

START

0036062

83

0001
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
1
1
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

HANFORD TANK WASTE REMEDIATION SYSTEM

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

FEBRUARY 16, 1994

THE HOOD RIVER INN/BEST WESTERN

1108 EAST MARINA WAY

HOOD RIVER, OREGON



0002

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

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

9413207.1677



9413207.1678

0003

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

AFTERNOON SESSION:

Page

DIRK DUNNING	4
ALINDA PAGE	6
GEOFFREY TALLENT	12
DONALD ALEXANDER	19
CAROLINE SPEAR	29
CINDY DeBRULER	37

EVENING SESSION:

Page

DIRK DUNNING	41
ALINDA PAGE	42
GEOFFREY TALLENT	48
DONALD ALEXANDER	55
JAMES WHITLEY	66
TODD MARTIN	69
GREG DeBRULER	75
ROARK SMITH	81
GREG DeBRULER	83

AFTERNOON SESSION

DIRK DUNNING

MR. DUNNING: Good afternoon and welcome. I'm Dirk Dunning with the State of Oregon Department of Energy. And I want to welcome you here on behalf of the Oregon Hanford Waste Board.

Today I'm acting in the role of staff. And basically my role in this meeting is just to open the meeting, give you a brief idea of what it's about, and then turn it over to Alinda Page with Triangle, who will then be acting as moderator or facilitator, who will be for the rest of meeting.

The meeting is primarily focused at the Tank Waste Remediation System, known by friend and foe alike as TWRS, and also on some new tanks for the Hanford site. The Tank Waste Remediation System is a program to handle the waste that is currently in the 177 tanks on the Hanford Site, which amounts to about 63 million gallons of high-level radioactive waste.

The program is going to be defined as a portion of this Environmental Impact Statement which the Department of Energy and Washington State Department of Ecology are preparing. And also a separate portion of it will be how they handle those

94-3207-1679

0005

1 wastes and what occurs with the waste long term.

2 A portion of the meeting tonight is
3 talking about the six new tanks that US DOE is
4 proposing to construct and what are currently
5 identified as being a part of the new Tri-Party
6 Agreement. The six new tanks are intended to be used
7 as an interim measure to handle waste out of the
8 single-shell tanks so that they can continue to
9 process that material and move on into future of
10 getting the material into a stable form.

11 Anyway, I'll be available throughout
12 today and this evening, if you have any questions
13 about Oregon's role in either the Hanford clean-up in
14 general or in terms of or inputs on these
15 environmental impact statements.

16 And with that, I will turn it over to
17 Alinda.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

0891-1023116
9473207-1680

0006

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

ALINDA PAGE

MS. PAGE: Good afternoon. I'm Alinda Page, and I'm working as the professional facilitator on contract to the Department of Energy. I work with Triangle Associates from Seattle, Washington. Welcome on behalf of the US Department of Energy and Washington State Department of Ecology.

Today's scoping meeting is officially designated as the Hood River public scoping meeting for two proposed Environmental Impact Statements at the Hanford site, Richland, Washington.

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

This meeting is being held on the 16th day of February, 1994, at the Hood River/Best Western, Hood River, Oregon. And we are commencing at 1 p.m., approximately. Today's meeting is the second of five being held in Washington and Oregon during the month of February.

Today's schedule calls for an afternoon

94-3207-1681

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

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

16 The National Environmental Policy Act of
 17 1969, which is commonly referred to as NEPA, requires
 18 that any federal agency proposing an action that
 19 might have impacts on the environment evaluate all
 20 reasonable alternatives and their potential
 21 environmental impacts before taking action.

22 When the projected environmental impacts
 23 might be considered significant, an Environmental
 24 Impact Statement must be prepared. NEPA also
 25 requires that the public be provided opportunities to

943207.1682

1 comment during the preparation of the Environmental
2 Impact Statement.

3 The Washington State Environmental Policy
4 Act, commonly referred to as SEPA, is very similar to
5 NEPA in its intent and scope. Like NEPA, SEPA
6 requires any state agency proposing an action that
7 might have impacts on the environment to evaluate all
8 reasonable alternatives and their potential
9 environmental impacts before taking action.

10 The potential Washington State action in
11 the remediation of the high-level tank waste and the
12 construction of six new safety tanks will be the
13 issuance of required Washington State environmental
14 permits and authorizations if the determination is
15 made to proceed with the proposed action.

16 As with NEPA, when the projected
17 environmental impact might be considered significant,
18 an Environmental Impact Statement must be prepared.
19 SEPA also requires that the public be provided
20 opportunity to comment during the preparation of the
21 Washington State Environmental Impact Statement.

22 Because the National Environmental Policy
23 Act and the Washington State Environmental Policy Act
24 are very comparable in their purpose, intent and
25 procedures, the State of Washington Department of

943207.1684

0009

1 Ecology and the United States Department of Energy
2 have decided to prepare one Environmental Impact
3 Statement for each of the two proposed actions,
4 addressing the requirements of both SEPA and NEPA in
5 a single document. That is, a single EIS will
6 address the tank waste remediation issues, and a
7 single yet different EIS will address the proposed
8 construction of the six new safety tanks.

9 On Friday, January 28, 1994, the
10 Department of Energy published a Notice of Intent in
11 the Federal Register, announcing its intent to
12 prepare these two Environmental Impact Statements.
13 On the same date, January 28, 1994, the Washington
14 State Department of Ecology determined that a SEPA
15 EIS was required for these two proposals.

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

23 The format for today's meeting has been
24 designed to give as many people as possible the
25 opportunity to participate. We will be taking formal

9473207.1685

0010

1 comments, and we will have people from the staffs of
2 the Department of Energy and a Department of Ecology
3 available to give informal information to those of
4 you who do not wish to comment formally.

5 A verbatim transcript is being made of
6 all the comments that are made in this formal comment
7 portion of the scoping meetings, and will be included
8 in the US Department of Energy and Washington State
9 Department of Ecology's record of these proceedings.
10 The Department of Energy and Department of Ecology
11 will make the transcripts from all of the scoping
12 meetings available at information locations
13 throughout Washington and Oregon as soon as
14 possible.

15 After they've reviewed all the formal
16 comments received at the scoping meetings and the
17 written comments that are received during the written
18 scoping period, the two departments will jointly
19 prepare the two Draft Environmental Impact
20 Statements. When each Draft EIS is available, the
21 public will once again have the opportunity to
22 participate by submitting comments on the Draft
23 EISSs.

24 The two Draft EISSs will be prepared on
25 different schedules. The Draft EIS for the six new

943207.1686

0011

1 safety tanks is scheduled to be available later this
2 year. The Draft EIS for the Tank Waste Remediation
3 program is scheduled to be available in 1995.

4 At this time, I would like to introduce
5 Mr. Geoff Tallent of the Washington State Department
6 of Ecology for the SEPA and NEPA activities. This
7 will be followed by Dr. Donald Alexander, Department
8 of Energy's Richland field office Tank Waste
9 Remediation System program office. Dr. Alexander
10 will make a brief presentation on the proposed six
11 new safety tanks and a Tank Waste Remediation System
12 program.

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

0012

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

GEOFFREY TALLENT

MR. TALLENT: Good afternoon. My name is Geoff Tallent, with the Washington State Department of Ecology.

The United States Department of Energy, referred to as US DOE, and the Washington Department of Ecology, or Ecology, are using an innovative approach to reviewing the environmental impacts of the TWRS program by combining the requirements of NEPA and SEPA. The two agencies expect ourselves and the public to realize several benefits from combining these processes.

The US DOE and Ecology are preparing a Memorandum of Understanding, which is available at the back, which will spell out how the two agencies intend to work together to streamline the NEPA/SEPA compliance process; allow for a joint NEPA/SEPA decision document; accelerate the process by consolidating meetings, mandatory processes and documentation; and provide a mechanism to expedite resolution of comments and issues.

The two agencies expect to realize several benefits from combined NEPA and SEPA processes. I'll go through some of these. First, combining streamlines the environmental review.

9413207.1687

1 Instead of taking a separate, fragmented and
2 sequential approach, Ecology and US DOE are
3 anticipating folding their NEPA and SEPA requirements
4 together and meeting them all up front. This will
5 avoid duplicative and time-consuming public reviews
6 in the future.

7 Second, NEPA and SEPA are very similar in
8 intent as well as process. The Washington State law
9 was modeled after the federal law and has no
10 differences in preventing the two processes from
11 being combined. In fact, both laws encourage
12 integration with their counterparts. Ecology and
13 US DOE believe that the combined effort will result
14 in a better process for environmental review.

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

21 Fourth, by working as equal partners,
22 Ecology and US DOE must agree on everything that the
23 EIS asks. Two agencies will eliminate the
24 possibility of debating over conflicting directions
25 later on, and instead will identify and resolve

1 differences early and cooperatively.

2 Finally, and most importantly, nothing is
3 lost in this combined effort. Ecology and US DOE
4 will continue to maintain full independent authority
5 over their respective requirements. This means NEPA
6 and SEPA must be completely followed to the
7 satisfaction of each agency. Additionally, no part
8 of either NEPA or SEPA will be sacrificed in the
9 joint EISSs. Any information or opportunity for
10 review or comment that NEPA or SEPA requires will be
11 part of the combined process.

12 Now I'll take you through what you'll see
13 in the combined -- in the two combined EISSs.

14 First, the statement of purpose and need
15 for action will explain the problem for which the
16 proposed actions are being studied. In these cases,
17 the purpose is the need to resolve tank safety
18 issues.

19 The description of alternatives will
20 describe the actions that the agencies propose to
21 take and compare these actions with alternative means
22 to resolve the tank safety issues. For these EISSs,
23 the preferred alternative will follow the processes
24 laid out in the Tri-Party Agreement. Other
25 alternatives will also be examined. One reason why

913207.1690

0015

1 we're here this afternoon is to find out from you
2 what alternatives we should look at.

3 Finally, the no action alternative is
4 required by both NEPA and SEPA as a way of comparing
5 other alternatives to continuing the present
6 situation.

7 The EIS will finally describe the
8 environment which will be affected by all the
9 alternatives. In these cases, it will be a
10 description of the areas at the Hanford site where
11 the TWRS activities would take place and any parts of
12 the environment beyond the Hanford site that might be
13 impacted.

14 In describing the environment, the EISs
15 will look at three aspects: first, the human
16 environment, which looks at such thing as potentially
17 impacted populations and areas of historic
18 significance; and second, the biological environment,
19 which looks at such things as potentially impacted
20 plant and animal species; and third, the physical
21 environment, which will describe such areas as
22 geology and ground and surface waters.

23 The third parts of the EISs will examine
24 the environmental impacts of the proposed action and
25 alternatives. This will look at impacts to the human

1 environment, such as impacts on jobs and disturbance
2 of historic areas; and will also look at potential
3 health risks from such things as radioactive releases
4 to both Hanford workers and the off-site public. The
5 impact section will thirdly look at possible impacts
6 to ecosystems, such as endangered plant and animal
7 species or interfering with migrations.

8 Finally, the EISs will examine methods
9 for mitigating or reducing the impacts of the
10 proposals and alternatives. These might include such
11 things as additional pollution control devices,
12 restoration of habitat or changes in the location of
13 buildings.

14 As with the alternatives, we are here
15 this afternoon to hear your comments on what
16 analysis -- what the analysis of the impacts to the
17 environment should include and what possible
18 mitigation measure should be considered.

19 To conclude my presentation, I'll take
20 you through the proposed schedule for the two EISs.

21 First, a notice of intent to prepare the
22 EISs was published in the Federal Register and
23 corresponding Washington State SEPA Register on
24 January 28. Those notices began the scoping process
25 for which we're holding this meeting. Comments on

9443207.1691

0017

1 the scope of either EIS will be due March 15.

2 At that time, the path of the two EISs
3 will split. For the New Tanks EIS, an Implementation
4 Plan should be prepared by the two agencies by April 15.
5 The Implementation Plan will lay out the schedule for
6 completion and scope of the New Tanks EIS. The Draft
7 EIS will follow in June, at which time there will be
8 a 45-day public review and comment period. After
9 that, the two agencies expect to have final EIS out
10 by August of this year, and a final decision by
11 September.

12 The TWRS EIS Implementation Plan will be
13 ready by June of this year, but will take until
14 August of next year to assemble all the information
15 for the Draft EIS. After a 45-day comment period, a
16 final TWRS EIS should be ready by April of 1996, with
17 a final decision by May of 1996.

18 However, by combining these two
19 processes, the agencies hope as a result to
20 accelerate the TWRS EIS. If that's successful, you
21 can see the accelerated schedule on the board, and
22 which should result in a final decision as soon as
23 June 1995.

24 This concludes my portion of the
25 presentation. If you have any questions about SEPA

9443207.1692
2691-2028-116

0018

1 or NEPA or the process we intend to use in preparing
2 EISs, please contact me, Geoff Tallent, during the
3 meeting or at area code 206 407-7112.

4 Next will be Don Alexander of the
5 Department of Energy to describe the two EISs.

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

9413207.1693

0019

1

DONALD ALEXANDER

2

DR. ALEXANDER: With an urgency in the

3

1940's to give the United States a weapons advantage,

4

many of the actions were taken without consideration

5

for the environment and were unregulated with respect

6

to the environment. The massive legacy of those

7

actions resulted in wastes stored in 177 tanks, 68 of

8

which are considered to be leaking and others of

9

which have potential for leaking. One of these was

10

recently removed from the list and so we now assume

11

that 67 are leaking.

12

As this slide shows, there are 149 tanks

13

which were constructed in that period of 1943 to 1966

14

which are single-shell tanks. There are 28

15

double-shell tanks that were constructed from 1968 to

16

1986. The tanks that we're going to be talking about

17

today are similar in nature to the double-shell

18

tanks, none of which have leaked.

19

The National Environmental Policy Act was

20

enacted in 1969 to assure that in the future any

21

major federal proposed actions, such as a major

22

construction project, especially those involving

23

radioactive wastes, be analytically evaluated. NEPA

24

requires that the federal agency complete three types

25

of analyses and weigh these in its decision making

9443207-1694

1 process. The first is an analysis of the
2 environmental impacts of the proposed action; the
3 second is an analysis for impacts of alternative
4 design solutions; 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 today
8 have been presented to you in public meetings over
9 the past year involving the Tri-Party Agreement. It
10 was in that process that some were dismissed. Grout
11 was a notable alternative among those dismissed.

12 Although the DOE had alternatives as
13 announced in the HDW DIS, better known as Hanford
14 Defense Waste DIS, as late as 1988 the TPA process
15 was essential in aiding the Department and
16 formulating the current proposed actions. Once the
17 Tri-Party Agreement was signed on January 25 of this
18 year, the Notice of Intent was immediately issued
19 with proposed actions on January 28.

20 DOE, the State and EPA are committed to
21 the Tri-Party Agreement and achieving the milestones
22 agreed to therein. We're also committed to
23 evaluating the environmental impacts of the proposed
24 actions so that we can make wise decisions which will
25 reduce risk to our workers, the public and the

1 environment as we proceed.

2 The next few moments, I'll give you an
3 overview of the two proposed actions to be discussed
4 today, and I will tell you how you can contribute to
5 this part of the process.

6 DOE and Ecology are recommending two
7 proposed actions: first, to construct six new waste
8 storage tanks; second, to retrieve, treat,
9 immobilize, store and dispose of waste from 177
10 storage tanks. The agencies are requesting
11 recommendations from you for alternatives to be
12 analyzed and additional environmental issues to be
13 considered.

14 This is a locate -- or map indicating the
15 affected area in the 200 Area. This slide represents
16 the two proposed actions. On the left we indicate
17 the six new storage tanks which are to retrieve waste
18 for 101-SY, 103-SY and 104-AN. And on the right, we
19 indicate the second proposed action: retrieval,
20 treatment, immobilization, storage and disposal.

21 The two preferred alternatives are
22 embodied in the newly signed Tri-Party Agreement and
23 are being implemented today. NEPA and SEPA will
24 evaluate the preferred and reasonable alternatives
25 and assess potential environmental consequences.

0022

1 Environmental consequences will be considered with
2 safety concerns, costs, schedules and public review.

3 If the environmental consequences
4 outweigh other considerations, then DOE, Ecology and
5 EPA could revise specific milestones, but not the end
6 date of the TPA of 2028. DOE and Ecology are
7 committed to full compliance with the Tri-Party
8 Agreement. Next slide.

9 In the Tri-Party Agreement, we agree to
10 build six tanks to eliminate immediate safety
11 concerns. This is a schematic of a proposed tank
12 with modern safety controls, including
13 mixer/retrieval pumps to reduce gas buildup, liquid
14 and gas sampling systems, improved ventilation
15 systems and improved tank integrity monitoring.

16 The Tri-Party Agreement action is to
17 construct six new waste storage tanks. We are
18 required by law to evaluate other alternatives to
19 make sure we have adequately considered the range of
20 environmental impacts. One potential alternative is
21 to construct fewer tanks and rely on other methods to
22 mitigate safety issues. If we were to choose no
23 action, we would not mitigate or resolve safety
24 issues. And I said earlier, this alternative is
25 required by law. We would like to receive your oral

9413207.1697

1 or written comments on other alternatives.

2 This is a schematic of the two tanks and
3 support facilities proposed for the 200 West Area.
4 There's a similar schematic for the one that would
5 appear in the 200 East Area. As you note, beyond the
6 two storage tanks is a broad support facility to
7 support activities related to the tanks.

8 Now I'd like to give you an overview of
9 the second proposed action. In this action, we
10 upgrade our current storage for safety reasons,
11 retrieve from the 177 tanks, treat, immobilize, store
12 and dispose of the wastes.

13 In the next slide I give you more
14 detail. On the left side of the slide in the upper
15 left-hand corner you notice there's a little icon
16 that indicates that we're going to accelerate the
17 safety issue with the construction of some
18 double-shell tanks. That's the interim action EIS
19 that I discussed earlier.

20 The remainder of the slide deals with the
21 overall TWRS effort. As you look across the slide
22 then, the major events are waste retrieval, second
23 frame on the left. Then there's a number of
24 activities involved with pretreating the waste,
25 solidification and vitrification, as was agreed to in

1 the TPA, the concept for a retrievable form for
2 low-level waste. And there's interim storage and
3 then shipment to an off-site repository for the
4 high-level waste.

5 The areas in blue are listed in the TPA
6 but are areas where additional development is
7 underway. And it's for that reason that these, as
8 options, need to be considered to give us a full
9 range of environmental impacts that are potential for
10 this system. Next slide.

11 We're required by law in this case as
12 well to evaluate the consequences of leaving the
13 wastes where they are so we can determine the benefit
14 of taking that proposed action on the last slide.

15 We have agreed with the State and EPA to
16 retrieve all wastes by sluicing, provide minimum
17 pretreatment of wastes, and vitrify high- and low-end
18 level waste. Next slide.

19 Although we prefer to retrieve waste by
20 hydraulic sluicing, we also identify two additional
21 alternatives for comparison of environmental
22 impacts: pneumatic retrieval and mechanical
23 retrieval. We prefer minimal pretreatment, but we
24 also recognize two additional alternatives for
25 comparing environmental impacts: no pretreatment and

1 extensive pretreatment.

2 For immobilization of high-level waste,
3 we agree to vitrification; but calcination is an
4 alternative for comparison of environmental impacts.
5 And for low-activity waste, we prefer vitrification;
6 but we will consider other solid waste forms, again,
7 for purposes of comparison. We request that you
8 provide other alternatives through oral or written
9 comments before March 15.

10 Environmental issues need to be evaluated
11 for the proposed action as required by NEPA,
12 including: effects of releases on the public and
13 on-site workers from operations and accidents;
14 effects on air and water quality and other
15 environmental consequences from operations and
16 accidents; effects on endangered species,
17 archeological and historical sites; unavoidable
18 environmental impacts; cumulative effects of these
19 and all other types of environmental impacts; effects
20 from transportation; effects of socioeconomic impacts
21 on surrounding communities; short-term use of the
22 environment versus long-term productivity; pollution
23 prevention and waste minimization; unavoidable
24 adverse environmental impacts; irretrievable and
25 irreversible commitments of resources.

9413207.1700

0026

1 We request that you provide other
2 alternatives through oral or written comments before
3 March 15.

4 In summary then, the Department of Energy
5 and Ecology are recommending two proposed actions:
6 construct six new waste storage tanks for safety
7 purposes in the new future; and to retrieve, treat,
8 immobilize, store and dispose of waste from 177
9 storage tanks. The agencies request recommendations
10 for alternatives to be analyzed and additional
11 environmental issues to be considered.

12 Thank you.

13 MS. PAGE: Mr. Tallent and Dr. Alexander
14 are going to sit as a panel to hear any comments that
15 we receive this afternoon and this evening. They
16 will not be commenting on the comments except as
17 clarified questions because this is a formal scoping
18 process.

19 If you do have questions that you'd like
20 to ask people from either of the departments, there
21 is an information display set up right outside, and
22 Ken Bracken and Toby Michelena from the two
23 departments are available to talk with you
24 privately.

25 Should you learn something outside or in

943207.701

1 the informal discussions that you would like to have
2 on the record, you need to come back in here and put
3 those comments in the formal record. It's the
4 comments that you make at this mike that are going to
5 be transcribed and included as part of the record of
6 these meetings.

7 Also, if any of you have written
8 comments, we'd appreciate any copies of those
9 comments so that we might include them as exhibits
10 for the record.

11 We've made it possible for people to
12 preregister at specific times at which they would
13 like to speak both this afternoon and this evening.
14 And also we're taking names outside of anyone who
15 would like to comment. So we will be available all
16 afternoon and all evening when people arrive and wish
17 to say something on the formal record.

18 Individuals who wish to make a comment
19 are going to be given five minutes, individuals who
20 are official representatives of organizations are
21 going to be given ten minutes.

22 And we do have a court reporter sitting
23 in front, Dee Johnson, who is responsible for
24 transcribing verbatim the informal comment portion of
25 today's meeting. If you do make a comment, we'd like

9413207-1702

9413207.1705

0028

1 you to say your name and spell it and also give your
2 address before you start your comments.

3 We'll begin today's portion -- formal
4 comment portion of the meeting now, and ask if there
5 is anyone in the audience who would like to make a
6 formal comment. No? Okay. Then we will recess the
7 meeting until someone comes who would like to make a
8 formal comment. Thank you.

9 [Meeting recessed, 1:28 to 1:58]

10 MS. PAGE: We will reconvene the meeting
11 in order to hear from a member of the public.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1

CAROLINE SPEAR

2

MS. SPEAR: My name is Caroline Spear.

3

And I am a citizen of Hood River. I am a volunteer

4

at Columbia River United, but I am not representing

5

them today. I am speaking as a concerned citizen.

6

And first of all, although I just perused

7

these quickly, I'd like to congratulate the agencies

8

and the government people who have taken the action

9

of getting an EIS scheduled and working together to

10

get that done, I understand at least from the wording

11

here, as soon as possible.

12

It was a little concerning to see the

13

dates '96. '94 would be a lot better, but I realize

14

the scope is quite large and the responsibilities

15

therein to complete. But I would like to thank you

16

for making that effort and getting going on -- and

17

encourage you to get going on that quickly.

18

I have a question from previous meetings

19

that I've attended regarding the material at Hanford

20

and looking at the slides of Mr. Tallent, the

21

reference is made consistently to waste material.

22

And one of the questions that was raised at other

23

meetings was whether or not in fact the material at

24

Hanford has been classified as waste or if it is

25

still being termed some low-level strategic kind of

9413207.1704

0030

1 material which would disallow certain kinds of
2 actions being taken. So that's a question I have.

3 MR. TALLENT: The way this proceeding is
4 set up, I don't know if we should be answering
5 questions or not. I think we're supposed to just
6 answer clarifying questions. We do have a couple of
7 resource people in the back, Toby Michelena with the
8 state and --

9 MS. SPEAR: All right. Has the material
10 been reclassified to be waste?

11 MR. BRACKEN: I'll answer that question.
12 Ken Bracken with the Department of Energy.

13 MS. PAGE: Is he supposed to get up and
14 talk?

15 MR. TALLENT: No.

16 MS. PAGE: The way we're running it is we
17 weren't going to have questions and answers during
18 the hearing.

19 MS. SPEAR: Oh, this is just comments.

20 MS. PAGE: Yes.

21 THE WITNESS: All right. Then I would
22 say I would encourage the agencies and the government
23 people responsible to look seriously at reclassifying
24 the material as waste so that it can be treated as
25 waste and not as strategic material.

9473207.1705

1 I also would like to express a concern
2 regarding the term one of the possible proposals of
3 using off-site geologic repositories as an interim
4 solution of storing the waste. I'm not sure I know
5 what that means, but it sounds like the ground. And
6 I would like to also express concern that the interim
7 solutions used are as safe as they certainly possibly
8 can be.

9 I'd like to reinforce that concern and
10 make it even more strong that I believe the interim
11 solutions for storing the waste and addressing the
12 safety issues between now and when the EIS will be
13 finished and when the tanks will be built is
14 insufficient; and it's inadequate as far as not just
15 safety but environmental impact. So I would ask you
16 to perhaps address the interim solutions with greater
17 urgency than I saw expressed in these slides and
18 reports.

19 And since I'm not asking a question, I'll
20 have to make this a statement then, which is also of
21 very great concern that the timing of actually
22 constructing these tanks is so long. And 2028, 2008,
23 2018. I realize these are big jobs; but I also feel
24 as though the kind of dollars, the millions and
25 billions of dollars and the criticality of the

1 situation is such that the time line of this could
2 possibly be shortened; that you might look at that,
3 of creating greater urgency or priority on that.

4 I'm going to be illuminated, I can tell.

5 DR. ALEXANDER: No, no, keep going.

6 MS. SPEAR: All right, educated, I'll
7 accept that. Well, actually that was it.

8 Those were my concerns and
9 recommendations that you make throughout: one is to
10 move along the EIS process even faster than you've
11 targeted; two is to reclassify all the material at
12 Hanford as waste and not in any strategic category;
13 three, to make sure that your interim solutions,
14 specifically the off-site geologic repository, is
15 reconsidered and perhaps addressed with greater
16 safety than at least I understood from this report.

17 And to also readdress and create greater
18 urgency and priority for the tanks. I don't see any
19 difficulty with the tanks; I think that they look
20 great, actually. It looks like a good solution, I
21 just -- I think you should hurry up.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. TALLENT: Thank you. Again, I
24 encourage you to ask questions informally outside the
25 comment period to Toby and Ken.

943207-1707

1 DR. ALEXANDER: If I can go ahead and
2 clarify some of it on the record.

3 MS. PAGE: He's going to clarify some of
4 this on the record for you.

5 Dr. Alexander is going to clarify some of
6 the earlier presentation that you missed.

7 MS. SPEAR: I know, I'm sorry.

8 MS. PAGE: That's fine.

9 DR. ALEXANDER: First, what I'd like to
10 do is thank you for your comments, and talk to you
11 first about some of the dates for moving forward.

12 In the TPA there are a series of
13 milestones that you may be familiar with that address
14 the issue of construction of tanks. And we have some
15 of those with us, they're not in view form. But
16 we're taking initiative right now to clear the way
17 with this EIS, with a short-term EIS to begin the
18 process of the construction of tanks. And I'll give
19 you the sheet. And we may review it together.

20 For the new tanks, we're looking at
21 approximately 1997, 1998, for construction of these
22 tanks, completion and construction of these tanks.
23 And between now and then, we'll be doing a number of
24 tests that are in the TPA that look at safety
25 considerations. And we'll be completing safety

1 analyses and completing the design process itself.
2 And so we're moving ahead very quickly to build these
3 six tanks we've talked about.

4 With regard to your other major issue of
5 storage and disposal, I thought I'd go through this
6 diagram one more time to better familiarize yourself
7 with what it is we're trying to do in the overall
8 TWRS EIS.

9 There are two EISs are represented on
10 this one diagram. The first is this construction of
11 six tanks, which is accelerated in order to deal with
12 these immediate safety concerns. And we would
13 construct six new tanks, two in the east and four in
14 the west. And then that's a subset of the overall
15 TWRS EIS, which is represented by the schematic.
16 It's -- it can be simplified very quickly in terms of
17 major actions.

18 There's a stage of retrieval; and
19 followed by a treatment phase, or remove and separate
20 out various kinds of compounds; and then we move into
21 a solidification stage, which was agreed to in the
22 TPA, which would produce a glass product both for
23 low-level waste as well as high-level waste. And in
24 my earlier remarks I pointed out that grout was one
25 alternative that was dismissed through that process

1 and a vitrified waste form has been substituted into
2 the TPA agreement.

3 And then finally for the low-level waste
4 there would be retrievable on-site storage and a
5 potential disposal of that. But for the high-level
6 waste, there would be interim storage on site, and
7 the repository would serve as the final option for
8 disposal of the waste. That option is being looked
9 at by the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste
10 Management, which has a major project at Yucca
11 Mountain in Nevada, which would serve as the nation's
12 first repository.

13 MS. SPEAR: Where would the low-level
14 wastes be held, sir?

15 DR. ALEXANDER: It's not certain what the final
16 disposition of that waste would be, but it would be
17 certainly stored in some sort of a glass form on site
18 for a period of time. And the plan has always been,
19 the department's plan as long as I've been with the
20 department back to 1983 has been to take the waste to
21 a repository. And they have identified the one at
22 Yucca Mountain as the one best suited.

23 MR. BRACKEN: Don, by law we have to.

24 DR. ALEXANDER: Yeah. And that decision
25 was made by Congress. When we went through a site

943207.1710

0036

1 selection process, we got down to three sites: there
2 was one at Hanford, there was one at Deaf Smith, and
3 there was the one at Yucca Mountain. Congress made a
4 decision that we would focus only on Yucca Mountain.

5 And so the idea is that this -- this
6 waste which would be produced in a -- in a form which
7 has very low dissolution and which would be very
8 stable would be stored in this repository in a place
9 where there's very little water to excess it. So
10 that the waste could be entombed basically for 10,000
11 years or more. So that's the objective.

12 MS. SPEAR: Thank you.

13 DR. ALEXANDER: Does it help?

14 MS. SPEAR: Yes, it does.

15 DR. ALEXANDER: Okay.

16 MS. PAGE: Anyone else who would like to
17 comment? If not, we will again recess the meeting.

18 [Meeting recessed, 2:10 to 2:34]

19 MS. PAGE: We will reconvene the meeting
20 to hear from a member of the public.

21

22

23

24

25

943207.1711

CINDY DeBRULER

MS. DeBRULER: Hi. My name is Cindy DeBruler. I'm just speaking as a citizen today. And I live in White Salmon, Washington. And I'm here I guess primarily just to very simply present a few statements and concerns about this.

Number one, it's been really difficult to get much information on what this meeting is really about other than it was an EIS scoping meeting. I feel that in the future it would be very wise if there were more available information to public interest groups specifically, who are the prime support for citizens along the river or elsewhere, on really what the issues are and what the meetings are about in advance. And it makes it real difficult to get anything out to the public.

I guess the three primary concerns I would like to put forth are, number one, that the EISs use existing information that has been developed from the Tank Waste Task Force in which there was a lot of citizen input, and a lot of values were put forward on dealing with the tanks. That those should be the evaluating principles.

Also, all the negotiations that have occurred in the last six months on the Tri-Party

9413207-1712

9413207.1713

1 Agreement. And that that information should be
2 really what guides this whole process, rather than
3 going into a really broad, very open type of process
4 where you're bringing in a lot of options that have
5 already been ruled out, like grout specifically. I
6 think the public's made it well known that grout's
7 out, that they don't want it. And it's been in the
8 Tri-Party Agreement, so let's not bring it back up
9 for consideration again, and anything else that might
10 be along similar guidelines in that.

11 Also secondly, I would just say that it's
12 really important to maintain all the commitments in
13 this process that we made in the Tri-Party
14 Agreement. And thirdly, that this whole process not
15 delay the clean-up. I think that was the biggest
16 message that you've heard from citizens here in the
17 gorge is get on with it, especially in regards to the
18 tanks which are a health and safety concern to
19 workers, to residents, as well as potential concern
20 to citizens in this area because of the river.

21 So please, as far as the scoping of these
22 EISS, keep them really relevant to what's going on
23 and to what you've heard, and don't worry about the
24 wheel and do work that doesn't need to be done here.

25 Thank you for listening.

0039

1 DR. ALEXANDER: Can I make a response?

2 MS. PAGE: Sure.

3 Cindy, one of the panelists would like to
4 respond to you.

5 DR. ALEXANDER: Cindy, I thought it would
6 be important to give you a little bit of background
7 of what we talked about this morning - or earlier in
8 the afternoon, I should say - with respect to the
9 effort that we have underway for this tank EIS in
10 which we're talking about the construction of six new
11 double-shell tanks.

12 We are in a precedent-setting mode for
13 shortening the time frame for producing an EIS. The
14 shortest that an EIS has ever been produced in the
15 Department of Energy is in about eleven months. And
16 we're targeting about a nine-month time frame in
17 order to do that. And we have brought on board a
18 number of innovations that have allowed us to do it
19 in that record setting time.

20 The first is that we've incorporated the
21 notice for the six new tanks into the notice for the
22 TWRS EIS.

23 As Geoff talked about in his remarks, we
24 have incorporated both the SEPA process, which is
25 normally conducted after the NEPA process, into the

9413207.1714

9443207.1715

0040

1 NEPA process in order to shorten it in that context.
2 And we're very keenly aware of the need to keep the
3 scope very well defined in order to move through the
4 process as expeditiously as we can.

5 So we want you to know that we're
6 committed, number one, to meeting the TPA
7 milestones. And it's for that reason that we have
8 shortened that part of the schedule. Thank you.

9 MS. PAGE: If there's no one else who
10 wishes to speak, we will recess the meeting.

11 [Meeting recessed, 2:39 to 4:30 p.m.]

12 MS. PAGE: We will now take a dinner break until
13 6:30 p.m.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

EVENING SESSION

1

2

3

DIRK DUNNING

4

MR. DUNNING: Good evening. I'm Dirk

5

Dunning with the State of Oregon Department of

6

Energy. I'm speaking tonight on behalf of the State

7

of Oregon Hanford Waste Board as staff to that Waste

8

Board. And I want to welcome you here tonight.

9

The meeting tonight is we've got a couple

10

of different purposes. It is being brought to us by

11

the US Department of Energy and Washington State

12

Department of Ecology on the Tank Waste Remediation

13

System, known to friend and foe alike as TWRS, and a

14

couple of Environmental Impact Statements on the

15

scoping or the project scope for the handling of the

16

wastes out of the high-level nuclear waste storage

17

tanks at Hanford, and for the proposed construction

18

of six new high-level storage tanks to handle some of

19

the problem tanks in the single-shell tank system.

20

I'm not going to be speaking tonight

21

other than just to welcome you here. And with this,

22

I think I'll turn it over to Alinda Page with

23

Triangle Associates.

24

Thank you.

25

9413207.1716

9413207.1717

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

ALINDA PAGE

MS. PAGE: Welcome on behalf of the United States Department of Energy and the Washington State Department of Ecology.

Tonight's scoping meeting is officially designated as the Hood River public scoping meeting for the two proposed Environmental Impact Statements at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington.

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

This meeting is being held on the 16th day of February, 1994, at Hood River, at the Best Western. And we are commencing at about 6:30 p.m., the second portion of today's meeting. Today's is the second of five meetings being held in Washington and Oregon during the month of February. Today's schedule calls for a session to last until 10 p.m. tonight. We met earlier in the day, starting at 1 until 4:30 p.m. also.

My name is Alinda Page, and I am a moderator on contract to the Department of Energy. I

1 work with Triangle Associates in Seattle,
2 Washington.

3 I've been asked by the Department of
4 Energy and the Washington State Department of Ecology
5 to conduct this scoping meeting to ensure that all
6 individuals and organizations here tonight who wish
7 to comment on the scope of the upcoming Environmental
8 Impact Statements have a fair and equal opportunity
9 to do so, in keeping with both the letter and the
10 spirit of the National Environmental Policy Act and
11 the State Environmental Policy Act.

12 The National Environmental Policy Act of
13 1969, commonly referred to as NEPA, requires that any
14 federal agency proposing an action that might have
15 impacts on the environment evaluate all reasonable
16 alternatives and their potential environmental
17 impacts before taking such action. When the
18 projected environmental impacts might be considered
19 significant, an Environmental Impact Statement must
20 be prepared. NEPA also requires that the public be
21 provided opportunities to comment during the
22 preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.

23 The Washington State Environmental Policy
24 Act, commonly referred to as SEPA, is very similar to
25 NEPA in its intent and purpose. Like NEPA, SEPA

9413207.1718

1 requires any state agency proposing an action that
2 might have impacts on the environment to evaluate all
3 reasonable alternatives and their potential
4 environmental impacts before taking action.

5 The potential Washington State action in
6 the remediation of the high-level tank waste and the
7 construction of six new safety tanks would be the
8 issuance of required Washington State environmental
9 permits and authorizations if the determination is
10 made to proceed with the proposed action. As with
11 NEPA, when the projected environmental impact might
12 be considered significant, an impact statement must
13 be prepared. SEPA also requires that the public be
14 provided opportunities to comment during the
15 preparation of the Washington State Environmental
16 Impact Statement.

17 Because the National Environmental Policy
18 Act and the Washington State Environmental Policy Act
19 are very comparable in their purpose, intent and
20 procedures, the State of Washington Department of
21 Ecology and the US Department of Energy have decided
22 to prepare one Environmental Impact Statement for
23 each of the two proposed actions addressing the
24 requirements of both NEPA and SEPA in a single
25 document. That is, a single EIS will address the

647.202.116

0045

1 tank waste remediation issues and a single yet
2 different EIS will address the proposed construction
3 of the six new safety tanks.

4 On February 20 -- On Friday, January 28,
5 1994, the Department of Energy published a Notice of
6 Intent in the Federal Register, announcing its intent
7 to prepare these two Environmental Impact
8 Statements. On that same day, Friday, January 28,
9 1994, the Washington State Department of Ecology
10 determined that a SEPA EIS was required for these two
11 proposals.

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

19 The format for tonight's meeting has been
20 designed to give as many people as possible the
21 opportunity to participate. You may wish to make
22 formal comments or you may wish to informally discuss
23 your concerns and ideas with people from the staffs
24 of the Department of Energy and Department of
25 Ecology.

9443207-1720

1 A verbatim transcript will be made of all
2 oral comments received in the formal comment portion
3 of this and the other four scoping meetings and will
4 be included in the US Department of Energy and
5 Washington State Department of Ecology's record of
6 these proceedings. The Department of Energy and the
7 Department of Ecology will make transcripts from all
8 five of the scoping meetings available as soon as
9 possible.

10 After they have reviewed all of the
11 formal comments received at the scoping meetings and
12 the written comments submitted during the scoping
13 comment period, the two departments will then jointly
14 prepare two Draft Environmental Impact Statements.
15 When each Draft EIS is available, the public will
16 once again have the opportunity to participate in
17 this effort by submitting comments on the Draft
18 EISs.

19 The two Draft EISs will be prepared on
20 different schedules. The Draft EIS for the six new
21 safety tanks is scheduled to be available later this
22 year. The Draft EIS for the Tank Waste Remediation
23 program is scheduled to be available in 1995.

24 At this time I would like to introduce
25 Mr. Geoff Tallent of the Washington State Department

9413207.1721

0047

1 of Ecology, who will make a presentation on
2 compatibility of the NEPA and SEPA requirements.

3 This will be followed by Dr. Don
4 Alexander of the Department of Energy's Richland
5 field office Tank Waste Remediation System program
6 office. Dr. Alexander will make a brief presentation
7 on the proposed six new safety tanks and the Tank
8 Waste Remediation System program.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

943207.1722

0048

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

GEOFFREY TALLENT

MR. TALLENT: Good evening. I'm Geoff Tallent with the Washington State Department of Ecology.

The US Department of Energy, I'll refer to as US DOE, and the Washington Department of Ecology, or Ecology, are using an innovative approach to reviewing the environmental impacts of the TWRS program by combining the requirements of NEPA and SEPA.

The two agencies expect ourselves and the public to realize several benefits from combining these processes.

As of today, in fact in the back, the US DOE and Ecology have prepared a Memorandum of Understanding which lays out how we plan to streamline the NEPA/SEPA compliance process; allow for a joint NEPA and SEPA decision document; accelerate the process by consolidating meetings, mandatory processes and documents; and provide a mechanism to expedite resolution of comments and issues that may arise in the preparation of these documents.

We expect to realize several benefits from combining the two processes. First, combining streamlines the environmental review. Instead of

943207.173

1 taking a separate, fragmented and sequential
2 approach, Ecology and US DOE are anticipating folding
3 their NEPA and SEPA requirements together and meeting
4 them all up front. This will avoid duplicative and
5 time-consuming public reviews in the future.

6 Second, NEPA and SEPA are very similar in
7 intent as well as process. The Washington State law
8 was modeled after the federal law and has no
9 differences which would prevent the two processes
10 from being combined. In fact, both laws encourage
11 integration with their counterparts. Ecology and US
12 DOE believe that the combined effort will result in a
13 better process for environmental review.

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

20 Fourth, by working as equal partners,
21 Ecology and US DOE must agree on everything in the
22 EIS -- or both EISs. The two agencies will eliminate
23 the possibility of debating over conflicting
24 directions later on, and instead will identify and
25 resolve differences early and cooperatively.

943207.1724

0050

1 Finally, and most importantly, nothing is
2 lost in the combined effort. Ecology and US DOE will
3 continue to maintain full independent authority over
4 their respective requirements. This means both NEPA
5 and SEPA must be completely followed to the
6 satisfaction of each agency. Additionally, no part
7 of either NEPA or SEPA will be sacrificed in the
8 joint EISs. Any information or opportunity for
9 review or comment that NEPA and SEPA requires will be
10 part of the combined processes.

11 Now I'll take you through what you will
12 see in both EISs.

13 The first part, the statement of purpose
14 and need for action, will explain the problem for
15 which the proposed actions are being studied. In
16 these cases, the purpose is the need to resolve tank
17 safety issues.

18 The description of alternatives will
19 describe the actions the agencies propose to take and
20 compare those alternatives with alternative means to
21 resolve the tank safety issues. For these EISs, the
22 preferred alternative will follow the process laid
23 out in the Tri-Party Agreement. Other alternatives
24 will also be examined. One reason why we're here is
25 to find out what alternatives you might think we

9443207.125

1 should look at.

2 Finally, the no action alternative is
3 required by both NEPA and SEPA as a way of comparing
4 the other alternatives to continuing the present
5 situation.

6 The EIS will also describe the
7 environment which will be affected by all of the
8 alternatives. In these cases, it will be a
9 description of the areas of the Hanford Site where
10 the TWRS activities would take place and any parts of
11 the environment beyond the Hanford Site that may be
12 impacted.

13 In describing the environment, the EIS
14 will look at three aspects: first, the human
15 environment, which looks at such things as
16 potentially impacted populations and areas of
17 historic significance; second, the biological
18 environment, which looks at such things as
19 potentially impacted plant and animal species; and
20 third, the physical environment, which describes such
21 areas as geology and ground and surface waters.

22 The third parts of the EISs will examine
23 the environmental impacts of the proposed action and
24 alternatives. This will look at impacts to the human
25 environment, such as impacts on jobs and disturbance

9413207-1726

1 of historic areas. It will also look at potential
2 health risks from such things as radioactive releases
3 to both Hanford workers and the off-site public. The
4 impact section will thirdly look at possible impacts
5 to the ecosystem, such as endangering plant or animal
6 species or interfering with migrations.

7 Finally, the EISs will examine methods
8 for mitigating or reducing the impacts of the
9 proposals and alternatives. These might include such
10 things as additional pollution control devices,
11 restoration of habitat or changes in the locations of
12 buildings.

13 As with the alternatives, we are here to
14 hear your comments on what the analysis of the
15 impacts to the environment should include and what
16 possible mitigation measures should be considered.

17 To conclude my presentation, I'll walk
18 through the proposed schedule for the two EISs.

19 First, a Notice of Intent to prepare the
20 EISs was published in the Federal Register and
21 corresponding Washington State SEPA Register on
22 January 28. These notices began the scoping process
23 for which we are holding this meeting. Comments on
24 the scope of either of the EISs will be due by March 15.

25 At that time, the path of the two EISs

9413207.1727

1 will split. For the New Tanks EIS, an Implementation
2 Plan should be prepared by the two agencies by April 15.
3 The Implementation Plan will lay out the schedule for
4 completion and scope of the New Tanks EIS. The Draft
5 EIS will follow in June, at which time there will be
6 a 45-day public review and comment period. After
7 that, the two agencies expect to have a final EIS out
8 by August of this year, and a final decision by
9 September.

10 The TWRS EIS Implementation Plan will be
11 ready by June of this year, but will take until
12 August of next year to assemble all information for
13 the Draft EIS. After a 45-day public comment period,
14 a final TWRS EIS should be ready by April of 1996,
15 with a final decision by May of that year.

16 The two agencies hope as a result of the
17 combined process to accelerate the TWRS EIS. If
18 that's successful, you can see on the slide a revised
19 schedule, which could arrive at a final decision on
20 the TWRS EIS as soon as June of 1995.

21 This concludes my portion of the
22 presentation. If you have any questions about SEPA
23 or NEPA or the process the two agencies intend to use
24 in preparing these EISs, please ask me during an
25 informal question and answer period, or contact me,

9413207-1728

0054

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

Geoff Tallent, at area code 206 407-7112.

Next will be Don Alexander of the
Department of Energy, who will talk to you about the
content of the two EISs.

9473207-1729

0055

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

DONALD ALEXANDER

DR. ALEXANDER: With an urgency in the 1940s to give the United States a weapons advantage, many of the actions were taken without consideration of environment and were unregulated with respect to the environment. The massive legacy those actions result -- actions resulted in waste stored in 177 tanks, 67 of which are considered to be leaking, and others which have potential for leaking.

As you can see on this slide, there are 149 single-shell tanks which were constructed between 1943 and 1966. 67 of those are assumed to have -- have leaked at some point, many of which may be still leaking. On the other hand, we have 28 double-shell tanks, none of which have leaked. The diagram at the left is similar to those that we're considering constructing in the east and -- 200 East Area and 200 West Area I'll describe later.

The National Environmental Policy Act was enacted in 1969 to assure that in the future any major federal proposed actions such as a major construction project, especially those involving radioactive waste, be analytically evaluated. NEPA requires that the federal agency complete three types of analyses and weigh these in its decision making

943207.1730

1 process.

2 The first is an analysis of the
3 environmental impacts of the proposed action. The
4 second is an analysis for impacts of alternative
5 design solutions to the proposed action; and finally,
6 the proposed and alternative actions are to be
7 compared to the environmental implications of taking
8 no action.

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

14 Although the DOE had alternatives as
15 announced in the Hanford Defense Waste EIS as late as
16 1988, the TPA process was essential in aiding the
17 Department in formulating the current proposed
18 actions. Once the Tri-Party Agreement was signed on
19 January 25 of this year, the Notice of Intent was
20 immediately issued, and the proposed actions were
21 released on January 28.

22 DOE, the State and EPA are committed to
23 the Tri-Party Agreement and achieving the milestones
24 agreed to therein. We're also committed to
25 evaluating the environmental impacts of the proposed

993207-1731

1 actions so that we can make wise decisions which will
2 reduce risks to our workers, the public and the
3 environment as we proceed.

4 In the next few moments, I'll give you an
5 overview of the two proposed actions to be discussed
6 in the meeting today, and I'll tell you how you can
7 contribute to this part of the process. Next slide,
8 please.

9 The Department of Energy and Ecology are
10 recommending two proposed actions: the first is to
11 construct six new waste storage tanks to alleviate
12 some immediate safety concerns; the second proposed
13 action is to retrieve, treat, immobilize, store and
14 dispose of the waste from the 177 storage tanks. The
15 agencies request recommendations for alternatives to
16 be analyzed and additional environmental issues to be
17 considered.

18 This is a map of the Hanford Site, and it
19 indicates the 200 Areas where the proposed actions
20 will take place. Next slide, please.

21 This slide is a schematic which shows the
22 two proposed actions. They are, on the left, to
23 immediately remove radioactive waste contents from
24 tanks with dangerous emissions of ignitable gas to
25 safer storage - 101-SY, 103-SY and 104-AN - to the

9443207.1732

0058

1 six new tanks; and the second proposed action, on the
2 right, which is to permanently retrieve, treat,
3 immobilize, store and dispose of the waste in the
4 system. Next slide.

5 The two preferred alternatives are
6 embodied in the newly signed Tri-Party Agreement and
7 are being implemented. NEPA and SEPA will evaluate
8 the preferred and reasonable alternatives and assess
9 potential environmental consequences. Environmental
10 consequences will be considered with safety concerns,
11 costs, schedules and public review.

12 If the environmental consequences
13 outweigh other considerations, then DOE, Ecology and
14 EPA could revise specific milestones, but not the
15 end -- end date of the TPA, which is 2028. DOE and
16 Ecology are committed to full compliance with the
17 Tri-Party Agreement.

18 In the Tri-Party Agreement, we agree to
19 build six tanks to eliminate immediate safety
20 concerns. This is a schematic of a proposed tank
21 with modern safety controls, including
22 mixer/retrieval pumps to reduce gas backup, liquid
23 and gas sampling systems, improved ventilation
24 systems and improved tank monitoring systems.

25 The Tri-Party Agreement action is to

943207.733

1 construct six new waste storage tanks. We're
2 required by law to evaluate other alternatives to
3 assure that we have adequately considered
4 environmental impacts. One potential alternative is
5 to construct fewer tanks and rely on other methods to
6 mitigate the urgent safety issues.

7 If we were to choose no action, we would
8 not mitigate or resolve safety issues. As I said
9 earlier, this alternative is required by law and sets
10 a basis for comparison with the proposed action. We
11 would like to receive your oral or written comments
12 on other alternatives that you think should be
13 analyzed. Next slide.

14 This is a schematic of the two tanks, and
15 it indicates the support facilities which are
16 proposed, and in this case for the 200 West Area.
17 There's a similar conceptual drawing for the 200 East
18 Area in which we show four tanks. And they both have
19 the extensive support systems as a part of the
20 overall proposed action. Next slide, please.

21 Now I'd like to give you an overview of
22 the second proposed action. In this action we
23 upgrade our current storage for safety reasons,
24 retrieve from the 177 tanks, go through a
25 pretreatment step, go to the vitrification steps with

94-3207-1734

0060

1 both the high-level and low-level waste, then we move
2 to storage and disposal for both. Next slide.

3 This slide is a more detailed
4 representation of the previous slide, and it shows
5 that the first proposed action to build six new tanks
6 is in the upper left-hand corner. I might borrow
7 this mike.

8 This diagram inte -- shows the
9 integration of the two proposed actions. The first
10 is an interim action to the second. The first
11 action, first proposed action is to accelerate our
12 safety mitigation and resolution program by removing
13 the contents of the three tanks I named earlier into
14 the six new double-shell tanks. As you can see,
15 that's only one component among many in the TWRS
16 system.

17 The TWRS system can be considered as
18 follows: the first phase would be waste retrieval;
19 the second phase would be pretreatment, which would
20 involve some separation, radionuclide removal;
21 vitrification of the two waste streams; and then
22 on-site disposal in a retrievable mode and off-site
23 geological disposal in a repository.

24 The blue items here on this particular
25 slide, which will be in a package that's outside the

943207-1735

1 door, indicate that there's a lot of developmental
2 work that will continue within the TWRS system. All
3 of these options affect the envelope that must be
4 analyzed for the environmental -- in the
5 Environmental Impact Statement.

6 And so as you can see here, there's still
7 developmental work to be developed with regard to the
8 removal processes, with regard to the high-level and
9 low-level waste melters, with regard to barriers, and
10 with regard to some of the pretreatment stages. And
11 so all of those need to be folded into our
12 Environmental Impact Statement.

13 We're required by law to evaluate the
14 consequences of leaving wastes where they are so we
15 can determine the benefit of taking the proposed
16 action. We've agreed with the State and EPA though
17 to retrieve all waste by sluicing, provide minimum
18 pretreatment of wastes, vitrify high-level wastes and
19 vitrify low-level wastes.

20 Although we prefer to retrieve wastes by
21 hydraulic sluicing, we have also identified two
22 alternatives for comparison of environmental impacts;
23 these include pneumatic retrieval and mechanical
24 retrieval. We prefer minimal pretreatment; but we
25 also recognize two additional alternatives for

94-3207-1736

1 comparing environmental impacts, no pretreatment and
2 extensive pretreatment.

3 For immobilization of high-level waste,
4 we agree to vitrification. Calcination is an example
5 of another alternative for the comparison of
6 environmental impacts. For low-activity wastes, we
7 prefer vitrification; but we will consider other
8 solid waste forms, again, for purposes of
9 comparison. We request that you provide other
10 alternatives through either oral or written comments
11 before March 15.

12 The environmental issues need to be
13 evaluated for the proposed action as is required by
14 NEPA, and they include: effects of releases on the
15 public and on-site workers from operations and
16 accidents; effects on air and water quality and other
17 environmental consequences from operations and
18 accidents; effects on endangered species,
19 archaeological and historical sites; unavoidable
20 environmental impacts; the cumulative effects of all
21 of these environmental impacts; effects from
22 transportation; effects from future decommissioning
23 decisions; socioeconomic impacts on the surrounding
24 communities; short-term use of the environment versus
25 long-term productivity; pollution prevention and

9413207.1737

1 waste minimization; unavoidable adverse environmental
2 impacts; irretrievable and irreversible commitments
3 of resources. For all of these also we ask that you
4 provide other alternatives through oral or written
5 comments before March 15.

6 In summary then, the Department of Energy
7 and Ecology are recommending two proposed actions:
8 the first is to construct six new waste storage tanks
9 for the purposes of remediating immediate safety
10 concerns; the second is to retrieve, treat,
11 immobilize, store and dispose of the waste from 177
12 storage tanks. The agencies request comments and
13 recommendations from you for alternatives to be
14 analyzed and additional environmental issues to be
15 considered.

16 Thank you.

17 MS. PAGE: Messrs. Tallent and Alexander
18 will sit as a panel to receive your comments this
19 evening. They're here to listen to your comments; as
20 this is a formal scoping meeting, they will not
21 engage in a lot of dialogue with you. But if you do
22 not have formal comments and would like to talk with
23 representatives of the Departments of Energy or
24 Ecology, there are a number of those people in the
25 audience who will be happy to talk with you about

9413207.1738

0064

1 what's being proposed.

2 If you have copies of your comments,
3 written copies of your comments, we'd like to have
4 them for the record, and we'll enter them as exhibits
5 in the record. Also, if you do not wish to make
6 comments, there are comment sheets for written
7 comments at the back of the room which are
8 preaddressed and should be helpful to those of you
9 who want to write your comments.

10 I'll be calling on the speakers in the
11 order that you signed up tonight. And we will stay
12 here until 10 p.m. for those people who come later in
13 the evening. The speakers who are representing
14 themselves will be given five minutes to talk and
15 speakers representing organizations will be given ten
16 minutes.

17 I should mention too that we are making a
18 transcript of tonight's meeting, the court reporter,
19 Dee Johnson, has as her assignment to complete a
20 verbatim transcript. And then the two departments
21 will publish those transcripts as soon as possible.
22 Please begin your comments by giving your full name
23 and spelling your name and also giving your address.

24 The first speaker that I will call on is
25 Todd Martin. And did he just leave? Okay. Do you

94-3207-739

0065

1 want me to call on Greg first?

2 MR. DeBRULER: I'm not ready.

3 MS. PAGE: Well, I only have two speakers
4 signed up to speak. Does anybody else want to
5 speak? Okay, we'll just wait for a minute or two.

6 Okay, we've got a speaker here. Come on
7 up and give your name and spell it, please.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

943207.1740

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

JAMES WHITLEY

MR. WHITLEY: My name is James Whitley, State Street, good old Hood River.

Good to see everybody back here again, and some new faces.

How do I spell Whitley? W H I T L E Y, for the record.

MS. PAGE: For the record.

MR. WHITLEY: Well, basically, we're all pretty concerned about the tanks. And another important meeting is coming up on the 28th, and I hope some of you have heard about it or haven't heard will come back to the high school and be involved in that meeting concerning the end stream that has to do with the end reactor and its effluence directly into our river.

Just to keep you up currently as to what we have, nothing is going on with the river right now, with a thousand gallons of diesel being dumped into it. I think a lot of us in this community depend on the tourism, et cetera, and have been following this situation for at least two or three years, some longer.

I'm concerned directly with what you said about costs. And I never saw any figures up here.

9413207-1741

1 And that's sort of startling to me because, although
2 I think it's a good idea to have some safe tanks -
3 and I believe your number is six - built, I never
4 heard a cost on how much it would take.

5 And also the cost of removing, safely
6 removing continually to these new tanks. You've got
7 six tanks, three tanks are going into six tanks. So
8 that I hope means that we have room for three more
9 tanks that by that time will definitely need to be
10 transferred. Because they're all leaking, these 67
11 anyway. And that leaves 82 tanks, as far as my math
12 goes, to continue to deteriorate until we try to get
13 this matter taken care of.

14 What I'm concerned about is the cost.
15 You said there were also developmental work, a lot of
16 developmental work that had to go on on both plans,
17 one plan more than the other. And none of that was
18 discussed as far as what funds you'd have to do
19 that. I know Mr. Clinton and Mr. Gore are really
20 concerned about Hanford, but we still don't know
21 where we're going to get all these funds.

22 And developmental means to me grout
23 tanks. I'm sorry, but I -- I return back to the
24 follies of the past and the millions that were spent
25 on systems that didn't work. And perhaps this

9413207.742

0068

1 developmental work, I'd like to hear more about that,
2 what funds are available for that work.

3 One other thing - and I just wanted to
4 jump up real quick while there was time - is
5 cryogenics. We know what the last earthquake did;
6 we've had a couple here in Oregon in the last year,
7 year and a half. And I've talked to many people
8 involved in the numerous meetings you've held. And
9 we thank you for coming here and educating us. But
10 at the same time, I didn't see much described about
11 the land and what the impacts would be.

12 And we all understand, and that is a
13 genuine concern between DOE and others that we've
14 talked to, about the stability of these tanks and
15 what might happen in the shifting. And cryogenics,
16 we still haven't heard anything on funding about
17 cryogenics and how you feel about stabilizing some of
18 the tanks for the use of cryogenics. Maybe you can
19 speak to that effect.

20 Anyway, that's a couple of comments. And
21 I thank you for being here.

22 MS. PAGE: Todd Martin, are you ready?

23 MR. MARTIN: Sure.

24 MS. PAGE: Okay.

25

943207.743

1

TODD MARTIN

2

MR. MARTIN: My name is Todd Martin, and

3

I'm the staff researcher for the Hanford Education

4

Action League. We're a citizens organization based

5

in Spokane, Washington, that does watchdog activities

6

for Hanford.

7

My points tonight are generally are going

8

to be same, guys, as they were in Richland, as you

9

would expect. This work has been done before. Over

10

the last two years, we've seen several advisory

11

groups - the Tank Waste Task Force, the Future

12

Sitings Working Group - at least peripherally look at

13

these issues and look at what this EIS is supposed to

14

do.

15

The public participation efforts

16

surrounding those task forces was -- was excellent.

17

Everybody has agreed to that. And as a result of

18

that public participation effort, we came out with

19

the Tri-Party Agreement that has a strong regional

20

consensus behind it from local governments, from

21

environmental organizations and from the DOE itself.

22

And then we look at these two new EISs.

23

And when we look at the flier for this meeting, we

24

see that decisions on how to safely manage, treat,

25

store and dispose of Hanford's waste will soon be

9413207-1744

1 made. We also see that the US DOE and Washington
2 Ecology are beginning a process to define the best
3 strategy for safely handling and disposing of these
4 wastes.

5 And again, my argument is that we're not
6 beginning this process. We're not -- Decisions have
7 actually been made. They won't real soon be made,
8 they have been made. And it is now your job to carry
9 out those decisions.

10 In short, we don't want to reconsider the
11 Hanford waste vitrification plant; we don't want to
12 reconsider grout; we don't want to consider advance
13 pretreatment. We feel we know where we stand on
14 those issues and we're ready to move forward.

15 In addition to things that I feel are
16 included in this EIS that shouldn't be, there are
17 things left out; and that's primarily tank closure.
18 I think the decisions that are made in this EIS, tank
19 closure is definitely one that needs to be made.
20 Justification for not making that decision is, quote,
21 it cannot be meaningfully evaluated, unquote, at this
22 time. I would argue that it can be. Much of the
23 work has been done, and it just takes an effort on
24 your part to -- to fold it into this EIS.

25 The Tank Waste Task Force called for DOE

1 to get on with clean-up. We need to ask if this EIS
2 actually does that. At the very least, it has the
3 potential for delaying the clean-up; at the worst, it
4 has the potential for DOE doing an end-run around the
5 commitments that have been made in the Tri-Party
6 Agreement. Nobody wants to see that.

7 What HEAL feels Ecology and DOE need to
8 do with these EISs is: number one, expedite them so
9 they don't affect the schedule that is currently in
10 the Tri-Party Agreement; and number two, use them as
11 a vehicle to flesh out the preferred alternative and
12 the impacts to the preferred alternative that we see
13 in the Tri-Party Agreement as it sits now.

14 You guys have an opportunity to really
15 better serve clean-up, to be two of the players that
16 are a reason, a major player and the reason that the
17 waste gets out of the tanks into a stable form. The
18 other option is to do an EIS that won't be meaningful
19 and will just gather dust on a shelf somewhere.

20 How am I doing on time, Alinda?

21 MS. PAGE: You have three-and-a-half
22 minutes.

23 MR. MARTIN: That's what I wanted to
24 hear.

25 Quickly, I didn't address the New Tank

9173207.716

1 EIS the other night, and I would like to do that
2 right now.

3 Two years ago, my organization, HEAL,
4 called for an Environmental Impact Statement on the
5 plans for the new tanks. And we wish you would have
6 started when we called for that two years ago. But
7 now that you didn't, I want to emphasize two of the
8 issues that were the reason we called for that EIS
9 and that you should pay particular attention to in
10 writing a Draft EIS.

11 And that is number one, exactly what will
12 they be used for? I don't want to say it is dubious,
13 but there is the potential for some dub --
14 dubosiosity - I don't know how to say the word - in
15 using these just to resolve safety issues. We're
16 talking about half a billion dollars simply for those
17 safety issue resolutions for -- for three tanks. Can
18 it be done in a better way?

19 Secondly, exactly how much space is
20 needed? Here we've got an agreement, we hear four
21 tanks, next we know it's six, at one time it was 44.
22 How many tanks are needed, and can you give us
23 numbers to justify the need for those tanks? That's
24 something we really want to see in this EIS for us to
25 get on board and fully support it.

943207-1747

1 We understand that tank space is tight.
2 We fully agree that tank space -- there may be the
3 need for new construction of tanks to support safety
4 resolutions, to support pretreatment, to support
5 ultimately treatment and disposal. But our question
6 is exactly how much is needed?

7 To wrap up, I really like Don's
8 presentation. I like your presentation. It seems so
9 few times when we come out that the DOE guy gets it
10 right the first time, that we're always editing,
11 we're helping the DOE guy edit. And I think you've
12 done a good job with your presentation, especially in
13 the -- the bullets on considering impacts.

14 And your last bullet is "Do you have any
15 others", you're asking the public if you have any
16 others. And I don't. I don't have any other impacts
17 that I want you to consider. What I do want you to
18 consider though is the options we have if you do not
19 tighten this EIS up and ultimately use it as a
20 vehicle for getting the waste out of the tanks and
21 not a vehicle for delaying the clean-up.

22 You take all the other impacts that are
23 listed up there - everything from the human health
24 impacts, the environmental impacts, the socioeconomic
25 impacts, the whole gamut, the whole entire list - and

9413207.1748

1 you magnify all those tenfold. Because that's how I
2 see this issue; I see this EIS as a lynch pin for
3 tank clean-up in that it's vital that this get done
4 to meet the schedules.

5 Because all of us know that if the --
6 those schedules are laid out in the Tri-Party
7 Agreement right now are not met, that the budget ax
8 comes out; and we're stuck with those tanks burping
9 and leaking in the desert for the foreseeable
10 future. Nobody wants that.

11 For my written comment, I will again
12 submit a HEAL Fact Sheet. And that's it. Thanks.

13 MS. PAGE: I'm accepting this Fact Sheet
14 as Exhibit Number 1 at the Hood River meeting.

15 The next speaker is Greg DeBruler.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

0075

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

GREG DeBRULER

MR. DeBRULER: Good evening. My name is Greg DeBruler. How you spell that is D E capital B R U L E R.

I'm a technical consultant to Columbia River United. And we're a grass roots organization located in the Columbia River Gorge. And I'm sure you all have seen my face at least once or twice.

Any way can you turn that volume down? My head is echoing here.

One thing I didn't see up here when we're talking about impacts, we talked about impacts to the land -- or pardon me, to the air and to the water. And one thing I think this EIS needs to address more specifically is the impact to the land. For some reason there is a dichotomy going on here.

Some people think it's a national sacrifice, and then there's others thinking that there would be a foreseeable use of the 200 Area in the near future. That's up for debate, and I'm not going to say what I believe. But we have to look at the land more critically in this EIS.

The one part that when I start talking about the land is in the tanks of that already leaked and the ground underneath the tanks that have already

9413207-1750

1 leaked, we have to include in the EIS what are the
2 alternatives for the disposition of this land. What
3 are we going to do with it, the dirt, the possible
4 contamination to the groundwater.

5 I know that that's something that's going
6 way beyond this first initial EIS. But somehow we
7 have to be able to address it and say before closure
8 what are our guesstimates or what are we envisioning
9 to do with this mess that's underneath the tanks; and
10 of course, if it went into the groundwater, what are
11 potential proposals for remediating the problem.

12 The other thing we have to do in this EIS
13 that sometimes is addressed, and for some reason that
14 when we look at a lot of Environmental Impact
15 Statements they say, well, these are the alternatives
16 and this is what we're going to do and this is the
17 best solution to the problem. And I'm going to be
18 talking about the liquid effluence that could be
19 being pumped into the designated disposal areas at
20 the -- on site at the 200 Area.

21 And what I would like addressed in the
22 EIS is a more analytical look at the impact that
23 these discharges of effluence of waste water is going
24 to have on the existing plumes and the actual travel
25 time to the river. The travel time to the river has

1 historically gone from a hundred years currently down
2 to five to 15 years, depending on who you talk to and
3 depending on where you're standing in the 200 Area.

4 So I could like that addressed a little --
5 little more accurately, because I see lots of
6 question about how much time it's actually going to
7 take before it reaches the Columbia River.

8 The other thing I would like addressed in
9 this EIS is the fact -- the problem of the long-lived
10 radionuclides. Perhaps we need to start looking at
11 separation of all the long-lived radionuclides up
12 front, and make sure that they don't get into the
13 soils or into the aquifers later on.

14 I would like a future look, I don't know
15 if this EIS can do it, of what they're proposing to
16 do or what they see to be done with the existing land
17 that they have up there. I don't know if that's
18 clear. It's not clear in my mind how far out this
19 thing is going to go because of the severity of the
20 problems that are up there.

21 I would like to read a Columbia River
22 United comments to the record, which I will give to
23 you also.

24 "CRU's position on these EISS is that
25 even though there might be a legal mandate for DOE to

1 conduct these EISs, in this case the scope of the
2 process is seriously misguided. In order for this
3 process to benefit clean-up and not slow it down, DOE
4 must:

5 "First point, use existing information.
6 The EIS and the tank waste treatment appears to be
7 looking -- looking at all options for management,
8 storage, treatment and disposal of tank waste, and
9 yet this has already been the subject of six months
10 of negotiations between US DOE, EPA, Ecology and the
11 Tri-Party Agreement nego -- in the Tri-Party
12 Agreement negotiations. As part of that process two
13 public meetings have been held in Hood River in the
14 last year. The Tank Waste Task Force, a citizen
15 advisory board on which CRU held a position, recently
16 met for six months to develop values for the
17 management of the tanks. We have told the DOE what
18 we want. Now let's get on with it and quit delaying
19 the clean-up process.

20 "Second point is maintain the commitments
21 made in the Tri-Party Agreement. The new agreement
22 was just signed in January. It was developed through
23 extensive negotiations and an extensive public
24 involvement process. Now, options like using grout,
25 not included in the new TPA and to which the public

9413207.1753

1 has clearly said no to, are being brought in again as
2 part of the EIS."

3 And I personally understand you have to
4 bring it in because it is an option. But we just
5 want to emphasize the word "No" capitalized.

6 "This EIS process must not be a vehicle
7 to avoid commitments made in the new agreement.

8 "Get on with the clean-up. CRU and the
9 other public interest groups share a concern that the
10 EIS may only serve to delay the clean-up efforts and
11 put the Tri-Party Agreement's activities, like
12 removing and stabilizing tank wastes, behind
13 schedule. DOE must not allow this EIS to delay the
14 clean-up activities."

15 Basically, we're saying get on with it.
16 We have a lot of interest in the river, we have a lot
17 of interest what goes on at Hanford. And the public
18 has been very supportive of the clean-up of Hanford.
19 And we know that if we do get on with clean-up of the
20 tanks, we know that the people back in Washington,
21 D.C., will continue to give us money to clean up the
22 problem.

23 And thank you all for coming.

24 MS. PAGE: This CRU Fact Sheet is
25 submitted as Exhibit Number 2 at Hood River.

943207.754

0080

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

Those are the only speakers that I have listed as desiring to speak right now.

I need your name, and if you would spell it since we don't have you signed up.

9443207.1755

1

ROARK SMITH

2

MR. SMITH: My name is Roark Smith,

3

R O A R K. My address is in Hood River here.

4

Listening to the previous speakers, it

5

certainly makes sense to me that we would like --

6

This EIS seems like the appropriate place to address

7

the question of tanks. It certainly makes sense that

8

you need someplace to put what you clean up into.

9

Physics is physics.

10

Based on the history of where you took

11

dollars that were called clean-up and made plutonium

12

that was -- that was classified bond material, that's

13

a poor example to -- to try to follow on. This is

14

why the tank -- we should know what the tanks are for

15

and why we -- why we need them. And we really don't

16

want to build any more grout vaults as another

17

monument to immediate tactics with no concept of

18

strategy.

19

I was encouraged when I read the thing

20

that came in the mail. I don't know much, I just

21

read what came in the mail here. Stuff I heard

22

mentioned in meetings, looks like you've written it

23

into the -- into the paperwork here a little bit

24

more. And I'm really pleased and would like to

25

encourage this openness.

9413207.1756

94-3207-1757

1 I think probably half or maybe more -- or
2 half the people in the room here are paid by -- paid
3 for by the taxpayers. It -- certainly people are
4 going to feel a lot better about paying their taxes
5 to clean this mess up if you listen to the people who
6 are paying you. That's what these meetings are for,
7 that's why we do it all over, over and over and over
8 again, so you can talk to all these people paying
9 you.

10 To me, Hanford is always going to be a
11 national sacrifice; and I would like to sacrifice as
12 little as possible. I would sure like to see a lot
13 more of that concept applied to the economics. My
14 understanding is Hanford's original history started
15 out with contract that was a dollar a year profit.
16 And I would sure like to see a lot more of that
17 attitude carried by the contractors at Hanford in
18 this present day cleaning it up.

19 Thank you very much.

20 MS. PAGE: Is there anyone else in the
21 audience who hasn't spoken who wishes to speak at
22 this time?

23 Okay. I call on Greg DeBruler to make an
24 addition to his earlier comment.

1

GREG DeBRULER

2

MR. DeBRULER: This is Greg DeBruler

3

again from Hood River, Columbia River United.

4

One thing did I did forget to bring out

5

was I want to talk about cost for a second. About

6

eight months ago, nine months ago, we had a meeting

7

here, it was over in the Gorge Club. And we were

8

learning about tanks. This is before the Tank Waste

9

Task Force really got rolling.

10

And what we learned was -- Actually, it

11

was a meeting in Portland where I had this number.

12

We learned that it cost Westinghouse \$52 million to

13

do a technical analysis to design the new future

14

tanks. \$52 million.

15

And my analogy at that time was wait a

16

second. If we spent \$52 million to design a tank for

17

these new tanks, why couldn't we take one of the

18

designs of the 177 existing tanks, pull it off the

19

shelf and duplicate it.

20

What I'm going to talk and what I want to

21

put on the record here is I think the Department of

22

Energy has an obligation to reduce all the fat from

23

any of the contractors. And I'm not picking on

24

Westinghouse or anybody in particular. The name of

25

the game in this day and age is cost effectiveness,

9413207.1758

1 cost compet -- a competitive bidding process.

2 And when we heard at the TWRS Task Force
3 in Richland that one tank was going to cost a hundred
4 million dollars to build for a million gallon tank -
5 I was in sales and marketing for years - I said to
6 myself, wow, there's a lot of fat on this tank. I
7 didn't know for sure, but I did decide to go out and
8 start doing some investigation.

9 And the numbers that we came up with so far to
10 date - now, this isn't an exact item for item on the
11 tank - but it's between 8 and \$22 million. So I
12 would like in the EIS a breakdown of how and what
13 these costs are going to to equate to a hundred
14 million dollars per tank. I don't believe that
15 anybody out there could build a tank for a hundred
16 million dollars and not have a lot of profit built
17 into it. Something's not right.

18 So in the EIS, I would like to see that
19 addressed. I don't know if you can do that. But a
20 cost has to come in line. If it only cost \$25
21 million a tank, we could save ourself almost half a
22 billion dollars. And I'll tell you what, John Wagner
23 would get a big, big plus on his record if he saved --
24 saved the American taxpayers that kind of money
25 then. So please look into cost.

0085

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

Thanks.

MS. PAGE: Are there are people who would like to speak at this time? If not, we'll recess the meeting until we hear from someone who would like to speak.

Let's open the meeting again because one of our panelists would like to say something.

Dr. Alexander.

DR. ALEXANDER: I just wanted to let Greg DeBruler know, and I think that he's being shown, there is information, there's cost information out on the table. And also we have some folks here that can speak to that tonight. We felt it was an important issue as well.

MS. PAGE: The meeting will be recessed until someone comes who would like to speak.

[Meeting recessed at 7:25 p.m.]

MS. PAGE: The Hood River public meeting for scoping on the EIS is closed.

9413207.1760

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**