

START

0036063

61

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

HANFORD TANK WASTE REMEDIATION SYSTEM

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY

FEBRUARY 24, 1994

SPOKANE CONVENTION CENTER

SPOKANE FALLS BOULEVARD

SPOKANE, WASHINGTON

BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES
Certified Shorthand Reporters
N. 910 Pierce Road
Spokane, Washington 99206
(509) 456-0586 - (800) 358-2345



00000000

START

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**



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

PANEL MEMBERS:

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

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

MODERATOR:

VICKIE KING
Triangle Associates
Seattle, WA

943207-763

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:

MORNING SESSION:

VICKIE KING	4
GEOFF TALLENT	10
DON ALEXANDER	16
THERESA POTTS	30
TERRY HENDRICKSON	32

EVENING SESSION:

VICKIE KING	33
GEOFF TALLENT	39
DON ALEXANDER	45
CHARLEY MILLER	58

947307-1764

1 VICKIE KING: I would like to
2 formally commence today's public meeting. Welcome
3 on behalf of U.S. Department of Energy and the
4 Washington State Department of Ecology.

5 Today's scoping meeting is officially
6 designated the Spokane public scoping meeting for
7 two proposed Environmental Impact Statements at the
8 Hanford Site in Richland, Washington.

9 One EIS will address the proposed Tank
10 Waste Remediation System activities, and the second
11 will address the proposed construction of six new
12 safety tanks for the storage of high-level
13 radioactive waste as an interim action to the Tank
14 Waste Remediation System Environmental Impact
15 Statements.

16 This meeting is being held on the 24th
17 day of February, 1994, at the Spokane Convention
18 Center, Spokane, Washington, and we're commencing
19 at 1:00 p.m.

20 Today's meeting is the fifth of five
21 being held in Washington and Oregon during the
22 month of February.

23 Today's schedule calls for the
24 afternoon session to last until 4:30 p.m., at which
25 time we will recess for a dinner break. The

927-272-116

1 evening session will commence at 6:30 with a repeat
2 of the opening remarks and a review of the meeting
3 procedures. Tonight's meeting is scheduled to
4 adjourn at 10:00 p.m.

5 My name is Vickie King. I'm a
6 professional facilitator; I work at Triangle
7 Associates. I've been asked by the Department of
8 Energy and Washington State Department of Ecology
9 to conduct this scoping meeting. My job is to
10 ensure that all individuals and organizations here
11 today who wish to comment on the scope of the
12 upcoming Environmental Impact Statements have a
13 fair and equal opportunity to do so in keeping with
14 both the letter and spirit of the National
15 Environmental Policy Act and the State
16 Environmental Policy Act.

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

9921-2078116

1 requires that the public be provided opportunities
2 to comment during preparation of the Environmental
3 Impact Statement.

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

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

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

24 Because the National Environmental
25 Policy Act and the Washington State Environmental

9413207-1767

9413207-176B
1 Policy Act are very comparable in their purpose,
2 intent and procedure, the State of Washington
3 Department of Ecology and the United States
4 Department of Energy have decided to jointly
5 prepare one Environmental Impact Statement for each
6 of the two proposed actions, addressing the
7 requirements of both SEPA and NEPA in a single
8 document. That is, a single EIS will address the
9 Tank Waste Remediation issues and a single yet
10 different EIS will address the proposed
11 construction of six new safety tanks.

12 On Friday, January 28th, 1994, the
13 Department of Energy published a notice of intent
14 in the Federal Register, announcing its intent to
15 prepare these two Environmental Impact
16 Statements. On the same day, January 28th, 1994,
17 the Washington State Department of Ecology
18 determined that a SEPA EIS was required for these
19 two proposals.

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

1 Statements.

2 The format for today's meeting has been
3 designed to give as many people as possible the
4 opportunity to participate, including those who do
5 not wish to make formal comments. We will take
6 formal comments throughout the time schedule for
7 today's meeting.

8 Concurrently, there's information
9 available in the foyer from U.S. Department of
10 Energy and Washington State Department of Ecology
11 Staff, as well as Staff from Westinghouse, Hanford
12 Company and Pacific Northwest Laboratory.
13 Individuals from these organizations will be
14 available between 1:00 p.m. and 4:30 p.m. today and
15 6:30 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. this evening to answer any
16 questions that you may have.

17 A verbatim transcript will be made of
18 all oral comments received in the formal comment
19 period of this and the other four scoping meetings
20 and will be included in the U.S. Department of
21 Energy's and the Washington State Department of
22 Ecology's records of these proceedings.

23 The Department of Energy and the
24 Department of Ecology will make the transcripts
25 from all five scoping meetings available at

697 076 16
993207 1769

1 information locations located throughout Washington
2 and Oregon as soon as possible.

3 After they have reviewed all the formal
4 comments received at the scoping meetings and the
5 written comments that are submitted during the
6 scoping comment period, the two departments, the
7 Washington State Department of Ecology and U.S.
8 Department of Energy will then jointly prepare two
9 Draft Environmental Impact Statements.

10 When each draft EIS is available, the
11 public will once again have an opportunity to
12 participate in this effort by submitting comments
13 on the Draft EIS. The two Draft EISEs will be
14 prepared on different schedules. The Draft EIS for
15 the six new safety tanks is scheduled to be
16 available later this year. The Draft EIS for the
17 Tank Waste Remediation Program is scheduled to be
18 available in 1995.

19 I would like now to introduce
20 Dr. Donald Alexander, the Department of Energy's
21 Richland office, Tank Waste Remediation System
22 Program office. Dr. Alexander will make a brief
23 presentation on the proposed six new safety tanks
24 and the Tank Waste Remediation System program.

25 Geoff Tallent of the Department of

9443207.770

1 Ecology is late getting to the meeting, and I
2 believe Dr. Alexander will give his presentation as
3 well. If Mr. Tallent arrives in time, he'll do
4 that. I guess at this point I'd like to ask
5 Dr. Alexander to come up.

6 Geoff Tallent has just arrived so they
7 will give the presentations as originally planned,
8 with Mr. Tallent speaking first and Dr. Alexander
9 speaking next.

10 GEOFF TALLENT: Good afternoon.
11 My name is Geoff Tallent with the Department of
12 Ecology. The U.S. DOE or U.S. Department of Energy
13 and Ecology are using an innovative approach to
14 reviewing the environmental impacts of the TWRS
15 program by combining the requirements of NEPA and
16 SEPA. The two agencies expect ourselves and the
17 public to realize several benefits from combining
18 these processes.

19 The U.S. DOE and Ecology have prepared
20 a Memorandum of Understanding which is available in
21 the materials outside, which outlines how the two
22 agencies will work together to streamline the NEPA
23 and SEPA compliance process, to allow for a joint
24 NEPA and SEPA document, accelerate the process by
25 consolidating meetings, mandatory processes and

9413207.1771

1 documents, and provide a mechanism to expedite
2 resolution of comments and issues.

3 The two agencies expect to realize
4 several benefits from combining the two
5 processes. I'll run through some of them. First,
6 combining streamline to the environmental review.
7 Instead of taking a separate, fragmented and
8 sequential approach, Ecology and U.S. DOE are
9 anticipating folding their NEPA and SEPA
10 requirements together and meeting them all up
11 front. This will avoid duplicate and time
12 consuming public reviews in the future.

13 Second, NEPA and SEPA are very similar
14 in intent as well as process. The Washington State
15 law was modeled after the federal law and has no
16 differences which would prevent the two processes
17 from being combined. In fact, both laws encourage
18 integration with their counterparts. Ecology and
19 U.S. DOE believe that the combined effort will
20 result in a better process for environmental
21 review.

22 Third, in combining the documents, the
23 two agencies expect to be able to save time and
24 money. The two processes each require extensive
25 public involvement, careful study in the

9443207.772

1 preparation of several documents. By only doing
2 these once, we will clearly realize the savings.

3 Fourth, by working as equal partners,
4 Ecology and U.S. DOE must agree on everything in
5 both of the EISSs. The two agencies will eliminate
6 the possibility of debating over conflicting
7 decisions later on, and instead will identify and
8 resolve differences early and cooperatively.

9 Finally, and most importantly, nothing
10 is lost in the combined effort. Ecology and U.S.
11 DOE will continue to maintain full independent
12 authority over their respective requirements.
13 This means both NEPA and SEPA must be completely
14 followed to the satisfaction of each agency.
15 Additionally, no part of either NEPA or SEPA will
16 be sacrificed in the joint EISSs. Any information
17 or opportunity for review or comment that NEPA or
18 SEPA requires will be part of the combined
19 processes.

20 Now we'll run through what you'll see
21 in both of the EISSs. The first part is the
22 statement of purpose and need for action. This
23 will explain the problem for which the proposed
24 actions are being studied. In these cases, the
25 purpose is the need to resolve tank safety

91122-773

1 issues.

2 The second part, the description of
3 alternatives, will describe the actions the
4 agencies propose to take and compare those actions
5 with alternative means to resolve the tank safety
6 issues. For these EISs the preferred alternative
7 will follow the processes laid out in the Tri-Party
8 agreement. Other alternatives will also be
9 examined. One reason why we are here this
10 afternoon is to find out from you what alternatives
11 we should look at.

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

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

23 In describing the environment, the EIS
24 will look at three aspects: first, the human
25 environment, which looks at such things as

42207.774

1 potentially impacted populations and areas of
2 historical significance; second, the biological
3 environment, which looks at such things as
4 potentially impacted plant and animal species; and
5 third, the physical environment which will describe
6 such areas as geology and ground and surface
7 waters.

8 The third parts of both EISS will
9 examine the environmental impacts of the proposed
10 action and alternatives. This will look at impacts
11 to the human environment, such as impacts on jobs
12 and disturbance of historic areas. It will also
13 look at potential health risks from such things as
14 radioactive releases to both Hanford workers and
15 the offsite public. The impacts section will
16 thirdly look at possible impacts to the ecosystem
17 such as endangering plant or animal species or
18 interfering with migrations.

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

25 As with the alternatives, we are here

9413207.1775

1 to hear your comments on what the analysis of the
2 impacts of the environment should include and what
3 possible mitigation measures should be considered.

4 To conclude my presentation, I'll take
5 you through the proposed schedule for the two
6 EISs. First, a Notice of Intent to prepare the
7 EISs was published in the Federal Register and
8 corresponding Washington State SEPA Register on
9 January 28th. Those notices began the scoping
10 process for which we are holding this meeting this
11 afternoon. Comments on the scope of either EIS
12 will be due March 15th.

13 At that time the path of the two EISs
14 will split. For the New Tanks EIS, an
15 implementation plan should be prepared by the two
16 agencies by April 15th. The implementation plan
17 will lay out the schedule for completion and scope
18 of the New Tanks EIS. The Draft EIS will follow in
19 June, at which time there will be a 45-day public
20 review and comment period. After that, the two
21 agencies expect to have a final EIS out by August
22 of this year and a final decision by September.

23 The TWRS EIS will be ready in June of
24 this year, but it will take until August of next
25 year to assemble all the information for the Draft

9413207.1776

1 EIS. After a 45-day comment period a final TWRS
2 EIS should be ready by April of 1996, with a final
3 decision by May of that year.

4 There's also a third schedule as you
5 see on the overhead up there, an accelerated
6 schedule. The two agencies hope as a result of the
7 combined process, to accelerate the TWRS EIS. If
8 that is successful, a TWRS final decision could be
9 made as soon as June of 1995.

10 This concludes my portion of the
11 presentation. If you have any questions about SEPA
12 or NEPA or the processes the two agencies intend to
13 use in preparing these EISs, please ask me during
14 the informal question and answer period or contact
15 me, Geoff Tallent, at (206) 407-7112.

16 Next will be Don Alexander to describe
17 the proposed Tank Waste Remediation System and New
18 Double Shell Tanks.

19 DON ALEXANDER: Thank you, Geoff,
20 for coming.

21 With an urgency in the 1940s to give
22 the United States a weapons advantage, many of the
23 actions were taken without consideration for the
24 environment and were unregulated at that time with
25 respect to the environment. As a result, there is

9413207.1777

94-3207-1778

1 a massive legacy resulting from those actions, of
2 waste stored in 177 tanks, 67 of which are
3 considered to be leaking and others which have a
4 potential for leaking.

5 The National Environmental Policy Act
6 was enacted in 1969 to assure that in the future
7 any major Federal proposed actions, such as a major
8 construction project, especially those involving
9 radioactive wastes, be analytically evaluated.
10 NEPA requires that the Federal agency complete
11 three types of analyses. Before I go to those
12 three analyses, we're going to talk to this slide
13 for a moment.

14 As you see on the right-hand side,
15 there are a number of bullets that I want to point
16 your attention to. With regard to the
17 single-shelled tanks, there are 149 tanks that were
18 constructed between 1943 and 1966 during the Cold
19 War. And in those tanks we have 55,000 to one-
20 million gallon contents, with regard to their
21 contents. We have a total of about 36 million
22 gallons of that waste in those tanks, and as said
23 earlier, 67 of those are leaking, known to be
24 leaking now.

25 We also have constructed more recently

1 double-shelled tanks to assure that we would
2 prevents leaks in the future. 28 of those tanks
3 were constructed between 1968 and 1986. None of
4 those are leaking today. The schematic on the left
5 is an example of the kind of tank that we will be
6 talking about today, and it's the double-shelled
7 design.

8 As I said, there were three types of
9 analyses that were required to do as a part of the
10 National Environmental Policy Act. The first is an
11 analysis of the environmental impacts of the
12 proposed action. The second is an analysis for
13 impacts of alternative design solutions to the
14 proposed action, and finally, the proposed and
15 alternative actions are to be compared to the
16 environmental implications of doing nothing or
17 taking no action.

18 The alternatives that we'll discuss
19 today have been presented in public meetings over
20 the past year involving the Tri-Party Agreement.
21 It was in that process that some were dismissed.
22 Grout was a notable alternative among those
23 dismissed.

24 Although the Department of Energy had
25 alternatives as announced in the Hanford Defense

9413207-1779

1 Waste Environmental Impact Statement as late as
2 1988, the Tri-Party Agreement was essential in
3 aiding the Department in formulating the current
4 proposed actions. Once the Tri-Party Agreement was
5 signed on January 25th of this year, the notice of
6 intent was immediately issued with the proposed
7 actions on January 28th.

8 The Department of Energy, the State and
9 the EPA are committed to the Tri-Party Agreement
10 and achieving the milestones agreed to therein.
11 We're also committed to evaluating the
12 environmental impacts of the proposed actions so
13 that we can make wise decisions which will reduce
14 risk to our workers, the public and the environment
15 as we proceed.

16 In the next few minutes I'll give you
17 an overview of the two proposed actions to be
18 discussed in the meeting today and I'll tell you
19 how you can contribute to this part of the
20 process.

21 DOE and Ecology are recommending two
22 proposed actions. The first is to construct six
23 new waste storage tanks and the second is to
24 retrieve, treat, immobilize, store and dispose of
25 radioactive waste from 177 storage tanks. The

9473207.1780

1 agencies are requesting comments and
2 recommendations from the public with regard to
3 alternatives to be analyzed and additional
4 environmental issues that we should consider.

5 This is a map of the Hanford Site. It
6 shows the Columbia River running through the Site.
7 It shows some of the locations along the river of
8 some of the reactors at that Site. And in the
9 center it shows the 200 areas where the proposed
10 actions would be taken. And we'll be talking a
11 little bit about the 200 West and the 200 East
12 areas. This is the location where I work.

13 This is a schematic that illustrates
14 the two proposed actions that we'll be talking
15 about. On the left-hand side of the slide it shows
16 that we would immediately remove radioactive waste
17 contents from tanks with dangerous emissions of
18 ignitable gas to safer storage. There are three
19 tanks of concern: 101SY, 103SY, 104AN. And the
20 contents of those tanks are being proposed to be
21 moved into the six new storage tanks.

22 On the right-hand side of the slide, we
23 propose to permanently retrieve, treat, immobilize,
24 store and dispose of the contents of the 177 tanks
25 plus the contents of these new tanks.

9413207.1781

1 The two preferred alternatives are
2 embodied in the newly signed Tri-Party agreement
3 and are currently being implemented. The National
4 Environmental Policy Act and the State
5 Environmental Policy Act will evaluate the
6 preferred and reasonable alternatives and assess
7 potential environmental consequences.

8 The environmental consequences will be
9 considered with regard to safety, cost, schedule
10 and public review.

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

18 This is the first of the two proposed
19 actions. In the Tri-Party Agreement, we agree to
20 build six tanks to eliminate immediate safety
21 concerns. And in this drawing, then, we illustrate
22 that we would operate it with modern safety
23 controls that are not part of some of the old
24 tanks. And these new controls would include mixer
25 and retrieval pumps to reduce gas build-up, liquid

9413207.1782

1 and gas sampling systems to sample the contents of
2 the tank, improve ventilation systems and improve
3 tank integrity monitoring.

4 The Tri-Party Agreement action is then
5 to construct six new waste storage tanks. We are
6 required by law to evaluate other alternatives to
7 assure that we adequately consider the
8 environmental impacts of constructing these six
9 tanks.

10 One option, of course, is to construct
11 fewer tanks and rely on other methods to mitigate
12 safety issues. However, the we were to choose no
13 action whatsoever, we would not mitigate or resolve
14 the safety issues. But as I said earlier, this
15 alternative is required by law and provides the
16 basis for comparison of how well we'll do when we
17 construct these six tanks, in alleviating the
18 safety problems. We'd like to receive your oral or
19 written comments on other alternatives.

20 This is a technical drawing of the two
21 tanks and the support facilities that go along with
22 it. This is proposed for the 200 West area.
23 There's a similar schematic for the 200 East area.
24 The difference between the two is that in the 200
25 West area, there are two tanks supported by an

943207-783

1 enclosure and back-up facilities so that we can
2 operate the tanks in winter months or in bad
3 weather. And the other schematic indicates four
4 tanks. That would be in the 200 East area.

5 Now I'd like to give you an overview of
6 the second proposed action. In this action we
7 upgrade our current storage for safety reasons
8 retrieved from the 177 tanks, not just the three
9 that I mentioned earlier, but 177, treat,
10 immobilize, store, and safely dispose of all the
11 wastes. This program will last until the year
12 2028.

13 We're required by law to evaluate the
14 consequences of leaving the wastes where they are
15 so we can determine, again, the benefit of taking
16 the proposed action. We've agreed with the State
17 and the Environmental Protection Agency to retrieve
18 all waste by sluicing, provide minimum pretreatment
19 of wastes, vitrify high-level wastes and vitrify
20 low-level wastes, which means we would put the
21 waste in a glass form.

22 Although we prefer to retrieve waste by
23 hydraulic sluicing, we have to look at other
24 alternatives as required by law. Two additional
25 alternatives for comparison of environmental

943207.784

1 impacts include pneumatic retrieval, and the second
2 is mechanical retrieval. We prefer minimum
3 pretreatment, but we also have to look at a couple
4 of other alternatives, and so we look at no
5 pretreatment and extensive pretreatment.

6 For immobilization of high-level waste
7 we agree to vitrification. But calcination is an
8 alternative again for purposes of comparing the
9 environmental impacts. For low activity wastes we
10 prefer vitrification, which again is to put the
11 waste in a glass matrix, but we will consider other
12 solid waste forms for comparison of environmental
13 impacts. We're requesting that the public provide
14 alternatives or options to what we have presented
15 here through oral or written comments by March
16 15th.

17 The law also requires that we look at
18 environmental issues beyond the proposed actions,
19 which are typical of any class of action like those
20 that we are talking about this afternoon. This
21 slide and the next slide give a list of those kinds
22 of things that we are required to look at.

23 The first are the effects of releases
24 on the public and onsite workers from operations
25 and accidents. Second, the effects on air and

987 202 116

1 water quality and other environmental consequences
2 from operations and accidents. We'll also look at
3 effects on endangered species, archeological and
4 historical sites, unavoidable environmental
5 impacts.

6 We look at the cumulative effects of
7 all of these items and those on the next slide and
8 add them all together to look at the total impact.
9 And then we look at effects from transportation,
10 moving the waste around on site and off site,
11 effects of future decommissioning decisions,
12 socioeconomic impacts on the surrounding
13 communities, short-term use of the environment
14 versus long-term productivity, pollution prevention
15 and waste minimization, unavoidable adverse and
16 environmental impacts, irretrievable and
17 irreversible commitments of resources.

18 And as I said before, we're requesting
19 that the public provide us with written comments
20 before March 15th.

21 In summary, then, the Department of
22 Energy and the State Department of Ecology are
23 recommending two proposed actions. The first is to
24 build six new tanks, storage tanks for the purpose
25 of alleviating some immediate safety concerns. The

9413207-1786

1 second proposed action is to retrieve, treat,
2 immobilize, store and dispose of waste from 177
3 tanks plus the contents of these six proposed
4 tanks.

5 The agencies are requesting that the
6 public provide us with recommendations for
7 alternatives to be analyzed and any additional
8 environmental issues that you feel we should
9 consider. Thank you.

10 VICKIE KING: Thank you.

11 Mr. Tallent and Dr. Alexander will now serve as a
12 panel for receiving your comments. As the purpose
13 of a scoping meeting is to make a formal record of
14 the issues that you would like to see addressed in
15 the EISs, Mr. Tallent and Dr. Alexander will mainly
16 be listening for the afternoon and the evening,
17 although they may ask clarifying questions.

18 If you do have questions you would like
19 to ask, please feel free to ask other Staff who are
20 here from the Department of Energy and from the
21 Washington State Department of Ecology. They will
22 be available in the foyer as well as in the back of
23 this room.

24 You need to be aware, however, that
25 only comments you make at the microphone will be

9443207-1787

1 transcribed by the court reporter and included in
2 the transcript which will constitute the record for
3 this meeting. Therefore, if you address any issues
4 during an informal conversation that you want to
5 have considered in either Draft EIS, please
6 remember to repeat your concerns either at the
7 microphone today or in writing.

8 If any of you have written comments you
9 would like to submit to supplement your oral
10 comments, please bring it forward to me after you
11 complete your comments. Documents submitted today
12 will be formally accepted into the record for the
13 meeting in addition to transcripts of the oral
14 comments that are received.

15 If you're not ready to make comments
16 orally or the you're uncomfortable getting up to
17 speak in front of a group of people, you may also
18 submit written comments by giving them to me today
19 or by mailing them to Dr. Alexander at the
20 Department of Energy's Richland field office or to
21 Geoff Tallent at the Washington State Department of
22 Ecology. The names and addresses are available at
23 the registration table.

24 Written comments must be postmarked by
25 March 15th to assure use in the preparation of

947207.1788

1 these EISs. That's March 15th, 1994. Comments
2 received after that date will be accommodated as
3 practicable.

4 Written comments will be given the same
5 level of consideration by the two departments as
6 formal comments that are received at the scoping
7 meetings and copies of the comment sheets are
8 available at the registration table.

9 Now, I'd like to take a few minutes to
10 go over the procedures I will be using for taking
11 oral comments during today's meeting. First, I
12 will call each person who would like to speak. If
13 you would like to speak but have not yet signed up,
14 you can sign up with the receptionist at the
15 registration table. I will call names from the
16 sign-up sheet on a first come, first serve basis.
17 There was an opportunity to preregister to speak at
18 a certain time, but I do not believe that anyone
19 has done so.

20 If I call your name while you're out of
21 the room, don't worry, I will call it again so
22 you'll have several opportunities, if you'd like to
23 go out and ask questions and come back. Throughout
24 the day I will call, if I have two speakers at a
25 time, I will call the first person and then let the

692 227 789

1 second person know that they are up next so you can
2 be forewarned.

3 Second, please remember that comments
4 addressing issues relevant to the scope of the
5 upcoming EISs will be the most available and useful
6 to the Departments of Energy and the Washington
7 State Department of Ecology.

8 Finally, I'd like to introduce Connie
9 Thome. She is our court reporter for this meeting.
10 Her job is to transcribe verbatim the formal
11 comment portion of today's meeting.

12 In order to help her prepare a complete
13 and accurate record, I'd like to ask that you come
14 forward to the microphone after I call your name.
15 Please begin your comments by stating and spelling
16 your name and providing your mailing address. If
17 you're representing an organization today, please
18 state the name of that organization, its address
19 and the capacity in which you are its
20 representative. We will now begin the formal
21 portion of today's meeting.

22 At this point I only have a single name
23 as a speaker, so I'll get that name. Theresa Potts
24 of the Hanford Education Action League.

25 THERESA POTTS: My name is

9443207.790

1 Theresa Potts, T-h-e-r-e-s-a, P-o-t-t-s, 4103
2 Arrowhead Road, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 83814.

3 And I'm speaking for the Hanford
4 Education Action League, and our address is 1408
5 West Broadway, Spokane, Washington 99201. I'm a
6 member of the Board and have been asked to read
7 this for Hele.

8 You are planning on doing at least two
9 environmental impact statements on the plans for
10 treating and disposing of Hanford's tank wastes.
11 Hele understands DOE's legal mandate to conduct
12 such assessments, but feels that the EIS's scope is
13 seriously misguided.

14 For this to be a process which benefits
15 the cleanup, DOE must take full advantage of
16 available information. Most of the work for these
17 EISS has already been done during the long, over
18 two years, comprehensive process studying the
19 options for dealing with Hanford's tank wastes.
20 It was called a Technical Options Report. It did
21 the type of analysis DOE is proposing to do in
22 these new EISSs.

23 There is nothing to be gained and a lot
24 of time and money to lose from trying to reinvent
25 this wheel. DOE must maintain commitments to the

9413207.1791

1 Tri-Party Agreement. The new Tri-Party Agreement
2 was signed on January 25th. It was developed
3 through negotiations and an extensive public
4 participation process. The process developed a
5 strong regional consensus behind Hanford cleanup.
6 Unfortunately these EISSs have a very real
7 possibility of undoing all the hard work that has
8 gone into the Tri-Party Agreement.

9 DOE could decide, through these EISSs,
10 to pursue a tank waste program completely countered
11 to the Tri-Party Agreement. DOE must not use these
12 as an escape hatch to get out of the commitments
13 outlined in the Tri-Party Agreement.

14 DOE must get on with cleanup. At the
15 very least, these EISSs are likely to delay
16 important Tri-Party Agreement activities.
17 Schedules for removing and stabilizing tank waste
18 are seriously threatened by these EISSs. This is
19 unacceptable. DOE must not allow these EISSs to
20 delay cleanup activities. Thank you.

21 VICKIE KING: These written
22 comments will be entered as Exhibit 1 for the
23 Spokane meeting, and they were submitted by Theresa
24 Potts and they will be formally entered into the
25 record.

9443207.1792

1 Is there someone else who would like to
2 speak at this time?

3 TERRY HENDRICKSON: My name is
4 Terry Hendrickson. I was here today to bring my --

5 VICKIE KING: Terry, would you
6 mind spelling your name and giving your address?

7 TERRY HENDRICKSON: T-e-r-r-y,
8 H-e-n-d-r-i-c-k-s-o-n. I come here today for one
9 reason, to bring my child and her friend to do a
10 report for school on environment and also on
11 nuclear energy. I was concerned -- as a concerned
12 citizen, I was just curious to one point. On the
13 low-level disposal -- and I don't know if that's
14 ever been brought up before -- but if there's any
15 way that they could come up with a building that's
16 totally filtered and could burn and make it into
17 ash and make a smaller way of disposing it.

18 This is all I have for comment. Thank
19 you.

20 VICKIE KING: Is there anyone
21 else who would like to make a comment at this
22 point? We'll recess the meeting at this point and
23 go into informal session until there is someone
24 else who has indicated they would like to speak.

25 (Short recess.)

944327.1793

1 VICKIE KING: This meeting is
2 recessed until 6:30 p.m.

3 (Afternoon recess.)

4 VICKIE KING: I would like to
5 formally recommence today's public meeting.
6 Welcome on behalf of the U.S. Department of Energy
7 and the Washington State Department of Ecology.

8 This meeting is officially designed as
9 the scoping meeting, the Spokane Public Scoping
10 meeting for two proposed environmental impact
11 statements at the Hanford Site in Richland,
12 Washington.

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

20 This meeting is being held on the 24th
21 day of February, 1994, at the Spokane Convention
22 Center, Spokane, Washington. Today's meeting is
23 the fifth of five being held in Washington and
24 Oregon.

25 This evening's session is commencing at

948202-794

1 6:30 and is scheduled to adjourn at 10:00 p.m. My
2 name is Vickie King, and I'm a facilitator for
3 Triangle Associates in Seattle.

4 I have been asked by the Department of
5 Energy and the Washington State Department of
6 Ecology to conduct this scoping meeting. My job
7 is to ensure that all individuals and groups,
8 organizations here today who would like to comment
9 on the scope of the upcoming environmental impact
10 statements, have a fair and equal opportunity to do
11 so in keeping with both the letter and spirit of
12 the National Environmental Policy Act and the State
13 Environmental Policy Act.

14 The National Environmental Act of 1969,
15 which is commonly called NEPA, requires that any
16 Federal agency proposing an action that may have
17 impacts on the environment evaluate all reasonable
18 alternatives and their potential environmental
19 impact before taking such action.

20 When the projected environmental
21 impacts might be considered significant, an
22 Environmental Impact Statement or EIS must be
23 prepared. NEPA also requires that the public be
24 provided opportunities to comment during the
25 preparation of any EIS.

9413207.1795

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

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

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

23 Because the National Environmental
24 Policy Act and the Washington State Environmental
25 Policy Act are very compatible in their purpose,

9413207.796

1 intent and procedures, the State of Washington
2 Department of Ecology and the U.S. Department of
3 Energy have decided jointly to prepare one
4 Environmental Impact Statement for each of the two
5 proposed actions, addressing the requirements of
6 SEPA and NEPA in a single document.

7 That is, a single EIS will address the
8 Tank Waste Remediation System issues and a single
9 yet different EIS will address the proposed
10 construction of six new safety tanks.

11 On Friday, January 28, 1994, the
12 Department of Energy published a notice of intent
13 in the Federal Register announcing its intent to
14 prepare these two environmental impact
15 statements.

16 On the same day, January 28th, 1994,
17 the Washington State Department of Ecology
18 determined that an EIS was required for these two
19 proposals.

20 The purpose of this scoping meeting is
21 to allow each of you an opportunity to identify for
22 the record the significant issues you believe
23 should be considered by the Department of Energy
24 and the Department of Ecology in the preparation of
25 these two environmental impact statements.

9413207.1797

1 The format for today's meeting has been
2 designed to give as many people as possible the
3 opportunity to participate, including those who do
4 not wish to make formal comments. We will take
5 formal comments in this room throughout the
6 evening, throughout the time scheduled for this
7 evening, and I mentioned we start at 6:30 and
8 conclude at 10:00.

9 Concurrently there's information
10 available from the Staffs of the Department of
11 Energy and the Department of Ecology as well as
12 from the Pacific Northwest Laboratory and the
13 Westinghouse Hanford Company.

14 There is Staff in the foyer as you came
15 in. These individuals will be available between
16 6:30 and 10:00 p.m. this evening to answer
17 questions on an informal basis.

18 A verbatim transcript will be made of
19 all oral comments received in the formal comment of
20 this and the other four scoping meetings that have
21 been previously held. They will all be included in
22 the Department of Energy and Washington State
23 Department of Ecology's records of these
24 proceedings.

25 The Department of Energy and the

864-70246

1 Department of Ecology will make the transcripts
2 from all five scoping meetings available at
3 information locations located throughout Washington
4 and Oregon as soon as possible.

5 After they have reviewed all of the
6 formal comments received at the scoping meetings
7 and the written comments that are submitted during
8 the scoping comment period, the two departments,
9 that is the Department of Ecology and the
10 Department of Energy, will then jointly prepare two
11 Draft Environmental Impact Statements.

12 When each Draft EIS is available, the
13 public will once again have the opportunity to
14 participate in this effort by submitting comments
15 on the Draft EISS.

16 The two Draft EISSs will be prepared on
17 different schedules. The Draft EIS for the six new
18 safety tanks is scheduled to be available later
19 this year. The Draft EIS for the Tank Waste
20 Remediation Program is scheduled to be available in
21 1995.

22 I would like now to introduce Mr. Geoff
23 Tallent of the Washington State Department of
24 Ecology, who will make a brief presentation on the
25 compatibility of SEPA and NEPA. This will be

9413207-1799

1 followed by Dr. Donald Alexander of the Department
2 of Energy's Richland field office, the Tank Waste
3 Remediation System Program office.

4 Dr. Alexander will make a brief
5 presentation on the proposed six new safety tanks
6 and the Tank Waste Remediation System Program.

7 GEOFF TALLENT: Good evening. My
8 name is Geoff Tallent with the Washington State
9 Department of Ecology. The U.S. Department of
10 Energy or U.S. DOE and Ecology are using an
11 innovative approach to reviewing the environmental
12 impacts of the TWRS program by combining the
13 requirements of NEPA and SEPA.

14 The two agencies expect ourselves and
15 the public to realize several benefits from
16 combining these processes. The U.S. DOE and
17 Ecology have prepared a Memorandum of Understanding
18 which lays out how the two agencies will work
19 together to streamline the NEPA and SEPA compliance
20 process, to allow for a joint NEPA and SEPA
21 decision document or EIS, to accelerate the process
22 by consolidating meetings, mandatory processes and
23 documents, and to provide a mechanism to expedite
24 resolution of comments and issues.

25 The two agencies expect to realize

9443207.1800

1 several benefits from combining these processes,
2 and I will run through some of those.

3 First, combining streamlines the
4 environmental review. Instead of taking a separate
5 fragmented and sequential approach, Ecology and
6 U.S. DOE are anticipating folding their NEPA and
7 SEPA requirements together and meeting them all up
8 front. This will avoid difficult and time
9 consuming public reviews in the future.

10 Second, NEPA and SEPA are very similar
11 in intent as well as process. The Washington State
12 law was modeled after the Federal law and has no
13 differences which would prevent the two processes
14 from being combined. In fact, both laws encourage
15 integration with their counterparts.

16 Ecology and U.S. DOE believe the
17 combined effort will result in a better process for
18 environmental review.

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

25 Fourth, by working as equal partners,

94327.00

1 Ecology and U.S. DOE must agree with everything in
2 the EISSs. The two agencies will eliminate the
3 possibility of debating over conflicting directions
4 later on, and instead will identify and resolve
5 differences early and cooperatively.

6 Finally and most importantly, nothing
7 is lost in this combined effort. Ecology and U.S.
8 DOE will continue to maintain full independent
9 authority over the respective requirements. This
10 means both NEPA and SEPA must be completely
11 followed to the complete satisfaction of each
12 agency.

13 Additionally, no part of either NEPA or
14 SEPA will be sacrificed in the joint EISSs. Any
15 information or opportunity for review or comment
16 that NEPA or SEPA requires, will be part of the
17 combined processes.

18 Now I'll take you through what you'll
19 see in both of the EISSs as a result of this joint
20 process. The first section of the EISSs will be the
21 statement of purpose and need for action, which
22 will explain the problem for which the proposed
23 actions are being studied.

24 In these cases, the purpose is the need
25 to resolve tank safety issues at Hanford. The

2081-07616

1 second session, the description of the
2 alternatives, will describe the actions the
3 agencies propose to take and compare those actions
4 with alternative means to resolve the tank safety
5 issues.

6 For these EISs the preferred
7 alternative will follow the processes laid out in
8 the Tri-Party Agreement. Other alternatives will
9 also be examined. One reason why we're here
10 tonight is to find out from you what alternatives
11 we should look at.

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

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

23 In describing the environment, the EISs
24 will look at three aspects. First, the human
25 environment, which looks at such things as

94327.93

1 potentially impacted populations in areas of
2 historic significance.

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

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

9 The third parts of both EISSs will
10 examine the environmental impacts of the proposed
11 action and alternatives. This will look at impacts
12 to the human environment such as impacts on jobs
13 and disturbance in historic areas. It will also
14 look at potential health risks from such things as
15 radioactive releases to both Hanford workers and
16 the offsite public.

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

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

9463207.1804

1 locations of buildings.

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

6 To conclude my presentation, I'll take
7 you through the proposed schedule for the two
8 EISs. First, a Notice of Intent to prepare the
9 EISs was published in the Federal Register and
10 corresponding Washington State SEPA Register on
11 January 28th. These notices began the scoping
12 process for which we are holding this meeting.
13 Comments on the scope of either EIS will be due by
14 March 15th. At that time the path of the two EISs
15 will split.

16 For the New Tanks EIS, an
17 implementation plan should be prepared by the two
18 agencies by April 15th. The implementation plan
19 will lay out the schedule for completion and scope
20 of the New Tanks EIS.

21 The Draft EIS will follow in June, at
22 which time there will be a 45-day public review and
23 comment period. After that, the two agencies
24 expect to have a Final EIS out by August of this
25 year and a final decision by September.

5081-1023116
9443207-1805

1 The TWRS EIS implementation plan will
2 be ready by June of this year, but will take until
3 August of next year to assemble all the information
4 for the Draft EIS.

5 After a 45-day comment period, the
6 Final TWRS EIS should be ready by April of 1996,
7 with a final decision by May of that year.

8 You can see a third schedule --
9 actually a second schedule under the TWRS
10 alternative up there, which is the agency's hope to
11 accelerate the process by combining NEPA and SEPA.

12 If that's successful, the TWRS final
13 decision should be made as soon as June of 1995.

14 This concludes my portion of the
15 presentation. If you have any questions about SEPA
16 or NEPA or the processes the two agencies intend to
17 use in preparing these two EISs, please contact me,
18 Geoff Tallent, at area code 206 407-7112.

19 Next will be Don Alexander of the
20 Department of Energy to describe what you will see
21 in these two EISs.

22 DON ALEXANDER: Thank you,
23 Geoff. This is the tenth time that Geoff and I
24 have pitched these talks, and I guess we both want
25 to extend our thanks to all the folks that have

900 202116

1 been supporting us in the areas around the State of
2 Washington and Oregon, our sound crew, Triangle
3 Associates, our court reporters, Westinghouse,
4 P & L and SAIC and others who have been supporting
5 us. We really appreciate their support.

6 With an urgency in the 1940s to give
7 the United States a weapons advantage, many of the
8 actions were taken without consideration for the
9 environment and were unregulated with respect to
10 the environment. The massive legacy of those
11 actions, the consequences that resulted, include
12 waste stored in 177 tanks, 67 of which are
13 considered to be leaking and others which have a
14 potential for leaking.

15 In this slide, we illustrate a
16 double-shelled tank on the left, and for purposes
17 of comparison, we show that there were 149
18 single-shelled tanks constructed between 1943 and
19 1966. Of those, 67 are assumed to be leaking at
20 this time, possibly more, and it involves 36
21 million gallons in total of waste.

22 The volumes of these tanks are roughly,
23 as some people pointed out at the recess this
24 morning, roughly the scale of this room filled with
25 liquid. Actually they are 35 feet tall, so they

9322.007

1 are probably a little bit taller than this room if
2 you were to stand in one, and the diameter is 75
3 feet nominally.

4 For double-shelled tanks, there were 28
5 of those that have been constructed during the
6 periods of 1968 to 1986, with a total volume of 25
7 million gallons of waste. None of those have
8 leaked.

9 The National Environmental Policy Act
10 was enacted in 1969 to assure that in the future
11 any major Federal proposed actions, such as a major
12 construction project, especially those involving
13 radioactive wastes, be analytically evaluated.
14 NEPA requires that the Federal agency complete
15 three types of analyses and weigh these in its
16 decision-making process.

17 The first is an analysis of the
18 environmental impacts of the proposed action. The
19 second is an analysis of impacts of alternative
20 design solutions to the proposed action, and
21 finally, the proposed and alternative actions are
22 to be compared to the environmental implications of
23 taking no action.

24 The alternatives under discussion today
25 have been presented in public meetings over the

9443207.1808

1 past year involving the Tri-Party Agreement. It
2 was in that process that some were dismissed.
3 Grout was a noble alternative among those
4 dismissed.

5 Although the DOE had alternatives as
6 announced in the Hanford Defense Waste EIS as late
7 as 1988, the TPA process was essential in aiding
8 the process and formulating the current proposed
9 actions. Once the Tri-Party Agreement was signed
10 on January 25th of this year, the notice of intent
11 was immediately issued with the proposed actions on
12 January 28th.

13 You need to underscore here that the
14 Department of Energy, the State and the EPA are
15 committed to the Tri-Party Agreement and achieving
16 the milestones agreed to therein. We're also
17 committed to evaluating the environmental impacts
18 of the proposed actions as required by law so that
19 we can make wise decisions which will reduce risks
20 to our workers, the public and the environment as
21 we proceed.

22 In the next few minutes I'll give you
23 an overview of the two proposed actions to be
24 discussed this afternoon and I'll tell you how you
25 can contribute to this part of the process.

9413207.1809

1 The Department of Energy and Ecology
2 are recommending two proposed actions. The first
3 of those is to construct six new waste storage
4 tanks. The second is to retrieve, treat,
5 immobilize, store and dispose of waste from 177
6 storage tanks. The agencies request
7 recommendations for all activities to be analyzed
8 and additional environmental issues to be
9 considered.

10 This is a schematic map of the Hanford
11 Site showing the river flowing through it; the
12 river runs through it. And it shows the reactors
13 that were constructed during the '40s, '50s, et
14 cetera, along the river, and it shows the 200 areas
15 that are under discussion today. I work in the 200
16 area where the tank farms are located.

17 This slide is a schematic, to get us
18 warmed up a little bit, of the two proposed
19 actions. The left side indicates that there are
20 three critical tanks that need to be retrieved, the
21 contents of which need to be retrieved to the six
22 new tanks. Those three tanks under consideration
23 are 101SY, 103SY, 104AN, all of which are
24 liberating hydrogen gas.

25 On the right side, the other proposed

99-7226-60

1 action is far broader in perspective, and it
2 involves retrieving waste from the 177 storage
3 tanks that are in the 200 area and the contents of
4 these new tanks. It also involves pretreatment,
5 immobilization of the waste, storage, and then
6 ultimate disposal of the waste.

7 The two preferred alternatives are
8 embodied in the new Tri-Party Agreement, and are
9 being implemented. NEPA and SEPA will evaluate the
10 preferred and reasonable alternatives and assess
11 potential environmental consequences.

12 Environmental consequences will be considered with
13 safety, cost, schedule, public review and other
14 concerns. If the environmental consequences
15 outweigh other considerations, then DOE, Ecology
16 and the EPA would revise specific milestones, but
17 not the end date of the TPA, which is in 2028.

18 DOE and Ecology are, as I said earlier,
19 in full compliance with the Tri-Party Agreement.
20 In the Tri-Party Agreement, we agree to build six
21 tanks as our first proposed action. This is a
22 schematic of the proposed tank, one of six to be
23 built, proposed to be built, with modern safety
24 controls, including this mixer retrieval pump kind
25 of system to reduce gas buildup. It also includes

9413207.1811

1 liquid and gas sampling systems so that we can
2 sample not only the liquid but the gas phase that
3 would be in the top part of the tank, improve
4 ventilation to reduce gas buildup and improve tank
5 integrity monitoring.

6 The Tri-Party Agreement action is to
7 construct six new waste storage tanks. And as I
8 said earlier, we're required by law, by NEPA and
9 SEPA, to evaluate other alternatives to assure that
10 we have adequately considered environmental
11 impacts.

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

19 Now what I'd like to do is cover the
20 second proposed action. In this action, we upgrade
21 our current storage for safety reasons, retrieve
22 from the 177 tanks, treat, immobilize, store and
23 safely dispose of all of the wastes.

24 In this action, as was the case in the
25 previous proposed action, we are required by law to

943207.1812

1 evaluate the consequences of leaving the wastes
2 where they are in order to provide us with a basis
3 for comparing it to the proposed action, the
4 results of the proposed action.

5 We have agreed with the State and EPA
6 to retrieve all the waste by sluicing, provide
7 minimum pretreatment of wastes, vitrify the high-
8 level waste fraction and to vitrify the low-level
9 waste fraction. As I said earlier, we also have to
10 look at options, and in the next slide, next two
11 slides, I'll be talking about options within this
12 larger system.

13 First part of the system that would be
14 considered, then, is an alternative for hydraulic
15 sluicing. There are two that we are looking at.
16 One is pneumatic retrieval, the second is
17 mechanical retrieval. But the proposed action, of
18 course, is hydraulic sluicing. Both of these will
19 be compared for purposes of evaluating impacts to
20 the environment.

21 With regard to pretreatment, then,
22 we're looking at two options. One is no
23 pretreatment at all, the second is extensive
24 pretreatment. For purposes of immobilizing the
25 high-level waste, we agree to vitrify the waste.

9413207-1813

1 But for purposes of comparing environmental
2 impacts, we are looking at other options, such as
3 calcination.

4 For low activity waste we also prefer
5 vitrification, but we will consider other solid
6 waste forms for purposes of comparing the
7 environmental impacts. And for all of these
8 options we are requesting that you provide other
9 alternatives that you think we should consider
10 through oral or written comments before March
11 15th.

12 In the next two slides what I review
13 are the environmental issues that we're required to
14 address through NEPA and SEPA. And these include
15 effects of releases on the public and onsite
16 workers from operations and accidents, effects on
17 air and water quality and other environmental
18 consequences from operations and accidents, effects
19 on endangered species, archeological and historical
20 sites, unavoidable environmental impacts,
21 cumulative effects of all of the issues on this
22 slide and the next, the effects from
23 transportation, effects of future decommissioning
24 decisions, socioeconomic impacts of surrounding
25 communities, short-term use of the environment

4191 2026 116

1 versus long-term productivity, pollution prevention
2 and waste minimization, unavoidable adverse
3 environmental impacts and irretrievable and
4 irreversible commitments of resources.

5 We are requesting that you provide
6 other alternatives through oral or written comments
7 on these issues by March 15th.

8 In summary, then, the Department of
9 Energy and Ecology are recommending two proposed
10 actions. The first is to construct six new waste
11 storage tanks for purposes of remediating an
12 immediate safety concern. The second is to
13 retrieve, treat, immobilize, store and dispose of
14 waste from 177 storage tanks.

15 The agencies request comments and
16 recommendations from you for alternatives to be
17 analyzed on both of these actions and additional
18 environmental issues that we should be considering
19 for each of these actions. Thank you.

20 VICKIE KING: Thank you.
21 Mr. Tallent and Dr. Alexander will now serve as a
22 panel for receiving comments. Because the purpose
23 of a scoping meeting is to make a formal record of
24 the issues that you would like to see addressed in
25 the EISs, Mr. Tallent and Dr. Alexander will mostly

9413207-1815

1 listen to your comments, although they may ask you
2 some clarifying questions.

3 If you do have questions you'd like to
4 ask, you are certainly invited to go outside in the
5 foyer. There are a number of people out there who
6 are knowledgeable.

7 You need to be aware, however, that
8 only comments you make at the microphone will be
9 transcribed by the court reporter and included in
10 the transcript, which will constitute the record
11 for this meeting. Therefore, if you address any
12 issues during an informal conversation that you
13 want included, considered in either Draft EISs,
14 please remember to repeat your concerns either at
15 the microphone today or in writing.

16 I encourage those of you who will be
17 speaking today to provide me with written versions
18 of your oral comments. If you have a transcript of
19 your oral comments or if you have prepared a
20 written document that you would like to submit to
21 supplement your oral comments, please bring it
22 forward to me after you complete your comments.
23 Documents submitted today will be formally accepted
24 into the record for the meeting in addition to
25 transcripts of your oral comments that are

9181-202116
943207-1816

1 refused.

2 If you're not ready to comment orally
3 or if you're uncomfortable getting up to speak in
4 front of a group of people, you may also submit
5 written comments by giving them to me today or by
6 mailing them to Dr. Alexander at DOE's Richland
7 field office or Mr. Tallent at the Department of
8 Ecology. Their names and addresses are available
9 at the registration table.

10 Written comments, as Dr. Alexander
11 said, must be postmarked by March 15th to assure
12 use in the preparation of the EISS. Comments
13 received after that date will be accommodated as
14 practicable. Written comments will be given the
15 same level of consideration as formal comments that
16 are received at the scoping meetings, and comment
17 sheets are available, also, at the registration
18 table.

19 Now, I'd like to take a few minutes to
20 go over the procedures I'll be using for taking
21 oral comments during this evening's meeting.
22 First, since there are no speakers who have
23 preregistered to speak at a specific time, I will
24 call on those who want to speak on a first come,
25 first serve basis. If you would like to speak but

9413207.1817

1 have not signed up, you can sign up with the
2 receptionist at the registration table.

3 If I call your name while you're
4 outside the room, I'll be sure and call it again so
5 you won't miss your opportunity. If there are more
6 than one speaker, I will identify two names so you
7 will have a little warning before it's your turn to
8 stand up and speak.

9 Second, please remember that comments
10 addressing issues that are relevant to the scope of
11 upcoming EISs will be the most valuable and useful
12 to these departments as they prepare these EISs.

13 Finally, I'd like to introduce Connie
14 Thome, who is the court reporter for this meeting.
15 Her job is to transcribe verbatim the formal
16 comment portion of today's meeting.

17 In order to help her prepare a complete
18 and accurate record, I'd like to ask that you come
19 forward to the microphone after I've called your
20 name. Please begin your comments by stating and
21 spelling your name and providing your mailing
22 address. If you're representing an organization
23 today, I'd appreciate it if you would state the
24 name of that organization, its address and the
25 capacity in which you are representing it.

918172616
918172616

1 And we'll begin the formal comment
2 portion of today's meeting. At this point I do not
3 have the name of anyone who would like to speak, so
4 I see several people in the audience who might like
5 to. Would someone like to make a comment at this
6 point? If you'd come up and give your name and
7 address and your organization. Thank you.

8 CHARLEY MILLER: My name is
9 Charley Miller and my address is 107 Post Office
10 Box, Rockford.

11 The question I have is -- now you're
12 the State of Washington and you're the Federal
13 Government. Now isn't this the way it's been from
14 the beginning, you guys have worked together? Has
15 the State of Washington worked with the Federal
16 Government?

17 GEOFF TALLENT: Yes. But not on
18 anything related to SEPA. We've never combined a
19 SEPA and NEPA government. Both the Federal
20 Government and the State Government have
21 environmental laws. Federal Government has the
22 National Environmental Policy Act, the State has
23 the State Environmental Policy Act. The two
24 agencies have never done a combined effort on that
25 element of Hanford cleanup before.

9413207.1819

1 CHARLEY MILLER: Don, can you
2 tell me how much radiation has been released from
3 Hanford now?

4 VICKIE KING: Excuse me,
5 Mr. Miller. Let me just ask a question. It sounds
6 like you have some questions that you'd like to
7 have answered.

8 CHARLEY MILLER: I just did. I
9 asked a question. Can you tell me, Don?

10 DON ALEXANDER: The bottom line
11 is that I really couldn't answer the question, but
12 there are folks in the back of the room that I
13 think could give you clarification on, number one,
14 radiation that's been released from the tanks. As
15 I pointed out, there are 67 tanks that are leaking.

16 CHARLEY MILLER. How much
17 radiation do you know has been --

18 DON ALEXANDER: And in terms of
19 curies, I'm not sure what it translates to, but
20 we're looking at about a million gallons of high-
21 level liquid radioactive waste. So it's a
22 significant amount.

23 CHARLEY MILLER: Can you estimate
24 how much has been released?

25 DON ALEXANDER. A million

9443207.1820

1 gallons.

2 CHARLEY MILLER: How many curies?

3 DON ALEXANDER: I couldn't

4 translate it into curies. But like I said, there

5 may be someone in the back of the room like Don

6 Woodrich, who's in the back, who may be able to

7 give you a rough estimate of the curies released.

8 But it's a million gallons, though.

9 CHARLEY MILLER: So really

10 there's going to be nobody watching the DOE here.

11 You guys are going to be working together; right?

12 The State of Washington is not going to protect the

13 State of Washington the way this is set up, and

14 that's my concern.

15 As in the past we have had over 700,000

16 curies put on us, which is a crime, which makes you

17 two criminals because you represent these two

18 organizations. Last week I buried my

19 ex-sister-in-law. She didn't smoke, she didn't

20 drink. The only thing she did was live in Connell,

21 Washington.

22 I think you guys have a responsibility

23 here. I hope you have children. We live in a very

24 dangerous area here because of your groups. And I

25 hope you really think about this.

9443207.1821

9413207-1823

1 STATE OF WASHINGTON)
 2 County of Spokane) ss.
 3)

4 I, CONNIE S. THOME, do hereby certify
 5 that at the time and place heretofore mentioned in the
 6 caption of the foregoing matter, I was a Registered
 7 Professional Reporter and Notary Public for Washington;
 8 that at said time and place I reported in stenotype all
 9 testimony adduced and proceedings had in the foregoing
 10 matter; that thereafter my notes were reduced to
 11 typewriting and that the foregoing transcript consisting
 12 of 61 typewritten pages is a true and correct transcript
 13 of all such testimony adduced and proceedings had and of
 14 the whole thereof.

15 WITNESS my hand at Spokane, Washington on
 16 this 24th day of February 1994.

17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

 CONNIE S. THOME
 Notary Public for Washington
 My Commission Expires:

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**