

START

0036061

0001

1

2

3

4

HANFORD TANK WASTE REMEDIATION SYSTEM

5

6

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

7

8

9

10

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

11

12

13

14

FEBRUARY 17, 1994

15

16

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION AUDITORIUM

17

18

911 N.E. ELEVENTH AVENUE

19

20

PORTLAND, OREGON

21

22

23

24

25

9413207.1578



START

0002

1

PANEL MEMBERS:

2

3

TOBY MICHELENA

State of Washington

4

Department of Ecology

P.O. Box 47600

5

Olympia, WA 98504-7600

6

GEOFFREY TALLENT

State of Washington

7

Department of Ecology

P.O. Box 47600

8

Olympia, WA 98504-7600

9

DONALD H. ALEXANDER, Ph.D.

U.S. Department of Energy

10

P.O. Box 550, MS R3-73

Richland, WA 99352

11

12

MODERATOR:

13

ALINDA PAGE

Triangle Associates

14

Seattle, WA

15

16

17

18



9413207.1579

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

DICK BELSEY	4
ALINDA PAGE	5
TOBY MICHELENA	11
DONALD ALEXANDER	18
DICK BELSEY	28
ELEANOR FRASER LITTLE	43

EVENING SESSION:

Page

MARY SHAVER	54
ALINDA PAGE	56
GEOFFREY TALLENT	62
DONALD ALEXANDER	69
TODD MARTIN	78
PAIGE KNIGHT	86
ROSS TEWKSBURY	93

9443207.1580

0004

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

AFTERNOON SESSION

DICK BELSEY

DR. BELSEY: Good afternoon. I'm Dick Belsey. I'm a member of Oregon's Hanford Waste Board and chair of their Waste Clean-Up and Site Restoration Committee. And I want to welcome you all and applaud your coming back to Oregon to -- to get input on issues concerning Hanford.

The Oregon board has worked assiduously to educate the public on these issues. And having you come here and have the meetings in Hood River I think is an important part of the process.

Members of the public, I'm glad you're here. I think that with -- during the summer and the Tank Waste Task Force and the public meetings, we're sort of played out on public involvement on -- on the TWRS issue. It's not that Oregonians are unconcerned; we are concerned. The impacts on the river are our major burden -- our major potential burden from Hanford at this particular time and we are concerned about it. So we are glad that you're here and taking input. Thank you.

1851-2076

0005

1

ALINDA PAGE

2

MS. PAGE: Good afternoon. I'm Alinda Page, and I'm the facilitator for this series of meetings. I work with Triangle Associates in Seattle, Washington.

3

4

5

6

In formally commencing today's meeting, I'd like to welcome you on behalf of the United States Department of Energy and the Washington State Department of Ecology.

7

8

9

10

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

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

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.

21

22

23

24

This meeting is being held on the 17th day of February, 1994, at the BPA Auditorium in Portland, Oregon. And we are commencing at approximately 1 p.m.

25

Today's meeting is the third of five

9413207.1582

943207.1585

0006

1 being held in Washington and Oregon during the month
2 of February.

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

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

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

25 When the projected environmental impacts

9413207-1584

0007

1 might be considered significant, an Environmental
2 Impact Statement must be prepared. NEPA also
3 requires that the public be provided opportunities to
4 comment during the preparation of the Environmental
5 Impact Statement.

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

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

19 As with NEPA, when the projected
20 environmental impact might be considered significant,
21 an Environmental Impact Statement must be prepared.
22 SEPA also requires that the public provide -- be
23 provided opportunities to comment during the
24 preparation of the Washington State Environmental
25 Impact Statement.

0008

1 Because NEPA and SEPA are very comparable
2 in their purpose, intent and procedures, the
3 Washington State Department of Ecology and the US
4 Department of Energy have decided to prepare one
5 Environmental Impact Statement for each of the two
6 proposed actions, addressing the requirements of both
7 SEPA and NEPA in a single document. That is, a
8 single EIS will address the tank waste remediation
9 issues, and a single yet different EIS will address
10 the proposed construction of six new safety tanks.

11 On Friday, January 28, 1994, the
12 Department of Energy published a Notice of Intent in
13 the Federal Register, announcing its intent to
14 prepare these two Environmental Impact Statements.
15 One EIS, as I mentioned before, will address the
16 proposed Tank Waste Remediation System, and the
17 second will address the proposed construction of the
18 six new safety tanks.

19 On the same date, Friday, January 28,
20 1994, the Washington State Department of Ecology
21 determined that a SEPA EIS was required for these two
22 proposals.

23 The purpose then of this scoping meeting
24 is to allow each of you the opportunity to identify
25 for the record the significant issues that you

9443207.1585

1 believe should be considered by the US Department of
2 Energy and the Washington State Department of Ecology
3 in the preparation of these two Environmental Impact
4 Statements.

5 The format for today's meeting has been
6 designed to allow as many people as possible to
7 participate. And you may participate by making
8 formal comments anytime during the open sessions, or
9 you may also make written comments either in your own
10 format or on comment sheets that are provided back
11 with the handouts in the back of the room.

12 There are staff present who will talk
13 with anyone who wishes, informally, answer questions,
14 hear your concerns, outside where the handouts are.

15 A verbatim transcript is being made of
16 all the oral comments received in the formal comment
17 portion of this and the four other scoping meetings,
18 and will be included in the US Department of Energy
19 and Washington State Department of Ecology's record
20 of these proceedings. The transcripts from all five
21 of the scoping meetings will be made available at
22 information locations located throughout Washington
23 and Oregon as soon as possible.

24 After they have reviewed all of the
25 formal comments received at these meetings and the

0010

1 written comments that are submitted during the
2 scoping comment period, the two departments will
3 jointly prepare the two Draft EISs. When each Draft
4 is available, the public will once again have an
5 opportunity to comment on the Draft EISs.

6 The EISs will be prepared on different
7 schedules. The Draft EIS for the six new safety
8 tanks is scheduled to be available later this year.
9 The Draft EIS for the Tank Waste Remediation Program
10 is scheduled to be available in 1995.

11 At this time, I'd like to introduce
12 Mr. Toby Michelena, who will talk about the
13 compatibility of the NEPA and SEPA requirements; and
14 he will be followed by Dr. Donald Alexander, from the
15 Department of Energy's Richland field office, who
16 will make a brief presentation on the proposed six
17 new safety tanks and the Tank Waste Remediation
18 System program.

19 Thank you.

20

21

22

23

24

25

943207.507

0011

1 TOBY MICHELENA

2 MR. MICHELENA: My name is Toby
3 Michelena. I'm with the Washington State Department
4 of Ecology.

5 The US Department of Energy, or US DOE,
6 and Ecology are using an innovative approach to
7 reviewing the environmental impacts of the Tank Waste
8 Remediation Program by combining the requirements of
9 NEPA and SEPA. The two agencies expect ourselves and
10 the public to realize several benefits from combining
11 these processes.

12 The US Department of Energy and Ecology
13 have prepared a Memorandum of Understanding which
14 will streamline the NEPA and SEPA compliance process;
15 allow for a joint NEPA and SEPA decision document;
16 accelerate the process by consolidating meetings,
17 mandatory processes and documents; provide a
18 mechanism to expedite resolution of comments and
19 issues. This Memorandum of Understanding is located
20 on the table outside the room.

21 The benefits of combining the NEPA and
22 SEPA processes include combining -- or the combining
23 streamlines the environmental review. Instead of
24 taking a separate, fragmented and sequential
25 approach, Ecology and US DOE are anticipating folding

9413207-1588

1 their NEPA and SEPA requirements together and meeting
2 them all up front. This will avoid duplicative and
3 time-consuming public reviews in the future.

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

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

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

24 Finally, and most importantly, nothing is
25 lost in this combined effort. Ecology and US DOE

943207.589

1 will continue to maintain their full independent
2 authority over their respective requirements. This
3 means both NEPA and SEPA must be completely followed
4 to the satisfaction of each agency. Additionally, no
5 part of either NEPA or SEPA will be sacrificed in the
6 joint EIS. Any information or opportunity to review
7 or comment that NEPA or SEPA requires will be part of
8 the combined process.

9 Now I'll take you through what you will
10 see in both EISs.

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

15 The description of alternatives will
16 describe the actions the agencies propose and -- to
17 take and compare those actions with alternative means
18 to resolve the tank safety issues. For both EISs,
19 the preferred alternative will follow the processes
20 laid out in the Tri-Party Agreement. Other
21 alternatives will also be examined. One reason why
22 we're here is to find out from you what alternatives
23 we should look at.

24 Finally, the no action alternative is required
25 by both NEPA and SEPA as a way of comparing the other

1 alternatives to continuing the present situation.

2 The EIS will also describe the
3 environment which will be affected by all of the
4 alternatives. In these cases, it will be a
5 description of the areas of the Hanford Site where
6 the Tank Waste Remediation System activities would
7 take place and any parts of the environment beyond
8 the Hanford Site that might be impacted.

9 In describing the environment, the EIS
10 will look at three aspects: first, the human
11 environment, which looks at such things as
12 potentially impacted population and areas of
13 historical significance; second, the biological
14 environment, which looks at such things as
15 potentially impacted plant and animal species; and
16 third, physical environment, which will describe such
17 areas as geology and ground and surface waters.

18 The third parts of the EISs will examine
19 the environmental impacts of the proposed action and
20 alternatives. This will look at impacts to the human
21 environment, such as impacts on jobs and disturbance
22 of historic areas. It will also look at potential
23 health risks from such things as radioactive releases
24 to both Hanford workers and the off-site public.

25 The impacts section will thirdly look at

943207.591

1 possible impacts to the ecosystem, such as
2 endangering plant or animal species or interfering
3 with migrations.

4 Finally, the EISS will examine methods
5 for mitigating or reducing the impacts of proposals
6 and alternatives. These might include such things as
7 additional pollution control devices, restoration of
8 habitat or changes in the location of buildings.

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

13 To conclude my presentation, I'll take
14 you through the proposed schedule for the two EISSs.

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

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

9413207.1592

0016

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

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

10 After a 45-day public comment period, a
11 final TW -- or Tank Waste Remediation System EIS
12 should be ready by April of 1996, with a final
13 decision by May of that year.

14 The two agencies hope as a result of the
15 combined processes to accelerate the Tank Waste
16 Remediation System EIS. If that is successful, a
17 final decision could be made as soon as June of
18 1995.

19 This concludes my portion of the
20 presentation. If you have any questions about SEPA
21 or NEPA or the process the two agencies intend to use
22 in preparing these EISs, please ask me during the
23 question and answer period, informal question and
24 answer period, or contact me, Toby Michelena, at area
25 code 206 407-7144.

9473207.1593

0017

1 Next will be Don Alexander of the
2 Department of Energy to describe the proposed Tank
3 Waste Remediation System and New Double-Shell Tanks.
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

681 207 159

0018

DONALD ALEXANDER

DR. ALEXANDER: Thank you, Toby.

With an urgency in the 1940's to give the United States a weapons advantage, many of the actions were taken without consideration for the environment and were unregulated with respect to the environment. The massive legacy of those actions resulted in waste stored in 177 tanks, 66 -- 67 of which are considered to be leaking and others which have potential for leaking.

In this slide then we show that there are 149 single-shell tanks, 67 of which were assumed to have been leaking through the period; but we have 28 double-shell tanks, none of which have leaked. The design that you see on the left is similar to the design that we'll be talking about this afternoon for the six new tanks under consideration.

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

The first is an analysis of the

944 307 155

1 environmental impacts of the proposed action; the
2 second is an analysis of impacts of alternative
3 design solutions to the proposed action; and finally,
4 the proposed and alternative actions are to be
5 compared to the environmental implications of taking
6 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 Hanford Defense Waste EIS as late as
14 1988, the TPA process was essential in aiding the
15 Department in formulating the current proposed
16 actions. Once the Tri-Party Agreement was signed on
17 January 25 of this year, the Notice of Intent was
18 immediately issued with the proposed actions on
19 January 28.

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

9651 2078 116

0020

1 the environment as we proceed.

2 In the next few minutes then, I will give
3 you an overview of the two proposed actions to be
4 discussed in the meeting today, and I will tell you
5 how you can contribute to this part of the process.

6 The DOE and Ecology are recommending the
7 two proposed actions shown on the slide: the first
8 is to construct six new waste storage tanks to reduce
9 the safety concern; and the second is to retrieve,
10 treat, immobilize, store and dispose of radioactive
11 waste from 177 storage tanks.

12 The agencies are today requesting
13 comments and recommendations from you for the
14 alternatives to be analyzed and additional
15 environmental issues to be considered. Next slide.

16 This is a slide of the proposed area that
17 would be affected by this construction. It's in the
18 200 West and 200 East Area. It's the area in which I
19 work. Next slide, please.

20 This slide is the schematic of the two
21 proposed actions. On the left, you see that there
22 are three waste storage tanks which are currently
23 considered to have significant safety concerns.
24 Those three tanks - 101-SY, 103-SY, 104-AN - would be
25 transferred to new storage tanks. That represents

9443207.1597

1 the first proposed action.

2 The second proposed action that we're
3 going to discuss today is shown on the right, which
4 involves the retrieval from 177 storage tanks,
5 treatment of that waste, immobilization in the form
6 of glass, and then storage and disposal. Next slide.

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

14 If the environmental consequences
15 outweigh other considerations, then of course DOE,
16 Ecology and the EPA could revise specific milestones,
17 but not the end of the TPA in 2028. DOE and Ecology
18 are committed to full compliance with that
19 agreement.

20 Now we'll take a more in-depth look at
21 the two proposed actions.

22 In the Tri-Party Agreement, we agreed to
23 build six tanks to eliminate immediate safety
24 concerns. This is a schematic of one of these new
25 tanks. This particular tank has been designed with

859 702 16
9113207.598

0022

1 modern safety controls in mind. These controls
2 include mixer/retrieval pumps to reduce the gas
3 buildup. It secondly provides liquid and gas
4 sampling systems, improved ventilation systems, and
5 finally improved tank integrity monitoring.

6 Therefore, the proposed action today is
7 to construct six new waste storage tanks. And as I
8 said earlier, we're required by law to evaluate other
9 alternatives to assure that we have adequately envir --
10 excuse me, adequately considered the environmental
11 impacts that would envelop the proposed action.

12 One potential alternative is to construct
13 fewer tanks and rely on other methods to mitigate
14 these safety issues. If we were to choose no action,
15 however, we would not mitigate or resolve the current
16 safety issues. As I said earlier, this alternative,
17 however, is required by law. We would like to
18 receive your oral or written comments on other
19 alternatives.

20 This is a schematic of the two tanks and
21 support facilities proposed for the 200 West Area.
22 As you note in the -- in the diagram, there are two
23 tanks shown in the lower left corner. The remainder
24 of the facility is a support structure that supports
25 the operations of those tanks. It allows us, by the

651-207-159

1 way, to operate those tanks in bad weather. A
2 similar -- similar facility is planned, as I said,
3 for the 200 East Area, but that would have four
4 tanks. Next slide.

5 Now we're moved to the second proposed
6 action. In this action, we upgrade our current
7 storage for safety reasons, retrieve from the 177
8 tanks, treat, immobilize, store and safely dispose of
9 all the wastes. And the next slide then.

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

18 Although we prefer to retrieve waste by
19 hydraulic sluicing, we've also identified two
20 additional alternatives for comparison of
21 environmental impacts; these include pneumatic
22 retrieval and mechanical retrieval. We prefer
23 minimal pretreatment, but we also recognize two
24 additional alternatives for comparing environmental
25 impacts; these include no pretreatment and extensive

943207.1600

1 pretreatment.

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

10 In the next two slides I'll be presenting
11 a list of environmental considerations that must be
12 analyzed as a part of the two proposed actions as
13 required by NEPA. The first are effects of releases
14 on the public and on-site workers from operations and
15 accidents; effects on air and water quality and other
16 environmental consequences from operations and
17 accidents; effects on endangered species,
18 archeological and historical sites; cumulative
19 effects of all those factors shown on this slide and
20 the next; effects from transportation; effects from
21 future decommissioning decisions; socioeconomic
22 impacts on surrounding communities; short-term use of
23 the environment versus long-term productivity;
24 pollution prevention and waste minimization;
25 unavoidable adverse environmental impacts; and

913207.60

1 finally, irretrievable and irreversible commitments
2 of resources.

3 We request that you provide any other
4 considerations of environmental impacts that should
5 be factored into these Environmental Impact
6 Statements through oral or written comments before
7 March 15.

8 In summary then, DOE and Ecology are here
9 today to present to you two proposed actions: the
10 first is to construct six new waste storage tanks to
11 remediate safety concerns; the second is to retrieve,
12 treat, immobilize, store and dispose of waste from
13 177 storage tanks. The agencies are requesting
14 comments and recommendations from you for
15 alternatives to be analyzed and additional
16 environmental issues to be considered. Thank you.

17 I'll turn the meeting back over to
18 Alinda.

19 MS. PAGE: Mr. Michelena and
20 Mr. Alexander are now forming a panel from the two
21 agencies to receive comments from the public.
22 They're here today to listen to your comments, not to
23 interact with you, because this is a formal scoping
24 meeting. Also, in the back of the room is Ken
25 Bracken, who is available to talk with you informally

9413207-1602

1 at any point during this open session.

2 If you have written comments, we'd
3 appreciate getting them from you because we can enter
4 them into the record as exhibits that way.

5 The procedures that we'll be using for
6 today's meeting are that I will call on people who
7 preregistered for specific times that they would like
8 to talk; and after that, I will call on people in the
9 order that they signed up to speak when they got
10 here. Individuals who are representing themselves
11 will be given five minutes to talk, and individuals
12 representing organizations will be given ten minutes
13 to talk.

14 We will keep the meeting open until
15 everyone who wishes to talk has had a chance to do
16 so. And when we've completed the first round of
17 comments, we'll recess until other people arrive who
18 wish to make comments.

19 We have a court reporter, and she -- her
20 job is to transcribe verbatim the formal comment
21 portion of today's meeting and prepare those
22 transcripts for the Department of Energy and the
23 Department of Ecology. So when you begin your
24 comments, we'd appreciate your saying your name and
25 spelling it and also identifying your address. Thank

0027

1 you.

2 The first speaker then on my
3 preregistered list is a Mr. Davies. Is Mr. Davies
4 here? Or Mrs. Davies, both are registered.

5 I might also mention that if people who
6 preregistered are not here at their requested time,
7 we're certainly available to have them comment at
8 other times. And I'll be calling again on Mr. and
9 Mrs. Davies.

10 How about Mark Lipe or Lipe, L I P E?
11 No? Okay. How about Eleanor Fraser Little? I know
12 Dick Belsey is here. And you're next, Dick.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

9413207-1604

0028

1

DICK BELSEY

2

DR. BELSEY: Thank you, Alinda.

3

My name is Dick Belsey, B E L S E Y. And

4

I live here in Portland. And I have spoken in this

5

auditorium of multiple aspects of EISs, starting just

6

about nine-and-a-half years ago, when we had this

7

auditorium packed from early in the morning till late

8

the -- early the next morning talking about whether

9

or not Hanford would be a good place to put the

10

nation's high-level nuclear waste.

11

At that time, the panel table was up on

12

the platform and the speaker's table was -- the

13

speaker's podium was over here. And it was not

14

inappropriate; it was a little hard for some

15

handicapped people to get there, but we got

16

microphones down below.

17

I spoke from this same podium here when

18

the panel was up on the top during the New Production

19

Reactor EIS hearings. And it felt very difficult

20

talking to the people up on high. And it's nice to

21

have the configuration in a way where we're sort of

22

on the same level and other people can be a part of

23

this.

24

I am speaking now for Physicians For

25

Social Responsibility. I was head of their study

943207 605

1 group on Hanford and Health. And Physicians For
2 Social Responsibility, Spokane Chapter, had the first
3 Hanford and Health Conference at the Ridpath Hotel in
4 1985. And we got a whole bunch of people in looking
5 at health and health-related issues.

6 And it was sort of the beginning of the
7 breaking open of the secrecy and getting behind the
8 scenes to begin to know what kind of health and
9 health-related environment and environment-related
10 issues were going on under the name of -- of
11 patriotism and protecting the secrets of making
12 bombs, which was no longer secret.

13 As I said before, I'm glad to have you
14 all here. And I would wish that we would have lots
15 more people. But I guess many people have the same
16 question that I have. We had a very effective public
17 involvement program over the summer on exactly this
18 issue. We had 15 public meetings, three meetings at
19 five sites around the two states.

20 And it feels like it's rather redundant
21 to come here and -- and do it all over again and
22 think that is this another one of those departmental
23 things where they really don't want to do what they
24 said they committed to do in the Tri-Party Agreement
25 negotiations, and are there going to be any

9413207.1606

0030

1 surprises, and how much is it going to cost both in
2 time and in money.

3 So my first concern is why are we doing
4 this and -- But I guess we need to go through the
5 steps of this charade in order to meet the legal
6 side.

7 The Tank Waste Task Force and the public
8 in the Northwest at most of those sites have said,
9 Let's get on with it. We need to start doing
10 things. And I hope that the part of your diagrams
11 which talks about upgrades in tank safety which will
12 be required for at least a decade or more while we
13 get the tanks built and we get -- we start moving
14 things out will not be held up by anything that we
15 are doing here.

16 There are clear and present safety
17 issues. And the people who are most likely to get
18 hurt are not in Portland and -- and not in Pendleton;
19 they are on the site. And at this point in time,
20 nothing that we're doing up on the site is worth any
21 of the workers getting hurt. They need to know
22 that. They need to take responsibility for that
23 themselves, and their managers need to help them feel
24 empowered so that they can take that responsibility.
25 But also, the basic infrastructure that's necessary

9443207-607

1 to monitor and react to and deal with tank safety
2 problems need to be upgraded to modern standards.

3 Let me talk again, get back now to
4 something else which standing at this podium reminds
5 me, and that is the fashion in which EISs have gone
6 in the past. And it's a sort of kamikaze sort of
7 thing. You know, you get everything together and you
8 get your reference alternative thing, after years of
9 study, you hold clear and dear to your heart. And
10 then you go out to the public; and goddamn it, they
11 don't see it the way you do.

12 And you're in -- the Department has been
13 in the position of defending -- defending, if nothing
14 else, the investment of a whole lot of money and a
15 whole lot of people who have come to really believe
16 that this thing needs to be done and it needs to be
17 done this way.

18 The experience with the tank waste
19 renegotiations, the whole renegotiation of the
20 Tri-Party Agreement has shown you a new model. And
21 maybe we can adapt it and open up the EIS process so
22 that it's not a serial fashion that you get to put
23 your foot on the first stepping stone at the -- at
24 the scoping hearing, and then the next time you hear
25 it, you come here, you're faced with a document

0032

1 that's at least six inches thick to digest in 60 days
2 and knowledgably comment and criticize and critique;
3 and then the Department goes and does what it wants
4 to do anyhow.

5 The fact is that going to the public,
6 leaving out the Tank Waste Task Force, was a very
7 profitable thing. Before we ever had any Task Force
8 meetings, a lot of ideas and a lot of directions had
9 been changed because ordinary folk said, Let's get on
10 with it, let's use current technology, let's -- that
11 grout is not a suitable waste form to protect the
12 people in the Northwest.

13 All of that happened before any of the
14 so-called stakeholders got together. The people
15 pounded -- pounded you all - the three parties, I'm
16 not just saying DOE - pounded them at the -- at the
17 first round of meetings in May. And I think that
18 there are knowledgeable people in the -- in the
19 community who can in fact help if you involve them in
20 the process in an ongoing way.

21 In Oregon, we had to struggle, the Oregon
22 Hanford Waste Board had to struggle with
23 transportation guidelines of transuranic waste that
24 was scheduled to go from Hanford to Carlsbad in
25 1991. It didn't go, none of it's gone yet, but they

9443207.1609

1 were scheduled. And so we had to get ready for
2 that. And we got our best shot at a transportation
3 plan.

4 And we brought it to the people who were
5 going to be impacted on it, the people who lived on
6 the freeway between the Columbia River and the Snake
7 River, from that whole area along I-84.

8 And they knew things about trucking and
9 about transportation and about weather and about
10 lay-bys and things that people on the board had never
11 even thought of, even with all of the -- and
12 certainly the people in the -- in the DOE who had
13 developed the transportation plan hadn't thought of
14 those things either.

15 Well, we took -- we took this testimony
16 along the eastern tier. And the interesting thing
17 was, it was one of the few times in my life that the
18 most conservative aspects of the community - that is
19 the emergency responders, police, fire, medical - and
20 the more radical parts of the community - the
21 environmentalists and other people like that -
22 identified exactly the same issues.

23 And we listened, and we incorporated that
24 into that transportation plan. And we gave it to the
25 governor, and the governor gave it to the western

943207.1610

1 governors, and the western governors gave it to the
2 DOE. And in fact, about 85 percent of that plan has
3 already been incorporated into the DOE's
4 transportation plan.

5 If you can involve the techies and not so
6 techies among us in the public interest groups and
7 other parts of the stakeholder the community, we can
8 help you to improve the plan. The idea of a serial
9 approach, where you come and you put your head above
10 the wall and say, Hey, throw your best shot. And
11 then you put your head down again at the other end
12 say, Okay, you got another shot. And then the next
13 thing we hear, they start doing something like the
14 record decision and it's all gone.

15 We'd like to help the Tank Waste Task
16 Force. And the -- and the people in the Northwest
17 are -- are sincere. We're not trying to knock
18 government. We have a real stake in doing the
19 cleanup at Hanford and doing it right this time. And
20 from my perspective, we all need all the help that we
21 can get.

22 There are a number of other issues,
23 Alinda. I don't know. There are some specific
24 things that I want to do. Do you want to call and
25 see if anybody else wants to pick up, or should I --

9413207.611

0035

1 should I continue? I don't see a stampede, but you
2 know.

3 MS. PAGE: I don't either. Let me just
4 check.

5 Are there other people in the audience
6 who are going to want to talk?

7 Keep going then. It's all yours.

8 DR. BELSEY: Okay, okay. One of the
9 issues that comes up, and in working on -- I was a
10 member of the Tank Waste Task Force for the people in
11 the room who don't know that. One of the things that
12 we found was that in developing values, there were in
13 fact frequently superficially conflicting values that
14 came up. And we had to deal with that.

15 And so some of the things that I'm going
16 to talk about now may -- may slow things down. But I
17 think that there are some important issues that need
18 to be dealt with sooner or later, and they all relate
19 to managing the tank wastes.

20 First, the -- I think the National
21 Environmental Protection Act requires that we account
22 for where these things go in a 10,000-year time
23 frame. There are some of the things that are in the
24 tank now which will be dangerous for a millennia, for
25 at least a million or millions of years: neptunium,

9413207.1612

0036

1 iodine 129, technetium 99.

2 And it seems to me that being responsible
3 for the clean-up and the spirit of cleaning up these
4 things, that we need to be sure that we account for
5 those kinds of materials during the course of their
6 dangerous period. Which means that we may have to
7 consider for certain fractions of the -- of the
8 clean-up some other ways of stabilizing it.

9 Or perhaps analysis will show that the
10 current inclination, which is to put -- use glass as
11 a low level -- a low-activity waste form as well as
12 the -- the other kind of glass as a high-activity
13 waste form will deal with it. But we should have
14 some sense about the impact of -- of -- potential
15 impact of these things on the environment.

16 One of the things that sunk grout was
17 that levels of iodine 129 being released or expected
18 to be released from the grout vaults at 10,000 years
19 was still rising. And the DOE peer review of grout --
20 of the grout plan at Hanford had rejected that
21 analysis, and said you need to find the bounding
22 limits of when that iodine 129 peaks in terms of its
23 release into the environment.

24 That's in marked contrast to the
25 performance assessment of the grout at the Savannah

9473207.615

1 River plant, where it was modeled out to peak at
2 about 4,000 years and was -- and was falling at the
3 10,000 year time. And their grout plan was
4 accepted.

5 The next issue really has to do with
6 physical boundaries. There are -- I really have to
7 endorse you all doing these two NEPA -- the NEPA/SEPA
8 process together and achieving some efficiencies,
9 both hopefully in money as well as in time.

10 There are a bunch of -- of alphabet soup
11 things that couple all of this: SEPA, CERCLA, RCRA.
12 And they are almost tossed like alphabet soup in and
13 around the Hanford Site. And it's very hard for
14 people like me to know where some things like this
15 end and where other things begin.

16 We need to be clear that we would like
17 one-stop shopping. That in terms of the tank wastes,
18 they should be covered by -- by this. Everything
19 within the tank waste system should be covered under
20 this EIS so that in fact we don't have to worry about
21 exceptions. Now, there may be some natural
22 boundaries.

23 And you all have in comment said that the
24 cribs which accepted the flow cascading through a
25 series of tanks, and then when they were all filled

0038

1 flowing out the back door, is a different issue
2 because those are not wastes that are in tanks but
3 they are from tanks.

4 We should be very clear that -- that -- I
5 personally would think they should be included, but
6 it may be enough that they -- they will be taken up
7 in timely fashion. But that's really confusing. And
8 it's hard for ordinary folk to -- to understand why
9 there is this arbitrary separation, the sort of
10 Balkanization of -- of the Hanford site. And you see
11 what happens with Balkanization and re-Balkanization
12 in the real world.

13 Remember that World War I started in the
14 Balkans, right where they're fighting now again. And
15 we just kind of put the fight on hold while this
16 other country, Yugoslavia, existed for a little
17 while. Well, I don't want to have that kind of
18 fighting over on Hanford, but I think we really have
19 to be careful about how -- how we separate these
20 things out arbitrarily.

21 The other -- the other issue I guess is a
22 potshot, and it's at the National Academy of
23 Science. I've been just reading the pluton -- the
24 Weapons plutonium Disposition Study of the National
25 Academy of Science. Four of the nine people on the

519
2007-05-16

0039

1 plutonium study are University of California,
2 Berkeley, Lawrence Livermore alumni.

3 These men, and they're all men,
4 considered seriously the ocean disposition of weapons
5 plutonium in their report. I don't see how anybody
6 can seriously recommend or even consider that,
7 knowing our concern about the two sunk Russian
8 submarines with their ruptured warheads and power
9 plants putting plutonium out into the oceans.

10 And so if you're going to base any of
11 your stuff on materials coming out of the National
12 Academy of Science, please check and make sure that
13 these are not just old cold warriors who are now
14 being asked as experts about plutonium what to do
15 with it, and that in fact who are not in this real
16 world.

17 Anyhow, those are the breadth and extent
18 of my remarks, Alinda. And I thank you very much for
19 your time and for your attention.

20 MS. PAGE: Is there anyone else in the
21 audience who would like to make a comment at this
22 time? If not, we will recess the meeting until there
23 is someone who would like to comment.

24 [Pause in the proceedings]

25 MS. PAGE: We'll reopen the meeting to

9413207-1616

0040

1 hear for a few minutes more from Dr. Belsey.

2 DR. BELSEY: Thanks a lot. I don't read
3 my own notes that well. The other -- the other issue
4 about EIS is -- Sometimes I stop thinking when I
5 start talking, and that's not good.

6 The other issue about the EIS process is
7 that it's supposed to deal with the full aspect of
8 impacts. And one of the issues that people in the --
9 in the region are concerned with is the kind of
10 piecemeal approach that people have taken in the EIS
11 process, looking at individual impacts of particular
12 programs, rather than the cumulative impact of a
13 variety of things and arbitrarily separating some
14 kinds of impacts.

15 For example, the waste management and
16 environmental restoration impacts of the
17 reconfiguration EIS to the programmatic environmental
18 assessment for waste management -- for environmental --
19 I'm getting my words mixed up. The reconfiguration
20 EIS is not dealing with waste management and
21 environmental restoration. They're putting it onto
22 the EIS for environmental restoration and waste
23 management.

24 In the case of the tanks, there is the
25 tanks, there's what's in the tanks, and there's

944307.1617

1 what's leaked out and is around the tanks. And the
2 total impacts on the environment, on -- on health and
3 the other aspects are the cumulative impacts of that
4 from the point we are today to the point of closure,
5 whether that's retrieval, in situ, digging up what's
6 underneath, treating what's around it, those need to
7 be in the scope of the EIS.

8 Now, that may be -- that may not be easy
9 to do. I mean, either you may not have technology
10 that you think is ideal. But it's very important
11 that it is part of this EIS and it's put on the
12 agenda and it stays on the agenda, so that in fact we
13 can look at the whole project for this part of
14 Hanford and say it's -- it's taken care of. There
15 are not -- there's not something going to come and
16 surprise us from someplace else.

17 And I guess I will close this time now by
18 saying that working on -- on Hanford issues is sort
19 of like dancing with an octopus: after you've got --
20 you think you got all the arms under control, there's
21 frequently something that comes out of the blue to
22 surprise you.

23 And I -- I would like very much that the
24 number one grass roots organizer in the country -
25 that is the US Department of Energy - be satisfied

0042

1 with being at least number two, or maybe even worse,
2 by actually getting their act together and continuing
3 the new directions that were very apparent in the
4 Tri-Party Agreement renegotiation. Thanks.

5 MS. PAGE: Thank you.

6 Eleanor Fraser Little?

7 And I will mention to those of you who
8 have come since we made the presentations that there
9 are outlines of all the speeches, presentations that
10 were made by the Department of Energy and Department
11 of Ecology officials, in the back -- or outside the
12 back of the room.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

6991 2025

1

ELEANOR FRASER LITTLE

2

MS. FRASER LITTLE: My name is Eleanor

3

Fraser Little. I own a small business, God and

4

Physics Unlimited. I do not have a college degree;

5

but I do consider myself, in part, an environmental

6

and theoretical physicist. I deal with a lot of

7

situations that could be sabotage, environmental

8

sabotage, done with the intent of harming America and

9

even of the world.

10

I want to speak about Hanford and the

11

tanks and the leakage. If the tanks will -- I don't

12

know that much about Hanford itself. I decided to

13

speak at the last minute and didn't have time to

14

research it.

15

So I'll have to start that way, saying

16

that I'm not sure what kind of rock the tanks are

17

on. If they are on solid rock and the waste leaked,

18

they're very caustic, they probably etched their way

19

through. If they're on pillow lava, it probably went

20

into a lot of those channels and weakened the pillow

21

lava formations. I do know that the area that has

22

Hanford has sheet layers of lava that go over the

23

whole valley, and that there could be and probably is

24

pillow lava there.

25

Now, if these leakages from certain tanks

9443207.1620

1 are bad enough, theoretically possible that those
2 tanks could actually tumble into a hole of their own
3 making, that the rock formations could actually
4 collapse and drop the tank in.

5 Hanford is doing blasts for nuclear waste
6 bullet tests and for other things. The blasts might
7 precipitate a quake-like action that will final --
8 cause the final collapse. So I think it's very
9 important that we check to see if the rock formations
10 under leaking tanks are still solid.

11 I did also want to suggest a way of
12 processing the nuclear wastes. I understand they are
13 going to be reprocessing and getting out weapon
14 material from them. If they're going to do that, the
15 nuclear wastes give off a lot of high frequency
16 light. That is just like solar energy, it's solar
17 light. We can harvest it, especially if we use the
18 right solar collectors.

19 You could do it in long, flat boxes with
20 an angle top so that the gases could be gathered and
21 harvested and reprocessed. You could gather up the
22 liquids by evaporation and -- and by siphoning off
23 those that are suitable for that. And you could take
24 care of the sludge that way. It's a slower process,
25 but it would enable us to handle everything.

9413207-1622

1 I do realize that I'm not allowing for
2 some the explosiveness of the wastes themselves.
3 I'm -- I'm not able to at this time make a suggestion
4 on that, other than the fact that tritium and
5 hydrogen in the gases are -- can be misted with water
6 to be cleaned. And we do even now gather those up
7 using a gas separator. The liquids -- the liquids
8 will be high in deuterium and in other things, many
9 of which are considered contaminants. But in
10 general, we can reprocess almost anything we've made,
11 even though it's sometimes expensive and potentially
12 dangerous.

13 So I wanted to indicate that I was
14 concerned, number one, about the tanks collapsing
15 into holes. Number two, I was thinking that maybe we
16 could use a solar energy collection system and
17 collect the energy from nuclear wastes just like you
18 do from the sun. And since it would give off high
19 frequency light in all directions and from all the
20 substances, that could be done in all directions
21 too. But it'd have to be automated in order to
22 reduce the amount of exposure, automated as much as
23 possible.

24 The -- I'm concerned that in our -- I
25 lived back east for a lot of years, I only moved out

0046

1 west here about ten years -- about seven years ago.
2 And back east they used to talk about the Mafia ties
3 to Hanford and to the nuclear cartel.

4 If we've got people with Mafia ties
5 running these plants, owning the companies that run
6 them, if we've got them with terrorist ties, then
7 we've got the fox in charge of the hen house, very
8 likely to steal anything valuable from there they
9 can, and likely to be willing to sabotage the place
10 if it suits their purposes.

11 The Mafia has known ties to terrorists
12 and to the Russians. And until just recently with
13 this alleged friendship with Yeltsin, Russia was
14 considered our enemy and was well known for doing
15 attacks. And I personally think that they're still
16 doing some attacks and are quite capable of attacking
17 America.

18 So we have to look into the ownership of
19 the companies, including GE and Westinghouse, but
20 also of the subcontractors that deal with these
21 plants. Because we have to make sure that there are
22 no Mafia and terrorists ties to those companies and
23 to get out anyone there who is involved with that.

24 The military is supposed to have troops
25 being stationed there at Hanford. It was in the

94-3207-623

1 papers. Well, military sites do not have to meet
2 normal environmental standards. I don't know if they
3 do now, but the last time I saw in the paper they
4 didn't. So is Hanford now a military site? And if
5 so, does it have to meet the environmental standards
6 at all?

7 So was the stationing of the troops there
8 because there have been threats to sabotage Hanford;
9 just like we had problems with the World Trade
10 Center, are we trying to protect Hanford from
11 terrorists? Or are the troops stationed there to
12 avoid environmental standards and to make it into a
13 military base? And as a military base, then it might
14 not -- it might be able to dump anything it wants.

15 So I'm concerned about the troops being
16 there. I think they're necessary because I do think
17 that Desert Storm has not ended, that the Arabs are
18 going to continue to attack us and the Serbs have
19 threatened to if we do any bombing, and the Russians
20 said they will. It wasn't Yeltsin but it was another
21 guy almost as powerful.

22 So you have a bunch of terrorists who
23 have a very tasty, tempting target. And it's not
24 well protected, from what I've heard. It's just wide
25 open for trouble. And alleged to have Mafia ties,

9413207-1624

0048

1 which means you've got maybe saboteurs right there
2 who just wait for the orders.

3 And terrorists might use truck bombs and
4 car bombs. And once one tank goes up, if they're too
5 close to another, they'll set off another and another
6 and another. So you have the potential of sabotage
7 of those tanks and accidental blasting.

8 Now, during World War II my parents
9 worked at the defense plant because my father was
10 color blind and couldn't go into the service after
11 Pearl Harbor. So they went to work for defense
12 plants. And when they were working in nitroglycerin
13 area, those -- those plants, they put the tank and
14 surrounded the tank with an earth barrier with just
15 room for people or trucks to go in, and then another
16 partial barrier.

17 And that way, if the nitro plant --
18 section of the plant went or that section of the
19 plant went, it hit the earth barrier and didn't go
20 sideways and carry the blast sideways to set off
21 other buildings; instead, it went up or down. So the
22 blast energy was actually directed, redirected by the
23 barrier.

24 And I know it worked because my mother
25 was working there, driving some physicists around

94-3207-625

0049

9413207.1626

1 that day when one of the big nitro sections went.
2 Nobody was left. They didn't even find the bodies.
3 They didn't find much of anything except a little bit
4 of debris. But the earthen walls held and kept that
5 plant -- that building from setting off the other
6 buildings.

7 So we have tanks that have -- are burping
8 hydrogen, that are having -- that if we start to try
9 to reprocess those wastes they're going to be
10 dangerous. If we put earthen barriers around each of
11 the tanks or sandbags or even a portable prefab
12 section using missile silo -- the silo material that
13 we used in our silos, at least it will absorb some of
14 that blast and keep it more or less localized. Some
15 will go in the air.

16 I mean, we can put in a concrete or some
17 kind of above-ground thing to at least slow down the
18 upper part too, but at least we can stop it from
19 going sideways and knocking off one tank and then
20 another and then another, or a tank knocking off a
21 whole building. So we can use that World War II
22 technology to protect our existing tanks even now.
23 And so to make them safer, to switch from one tank to
24 another, and to -- to look for things.

25 Now, if you've had dumping or leaking of

0050

1 wastes into the ground, then you've got liquids,
2 you've got gases and you've got solids. If lava
3 absorbs these things, sort of like sand filters out
4 wastes, then you've got that stuff sitting right
5 there, right near the tanks and right where they flow
6 to. So you have the potential of a lot of plutonium
7 and other wastes, some of it quite valuable, some of
8 it quite deadly, being very near any of the leaking
9 tanks and down water of them.

10 Now, if you've got a tank that's a --
11 weak structurally because the wastes have weakened
12 the rock formations, perhaps you can pump in
13 concrete, or especially treated concrete. Perhaps
14 you can pump in clay, because clay is a good
15 absorber. Then if you can do a slurry wall for the
16 end reactors, consider that for the end reactor, you
17 can certainly consider a slurry wall to try to help
18 support the tanks that have ground that has weakened
19 under them.

20 And if you've got explosive gases coming
21 up, you have to check for that before you do any
22 drilling, before you do any moving of anything,
23 because you may have two sources of hydrogen gas
24 and -- and other explosive of tritium and things. So
25 you may have the tank itself and you may have the

943207.627

1 ground. And that's why it's particularly important
2 to evaluate each tank site, especially those that
3 have leaked, and to devise a way to reinforce the
4 ground before you move in heavy equipment to try to
5 move tanks or mess around there.

6 MS. PAGE: Are you just about ready to
7 wrap up?

8 MS. FRASER LITTLE: Okay. And I do
9 think that Hanford needs the military there. I think
10 we need military type controls. But I think we need
11 environmental rules no matter who's controlling
12 Hanford, and that we need to make sure that there's
13 pollution -- that the pollution is taken care of.
14 And that -- that new processes may not have standards
15 already, but I think that existing standards for
16 other things should apply, even if there are new
17 processes.

18 So if you have a new process like the
19 solar collector that I suggested, which would be
20 quite a little bit different than some of the
21 systems, then you might need to develop new standards
22 for pollution. But you could still use the old ones
23 to -- as a shield to make sure that things didn't get
24 worse because you were doing experiments.

25 And so I just feel that because of the

1 terrorist problem and having the Arabs and Russians
2 and Serbs and -- and other groups wanting to sabotage
3 us, that we really do need military type security and
4 military control of those units to avoid theft, to
5 avoid sabotage.

6 And we do need to put barriers around
7 those tanks if they don't have -- already have them.
8 And sandbags are a fast way to get -- once we make
9 sure that the ground is structurally sound enough,
10 sandbags is a very fast way to build up a very rapid
11 wall and to do it by -- by very hastily but to at
12 least contain any potential blast and protect one
13 tank from another.

14 MS. PAGE: Thank you.

15 MS. FRASER LITTLE: I have a copy -- I
16 have a copy of this.

17 MS. PAGE: Okay, I'll take that. Thank
18 you.

19 MS. FRASER LITTLE: Are there any
20 questions?

21 MS. PAGE: Oh, I don't -- You missed the
22 opening presentation, but they're not engaging in
23 dialogue. They will, when we recess, talk informally
24 with people. But because it's a formal scoping
25 process, there's not a back and forth because of the

1 requirements of scoping.

2 MS. FRASER LITTLE: Okay.

3 MS. PAGE: Thank you.

4 I have received this submittal from
5 Eleanor Fraser Little, which I'll designate Exhibit
6 Number 1 in Portland, and submit it to the record.

7 Are there other speakers who wish to talk
8 at this time? If not, we will recess until there is
9 someone who wishes to talk. Thank you.

10 [Meeting recessed at 2:12 p.m.]

11 MS. PAGE: The afternoon session is
12 closed and we will reopen at 6:30.

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

9413207.1630

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

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

EVENING SESSION

MARY SHAVER

MS. SHAVER: Well, good evening and welcome. This is kind of a treat for me. Every time I've been asked to do this, there have been a lot of people and it's been a much smaller room. So I'm going to practice my Toastmasters here, because I really am a dismal speaker. So I'll see how this one goes with a big room, and here we go.

I am Mary Shaver. And I am co-chair of the Transport Committee for the Oregon Hanford Waste Board. It's my pleasure to welcome you here this evening on behalf of the Oregon Hanford Waste Board.

The US Department of Energy and the Washington State Department of Ecology are holding this series of public meetings to involve the public and to request your input.

The subjects of tonight's meeting are very important. US DOE and Ecology are asking for your comments on the scoping of the Environmental Impact Statement for Tank Waste Remediation System at US DOE's Hanford site. They are asking for your comments on the construction of new radioactive waste storage tanks at Hanford.

943207.651

1 The Tank Waste Remediation System, known
2 to friends and foes alike as TWRS, is the name for
3 the complete program to deal with tank waste
4 management at Hanford. The tank wastes are a large
5 and complex issue; TWRS is large and complex as
6 well.

7 If you have questions about the State of
8 Oregon's involvement in the TWRS program or Hanford
9 clean-up in general, Dirk Dunning, who is out of town
10 right now but flying back in as soon as he can, will
11 be here a little bit later to answer your questions
12 regarding Oregon's involvement in TWRS and Hanford
13 clean-up in general.

14 Again, I want to thank everyone for
15 coming. I want to thank US DOE and Ecology for
16 coming to Portland to ask our thoughts and our
17 concerns. And now I'd like to turn the meeting over
18 to the facilitator for the evening, Alinda Page.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

9413207.1632

0056

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 evening. This is the evening portion of the meeting that began at 1:00 this afternoon for scoping on the two proposed Environmental Impact Statements. I'm Alinda Page, and I work with Triangle Associates in Seattle, Washington, as the contracted facilitator for these meetings. Welcome on behalf of the United States Department of Energy and the Washington State Department of Ecology.

Today's and tonight's meeting is officially designated as the Portland public scoping meeting for the two proposed Environmental Impact Statements at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington. One of the EISs, as was mentioned earlier, will address the proposed Tank Waste Remediation System activities, and the second will address 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.

The meeting is being held on the 17th day of February, 1994, at the BPA Auditorium in Portland, Oregon. And we are reopening the meeting at 6:30 p.m. Today's meeting is the third of five being held in

9403207.1635

1 Washington and Oregon during the month of February.

2 Tonight's schedule calls for a session
3 that will remain open until 10 p.m. We will keep the
4 meeting open as long as there are people who wish to
5 speak, and recess the meeting when there are not
6 people who wish to speak, go that way throughout the
7 evening until we finally close the meeting.

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

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

9113207.1634

1 provided opportunities to comment during the
2 preparation of an Environmental 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 its purpose. 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 and
11 the remediation of high-level tank waste and the
12 construction of the 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 actions.

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 opportunities to comment during the preparation of
21 the 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 Washington State Department of

9413207.635

94-3207-636

0059

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

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

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

24 The format for tonight's meeting has been
25 designed to give as many people as possible an

1 opportunity to participate, including those of you
2 who do not wish to make formal comments. We will
3 take formal comments in this room throughout the time
4 period until 10 p.m. Also, there are officials from
5 the Department of Energy and the Department of
6 Ecology and Westinghouse here who can talk with you
7 informally, outside where the displays are, at any
8 point during the meeting that you feel you'd like to
9 speak with someone.

10 I should mention, however, that if you do
11 speak informally with someone and then wish to have
12 those ideas on the record, you need to come in here
13 and speak so that they can be transcribed and put
14 into the formal record.

15 We are having a verbatim transcript made
16 of all oral comments received in this formal comment
17 portion and in the other four scoping meetings. And
18 this will be included in the United States Department
19 of Energy's and Washington State Department of
20 Ecology's record of these proceedings. The
21 Department of Energy and Department of Ecology will
22 make transcripts from all five of the scoping
23 meetings available at information locations
24 throughout Washington and Oregon as soon as
25 possible.

9473207.1637

1 And then after they have reviewed all the
2 formal comments received at the scoping meetings and
3 the written comments that are submitted during the
4 scoping comment period, the two departments will then
5 jointly prepare the two Draft Environmental Impact
6 Statements. When each Draft EIS is available, the
7 public will once again have the opportunity to
8 comment.

9 The two Draft EISs are going to be
10 prepared on different schedules. The Draft EIS for
11 the six new safety tanks is scheduled to be available
12 this year. The Draft EIS for the Tank Waste
13 Remediation Program is scheduled to be available in
14 1995.

15 I'd like now to introduce Mr. Geoff
16 Tallent and Mr. Don Alexander. Geoff Tallent is from
17 the Department of Ecology, and he's going to give you
18 a brief presentation on the compatibility of the SEPA
19 and NEPA procedures. Dr. Alexander, from the
20 Department of Energy's Richland field office Tank
21 Waste Remediation System Program office, will talk
22 about the proposed six new safety tanks and the Tank
23 Waste Remediation System. Thank you.

94-3207-163B

94327.639

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. My name is Geoff Tallent. I'm with the Department of Ecology.

The US Department of Energy, or US DOE, and Ecology are using an innovative approach in 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 have prepared a Memorandum of Understanding, which is available on the materials table outside, which will spell out how the two agencies will work together to streamline the NEPA and SEPA compliance process; allow for a joint NEPA/SEPA decision document; accelerate the process by consolidating meetings, mandatory processes and documents; and provide a mechanism to expedite resolution of comments and issues.

We expect to realize several benefits from combining the NEPA and SEPA processes, and I'll run through a few of those. First, combining streamlines the environmental review. Instead of taking a separate, fragmented and sequential approach, Ecology and US DOE are anticipating folding

1 their NEPA and SEPA requirements together and meeting
2 them all up front. This will avoid duplicative and
3 time-consuming public reviews in the future.

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

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

18 Fourth, by working as equal partners,
19 Ecology and US DOE must agree on everything in the
20 EISS. The two agencies will eliminate the
21 possibility of debating over conflicting decisions
22 later on, and instead will identify and resolve
23 differences early and cooperatively.

24 Finally, and most important, nothing is
25 lost in this combined effort. Ecology and US DOE

943207.640

1 will continue to maintain full independent authority
2 over their respective requirements. This means both
3 NEPA and SEPA must be completely followed to the
4 satisfaction of each agency. Additionally, no part
5 of either NEPA or SEPA will be sacrificed in the
6 joint EISs. Any information or opportunity for
7 review or comment that NEPA or SEPA requires will be
8 part of the combined process.

9 Now I'll take you through what you will
10 see in both of the EISs.

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

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

943207.641

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

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

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

21 The third parts of the EISS will examine
22 the environmental impacts of the proposed action and
23 alternatives. This will look at impacts to the human
24 environment such as impacts on jobs, and disturbance
25 of historic areas. It will also look at potential

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

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

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

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

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

24 At that time, the path of the two EISs
25 will split. For the New Tanks EIS, an Implementation

9473207.643

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

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

15 The two agencies hope as a result of this
16 combined effort to be able to accelerate the TWRS EIS
17 schedule, which is the third column on that slide
18 there. If that's successful, a TWRS final decision
19 could be made as soon as June of 1995.

20 This concludes my portion of the
21 presentation. If you have any questions about SEPA
22 or NEPA or the process we intend to use in preparing
23 these EISs, please ask our Department of Ecology
24 representative outside during anytime you want when
25 you wander outside. Otherwise, you can give me a

9413207-1644

0068

1 call, Geoff Tallent, at area code 206 407-7112.

2 Next will be Don Alexander of the
3 Department of Energy to describe the proposed Tank
4 Waste Remediation System and New Double Shell Tanks.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

9413207.1645

0069

1

DONALD ALEXANDER

2

DR. ALEXANDER: Thank you, Geoff. Good

3

evening.

4

With an urgency in the 1940'S to give the

5

United States a weapons advantage, many of the

6

actions were taken without consideration of the

7

environment and were unregulated with respect to our

8

environment. The massive legacy of those actions

9

resulted in waste stored in 177 tanks, 67 of which

10

are considered to be leaking and others of which have

11

potential for leaking.

12

In this slide, we show that there are 149

13

which are single-shell tanks which contain 36 million

14

gallons of waste, and 67 of those are assumed to be

15

leaking at present. There are 28 double-shell tanks

16

similar to those that we're proposing to build, and

17

none of those have leaked.

18

The National Environmental Policy Act was

19

enacted in 1969 to assure that in the future any

20

major federal proposed actions such as a major

21

construction project, especially those involving

22

radioactive wastes, be analytically evaluated. NEPA

23

requires that the federal agency complete three types

24

of analyses and weigh these in its decision making

25

process.

9413207.1646

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

8 The alternatives under discussion today
9 have been presented to you in public meetings over
10 the past year in the Tri-Party Agreement. It was in
11 that process that some were dismissed. Grout was the
12 most notable alternative among those that was
13 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 for
20 these EISs was immediately issued on January 28.

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

491-208116

0071

1 which will reduce risk to our workers, the public and
2 the environment as we proceed. In the next few
3 moments I'll give you an overview of the two proposed
4 actions, and I'll tell you how you can contribute to
5 this part of the process.

6 DOE and Ecology are recommending two
7 proposed actions: the first is to construct six new
8 waste storage tanks for safety reasons; and the
9 second is to retrieve, treat, immobilize, store and
10 dispose of radioactive waste from 177 storage tanks.

11 The agencies this evening are requesting
12 comments and recommendations from you for
13 alternatives to be analyzed and additional
14 environmental issues to be considered.

15 This slide indicates the affected area at
16 Hanford, the 200 Areas, both in the 200 West Area and
17 200 East Area. And we'll be discussing those areas a
18 little bit more tonight. I work in the 200 Area.

19 This slide is a schematic of the two
20 proposed actions. On the left, we show the proposed
21 action to build six new safety tanks or storage tanks
22 for safety purposes. On the left side of the slide,
23 it indicates that there are three key tanks of
24 concern: 101-SY, 103-SY, 104-AN. The new storage
25 tanks, of which there are six planned, are also

9413207.1648

1 indicated.

2 On the right-hand side of the screen, we
3 indicate the second proposed action to be discussed
4 tonight. That proposed action is to retrieve waste
5 from the 177 storage tanks, treat those wastes,
6 immobilize those wastes, as you'll hear, in vitrified
7 form, and then store and dispose of the wastes.

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

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

21 This begins my presentation on the first
22 proposed action.

23 In the Tri-Party Agreement, we agreed to
24 build six tanks to eliminate immediate safety
25 concerns. This schematic is of a proposed tank with

9443207.1649

0073

1 modern safety controls, including mixer/retrieval
2 pumps to reduce gas buildup, liquid and gas sampling
3 systems, improved ventilation systems, and improved
4 tank integrity monitoring. Next slide.

5 The Tri-Party Agreement action is to
6 construct six new waste storage tanks. And we're
7 required by law to evaluate other alternatives to
8 ensure that we have adequately considered
9 environmental impacts.

10 One potential alternative is to construct
11 fewer tanks and rely on other methods to mitigate
12 safety issues. If we were to choose no action, we
13 would not mitigate or resolve safety issues. And as
14 I said earlier, this alternative is required by law.
15 We would like to receive your oral or written
16 comments on other alternatives.

17 This is a schematic of the two tanks and
18 support facilities which are proposed for the 200
19 West Area. As you note in the diagram, the two tanks
20 in the proposed action are accompanied by support
21 facilities. The facility on the left is designed to
22 let us operate those tanks in bad weather. A similar
23 diagram is available for the tanks in the East Area.
24 The difference is that we are going to construct four
25 tanks there. Next slide, please.

9413207.1650

1 Now I would like to turn to the second
2 proposed action. In this action, we upgrade our
3 current storage for safety reasons, retrieve from the
4 177 tanks, treat, immobilize and safely dispose of
5 all the wastes.

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

13 Although we prefer to retrieve waste by
14 hydraulic sluicing, we also identify two additional
15 alternatives for purposes of comparing environmental
16 impacts: pneumatic retrieval and mechanical
17 retrieval. We prefer minimal pretreatment, but we
18 also recognize two additional alternatives for
19 comparing environmental impacts: no pretreatment and
20 extensive pretreatment.

21 For immobilization of high-level waste,
22 we agree to vitrification; calcination is an
23 alternative for comparison of environmental impacts.
24 For low-activity wastes, we prefer vitrification; but
25 we will also consider other solid wastes forms,

94-327-151

1 again, for purposes of comparing environmental
2 impacts. We request, as in the other case,
3 that you provide other alternatives through oral or
4 written comments before March 15.

5 NEPA provides us with a list of
6 environmental issues that must be evaluated as a part
7 of our process. This slide and the next slide
8 provide you with an overview of those requirements.

9 They include effects of releases on the
10 public and on-site workers from operations and
11 accidents; effects on air and water quality and other
12 environmental consequences from operations and
13 accidents; effects on endangered species,
14 archeological and historical sites; unavoidable
15 environmental impacts; cumulative effects of all the
16 items on this slide and the other; effects from
17 transportation; effects of future decommissioning
18 decisions; socioeconomic impacts on surrounding
19 communities; short-term use of the environmental
20 versus long-term productivity; pollution prevention
21 and waste minimization; unavoidable adverse
22 environmental impacts; irretrievable and irreversible
23 commitments of resources.

24 And again, we request that you provide
25 other alternatives to these environmental impacts

9413207-1652

1 through oral or written comments before March 15.

2 In summary then, the Department of Energy
3 and Ecology are recommending two proposed actions:
4 the first is to construct six new waste storage tanks
5 for the purpose of remediating the safety issues with
6 those three tanks that I mentioned earlier; and to
7 retrieve, treat, immobilize, store and dispose of the
8 waste from 177 storage tanks. The agencies request
9 comments and recommendations from you for
10 alternatives to be analyzed and additional
11 environmental issues to be considered. Thank you.

12 MS. PAGE: Mr. Tallent and Mr. Alexander
13 will now sit as a panel to receive comments from the
14 public. Because this is a formal scoping meeting,
15 they won't be engaging in dialogue with you, although
16 as I mentioned earlier there are other people from
17 the Department of Energy and the Department of
18 Ecology and Westinghouse here who could talk with you
19 at any point during the evening if you have questions
20 or comments that you would like to make informally.

21 Any of you who have written comments, I'd
22 like to receive them and submit them as exhibits for
23 the record. So it would be helpful if you could give
24 us copies of those. And if you're not ready to make
25 comments orally, you can use comment sheets that have

943207-1653

1 been provided in the back where the handouts are, or
2 you may submit your comments on your own letterhead
3 or paper.

4 The procedures that I'm going to use for
5 tonight are to call on those people who have signed
6 up in advance OF this meeting at the times -- as
7 close as possible at the times at which they've
8 requested to speak. In addition, some of you signed
9 since you came here and I'll be calling on you in the
10 order that you signed up.

11 If at any point you decided that you'd
12 like to speak, just tell the person in the back and
13 she'll be happy to indicate to me that you would like
14 to make come comments and they'll include you in this
15 meeting.

16 The -- we have a court reporter with us,
17 Dee Johnson, whose job it is to make a verbatim
18 transcript of this meeting. In order to help her
19 prepare an accurate record, I'd ask you to say your
20 name and spell it, and also tell her your address if
21 you wish to. We'll now begin the formal position of
22 this evening's meeting. And the first speaker
23 registered is Todd Martin. After Todd Martin is Jay
24 Ward. Is Mr. Ward here? No. And after Jay is Paige
25 Knight.

943207.1654

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

TODD MARTIN

MR. MARTIN: Round three. My name is Todd Martin, and I am a staff researcher for the Hanford Education Action League. We are a citizens group based in Spokane, Washington, that does oversight activities and watchdog activities for the ongoing clean-up at Hanford.

My comments tonight center around the fact that much of this work has been done before. Over the past two years, the public, the regulators and DOE as well as its contractors have been working on an effort to rebaseline the tank waste treatment programs at Hanford.

The Technical Options Report was a document that was produced that took well over a year to produce. As a result of it, there was a reopening of negotiations with the Tri-Party Agreement. A task force of stakeholders was put together to advise on that renegotiation of the Tri-Party Agreement.

Public participation effort was phenomenal, it was done very well by the agencies, and it resulted in a renegotiated Tri-Party Agreement that has a strong regional consensus behind it, the kind of regional consensus that we need that maintains the kind of public support and

99-3207-1655

1 congressional support to keep the clean-up ongoing
2 and keep the dollars flowing.

3 This EIS has the potential to usurp and
4 undermine everything we've done up to this point.
5 And I hope it won't do that. I've been encouraged by
6 the reaction we've got from these two fellows at the
7 other meetings, and I hope that the Draft reflects
8 that.

9 In reading from the fact sheet prepared
10 for this meeting, we read: "The decisions on how to
11 safely manage, treat, store and dispose of Hanford's
12 waste will soon be made. Be a part of the process."
13 I would argue that we've been a part of the process
14 and that those decisions have been made. And now
15 it's time to go forward.

16 Also from that sheet we see that the US
17 Department of Energy and Washington Ecology are
18 beginning a process to define the best strategy for
19 safely handling and disposing of Hanford's tank
20 waste. Again, I would say this isn't the beginning
21 of the process. This is the beginning of actually
22 treating the waste. We need to start pulling the
23 waste out and treating it. Those decisions have
24 already been made.

25 In short, we don't want to reconsider the

9443207.1656

0080

1 Hanford waste vitrification plan, we don't want to
2 reconsider out grout, and we don't want to reconsider
3 advance pretreatment. We've already done that job
4 and we're ready to go forward.

5 Closure is an issue -- full tank closure
6 is an issue that's been -- has been slated to fall
7 outside of the scope of this EIS. That's something
8 that we think needs to be meaningfully evaluated as
9 soon as possible. If it's in this EIS, you'll need
10 to do it. As you guys know, some of the largest
11 doses from the tank waste treatment program will come
12 from the waste that's already in the soil in terms of
13 current projections.

14 The Tank Waste Task Force called for DOE
15 and its contractors to get on with clean-up. And our
16 question is, is this EIS going to help us get on with
17 clean-up? At the very least, it's got the potential
18 for delaying clean-up. At the worst, it's got the
19 potential for DOE doing a full end run around the
20 commitments it's made in the Tri-Party Agreement.

21 That would threaten the regional
22 consensus I talked about that we have behind this
23 clean-up, and basically put everybody out of a job
24 except the folks who are building the fence that's
25 going to go around the Hanford Reservation when the

943207.1657

1 dollars dry up.

2 So what we're asking for is that you all
3 do this EIS in such a way as not to affect the
4 schedule of the current Tri-Party Agreement, not to
5 affect the activities that are prescribed in the
6 current Tri-Party Agreement, but to take the
7 preferred alternative, the one that many of the folks
8 here worked very hard on, and flesh out those
9 impacts, figure out what the impacts are going to be,
10 and then go forward on the -- on the prescribed
11 schedule.

12 How am I doing, Alinda?

13 MS. PAGE: You're doing great.

14 MR. MARTIN: What does that mean?

15 MS. PAGE: We don't have very many
16 speakers so I'm being fairly loose.

17 MR. MARTIN: Okay, good.

18 New Tank EIS. HEAL called over two years
19 ago for the new tanks that were proposed to be built,
20 that an Environmental Impact Statement be done on
21 those new tanks. What we wanted to see was
22 justification for how many tanks needed to be built,
23 what was going to be done with those tanks when they
24 were built, and what was going to be done with them
25 when they were -- when we were done with them, how

9443207.1658

1 would they be disposed of. That's what the questions
2 this EIS is -- is purportedly going to answer.

3 And I want you guys to pay particular
4 attention to what will they be used for, is there
5 going to be any pretreatment in them, and exactly how
6 much space is needed. That needs to be very clearly
7 justified, because that's -- those are the numbers we
8 haven't seen yet.

9 Understandably, they're based on
10 assumptions that shift and change every other day.
11 But still, you know, we can take those caveats. We
12 still need some numbers to understand exactly how
13 many tanks are needed to justify the six that are
14 going to be built.

15 Like I said last night, I think Don's
16 presentation is pretty decent. I think he does a
17 good job of laying out the environmental impacts that
18 are going to be considered in this EIS. Oftentimes,
19 those environmental impacts aren't put forward in
20 very straightforward English and nobody understands
21 what the official is talking about. But in this
22 case, we do.

23 And in the question do we have any other
24 impacts to add, I don't because I think they've done
25 a pretty decent job. But what I do want to say is

943207.659

1 that if you take every one of those impacts from the
2 public health impacts to the environmental health and
3 safety impacts to the socioeconomic impacts, if this
4 EIS isn't conducted in such a way as to support the
5 Tri-Party Agreement and not do an end run around it,
6 all of those impacts will be experienced at least
7 tenfold.

8 Socioeconomic impacts, these guys will be
9 out of a job because the dollars will dry up; the
10 Tri Cities' economy will dry up; the environmental
11 impacts from continuing burping and leaking tanks,
12 public health impacts from the same. That's
13 unacceptable. I think the bulk of the Northwest is
14 looking at the Tri-Party Agreement we have now as the
15 last chance. We've renegotiated it several times;
16 finally we have one everybody can agree on. If we
17 don't make progress this time, it's over.

18 Another -- just to wrap up, commenting on
19 the turnout. I think -- I mean, we've had a poor
20 turnout at every one of these things so far. And I
21 don't think that's a direct reflection on you all.
22 What I think that is a reflection of is the fact that
23 we have done this before. There -- over the summer
24 there was multitudes of tank meetings with exactly
25 the same issues on the table, put forth in exactly

9413207.1660

1 the same way. And I've talked to folks who said,
2 "I'm not going, I thought we already did that."

3 So don't think this is representative of
4 a public that doesn't care, nor is it representative
5 that you guys aren't doing a good job in getting the
6 word out that these meetings are ongoing. It's
7 representative of folks who have had it with studying
8 this any more and are ready to go forward.

9 I will submit a HEAL fact sheet as my
10 written comments tonight. And I will be sending
11 written comments off within the next two weeks. And
12 I would also like to say that I hope that these
13 scoping meetings aren't the last opportunity for you
14 all to get scoping comments and to get feedback on
15 your work.

16 I'm available at HEAL at any time if you
17 need to call somebody and say, "You said this in the
18 scoping meeting. What did you mean? Does this meet
19 your needs?" And if it's not going to meet my needs
20 and you know that, call me and tell me, "This is
21 where we're not meeting your needs and this is why."
22 I think everybody is willing to continue a good
23 dialogue here, and that's what these scoping meetings
24 are kicking off and I hope that continues.

25 So that's it. See you in Seattle.

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

MS. PAGE: Thank you. We'll submit for
the record Portland Exhibit Number 2 from Todd
Martin, HEAL Action Memo Newsletter.

Next speaker registered is Jay Ward. Is
Mr. Ward here? No. Okay. Paige Knight.

943207-662

1

PAIGE KNIGHT

2

MS. KNIGHT: I'm Paige Knight from

3

Hanford Watch here in Portland, Oregon, a citizens

4

group that is -- has been participating in the I

5

guess recent decisions or hopeful decisions up at

6

Hanford. And I was one of the people that Todd

7

referred to that participated this past summer on the

8

Tank Waste Task Force remediation thing.

9

I have actually just sort of a series of

10

observations and comments. They're not in a real

11

necessarily cohesive form, so I'll just go with it

12

from there.

13

I want to start out with sort of

14

recounting an observation that Elizabeth Furse's aide

15

Ann Richardson made after a recent tour up to

16

Hanford. Most people I don't think realize the

17

immensity of what we're dealing with until they visit

18

one of the nuclear weapons complexes.

19

And I'm finding out that the more of them

20

you visit, the more stunning the whole thing is and

21

the more overwhelming the clean-up looks; especially

22

when you stop to think that the production really

23

hasn't ended and that nuclear weapons are still being

24

designed as we speak, which means more waste is being

25

created to continue flooding our environment in -- in

99-207-665

1 all ways possible.

2 Ann Richardson's comments were that she
3 was impressed with the immensity of Hanford and
4 stunned by the lack of evidence that -- that anything
5 had happened with the \$1.7 billion times I believe
6 five years that had gone into Hanford. So those are
7 some -- some things that I think need to be taken
8 into consideration; especially if you put them, you
9 know, into the context of some of Todd's comments
10 current -- that he made just moments ago about the
11 fact that if we don't get on with clean-up, which was
12 the main message from the Tank Waste Task Force this
13 summer, that we are going to have no dollars for
14 clean-up.

15 And there is a debate out there among
16 citizens, some of whom think that the dollars are a
17 waste and that the funds should be dried up and put a
18 fence around the place and stop it. And I think the
19 cynicism indicates that we do have to get on with
20 it.

21 My -- I feel that the length of the
22 process that's being described in this whole round of
23 hearings is -- is very disturbing because of that, we
24 need to get on with the clean-up. And I think we can
25 study ourselves to death, and this gives me that

99-207-664

1 sinking feeling that we're doing it one more time.

2 So my question is why are we
3 reconsidering this yet once again. And I will not
4 reiterate Todd's comments, he said them quite well.
5 Let's get on with the clean-up.

6 I have some concerns that I hope are
7 taken into serious consideration about the future
8 effects of the clean-up. And maybe the -- I always
9 use the word "clean-up" in quotes because I don't
10 think that it's possible, personally, that we ever
11 totally clean up of this environment, the damage is
12 too great.

13 I was talking with Dirk Dunning from the
14 Oregon Department of Energy yesterday morning, I
15 believe. And he was talking a little bit about his
16 concerns. And he's going to speak to us later on
17 tonight when he gets here, hopefully. For example,
18 the neptunium 237 that is in the tanks that we're
19 talking about, the 177 tanks. I don't know if it's
20 in all of them, but I would venture to say there are
21 some amounts in a great many of them.

22 And he was talking to me. And I'm a
23 regular citizen; I'm not a physicist, I'm not a
24 chemist, and you know, I don't always get math. So
25 this is putting it in some terms that make it sort of

9443207-1665

1 awesome and understandable to me and worrisome. If
2 we do not get the neptunium 237 not only out of the
3 tanks but out of the ground around the tanks after we
4 supposedly clean up the tanks, we have a health risk
5 that is not going to slow down because of the
6 half-life of neptunium, which is 2.14 million years.
7 That's just a half-life. That it's a very harmful
8 radionuclide. This risk becomes greater and greater
9 over years.

10 And one of the things that has caused me
11 I think to be such an active critic and hopefully an
12 active solution builder in this whole Hanford process
13 is that I am really concerned about the future
14 generations. And you're going to hear that from me
15 everywhere I go and it may get really boring. But we
16 can't think of just our lifetimes; we really have to
17 think about what we're leaving the planet in the
18 next -- in the lifetime of our children, in the
19 lifetime of our grandchildren and our great
20 grandchildren, and I say and on and on.

21 And just looking at the neptunium 237
22 that is such a problem in the tanks, the health risks
23 here, when the Department of Energy and Westinghouse
24 and various people start talking to us about health
25 risks and how we're just -- we're really trying to

999 207 666

0090

1 minimize the health risks, what I keep hearing is
2 that somebody out there is deciding that they can say
3 so many people can die of cancer and it's okay.

4 And with neptunium, as the years go on --
5 Let me see, I think the normal health risks that's
6 within, you know, most standards is that three or
7 four people out of 10,000 will get cancer. And with
8 neptunium, it goes down to something like 300,000
9 cancer deaths in the general population from the
10 Columbia River alone, once all of this neptunium gets
11 into the Columbia River.

12 And we're talking about you have a one
13 percent chance of getting cancer. And a one percent
14 chance is far greater than, you know, I might be the
15 third person out of 10,000 to get cancer. So you
16 know, I just sort of look at that and think who has
17 the wherewithal to tell me that they can decide how
18 many people can get cancer because of the lack of
19 money or whatever, or the, you know, lack of
20 expediency in this clean-up.

21 So those are some of the things that I'm
22 looking at, and that our group is looking at as we
23 try to give decent input to this whole process. And
24 I will say, I don't necessarily want the money to dry
25 up. But if clean-up goes nowhere, I'm not going to

9443207.667

0091

1 want my taxes spent for nothing except to keep a few
2 people in fat pockets. That's certainly not going to
3 benefit me or future generations at all. So we're
4 concerned about that.

5 I also would like to reiterate something
6 that Todd was saying about the closure of the tank
7 farms. I think that that whole looking at the
8 closure of the tank farms in 20 -- or 2028, although
9 it seems like sort of a mystical number out there -
10 Am I even going to be alive in 2028 - we have to
11 consider the fact that if we don't start planning for
12 the closure of the tank farms now, I think it's going
13 to make us do a lousier job of clean-up in the long
14 run; that you have to have the end picture in mind
15 there, and the end picture is health and safety of
16 the country and health and safety of the Columbia
17 River.

18 And that planning has to begin now so
19 that you are doing what you can do now. But I don't
20 think at the same time that we have to plan ourselves
21 to death and not do some action now. I would like to
22 see the tanks -- the wastes start being taken out of
23 the tanks and pretreated and, you know, analyzed or
24 whatever you need to do. But something has to happen
25 now.

8991-2026-16

1 What I'm looking at the time tables of
2 the -- you know, the newly signed Tri-Party
3 Agreement, I'm still looking at, gees, in 1998 we
4 might have a sample of what's coming out of the tanks
5 and what are we going to do about it. So I -- I just
6 think my most important message to you is get on with
7 it. Cut the BS sort of or cut the process.

8 And I know you're going to get hung from
9 some people for cutting the process too short, and
10 some of us are telling you, you know, make it longer,
11 whatever. We have to get on with it. We have done
12 enough public input on this and we've done enough so
13 that we can start getting some work going on this
14 whole matter. So thank you.

15 MS. PAGE: Thank you. Are there other
16 people who wish to speak at this time?

17 Do you want to make a formal comment? If
18 you'd state your name and spell it, since we don't
19 have you signed up.

20 MR. TEWKSBURY: My name is Ross Tewksbury,
21 T E W K S B U R Y. And do you need my address?

22 MS. PAGE: Excuse me?

23 MR. TEWKSBURY: Do you need my address?

24 MS. PAGE: Only if you want to give it.

25 MR. TEWKSBURY: Oh, all right.

1

ROSS TEWKSBURY

2

MR. TEWKSBURY: First of all, I really have to disagree with one of the comments that was made earlier about the publicizing the public meetings, because I think that that really is one of the main reasons why there's not more people here.

3

4

5

6

7

Because sometimes there's -- Now see, I'm not talking about people that, you know, work for HEAL or work for Heart of America or organizations that are intimately involved in this and it's their job to keep up on these things and keep track of them.

8

9

10

11

12

13

I'm talking about your average person doesn't have a lot of time to do that, or people even that are pretty interested in it, like me, but still only has a limited amount of time to do these things. Because once in a while you'll see advertisements in the paper. And I'm on the mailing list so I get a lot of the advertisements.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But I really think that there should be more public announcements in various types of newspapers and in radio stations and TV stations about meetings. Because otherwise, it just really limits the whole public exposure. Because most the people that go to meetings are the people that are

1 mostly interested in them. But I think more people
2 ought to become involved, people that don't know that
3 much about it, and get more and more people
4 involved.

5 I think there should be a calendar of all
6 the meetings that's issued at least monthly from
7 whatever source, because there's lots of sources.
8 And a couple days ago, I called up to find out about
9 this meeting to make sure exactly when and where it
10 was. It's hard for me to keep track of it. And
11 today, I tried confirming that with various other
12 places.

13 I called the BPA, they didn't even know
14 about this meeting. I called the public affairs
15 office in Richland, they didn't know anything about
16 it. They tried transferring me to people that work
17 in your section somewhere, who weren't available
18 anyway. So if I had depended on that, I wouldn't
19 have found out anything. So I just showed up because
20 I figured it probably was going to be tonight. Now,
21 I think it's really a communications problem there.

22 Now, this whole operation seems to
23 fluctuate back and forth between a tendency to just
24 rush through the cleaning up any old way just to get
25 it over with to show some progress, such as in the

94-3207-1671

1 section about using surrounding lands and excess
2 lands for other purposes, and the other extreme of
3 stretching everything out as long as possible, which
4 I think is in order to milk more billions out of the
5 government process for cleaning things up. And I
6 really think it's got to -- got to find a in-between
7 of those two streams. Because a lot of these
8 proposals I read about always seem to fit into one or
9 the other.

10 I think that the plan's main goal must be
11 to have zero releases of radioactive or other toxic
12 contamination, whether it's in the air, water or the
13 ground. And that's got to be the -- the number one
14 goal in whatever way that it's chosen to do. And
15 there shouldn't be any exceptions to that.

16 I think that the plan has to be put in --
17 planning for the longest term possible, and it also
18 should be made as easy as possible to go back in and
19 fix later or clean up later, as we are now having to
20 do after 20, 30, 40 years of what was done
21 previously.

22 Well, we're going to have to do that
23 again, because that's inevitable in the future.
24 Because the future in this case is, at least as far
25 as we know at this point, is going to be for

943207.1672

0096

1 thousands of years in one form or another form of
2 dealing with this stuff.

3 I think that the designs of, for example,
4 the new tanks, they have to be designed so that at
5 some point in the future they can be dismantled with
6 less contamination. And we're -- the -- the way
7 they're designed I really think should be made in
8 such a way that the contamination from the radiation
9 is limited as much as possible.

10 Because the tanks they have now, the
11 walls are contaminated, the floors, the ceiling, the
12 whole thing is contaminated. The ground, you know,
13 around a lot of the ones that are leaking is
14 contaminated, and everything that touches it is, you
15 know, contaminated, including the clothing of the
16 workers, the tools that they use to work with it.

17 So the design has to be so that it
18 minimizes whatever the tools are, the methods of
19 working are. And the contact with the radioactive
20 material should be just limited, you know, as much as
21 possible, whether there's some kind of a binder you
22 can use in the tank to keep the stuff from contacting
23 the walls of the tank or whatever the method is.
24 Because I'm not a, you know, engineer or scientist.
25 But whatever the method is, it really -- I think

94-3207-1673

0097

1 should take that into account. Because it wasn't
2 done in the past, and now it's tremendously more
3 expensive and costly in dealing with it.

4 And I think that's -- that's about all.

5 MS. PAGE: Thank you.

6 Are there other people who wish to speak
7 at this time? No? Then we will recess the meeting
8 until someone comes who would like to speak.

9 [Meeting recessed at 7:26 p.m.]

10 MS. PAGE: The meeting is adjourned.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

9413207-1674

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**