

START 07/3740.1472

0045721
037661

FAX Cover Sheet

To:	Tom Ferns	Date:	Oct. 14, 1996
FAX #:	376-4360	Company:	
From:	Liz Williams	Pages:	4
Subject:			

REMARKS: Confidential For your review Urgent - Reply ASAP Please comment

Attached please find Judy Chasse's notes from our public information meeting. (Judy was our volunteer & notetaker from the League of Women Voters.)

LIZ



RECEIVED
OCT 16 1996
DOE-RL / DCC



9713540.1473

OCTOBER 1, 1996: HRA DRAFT EIS PUBLIC MEETING, SHILO INN, RICHLAND

037661

Question and Answer Period

Walt Ferguson, Richland: Comment: He doesn't believe DOE should have any say in the future use of Hanford, once it's cleaned up. Also, the Indian tribes have no more right to the use of the land than any other citizens.

His question: Have prisons been considered on the land?

Phil Mees: A prison is an institution and the County hasn't looked at that type of use.

Todd Martin, HEAL: What is the HRA EIS going to do for citizens?

Lloyd Piper: 2 aspects of EIS: 1. Make decisions regarding clean up.

2. DOE will have a future role because of on-going nuclear activities

Linda McClain: DOE is trying to look at the entire site from the perspective of cleanup and to examine boundaries.

Ray Isaacson, Benton Co. Commissioner: What is the criteria for establishing a boundary for a particular section?

Lloyd Piper: Boundaries for safety are determined by calculations for worker safety

Isaacson: Comment: Land that is beyond the boundaries should be surplus. He also questioned the inconsistency of a boundary zone for worker safety and public safety and asked about the county's need to provide for emergency planning, if there are no emergency situations identified by DOE.

Piper/McClain: DRAFT document has definition of safety buffer zone.

John Bickfast(?), Richland: How will differences be resolved?

Piper: EPA will consider differences in plans when it makes decisions about "How clean is clean"

Jerry, Pasco: Concern about County's desire for economic return on Hanford land.

Mees: It is or will be a question of economic return on clean up: because of the enormous cost to clean up site, at some point there needs to be some economic return.

Piper: Under Tri-Party agreement, DOE is required to clean up site

Marty Zumbisch, Richland: comment: Appears people are stumbling over themselves to plan for the sake of planning. What's wrong with leaving the land as it was before the Manhattan Project? What's wrong with open space habitat?

Dr. Bellsee: comment: Return on the investment from the land. Big payoff on investment protecting health and safety of people and products of NW - it's not just a single return investment. This is a potential timebomb. Return on investment is a separate issue.

Unidentified gentleman: Comment: The public needs to know how the whole land-use planning issue will be resolved. What happened to the surveys the county mailed to residents - what were the results?

Piper: This is part of the NEPA process - to develop a document with public participation, public input. The record of decision is binding on DOE.

Mees: County has own process and will develop a plan. Have to work through the issues by interacting with DOE.

9713540.1474

October 1, 1996 HRA Draft EIS Public Meeting, P. 2

037661

Gordon Rogers: Comment: To consider a time frame of impacts longer than 10,000 years causes him great pain. Where does this number come from?

McClain: Admits it is hard to comprehend such a number. Historical legislation and documentation are part of the time frame issue.

Rogers: Question: Can DOE transfer land to any other owner with any restrictions due to contaminants?

Piper: DOE uses GSA to handle the excess property process for Hanford site.

Rogers: Comment: The planning conundrum can work itself out over an extended period of time. We are kidding ourselves if we think we can settle the land use plan in any near future.

Ferguson: Question: When it comes to the final EIS, will it be DOE who makes the decision regarding use?

Piper: As long as DOE owns the land, it will make the decision.

Ferguson: Does the land go to GSA? Does the GSA process include public involvement?

Piper: GSA process does not include public involvement.

Paige (Hanford Advisory Board): Question: How does EIS relate to strategic plans for Hanford site already in place?

Piper: Strategic plans are plans, this is a decision.

Paige: Comment: The strategic plans make no sense relative to the decision.

Piper: Decision takes precedence over plans.

Madeleine Brown (Hanford Advisory Board): Comment: There is 1 land-use plan. Question: Will the ultimate record of decision lock into place the comprehensive land-use plan?

Piper: Yes.

Brown: Question: Will future Tri-Party Agreements take precedence over the comprehensive plan?

Piper: Yes, but Tri-Party Agreement does not address land-use. It addresses clean up.

Man from Richland: Involved question about tank wastes, tank leaks, contaminated area, plumes drifting north and DOE's numbers concerning these issues.

Tom Ferns: Tank Waste, EIS addresses cleanup under RECRA guidelines. Currently looking at 5-10-15 year windows. When there is more data, can look at other.....

Same Man from Richland: Comment: Doe is ignoring a 10 times bigger problem of 200 Area wastes which drives the land-use decision.

***MODERATOR: Urges Man to put his comments/concerns in writing for a response from officials.

Todd Martin, HEAL: Comment: Waste that has leaked has not been addressed in any EIS. Question: If CERCLA is the driving force, why is DOE engaged in land-use planning? Also, can the 3 proposed land use plans (Richland, DOE, Benton County) be lumped into 1 plan?

DOE (PAUL): Land-use planning came about during scoping process and as part of the Hanford Future Site Uses Working Group.

Martin: Clarification: The Hanford Future Site Uses Working Group had to request DOE to extend its deadline for comments on the scoping process to allow the Working Group's recommendations be included.

9713540.1475

037661

October 1, 1996 HRA Draft EIS Public Meeting, P. 3

Piper (response to Martin's question about the planning process):
DOE requires a land-use plan. NEPA requires a land-use plan. The NEPA planning process is different than the State planning process. The County works under a different set of requirements. Another element is the involvement of the Tribes.

Madeline Brown: Question for Linda McClain: What are the fuzzy dots in areas along the river in the DOE plan?

Linda: They have a specific meaning. Linda called on Paul Krupin.

Paul: Pattern of dots refers to areas proposed for public control and access. Once there is a record of decision, DOE will look at these areas again. Dots refer to areas with site specific planning, not restricted, unrestricted or exclusive designations.

Closing Comment: Record of decision will allow plenty of opportunity for public involvement.

Meeting adjourned about 8:45 P.M.

Judy Chasse
Benton-Franklin League of Women Voters