly what the public said?

3 We believe grout is nothing more than
4 the creation of a surface level high-level
5 nuclear waste dump. The public repeatedly and
6 clearly stated that any form of grout was
7 unacceptable as an alternative measure during the
8 Tri-Party Agreement renegotiation hearings.

9 Simply put, just, again, for this
10 EIS, grout should not be considered as an
11 alternative. The reappearance of grout as an
12 alternative also sends up a warning flag to me,
13 it makes me question if you are planning to
14 ignore the binding nature of the Tri-Party
15 Agreement.

16 I saw your little sheet saying, no,
17 you intend to comply fully with it. It was
18 signed less than a month ago, and yet, sort of
19 under the banner of NEPA compliance, which I also
20 applaud, this is sort of convoluted here, you
21 seem to be covering ground which was already
22 covered under the TPA, and to me that indicates a
23 possibility that the DOE is attempting to stall
24 implementation of the Tri-Party Agreement and
25 Hanford cleanup.

9413208-0045

1 I am relieved that the USDOE is
2 planning to comply with NEPA as a matter of
3 course, but in the instance of this EIS,
4 considering the renegotiated TPA last month, it
5 seems that this EIS should be held, considering
6 the environmental impacts or potential
7 environmental impacts that would arise from the
8 actions or activities that are called for in
9 the new Tri-Party Agreement, and of course the
10 way those potential impacts can be avoided or
11 solved.

12 Hopefully, I won't have to testify
13 about grout again.

14 MS. ALINDA PAGE: Kip Wilson.

15 MR. KIP WILSON: Kip Wilson,
16 address is 2249 N. E. 46th, Seattle, Washington,
17 98105.

18 I mostly have some comments and not
19 anything that's as coherent as Hilary at this
20 point. And I don't see anybody else who wants
21 to speak today, which is sort of interesting.
22 Hopefully, there will be more people here
23 tonight.

24 I have some concerns, and some of
25 these were addressed when I was speaking with

1 Toby.

2 The concerns were where was, once we
3 built these six high-level waste tanks, where
4 would the decommissioning and decontamination of
5 ongoing cleanup processes be going to?

6 He explained to me that during this
7 process of emptying the tanks, the 177 tanks,
8 there would be more tank space opened up, and
9 then those tanks would be taking in the liquids
10 from the decommissioning, such as PUREX and so
11 forth. So that was a question that is
12 resolved.

13 Another issue is, if you did perhaps
14 not follow what was set out in the task force,
15 and used a higher, let's see, what was it, higher
16 separation of high-level nuclear waste and
17 low-level nuclear waste, I was very concerned on
18 what would happen with the plutonium-239 and
19 uranium-235.

20 And it was also explained to me, but
21 I want to emphasize, that we don't want to see
22 these things pulled out, these two elements
23 pulled out and kept for any further uses.
24 Concerned that they should be just gone on to
25 high-level vitrification.

9413208 0016

1 Then I found out what the cost of the
2 six tanks were, and the price went down as you
3 decided to build more, which was good.

4 And I also had a question on what
5 is an unavoidable environmental impact
6 statement -- or unavoidable environmental
7 impact.

8 That's a concern. That sounds like
9 an accident waiting to happen. That means that
10 we're not training the people well enough out at
11 the tank farms or future building isn't done
12 properly. I don't see why we should be having
13 any unavoidable environmental impacts.

14 You should know what you're doing
15 by the time you go in to take care of these
16 problems in moving the waste from the older tanks
17 to the newer tanks, and that the infrastructure
18 should be taken care of before that happens.

19 There was another one, which was
20 unavoidable adverse environmental affects, and
21 once I sat down and talked to somebody about it,
22 it makes a lot of sense.

23 Once we take a high level waste
24 tank that is going to -- that has deteriorated
25 and you start sluicing out one of these tanks,

9413208.0047

1 what kind of impact is that going to have from
2 leaking?

3 And to follow up on that, we want
4 to make sure that there's some type of barrier
5 technology that keeps that material from moving
6 away from the tank, or that you can prevent any
7 type of discharge, unavoidable discharge from
8 any of these tanks during either mechanical or
9 sluicing processes, some other process where
10 you're going to get rid of this difficult
11 waste.

12 Okay. So, again, I'll say, I think
13 we should be using barrier technology in any
14 instance that it applies.

15 Okay. Here's another question, or
16 comment. What will be the long-term effects of
17 the low-level glassification and the storage of
18 that on the Hanford Site? What type of length of
19 time are we talking about where, if it does break
20 down, are we talking about 500 years, a thousand
21 years, 10,000 years, or what, will all of the
22 radioactive nuclides that have an impact, their
23 half-lives have gone through enough process, I
24 believe it's 10 before they become pretty much
25 innocuous.

9413205-0048

1 How am I doing for time?

2 MS. ALINDA PAGE: You are not
3 running out of time.

4 MR. KIP WILSON: And I guess
5 basically, to end up, we've got some goals that
6 we would like to again state at this time.

7 It's time to get on with the
8 cleanup. We want this EIS done as quickly as
9 possible. We want those tanks on line with the
10 goal set by the TPA and the tank waste force this
11 last year.

12 And I believe you've got some
13 deadlines. We want you to stick to those
14 deadlines, having those tanks done by I believe
15 '96 and '98. Is that correct? I can't get any
16 answers. That's right.

17 And the other is, are there any
18 simpler solutions to the double tank -- building
19 double tanks, double-shell tanks, besides no
20 action at all?

21 At this point it doesn't look like
22 there is any.

23 Are there any type of simpler
24 solutions?

25 But for the most part, please get on

9413208-0049

1 with the EIS, get it completed on time so
2 construction and manufacture of these tanks will
3 meet the TPA guidelines.

4 Also, the tank waste remediation
5 system is part of and designed to resolve tank
6 leaks. There are available, and more cost
7 effective solutions than extended pretreatment of
8 vitrification studies. Double-shell tank
9 capacity and using existing technology for the
10 new tanks, and possibly barriers.

11 Basically, coming down to it, we've
12 got the technology, let's put it on line and
13 get it done. And, again, going over, the
14 infrastructure needs to be taken care of, and
15 it's really a shame we've come to this point,
16 since the Tri-Party Agreement was signed back in
17 1989, that we have this past summer, we have had
18 safety problems that should have been resolved
19 years ago, and that we hope that their will not
20 be any more safety issues, that the workers,
21 management, understands that this is a very, very
22 important issue out there, and we would like to
23 see only glowing reports from here on out,
24 especially since you are using our tax dollars to
25 clean up the Hanford Site.

1 Thank you very much.

2 MS. ALINDA PAGE: Is there anyone
3 else who would like to speak at this time? If
4 not, the meeting is recessed until someone else
5 comes who would like to see.

6 (Recessed at 2:20 p.m.)

7

8 (Commenced at 4:30 p.m.)

9 MS. ALINDA PAGE: The meeting is
10 recessed until 6:30.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1900 9029116
9413209.0051

1

2

MS. ALINDA PAGE: Good evening.

3

I would like to formally commence today's public meeting and to welcome on behalf of the U.S.

4

5

Department of Energy and the Washington State

6

Department of Ecology all of you who have come

7

today.

8

Today's scoping meeting is officially

9

designated as the Seattle public scoping meeting

10

for the two proposed Environmental Impact

11

Statements at the Hanford Site, Richland,

12

Washington.

13

One EIS will address the proposed

14

Tank Waste Remediation System activities, and the

15

second will address the proposed construction of

16

six new safety tanks for the storage of

17

high-level radioactive waste as an interim action

18

to the Tank Waste Remediation System Environ-

19

mental Impact Statement.

20

The meeting is being held on the 22nd

21

day of February, 1994, at the Mountaineer's

22

Building in Seattle, Washington, and we are

23

commencing at 6:37 p.m.

24

Today's meeting is the fourth of five

25

being held in Washington and Oregon during the

9413208.0652

1 month of February.

2 Tonight's schedule calls for
3 presentations beginning now, and then the meeting
4 will continue until ten p.m. tonight.

5 My name is Alinda Page, and I am a
6 professional facilitator with Triangle Associates
7 from Seattle, Washington.

8 I have been asked, by the Department
9 of Energy and the Washington State Department of
10 Ecology, to conduct this scoping meeting to
11 ensure that all individuals and organizations
12 here today who wish to comment on the scope of
13 the upcoming Environmental Impact Statement have
14 a fair and equal opportunity to do so, in keeping
15 with both the letter and the spirit of the
16 National Environmental Policy Act and the State
17 Environmental Policy Act.

18 The National Environmental Policy
19 Act of 1969, commonly referred to as NEPA,
20 requires that any federal agency proposing an
21 action that might have impacts on the environment
22 evaluate all reasonable alternatives and their
23 potential environmental impacts before taking
24 such an action.

25 When the projected environmental

9413208.0053

1 impacts might be considered significant, an
2 Environmental Impact Statement must be
3 prepared.

4 NEPA also requires that the public
5 be provided opportunities to comment during the
6 preparation of the Environmental Impact
7 Statement.

8 The Washington State Environmental
9 Policy Act, commonly referred to as SEPA, is very
10 similar to NEPA in its intent and purpose. Like
11 NEPA, SEPA requires any state agency proposing an
12 action that might have impacts on the environment
13 to evaluate all reasonable alternatives and their
14 potential environmental impacts before taking
15 action.

16 The potential Washington State action
17 in the remediation of the high-level tank wastes
18 and the construction of the six new safety tanks
19 would be the issuance of the required Washington
20 State environmental permits and authorizations,
21 if the determination is made to proceed with the
22 proposed action.

23 As with NEPA, when the projected
24 environmental impact might be considered
25 significant, an Environmental Impact Statement

913208 0054

1 must be prepared. SEPA also requires that the
2 public be provided opportunities to comment
3 during the preparation of the Washington State
4 Environmental Impact Statement.

5 Because the National Environmental
6 Policy Act and the Washington State
7 Environmental Policy Act are very comparable in
8 their purpose, intent and procedures, the State
9 of Washington Department of Ecology and the
10 United States Department of Energy have decided
11 to prepare one Environmental Impact Statement for
12 each of the two proposed actions addressing the
13 requirements of both SEPA and NEPA in a single
14 document.

15 That is, a single EIS will address
16 the Tank Waste Remediation issues and a single,
17 yet different EIS, will address the proposed
18 construction of the six new safety tanks.

19 On Friday, January 28th, 1994, the
20 Department of Energy published a Notice of
21 Intent in the Federal Register announcing its
22 intent to prepare these two Environmental Impact
23 Statements.

24 One EIS, as I said, will address
25 the proposed Tank Waste Remediation System

500 002116
913209.0055

1 activities, and the second will address the
2 proposed construction of six new safety tanks
3 for the storage of high-level radioactive waste
4 as an interim action to the Tank Waste
5 Remediation System Environmental Impact
6 Statement.

7 On the same date, January 28th, 1994,
8 the Washington State Department of Ecology
9 determined that a SEPA EIS was required for these
10 two projects.

11 The purpose of this scoping meeting
12 is to allow each of you have an opportunity to
13 identify for the record the significant issues
14 that you believe should be considered by the
15 United States Department of Energy and the
16 Washington State Department of Ecology in the
17 preparation of these two Environmental Impact
18 Statements.

19 The format for tonight's meeting
20 has been designed to give as many people as
21 possible the opportunity to comment, including
22 those of you who do not wish to make formal
23 comments.

24 We will take formal comments in this
25 room throughout the time scheduled for today's

1 meeting.

2 A verbatim transcript of this
3 meeting will be made with all oral comments
4 received contained in the transcript. And a
5 transcript will also be made of the other four
6 scoping meetings. It will be included in the
7 United States Department of Energy and
8 Washington State Department of Ecology's record
9 of these proceedings. The Department of Energy
10 and the Department of Ecology will make the
11 transcripts from all five of the scoping meetings
12 available at information locations located
13 throughout Washington and Oregon as soon as they
14 are available.

15 After they have reviewed all of the
16 formal comments received at the scoping meetings
17 and the written comments that are submitted
18 during the scoping comment period, the two
19 Departments, the Washington State Department of
20 Ecology and the Department of Energy, will then
21 jointly prepare two Draft Environmental Impact
22 Statements.

23 When each Draft EIS is available, the
24 public will once again have the opportunity to
25 participate in this effort by submitting comments

9413208.0057

1 on the Draft EISs. The two Draft Environmental
2 Impact Statements will be prepared on different
3 schedules.

4 The Draft EIS for the six new
5 safety tanks is scheduled to be available later
6 this year. The Draft EIS for the tank waste
7 remediation program is scheduled to be available
8 in 1995.

9 At this time, however, I would like
10 to introduce Mr. Geoff Tallent of the
11 Washington State Department of Ecology who will
12 make a brief presentation about the compatibility
13 of the NEPA and SEPA processes. He will be
14 followed by Dr. Donald Alexander of the
15 Department of Energy's Richland Field Office Tank
16 Waste Remediation System Program Office. Dr.
17 Alexander will make a brief presentation on the
18 proposed six new safety tanks and on the tank
19 waste remediation system program.

20 Mr. Tallent?

21 MR. GEOFF TALLENT: Good evening.

22 My name is Geoff Tallent with the Washington
23 State Department of Ecology.

24 The United States Department of
25 Energy, which I have referred to as USDOE, and

94328.003

1 the Washington State Department of Ecology, or
2 Ecology, are using an innovative approach to
3 review the environmental impacts to the TWRS
4 program by combining the requirements of NEPA and
5 SEPA. The two agencies expect ourselves and the
6 public to realize several benefits from combining
7 these processes.

8 The USDOE and Ecology are preparing a
9 Memorandum of Understanding between the two
10 agencies will which allow us to streamline the
11 NEPA-SEPA compliance process;

12 Allow for a joint NEPA-SEPA decision
13 document, a combined EIS;

14 Accelerate the process by
15 consolidating meetings, mandatory processes and
16 documents;

17 And to provide a mechanism to
18 expedite resolution of comments and issues.

19 Benefits of combining the NEPA and
20 SEPA process are as follows:

21 First, combining streamlines the
22 environmental review. Instead of taking a
23 separate fragmented and sequential approach,
24 Ecology and USDOE are anticipating folding their
25 NEPA and SEPA requirements together and meeting

9413208.0059

1 them all upfront.

2 This will avoid duplicative and time
3 consuming public reviews in the future.

4 Second, NEPA and SEPA are very similar
5 in intent as well as process. The Washington
6 State law was modeled after the federal law and
7 has no differences which would prevent the two
8 processes from being combined.

9 In fact, both laws encourage the
10 integration with their counterparts. Ecology
11 and USDOE believe that the combined effort will
12 result in a better process for environmental
13 review.

14 Third, in combining the documents,
15 the two agencies expect to be able to save time
16 and money. The two processes each require
17 extensive public involvement, careful study and
18 the preparation of several documents. By only
19 doing these once, will clearly realize a
20 savings.

21 Fourth, by working as equal
22 partners, Ecology and USDOE must agree on
23 everything in the EISs. The two agencies will
24 eliminate the possibility of debating over
25 conflicting directions later on, and instead

1 will identify and resolve differences early and
2 cooperatively.

3 Finally, and most importantly,
4 nothing is lost in this combined effort. Ecology
5 and USDOE will continue to maintain full
6 independent authority over their respective
7 requirements.

8 This means both NEPA and SEPA must
9 be completely followed to the satisfaction of
10 each agency. Additionally, no part of either
11 NEPA or SEPA will be sacrificed in this joint
12 EIS -- or both of these EISs. Any information
13 or opportunity for review or comment that NEPA
14 or SEPA requires will be part of the combined
15 process.

16 Now I will take you through what you
17 will see in both of the EIS's.

18 The statement of purpose and need for
19 action will explain the problem for which the
20 proposed actions are being studied. In these
21 cases, the purpose is the need to resolve tank
22 safety issues.

23 The description of alternatives
24 will describe the actions the agency is
25 proposed to take and compare those actions with

9413208-0061

1 alternative means to resolve tank safety
2 issues.

3 For these EISs, the preferred
4 alternative will follow the processes laid out in
5 the Tri-Party Agreement. Other alternatives will
6 also be examined.

7 One reason why we are here is to
8 find out from you what alternatives we should
9 look at.

10 Finally, the no action alternative is
11 required by both NEPA and SEPA as a way of
12 comparing the other alternatives to continuing
13 the present situation.

14 The EIS will also describe the
15 environment which will be affected by all of the
16 alternatives. In these cases it will be a
17 description of the areas at the Hanford Site
18 where the TWRS activities would take place and
19 any parts of the environment beyond the Hanford
20 Site that may be impacted.

21 In describing the environment, the
22 EISs will look at three aspects.

23 First, the human environment, which
24 looks at such things as potentially impacted
25 populations and areas of historical significance.

9413208.0062

1 Second, the biological environment,
2 which looks at such things as potentially
3 impacted plants and animal species.

4 And third, the physical environment,
5 which will describe such areas as geology and
6 ground and surface waters.

7 The third parts of the EISs will
8 examine the environmental impacts of the
9 proposed action and alternatives. This will
10 look at impacts to the human environment, such as
11 impacts on jobs and the disturbance of historic
12 areas.

13 It will also look at potential
14 health risks from such things as radioactive
15 releases to both Hanford workers and the off-Site
16 public.

17 The impacts section will thirdly look
18 at possible impacts of the ecosystem such as
19 endangering plant or animal species or
20 interfering with migrations.

21 Finally, the EIS will exam methods
22 for mitigating or reducing the impacts of the
23 proposals and alternatives. These might include
24 such things as additional pollution control
25 devices, restoration of habitat, or changes in

9413209.0063

1 the location of buildings.

2 As with the alternatives, we are
3 here to hear your comments on what the analysis
4 of impacts to the environment should include,
5 and what possible mitigation measures should be
6 considered.

7 To conclude my presentation, I will
8 take you through the proposed schedule of the two
9 EISs.

10 First, a Notice of Intent to prepare
11 the EISs was published in the Federal Register
12 and corresponding Washington State SEPA register
13 on January 28th. Those notices began the scoping
14 process for which we are holding this meeting.
15 Comments on the scope of either EIS will be due
16 March 15th.

17 At that time the path of the two EISs
18 will split. For the New Tanks EIS, an
19 Implementation Plan should be prepared by the two
20 agencies by April 15th. The Implementation Plan
21 will lay out the schedule for completion and
22 scope of the New Tanks EIS.

23 The Draft EIS will follow in June at
24 which time there will be a 45 day review and
25 comment period. After that, the two agencies

1 expect to have a Final EIS out by August of this
2 year and a final decision by September.

3 The TWRS EIS Implementation Plan will
4 be ready in June of this year, but will take
5 until August of next year to assemble all of the
6 information for the Draft EIS.

7 After a 45 day comment period, the
8 final TWRS EIS should be ready by April of
9 1996, with a final decision by May of that
10 year.

11 The two agencies hope, as a result of
12 this combined process, to accelerate the TWRS EIS
13 from the schedule I just laid out. If that is
14 successful, a TWRS final decision could be made
15 as soon as June of 1995.

16 This concludes my portion of the
17 presentation. If you have any questions about
18 SEPA or NEPA, or the process the two agencies
19 intend to use in preparing these EISs, please
20 give me a call at 206-407-7112.

21 Next will be Don Alexander of the
22 Department of Energy, to describe the proposed
23 Tank Waste Remediation System and the New Double
24 Shelled tanks. Thank you.

25 DR. DON ALEXANDER: Thank you,

941320B.0065

1 Geoff, and good evening.

2 With an urgency in the 1940s to give
3 the United States a weapons advantage, many of
4 the actions were taken without consideration for
5 the environment and were unregulated with respect
6 to the environment.

7 The massive legacy of those actions
8 resulted in waste stored in 177 tanks, 68 of
9 which are considered to be leaking, and others
10 which have potential for leaking.

11 The National Environmental Policy
12 Act was enacted in 1969 to assure that in the
13 future any major federal proposed actions, such
14 as a major construction project, especially those
15 involving radioactive wastes, be analytically
16 evaluated.

17 NEPA requires that the federal agency
18 complete three types of analyses and weigh these
19 in its decision-making process.

20 The first is an analysis of the
21 environmental impacts of the proposed action.

22 The second is an analysis of the
23 impacts of alternative design solutions to the
24 proposed action.

25 And, finally, the proposed and

1 alternative actions are to be compared to the
2 environmental implications of taking no action.

3 The alternatives under discussion
4 today have been presented to you in public
5 meetings over the past year involving the
6 Tri-Party Agreement. It was in that process that
7 some were dismissed. Grout was a notable
8 alternative among those dismissed.

9 Although the DOE had alternatives
10 as announced in the HDW EIS as late as 1988,
11 the TPA process was essential in aiding the
12 Department in formulating the current proposed
13 actions.

14 Once the Tri-Party Agreement was
15 signed on January 25th of this year, the Notice
16 of Intent was immediately issued for the proposed
17 actions on January 28th.

18 In the next few moments I will give
19 you an overview of the two proposed actions to
20 be discussed in the meeting today, and I will
21 tell you how you can contribute to this part of
22 the process.

23 DOE and Ecology are recommending two
24 proposed actions.

25 First, to construct six new waste

1 storage tanks, and second, to retrieve, treat,
2 immobilize, store and dispose of radioactive
3 waste from 177 storage tanks.

4 The agencies request comments and
5 recommendations from you for:

6 Alternatives to be analyzed; and
7 Additional environmental issues that
8 we should consider.

9 The proposed facilities are to be
10 constructed in the 200 Areas, the area where I
11 work.

12 The two proposed actions are:

13 First, to immediately remove
14 radioactive waste contents from tanks with
15 dangerous emissions of ignitable gas to safer
16 storage, as shown on the left part of the
17 slide;

18 And second, to permanently retrieve,
19 treat, immobilize and safely store all tank
20 wastes on an interim basis, until a permanent
21 repository is available.

22 Next slide, please. The two
23 preferred alternatives are embodied in the newly
24 signed Tri-Party Agreement and are being
25 implemented as we speak.

1 NEPA and SEPA will evaluate the
2 preferred and reasonable alternatives and assess
3 potential environmental consequences.

4 Environmental consequences will be
5 considered with safety concerns, costs,
6 schedules, and public review.

7 If the environmental consequences
8 outweigh other considerations, then the DOE,
9 Ecology, and the EPA could revise specific
10 milestones, but not the end date of the TPA
11 2028.

12 DOE and Ecology are committed to full
13 compliance with the TPA.

14 In the Tri-Party Agreement we agree
15 to build six tanks to eliminate immediate safety
16 concerns.

17 This is a schematic of a proposed
18 tank with modern safety controls, including mixer
19 and retrieval pumps to reduce gas build-up,
20 liquid and gas sampling systems, improved
21 ventilation systems, and improved tank integrity
22 monitoring.

23 For this proposed action, then, the
24 Tri-Party Agreement defines that we would
25 construct six new tanks.

9413208.0069

1 We are required by law to evaluate
2 other alternatives, as Geoff and I have both
3 said, to assure that we have adequately
4 considered environmental impacts. One potential
5 alternative is to construct fewer tanks, and rely
6 on other methods to mitigate safety issues.

7 If we were to choose no action, we
8 would not mitigate or resolve safety issues. As
9 I said earlier, this alternative is required by
10 law.

11 We would like to receive your oral or
12 written comments on other alternatives to this
13 proposed action.

14 This is a schematic of the two
15 tanks and the supporting facilities proposed for
16 the 200 West Area. A similar conceptual design
17 has been prepared for the four tanks that would
18 be found in the eastern area. Notice that the
19 costs of this construction involve not only the
20 tanks themselves but the necessary support
21 facilities that support them.

22 Next slide. Now I would like to
23 give you an overview of the second proposed
24 action.

25 In this action we upgrade our current

9413208.0070

1 storage for safety reasons, we retrieve from the
2 177 tanks, treat, immobilize, store and safely
3 dispose of all of the waste.

4 Next slide, please. We are
5 required by law to evaluate the consequences of
6 leaving the wastes where they are so we can
7 determine the benefit of taking the proposed
8 action. We have agreed with the State and EPA
9 to retrieve all of the waste by sluicing,
10 provide minimum pretreatment of wastes, vitrify
11 high-level wastes, and vitrify low-level
12 wastes.

13 Although we prefer to retrieve waste
14 by hydraulic sluicing, we have also identified
15 two additional alternatives for comparison of
16 environmental impacts; pneumatic retrieval, and
17 mechanical retrieval.

18 We prefer minimal pretreatment, but
19 we also recognize two additional alternatives
20 for comparing environmental impacts. These
21 include no pretreatment, and extensive
22 pretreatment.

23 For immobilization of high-level
24 waste we agree to vitrification.

25 Calcination is an alternative for

1 comparison of environmental impacts.

2 And for low activity wastes, we
3 prefer vitrification, but we will consider other
4 solid waste forms, again, for comparison of
5 environmental impacts.

6 We request that you provide other
7 alternatives through oral or written comments
8 before March 15th.

9 Environmental issues need to be
10 evaluated for the proposed action as required by
11 NEPA, and SEPA, including:

12 Effects of releases on the public
13 and on-site workers from operations and
14 accidents;

15 The effects on air and water quality,
16 and other environmental consequences from
17 operations and accidents;

18 Effects on endangered species,
19 archaeological, and historical sites;

20 Unavoidable environmental impacts;
21 Cumulative effects of all of the
22 above;

23 Effects from transportation;

24 Effects of future decommissioning
25 decisions;

943208.002

1 Socio-economic impacts on the
2 surrounding communities, like the one that I live
3 in;

4 Short-term use of the environment
5 versus long-term productivity;

6 Pollution prevention and waste
7 minimization;

8 Unavoidable adverse environmental
9 impacts;

10 Irretrievable and irreversible
11 commitments of resources.

12 And, again, we request that you
13 provide other alternatives through oral or
14 written comments before March 15th.

15 Next slide. In summary, then, the
16 DOE and Ecology are recommending two proposed
17 actions.

18 Construct six new storage tanks.

19 And, secondly, retrieve, treat,
20 immobilize, store, and dispose of the waste from
21 177 storage tanks.

22 The agencies are requesting comments
23 and recommendations from you for alternatives to
24 be analyzed and additional environmental issues
25 to be considered.

9413208.0073

1 Thank you.

2 MS. ALINDA PAGE: Thank you. Mr.

3 Tallent and Dr. Alexander will be sitting up here
4 during the remainder of the meeting, listening to
5 your comments.

6 Because this is a formal scoping
7 hearing, they will not be engaging with you in
8 conversation, except to ask clarifying questions
9 to make sure that they understand the purpose of
10 your comments.

11 However, there are representatives
12 from the Department of Energy and the
13 Department of Ecology, specifically Mr. Ken
14 Bracken and Mr. Toby Michelena in the back of
15 the room and if any of you have questions or
16 would like to talk informally during any part
17 of this evening with those representatives,
18 please do so.

19 You do need to be aware, however,
20 that only the comments that you make here at
21 the microphone are going to be transcribed by
22 the court reporter and included in the transcript
23 which will constitute the record for this
24 meeting.

25 Therefore, if you address any issues

9113208.0079

1 during any informal conversations that you want
2 considered in the Draft EIS, you need to come
3 forward to the mike and repeat those issues and
4 concerns in this formal process.

5 I encourage those of you who will
6 be speaking today to provide me with written
7 versions of your oral comments. If you have a
8 transcript of your oral comments or if you have
9 prepared a written document that you would like
10 that will supplement your oral comments, please
11 give it to me and we will enter it into the
12 record. Documents submitted today are formally
13 accepted into the record for the meeting and will
14 be given the same consideration as the oral
15 comments that are heard.

16 If you are not ready to make comments
17 orally or you are uncomfortable getting up in
18 front of people to speak, there is a comment form
19 that's been prepared and is available for you in
20 the back of the room. You may also submit
21 comments on any kind of form that you have
22 available. The names of Mr. Tallent and Dr.
23 Alexander are on that form also at the
24 registration desk and the address to which you
25 must mail the comments.

9413208.0075

1 Written comments must be postmarked
2 by March 15th, 1994, to assure their use in the
3 preparation of the Environmental Impact
4 Statements. Comments received after that date
5 will be accommodated as practical.

6 Written comments will be given the
7 same level of consideration by the Department of
8 Energy and Ecology as formal comments that are
9 received at the scoping meeting.

10 Now I would like to take just a
11 moment or two to go over the procedures that we
12 will be using for the oral comments for today's
13 meeting.

14 We have pre-registered speakers,
15 people who signed up in advance of this meeting
16 to speak, and indicated a time at which they
17 wished to be called on. So as close as possible
18 to those requested times, I will call on the
19 pre-registered speakers.

20 In addition, some of you have
21 probably signed up to speak as you got here
22 today. And I'll call on those of you who signed
23 up today in the order in which you signed up. If
24 you are out of the room and missed the call,
25 don't worry, we'll call you again, until you

1 finally get a chance to talk.

2 The people who wish to comment today
3 will be given five minutes each. And I have a
4 stop watch and I'll be jumping up and down in
5 front of you if you go over the five minute
6 period. Organizations, people who are
7 representing organizations and are the official
8 representative of an organization, will be given
9 ten minutes. So it's important that you indicate
10 that you are official spokespeople for organiza-
11 tions and you expect to speak for ten minutes, if
12 that's your circumstance.

13 I will not limit the comment of any
14 -- the content of any of the statements that you
15 make today, but I would like to ask you to keep
16 your comments to the scoping of these two
17 Environmental Impact Statements.

18 And, finally, I want to introduce our
19 court reporter, Bill Bridges, who is transcribing
20 verbatim the formal comment portion of today's
21 meeting. In order to help him prepare a complete
22 and accurate record, I would like to ask that you
23 come forward to this mike, before you begin your
24 comments, that you say your name and that you
25 give your address. It would help also if you

9413208.0077

1 would spell your name and be quite clear about
2 your mailing address.

3 We'll now begin the formal comment
4 period for today's meeting.

5 At this time I will turn the meeting
6 over to the first speaker, Gordon Smith, and then
7 we will see if there are other speakers after
8 that who wish to comment.

9 MR. GORDON SMITH: My name is
10 Gordon Smith, 8029 Meridian North.

11 You know, we've got to do something
12 about stopping the immediate problems, and it
13 seems to me like the two tank -- or new tanks and
14 moving on with solidifying and most likely
15 vitrifying this stuff, it seems like a reasonable
16 thing.

17 The half-life of this stuff, I mean,
18 we're talking an environmental impact of
19 thousands of years, am I right? I believe so.
20 We're talking huge, long times, even in
21 geological time.

22 In the economy which has to do with
23 the socioimpact of all of this that I would
24 really like to speak to. It strikes me that
25 virtually all the technologies that we have

1 looked at here are technologies that are pretty
2 dead end. I mean, we're not going to be driving
3 things or living off of things that have to do
4 with this, any of these technologies, not an
5 expanding kind of benefit that any economy is
6 going to be able to gain by being able to vitrify
7 nuclear waste.

8 You know, I've heard pretty light
9 hearted and humorous discussion of moving nuclear
10 waste to an off-planet geological site. I'd
11 suggest the sun, out of the solar system. And I
12 guess my proposal really is towards applying some
13 amount of the large dollars we've got to dedicate
14 to this kind of thing to developing a reliable
15 launch technology that would have a much broader
16 and healthy impact on the economy as a whole in
17 that we could use it for all kinds of other
18 applications, and get this stuff off the planet
19 so we're not looking at it in our oceans, in our
20 crust, in our salt mines for another many
21 thousands of years.

22 You know, I mean, we've got access
23 to solid fuel technology from Russia these
24 days. I'd consider, you know, using artillery
25 and ballistics as a potential for launching

9413208.0079

1 unpowered gas cylinders, possibly freezing some
2 of this stuff and shooting it right out of
3 here.

4 A serious thought. I think it's
5 been overlooked. I think the benefits are much
6 broader than any of the technologies mentioned.
7 Thanks.

8 MS. ALINDA PAGE: Our next
9 speaker is Gerald Pollet from the Heart of
10 America Northwest.

11 MR. GERALD POLLET: Heart of
12 America Northwest basically simply wants to add a
13 few comments offered earlier today by Kip Wilson
14 and Hilary Harding.

15 One of the key issues that we think
16 needs to be incorporated into the scoping
17 process that I don't believe they talked about
18 this afternoon is the question of what to do
19 with liquids from PUREX, T-Plant, PFP, reactor
20 decommissioning.

21 We are generating large waste streams
22 currently at Hanford, and we are planning on
23 generating extremely large waste streams that
24 will go to double-shell tanks theoretically
25 during what's called D & D.

943200000

1 And we're concerned that we're
2 building new tanks while generating more wastes.
3 The goal is to take waste that we cannot
4 accommodate in existing double-shell tanks. But
5 then we're going to take D & D waste and use
6 double-shell tank capacity.

7 And one key question here is
8 whether or not we would need six new tanks of
9 extremely high technology and dubiously high
10 cost, instead of building lower technology tanks
11 to handle lower activity, lower contamination
12 level D & D waste streams and current waste
13 streams.

14 These waste streams are such that
15 they do not need all the, let's call it, high
16 tech that's being built into the new double-shell
17 tanks.

18 There's also another major question
19 of the potential impact of adding waste streams
20 to tanks such as 104-C, 106-C, -- excuse me,
21 double-shell tanks that, like 101-SY, that along
22 with 104 and 106-C, we're going to try to empty
23 and move into double-shell tanks.

24 We're going to leave stuff behind
25 in 101-SY, and then we are going to add waste

9413208-0081

1 streams. We don't understand the chemistry of
2 many of the high-level waste tanks. We don't
3 have anywhere near adequate sampling, and we are
4 proposing in essence to add chemicals when we
5 don't know what the interactions will be.

6 And we would be far better off
7 perhaps to simply build new, cheap RCRA
8 compliant double-shell tanks for the D & D
9 wastes.

10 The scope of the EIS needs to
11 examine questions about characterization of
12 tanks, adequacy of monitoring, adequacy of
13 vapor space monitoring, and the interaction of
14 any new wastes that are introduced into
15 existing tanks, along with what we can do to
16 totally eliminate the generation of some of
17 these liquid waste streams that I am talking
18 about.

19 It ought to be possible to totally
20 eliminate, for instance, or greatly eliminate
21 waste streams from T-Plant, from basically
22 rinsing, which is a low tech word for what we're
23 planning on doing to D & D highly contaminated
24 equipment.

25 Right now we exercise no treatment

9413208.0002

1 option whatsoever before those liquids are
2 being sent to double-shell tanks. It makes a
3 heck of a lot more sense to reduce, reuse and
4 recycle than it does to take double-shell tank
5 capacity.

6 We want to remind the two agencies
7 to bear in mind a very important and highly
8 technically worded recommendation of the Tank
9 Waste Task Force, and that is we don't need
10 monuments, keep the double-shell tanks simple.
11 At 435 million dollars for six tanks, these are
12 not simple tanks.

13 The cost is in fact obscene compared
14 to what it costs to build double-shell tanks just
15 a decade and a half ago. And there are serious
16 questions about whether it ought to cost that
17 much, or shouldn't we be able to build the tanks
18 for far cheaper.

19 We're concerned about, if you build
20 it, you will fill it. And, again, that comes
21 back to if you build it, will you actually
22 reduce, reuse and recycle liquids instead of just
23 generating them, and treating them as you always
24 had, something to be dealt with 20, 30 years from
25 now, with a vitrification plant.

1 I would like to touch on the issue
2 of grout. Grout is something that the public
3 has universally abandoned. It has no public
4 support. I understand that you are holding it in
5 reserve, despite the public displeasure with the
6 whole concept, despite the fact that it's not
7 retrievable.

8 If you are holding it in reserve,
9 then you must also fully discuss all the issues
10 related to grout that were raised during the TWRS
11 renegotiation process at public meetings.

12 So, in essence, what I would like
13 to formally ask right now is that the public
14 comments relating to the rescoping of TWRS
15 during the Tri-Party Agreement renegotiation,
16 the three rounds of workshops and hearings,
17 that the public comments which have already
18 been recorded, have already been broken out by
19 category, so this isn't a heck of a lot of work,
20 that those comments dealing with grout be
21 included and appended to this record and to guide
22 you in terms of scoping what the public views as
23 the environmental impacts of proceeding with
24 grout.

25 Lastly, we'd like to ask that the

9413208.0084

1 scope of the EIS also include some simple
2 examination of tank safety and leak prevention
3 issues.

4 In terms of tank safety, experimenta-
5 tion in the laboratory with tank wastes to see
6 what off-gasses are being generated by samples of
7 tank waste.

8 It seems as if you can take a sample
9 of tank waste and measure in a laboratory what
10 the off-gasses are, you then can design a vapor
11 space monitoring program and air emission
12 monitoring program around what you observe in the
13 laboratory.

14 As I understand it, this approach has
15 been rejected for being too simple. It's
16 something that needs to be examined.

17 Similarly, we need to look at
18 issues relating to how are you going to speed
19 up vapor space monitoring and safety-related
20 improvements in the tank farm, including the
21 adequacy of training. Because the most
22 important safety upgrade we can have as part of
23 TWRS is training. There is no doubt about
24 that.

25 We need infrastructure, and, again,

943209 005
007 072116

1 we would like you to take the TWRS task force
2 comments about speeding up infrastructure and
3 safety improvements that are cheap as part of
4 this process and examine the range of things that
5 are available in off-the-shelf technology,
6 basically, for air emission monitoring, leak
7 detection monitoring, both in groundwater
8 monitoring wells and other devices.

9 Again, we urged during the task force
10 process that the agencies bear in mind the
11 premise that we ought to keep things simple and
12 use available technology. And a major focus of
13 the TWRS EIS ought to be devoted to how we can
14 get on with significant safety improvements with
15 training and available technology, not just the
16 highfalutin pie in the sky we will have a fancy
17 pretreatment program, it will cost a billion
18 dollars for mobile pretreatment plants on wheels,
19 fit into 435 million dollar double-shell tanks.

20 We can improve safety and leak
21 prevention much quicker and cheaper with simple
22 available fixes, and a major portion of the EIS
23 needs to be devoted to that.

24 Thank you.

25 MS. ALINDA PAGE: The next

1 speaker is Todd Martin from the Hanford Education
2 Action League.

3 MR. TODD MARTIN: My name is Todd
4 Martin, and I am a staff researcher for the
5 Hanford Education Action League. We are a
6 citizen's organization based in Spokane,
7 Washington, that watchdogs Hanford activities.

8 What I'm going to say tonight I've
9 said before, but that's not going to stop me from
10 saying it again, hoping that the message gets
11 across loud and clear.

12 The work that is being proposed in
13 these EISs has been done before.

14 Jerry talked about the TWRS task
15 force, the tank waste remediation system task
16 force, which was a massive public participation
17 effort that the three parties to the Tri-Party
18 Agreement should be commended for. Unfortu-
19 nately, we have the potential for undoing it with
20 these Environmental Impact Statements.

21 The technical options report, was a
22 report that was worked on for well over a year,
23 nearly two years, and resulted in some sound
24 technical information on which way we should go
25 in terms of treating Hanford's tank wastes.

1 And the task force that Jerry
2 talked about resulting in a renegotiated
3 Tri-Party Agreement that the environmental
4 groups have bought off on, largely, that the
5 regulators had obviously bought off on, since
6 they had to sign it, that DOE was showing support
7 for, that the contractors were shows support for,
8 that the local governments were showing support
9 for.

10 In short, we had a regional consensus
11 behind this agreement and we are ready to go
12 forward and start getting the wastes out of the
13 tanks, treat it and get it into a safe, stable
14 form.

15 But now we get this EIS that comes
16 down the pike that tells us, according to the
17 fact sheet that is handed out, that decisions on
18 how to safely manage, treat, store and dispose of
19 Hanford's waste will soon be made. I would argue
20 that they have been made. That's what we've been
21 doing over the last two years.

22 It also says that USDOE and the
23 Washington State Department of Ecology are
24 beginning a process to define the best strategy
25 for safely handling and disposing of Hanford tank

9413209 0000

1 wastes. Again, beginning a process.

2 We are not beginning a process. We
3 just wrapped one up. We got the right answer.
4 We're ready to go forward.

5 All we're asking now is that the
6 Department of Energy and the regulators carry
7 out the plan that is outlined in the Tri-Party
8 Agreement.

9 In short, we don't want to
10 reconsider the HWVP, we don't want to
11 reconsider grout, we don't want to reconsider
12 advanced pretreatment. Something that should be
13 considered in this EIS very seriously, if not
14 taken into account, is the closure of the tank
15 farms.

16 Anyone who is familiar with Hanford
17 realizes that in the initial analysis, much of
18 the dose to the public and to the environment
19 from the tanks comes from waste that has already
20 leaked out of the tanks, and it's far off in the
21 future. Dealing with those subsoils and the
22 contamination that's already in them is a very
23 important issue.

24 In short, as Jerry pointed out, the
25 Tank Waste Task Force said, let's get on with

1 cleanup. And we have to ask if this EIS does
2 that.

3 It has the potential to do it. And
4 starting a dialogue with the guys who are running
5 this EIS, it seems that they are willing to take
6 the preferred alternative that is outlined in the
7 Tri-Party Agreement, what everybody thinks is a
8 good idea, further flesh out the impacts, the
9 environmental impacts of that decision, with this
10 EIS.

11 If that's what happens, there's a
12 definite value added from this process, the
13 whole cleanup can benefit. If, on the other
14 hand, they go back and reconsider decisions that
15 have already been made, go through technical
16 analyses that have already been made, everybody
17 loses.

18 So what we want to happen is we want
19 this EIS to go fast. We want it to flesh out
20 those impacts of the preferred alternative. We
21 don't want it to affect the schedule of the
22 Tri-Party Agreement as it is now laid out.

23 Addressing the New Tank
24 Environmental Impact Statement, HEAL, my
25 organization, called for this Environmental

9413208.000

1 Impact Statement over two years ago. We wish
2 it would have started then. But now we're on
3 the fast track and it's got to be done inside
4 of nine months. We're fully supportive of
5 this.

6 But we want two issues to be
7 focused on in that Environmental Impact
8 Statement. One, exactly what will the uses of
9 the tanks be? We want that to be very clear and
10 very focused. And then two, exactly how many
11 tanks are needed, how many millions of gallons of
12 space are needed in order to fulfill their
13 mission.

14 When I said nobody wins, what I mean
15 is, this Tri-Party Agreement is basically our
16 last chance. We consistently renegotiate this
17 agreement, it seems like every six months we are
18 renegotiating this agreement. Congress has seen
19 that and the public has seen that.

20 The public support is contingent upon
21 making some clear progress in cleanup. And
22 Congressional support is contingent upon that
23 public support.

24 So what we need to consider is the
25 environmental impacts of this EIS essentially

1 circumventing the work that has already been
2 done. Those environmental impacts, from
3 socio-economic impacts, to impacts on public
4 health and safety, to impacts on environmental
5 health and safety, are ten fold of anything that
6 we could consider if the waste is actually pulled
7 out of the tanks and we go on with the Tri-Party
8 Agreement as it is now scoped.

9 I think that's what I'm going to
10 leave it with tonight. I will enter as written
11 comments a fact sheet, and that's it.

12 Thanks.

13 MS. ALINDA PAGE: We will enter
14 as Seattle Exhibit Number 1 the HEAL Action Memo.

15 Are there other people in the
16 audience at this time who would like to make a
17 formal comment on the record? If not, we will
18 recess --

19 MR. GERALD POLLET: In my rush,
20 I skipped two of my points. Could I just make
21 them?

22 MS. ALINDA PAGE: We will turn
23 the mike over to Gerry Pollet again.

24 MR. GERALD POLLET: Two very
25 quick points that I missed as I just walked in, I

943208-002

1 apologize.

2 We are, Heart of America Northwest,
3 is concerned that during this EIS process the
4 U.S. Department of Energy must step away from
5 repeated statements in the past, recent past,
6 that tank leaks, quote, "pose no threat to human
7 health or the environment."

8 That statement has been made
9 repeatedly over and over again. It is not
10 credible. And in order to properly assess the
11 environmental impacts of leaving waste tanks
12 in-place, you must step away and offer an
13 independent assessment of the wastes that have
14 already leaked.

15 And in that regard, we request that
16 you specifically address the findings of the 1989
17 and 1991 reports of the United States General
18 Accounting Office.

19 In regard to removal of wastes from
20 tanks, significant safety concerns have been
21 raised regarding the ability of some of the tanks
22 proposed for sluicing and removal of waste
23 contents for transport through pipelines to the
24 new double-shell tanks.

25 Particularly some of them in the C

9413208-0093

1 Tank Farm that are proposed for sluicing and
2 removal.

3 Those safety concerns need to be
4 addressed in this Environmental Impact
5 Statement.

6 It is clear from documents that we
7 have seen that some of those tanks are
8 engineering, in engineering terms, totally
9 unsound. They have failed. And if they have
10 failed, will they survive the placing of
11 equipment on the tanks to conduct these
12 operations and the sluicing operation.

13 Therefore, we have to consider the
14 environmental consequences of a failure, that is
15 heightened by sluicing and mechanical operations
16 in the tank. And what kind of barrier technology
17 can we utilize as one effort at mitigating those
18 impacts, what kind of barrier potentially is
19 there.

20 And those were the two points. Thank
21 you.

22 MS. ALINDA PAGE: Are there
23 other people in the audience who would wish to
24 speak at this time? If not, we will recess the
25 meeting until someone comes who would like to

94300.001

1 speak.

2 (Recessed at 7:30 p.m.)

3 (Reopened at 9:50 p.m.)

4 MS. ALINDA PAGE: The Seattle
5 public scoping meeting is adjourned.

6

7 * * *

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5200-9026116
9413208-0095

1 STATE OF OREGON)
2) ss.
3 County of Umatilla)
4

5 I, WILLIAM J. BRIDGES, do hereby
6 certify that at the time and place heretofore
7 mentioned in the caption of the foregoing matter,
8 I was a Registered Professional Reporter and
9 Notary Public for Oregon; that at said time and
10 place I reported in stenotype all testimony
11 adduced and proceedings had in the foregoing
12 matter; that thereafter my notes were reduced to
13 typewriting and that the foregoing transcript
14 consisting of 83 typewritten pages is a true and
15 correct transcript of all such testimony adduced
16 and proceedings had and of the whole thereof.

17 WITNESS my hand at Pendleton,
18 Oregon, on this ___ day of February, 1994. _____

19
20
21
22
23
24
25

WILLIAM J. BRIDGES
Registered Professional Reporter
Certified Shorthand Reporter
No. 91-0244 Expires: 10-31-95

9113209.0096