

with.

- PE: I am Pam Enis I am a C.P.A. I am the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility. ???
- OR: I am Owen Robertson and the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility, Project Manager for the Department of Energy.
- OR: My name is Owen Robertson, can you hear that? And I am the U.S. Department of Energy's Project Manager for the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility, commonly referred to as ERDF. Pam do you want to do it one more time?
- PE: I am Pam Enis with the US. CPA and I am the Project Manager for the ERDF.
- NH: I am Norm Hepner with the Washington State Department of Ecology. I have been working with Pam and Owen on the ERDF Project.
- MT: Good evening, I am Mike Thompson with the Department of Energy, by training I am Hydrologist for the Environmental Restoration Division there. And I have served as a lead negotiator for the Department of Energy for the Environmental Restoration refocusing negotiations.
- RS: My name is Roger Stanley and I am with the Washington Department of Ecology Nuclear Waste Program. I am the Department of Ecology's Hanford Project Manager and most recently I have been spending some time on negotiations under DOE's ER Program.
- DS: Good evening, my name is Doug Sherwood and I am the Hanford Project Manager for the Environmental Protection Agency and

their lead negotiator for the Environmental Restoration Refocusing effort.

LP: The first presentation tonight is going to be made by Doug Sherwood from the U.S. EPA and he is going to talk about the Environmental Restoration and Refocusing negotiations and the agreement that they have reached.

DS: Once again thank you for coming to tonight's meeting. I really appreciate the turn-out I think it is great. I am here to welcome you on behalf of all three parties tonight. We have decided that we are going to try shorter presentations. Hear from one of us and try not to bore you to tears with three of us getting up here and successfully discussing mostly the same stuff. But the purpose of our meeting tonight is to gather your comments on two major efforts on cleaning up the Hanford site. The Environmental Restoration Refocusing negotiations which have essentially gone for quite sometime and were really started as a result of the last set of negotiations on the tank waste remediation system that we negotiated over the summer of 1993. And the second topic is very closely related to that. It is environmental restoration and disposal facility and it is really the location where we planned to put wastes generated in cleaning up the Hanford site. So if we want accelerate, clean up and move forward with clean up at the Hanford. We really need to have a disposal facility to put our waste. And so those are the two topics we are here to discuss here this evening and to get your input on. What I would like to do briefly is go over the negotiation process, the scope of the milestones that we altered. Kind of a status of the Clean-up Program so that you can understand what are changes, what changes we have made and how they have effected the program. And then briefly a couple answers to some of the questions that we have been provided by the citizens guide that was produced by Heart of America

and other environmental groups interested in Hanford clean-up issues. And then we will move on to the ERDF presentation by Pam Enis. This negotiation process was really decided last year when the tank waste task force efforts started. During the tank waste task force effort we received a lot of input from stakeholders, tribes and other interested members of the public. Who said, we would like you to concentrate on these things, in addition to the activities that were going on to clean-up tank waste at Hanford. And once we started addressing those issues of ground water clean-up and looking at the Columbia Rive and doing a lot of those things. The Environmental Restoration Program of the Clean-up Program that we had previously outlined didn't really fit with those new initiatives and so we recognized last year that we needed to go back and take a re-look at the Environmental Restoration Program and try to scope the whole program to reflect the values that we received from the public and the stakeholders. And over the course of this negotiation process and if you will recall last July I believe we were here in Seattle to discuss our initial issues on the Environmental Restoration Program. And over the course of this year we have had a very open negotiation process where we have met with the Hanford Advisory Board, had input from the tribes on a weekly basis and discussed some of the issues with the State of Oregon as well during this negotiation process. So we have really tried to get input throughout the process rather than coming to you with the product that we have kind of decided behind closed doors. I really think this has helped our negotiations. What I would like to do now is to go briefly through the milestones that we have worked on these last few months.

NV: Oh, boy. I would say we would have to pull that one down so that they can just see the top.

DS: OK If some of you have the package on the tentative agreements for the Environmental Restoration Refocusing. I believe this is page 8 in that agreement book. The two clean-up process we are talking about are under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act or RCRA. In the CERCLA process under the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act. These are essentially the process names for how these regulations deal with past practice clean-ups. But what I would like you to concentrate on is the milestone number on the far side and this column here which is really the goal of those two process. Milestone 13 is a plan for doing the investigation. Investigating waste sites, deciding potential clean-up alternatives and evaluating them. The second part of the program covered by milestone 15 is actually doing the investigation and reaching the end of the investigations. And as an example tonight we are here gathering public comment on the proposed plan for the environmental restoration disposal facility. So this is really the end of the investigation portion for the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility. Then the agencies will issue a ??? decision and then clean-up schedules will be established once the proposed or the preferred alterative is established in the record of decision based on the proposed plan and public comment. And this is essentially the final step in the process is the remedial design and actual clean-up process. These are three of the milestones that we have addressed during the renegotiation. The other milestones ah, that we addressed were milestone M-20 which is a milestone that now as a result of these negotiations coordinates the closure of RCRA for active waste management units with the clean-up units. So if RCRA disposal site is located within an operable unit now those two activities will be addressed concurrently. And the last milestone that we dealt with in this refocusing of the Environmental Restoration Program dealt with the N-

reactor area and clean-up of the N-reactor area. This is an area where we tried to integrate clean-up under both the RCRA and CERCLA processes with the deactivation and the clean-up of the N-reactor facility itself. And you will be hearing that referred to as the N-reactor Pilot Project. What I would like to do now is go briefly through the status of the clean-up efforts, kind of by area of the Hanford site. If some of you will recall, there was an effort approximately two years ago now, it started about two years ago to look at future uses of the Hanford site and the group that worked on that was called the Hanford Future Site Uses Working Group of which I believe there were several members from the Seattle area. They divided the site into essentially six units. They are the arid lands ecology reserve. This portion of the site is all ready. The clean-up actions are complete for that area of the site. They were included in a record of decision that has all ready been issued on the 11 hundred area. The north of the river area, or the Willukie Slope as it is called. Is also an area where we have done, removed a series of removal actions to clean-up. These areas are really not effected by this renegotiation effort. The other areas of the site, the all other areas portion of the site there is some increased emphasis on cleaning up waste sites within this area. The 300 area has not really been a topic of this negotiation. Those investigations have all ready been initiated and the final ones will be initiated in December of this year the work plans will be submitted so we really haven't changed a lot of priorities in the 300 area. Where the changes have been made are in the 100 areas or the reactors along the river and the 200's. And what I would like to do is briefly describe what the major emphasis of those changes were. We really have an increased emphasis in cleaning up the hazards along the river. If you see the five sets of numbers that are on there, 100-KR2, KR3 and so on. Those are the remaining operable units or groups of waste sites that can

be assessed and characterized and remediated as a group. Those are the last set of operable units left in the 100 areas or the near river environment which we need to address. We have set schedules in this new agreement to address all of those operable units and complete the investigation by the year 2000. So we have significantly accelerated the efforts to clean-up those areas along the river. In addition we have a commitment from the Department of Energy to not only clean-up the waste sites. And why I am putting this up here is that this is an example of the waste site facilities. These are received reactors cooling water and some other waste sites. Now the commitment is not simply to clean-up the waste sites around these reactors, but it is also to clean-up the buildings and the ??? facilities here. Because in order to meet the future site uses, goals and objectives we don't only need to clean-up the waste site problem we have, we need to clean-up the facilities as well. And we think this is good progress, very important to the clean-up efforts and without this kind of a change we couldn't really meet the future site uses, goals and objectives. And we are pleased to get these commitments in our agreement. There are some facilities though that may have a long-term future use that we do not want to tear down. Let me give you an example, this area is essentially the old water treatment plant before water drew from the river was put in these basins and then run through the reactors. These are essentially clean water treatment plants. Currently those basin are being used to rear Salmon which are released in the Columbia River, in a cooperative effort between the Yakima tribes and the Department of Energy. This is a productive use of these facilities and I don't think we are going to be tearing them down during this process. If there are other productive uses we are going to look at those seriously. There are some delays as a result of these changes. They are mostly delays to clean-up activities within the 200 areas. There are some sources or

groups of waste sites in the 200 areas for which we currently don't have technology to clean them up. And these are ones which may require technologies that we are developing for other programs. For instance, if waste sites would need to have materials vitrified, we are not going to have that capability here in the very near term. That capability is not going to be coming about until the mid year 2005 and 2009. So the sense of doing those investigations now and kind of letting them set on the shelf and not deciding on how to clean them up until later is really as poor use of money now that we can use to clean-up these problems along the river. But because we are delaying those projects in the 200 area, we are concentrating our efforts in that area more vigorously on ground water clean-up and containment activities. There is also a proposed plan out for cleaning-up carbon tetrachloride contaminations which I believe there is a fact sheet on the back table dealing with that clean-up project. This is the N area, this is the N-reactor and the disposal facilities that are associated with the N-reactor. Essentially every thing here is the subject of the N-reactor pilot project. We are looking at doing some expedited response actions to install a pump and treat system to clean-up ground water contamination here at N-reactor. We are also installing a hydraulic barrier to keep the contaminated water from entering the Columbia River through what is called M-springs. There is also a rather major effort within the reactor facility to remove radio active contaminated material and get this facility in a safe and stable form for a later shut down and eventually dismantlement effort. So this is a project that includes clean-up of not only the reactor facilities but also of the wastes site and the RCRA type waste sites that are located in the N area.

NV: When you speak of the waste water and the facility are you also speaking of the ??? reactor?

DS: In this case the reactor is currently not covered by the work we are doing now. This is really the first part in the clean-up process. It is just to get the facility into a safe and stable form. At which there will have to be a national environmental policy act decision on what needs to be done here at N-reactor. So there will be another public process to decide the actual disposition of this reactor facility at a later day. Right now our concern is just get it in a safe and stable form for the near term.

NV: Is that true of the other reactors along the Columbia River too? That they are not dismantling them.

DS: No there has been a decision all ready under the NEPRA process to remove those reactors and place them within in the 200 area. It is true that we didn't establish schedules in this negotiation for that action. OK. We didn't establish schedules. We had a previous agreement with the department of energy to establish those schedules by December of 1996. That was negotiated in our agreement last summer. So in this part we have not dealt with what is called the 105 buildings. That is the actual reactor building itself, but all other buildings are covered. In conclusion, I really think these are good changes for the Environmental Restoration Program. I think they reflect all lot of the values and the principals that we have heard from our stakeholders and from the tribes. And they do raise the priority and increase our efforts along the Columbia River. What I would like to do is briefly lead into the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility discussion. By just trying to show you the kind of waste we have to deal and the need we have for this facility. It is just a little bright to see this very well. Mostly what you see is contaminated soil. That is what most of our problem is. We have soil that is contaminated with radio active constituents and with hazardous substances. And its simply

to go in a dig this material up and it is not highly radio active material, these people don't require shielding and that to dig into this material. This is one example of equipment that may be used to essentially run over the contaminated area and look for radio active constituents. Hopefully we can use some of these technologies both in finding contamination as well as deciding when is something is cleaned up. For this initial investigation this was into a waste site that was called a Pluto Crib. It is a crib where when a reactor had failed fuel and the water was no longer going into the Columbia River it was diverted to this kind of a soil site. We investigated this because we felt it might be one of the worst sites in the 100 areas. Fortunately, we didn't find extremely high levels of contamination and this waste is currently packaged up and awaiting a disposal location. And what I would like to do is to turn it over to Pam and let her discuss that disposal.

PE: Good evening everyone. As Doug described we are trying to changes are underway that will lead to an earlier clean-up of areas along the Columbia River. Clean-up which will likely require removal of large amounts of contaminated soil. We believe that the facilities are needed for disposal of Hanford waste. Tonight we would like to hear your concerns and answer questions about the proposed plan for this facility. This proposal is for CERCLA landfill that protects human health and the environment, provides for timely clean-up, gets contamination away from the Columbia River. Allows disposal of only Hanford clean-up waste and the size should support additional clean-up activities. To provide you with better framework for where we are now. I would like to start by briefly going through the process that we have been working with. The information that I will cover is provided in the handouts that are located in the back of the room. Again, we were originally working with two regulatory processes, the Resource Conformation and

Recovery Act or RCRA and the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act or CERCLA. In order to provide more timely clean-up we have selected the CERCLA process for the ERDF. We have prepared documents that evaluate the options for disposal of Hanford clean-up waste. The medial investigation feasibility study for RIFS provides the evaluation of these options. The additional information about the facilities included which discussed the proposed site in the waste that may be going to ??? The proposed plan provides as a summary of RIFS proposes a preferred option. As part of this effort we have tried to integrate two regulatory process CERCLA and NEPA. The proposal reviews and considers the environmental elements normally found in a NEPA EIS or Environmental Impact Statement. Throughout the development of these documents we have asked for input from the public, the tribes, the Hanford Advisory Board and the Natural Resource Trustees, and considered recommendations from the Hanford Future Site Working Group. We have tried to respond to your needs by including many of the concerns that we have heard within the documents that have led to this proposal. We encourage you to review the complete package and give us your comments. Sizing the landfill was not an easy task. We are proposing that the landfill be located on the central plateau on the Hanford site between 200 East and 200 West as shown here in more detail. This location is within the area that the Hanford Future Site Working Group recommended for waste management. That is the smaller blacked out area surrounding 200 East and 200 West. We looked at other sites, but we believe that this site more protective of ground water in the Columbia River and provides for timely clean-up. The site we are proposing would be available for clean-up waste in 1996. Unfortunately putting in the landfill and the support facilities at the proposed site could destroy up to 1.6 square miles of mature sagebrush habitat. This habitat is important to wildlife such as the sage sparrow and the

loggerhead shrike. And has been designated by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife as priority habitat. In response to your concerns we have made a commitment to require mitigative actions for the loss of its habitat. We have developed a range of options for loss of this habitat including restoration, creation or enhancement of a similar habitat by seeding, planting nursery stock or transplanting mature sagebrush. The options will be evaluated as part of the site wide mitigation program. The clean-up waste disposal options that we looked at are a double line trench, this is option one in the corner. This option proposes that the landfill would be built using the standard record of compliance, double line trench. The line would collect any liquids that may be generated during operation. The double line would provide an additional more reliable system to protect ground water. Option two, is this single line trench. This option proposes the land with a single liner in the trench. The liner would collect any liquids generated during operation. Option three, would be an unlined trench. This option proposes an unlined landfill. And final option, option four is no action. This option consists of not constructing a landfill at Hanford and examining at using transporting waste off-site or using existing facilities. Other than the no action option, each option includes the use of record compliant protective cap over the completed landfill and it requires that the waste that is going to the disposal facility meet specific waste exceptions criteria. At this time I would like Norm Hepner to discuss the waste acceptance criteria for the ERDF.

NH: The proposed alterative the doubled lined trench can safely dispose of Hanford clean-up waste. For you to understand and know that is to know what waste will be going into this facility. The waste that will going into a double lined facility will consist mainly of soil. 75% of what we are going to dig up from along the river will be soil that is

contaminated with organics, metals and radio nuclides. Many
??? ninety, CC137 and Chromium six. In addition, 25% of the
waste will be garbage. This is the waste that at the
reactor facilities it was contaminated with radio nuclides
and they buried it. We can safely handle this waste. But
what is important to note is that the state of Washington,
US EPA and DOE have agreed that only Hanford clean-up waste
will go into the ERDIF. We do not want to accept waste from
outside of the Hanford site. NO WASTE OUTSIDE OF HANFORD.
In addition, we will only accept low level waste. We will
not accept transuranic waste or spent fuel or high level
waste. This facility is not designed to handle that waste
safely. We will allow the disposal of hazardous or
dangerous waste. But the state of Washington will not,
cannot stand by extremely hazardous waste going into this
facility. We want the waste to be retrievable. If thirty
years down the road if there is a better way to dispose of
this waste we want to do the right thing. We don't want to
limit our possibilities. We want the waste to be treated.
One of the treated RDL standards, there are standards on the
books that says what is safe to be safe to
dispose of in land disposal facilities. We are going to
follow that law. In addition we are looking at some kind of
soil washing. This is a method to minimize how much waste
is generated. It is basically you wash the dirty
contaminate out of the soil. We want to use that technology
if it works. And we want this facility to be able to
handle that waste. Again no outside waste. Only
Hanford waste.

PE: As you can see we have a variety of waste that need to be
disposed of and need to be handled in a protective manner.
Again we are looking at the four different options for the
Hanford Disposal Facility. The options were evaluated using
certain criteria. We have used eight of those criteria in
the RIFS for evaluating these options. The ninth criteria
is the reason why we are here tonight. That is community

acceptance. Our proposed alternative for the Hanford clean-up waste is record compliance double line trench with a leak retention and a recovery system. We believe this option protects human health in the environment follows the law by complying with applicable, relevant appropriate requirements. It provides for long term protection of the groundwater in the Columbia River. The proposed landfill will only have capacity for Hanford clean-up waste generated over the next six years. We were going to consider expanding the landfill only if there were justified need and only after we had an opportunity for comment. Again, tonight we would like to hear your concerns and answer questions about the proposal for a Hanford landfill. Copies of the proposed plan are located in the back of the room.

NV: ???

NV: Does she have a clip on mic?

NV: Is that working now? Get up really close. Now test it.

NV: Many people probably picked-up a citizens guide prepared by several public interest groups and in addition in the back of the room there is another handout I will be referring to Promises vs. Reality. In ten minutes I cant possibly begin to cover all the issues that have just been covered in the last half hour. Let me try to cover some key issues focusing on the enviromental restoration renegotiation. And I will pull this up. These are what we believe are five critical points for people to consider. And the first is that the public has been promised over the last year and half I guess. Certainly, last year that the renegotiation of the Hanford Clean-up Agreemeent this year would result in real eccelartion of real clean-up along the Columbia River, as the highest priority for clean-up and showing progress. Secondly, the draft agreement does not address

the need to reduce extremely high levels of radiation for people using the 50 mile Hanford reach of the Columbia River and other toxic chemicals exposures along the river. We are suggesting that by the year 2000 and we think that is plenty of time, the Department of Energy should be required to meet a new milestone that says no one in the public using the Columbia River should be exposed to levels of radiation or toxic chemicals in excess of EPA and state standards for an operating facility. Right now people using the Hanford reach of the Columbia River are exposed to levels of radiation twenty-four times what EPA sets as the maximum allowable level of radiation from USDOE nuclear facility in a year. That is not what we would consider a safe standard, that is based on the level of risk that one person out of every 10,000 exposed to it each year will get fatal cancer. And we are talking about a level of radiation along the Columbia River shorelines, twenty-four times that allowed under EPA standards.

NV: Can you be more specific?

NV: That is in the N area and I am going to come back with a map and we will show it as we go through this. We are, one of our comments has to do with other radiation levels along the stretch of river that we havent been able to get a hold of from you folks. Thirdly, the committment to complete remdial action along the Columbia River clean-up. As I mentioned before wasnt eccelerated from the year 2018, but it is actually weakened and someone asked the question and that goes right to the heart of this. It is actually weakened by creating a exception for the 2018 deadline, removale of the huge emenise contiminated 9 reactor buildings. Everyone thought they were in the 2018 deadline, all of a sudden under this new agreement they are out of the 2018 deadline. Fourth, milestones deadlines EPA milestones is the legal term for in the agreement what they call a

deadline for completing investigations of the contaminated areas in the essential part of Hanford, the 200 areas are delayed. Obstenibly because we have a trade off for the speed up of clean-up from the year 2018 along the river. As I have mentioned we dont have speed up of any clean-up deadline along the river. Lastly, the report required under the TPA about the levels of contimation in the Columbia River, what islands, what let areas downstream will be cleaned up is left in the hands of Pacific Northwest Labratory which for 30 years has been issuing reports and saying things like maximum exposed hypotethical individual is someone who has never seen the Hanford reach of the Columbia River because they dont include radiation exposures to people along the Hanford reach in their calculations. But Battell Pacific Northwest Lab is a polluter that is liable under Federal Law and State enviromental laws yet they are given job of doing the study of ??? that their liability. It is a conflict of interest and we are saying they simply should have an independent entity do this. I mean do it once and do it right, they have to do a study of the end of clean-up called the natural resource damage assesment. Under EPA and state rules Battell cant do that as a potentially liable polluter. Why are we wasting our money and letting them do it now and having to do the same study twice. So what are we talking about in terms of levels of risk here? Let me put up a map showing the area of the fifty mile Hanford reach of the Columbia River near the DER and N reactors. This is the N reactor buildings, these are the liquid waste disposal trenches near the N reactor which recieved huge quantities of contiminated waste from the reactor. These trenches are so radio active that they give off levels of radiation that are according to one estimate published in the Response to Comments on last years TPA 24 times EPA's allowable limit for public exposure. Now hundreds of people on the opening day of Salmon season and on summer weekends use this stretch of the Columbia River.

You can see that the radiation levels extend all the way across the Columbia River. That is not the only area. Up here near the B reactor you see shoreline areas and an island with higher levels of radiation as well. Up and down the fifty mile stretch of the Columbia River we have levels of radiation that are way in excess of what we should allow the public and the environment to be close to. And we can reduce it, but what we need is a milestone in the agreement that is real progress for Hanford clean-up, real risk reduction by the year 2,000. And we cant understand why this wasnt the topic of negotiation. Given the fact that EPA's clean air act limit of 10 miliram per year is clearly being exceeded here. Now in the response to comment issued in January, something very interesting was also disclosed for the first time. It said that while EPA's level standard is 10 miliram per year. Some readings in this area alone of the shoreline are 100 miliram per hour. That is in one hour 10 times EPA says you can get in a year. This is why we need to eccelerate real clean-up along the Columbia River and soon. Lets take a look at what was promised in the negotiations quickly. Now it wont quite fit on here but let me read it to you. These are actual quotes of the promises made for these negotitions

TAPE 1-Side B

The Columbia River milestones were to be achieved sooner and the land can be ready for new uses. It was promised that consistent with the future site advice before the year 2018 the area along the Columbia River will be ready for unrestricted public use. Now what is the reality here. First of all, there is no accelerated real deadline for clean-up along the Columbia River. It remains at the year 2018. The only things changed were milestones relating paperwork studies when we went through them in the existing agreement all of the paperwork studies were going to be done by the end of the century which is the new milestone anyway. There isn't a real speed-up. Secondly, and this is very important. The Department of Energy is only spending 13% of its 1 and 1/2 billion dollar cleanup funding for 1995, only 13% is going to environmental restoration and they have imposed an internal cap on that expenditure so it will remain flat. Right now we are only paying for studies in environmental restoration. We are not paying for any large scale clean-up. As long as this funding level remains flat, the Department of Energy has decided it will violate the agreement. In essence it will not be able to do large scale remediation. These are actual quotes out of the Department of Energy's own activity data sheets. That for every area along the Columbia River, repeat that their plan budget requests. The target case does not provide for remediation at waste sites after the paperwork study is done. Remember clean-up costs more than paperwork. And as long as they have a million dollars a year to spend on ??? and pizza delivery and millions of dollars on planned new highways and new offices and as long as Westinghouse spends this is going to amaze you but they spent more on overhead last year than they did on environmental restoration, folks. As long as this remains the priority you are not going to see any acceleration of clean-up along the river unless the regulators say we are going to set real deadlines. I am

just about done here. The new agreement works to protect the Columbia River sets risks of schedules to deal with the greatest risks first. We are going to deal with all the discharge pipes. Two different promises. Well we dont have any schedule for dealing with the real great risks, as I have said. No radiation, no chemical exposure reductions guaranteed between now and the end of the century. . Again, we have the citation here out of the comments issued in January of 1994 by US DOE that show that the levels of radiation are may be as high as one hundred miliram per hour, ten times what EPA says the public can get in a year. Finally, five and six. The draft agreement does not include any new milestones at all to clean up the shorelines, islands or river beds. Despite the promise last year that very specifically made at the public meetings that this year islands would be included and there would be new milestones for dealing with contaminated islands and freeing them up for unrestricted public use. Same with the shorelines, same with the river bed. Again, the only thing that is done is given Battell a study to do that ought to be rejected out of hand. Last set here. The promise was that the agencies would coordinate clean-up and decontamination, decommissioning work in the 100 areas. That is along the river where the reactors are. You see quotes based on the agencies promises that they would set a deadline this year for removal of the reactors. This was their promise. That they would set a deadline for removal of the reactors. There is no deadline for removal of the reactors. In fact we are going the other direction and we urge people to say we need to reject the change to milestone 16 which says you can wait until after the year 2018 for removal of the reactors. That is like saying we are going to spend millions of millions of dollars remediating the areas around the reactors and then after we have replanted and encouraged the public to use this area. Then we are going to go back in with the world's largest moving vehicle, something like

280 wheels to put the reactor core on and tear up the area we just cleaned-up. It is crazy. It is not integrated at all. And we need a deadline that is before the year 2018 if we are really going to tell the public that you are going to get accelerated meeting of the goal of unrestricted use along the Columbia River before the year 2018. You cant leave the contimated huge monuments that are the 9 reactors sitting there after the year 2018 and pretend you have unrestricted public useage along the Columbia River. I guess this closes this. Its time to talk about, take questions whenever. In this document is the advice by the Hanford Advisory Board which unamisouly stated that the Hanford Advisory Board is outraged that Enviromental Restoration milestones remediation protection of the Columbia River once again are under-funded and will not be met based on internal US DOE cap on ER funding. Thank you.

NV: There may be some of you who cant stay until the public comment period. I would like most of you to be able to participate in the informal questioning and answers and discussions of the panelists before the public comment period. Because it seems like there would be better public comment if we had a chance to questions and answers. But there is also a concern on part of the stakeholders and the agency that some of you may have and not been able to talk. And if you dont get to talk until 8:30 or 8:45. So if there is someone who came here thinking I have something to say and I need to say it right now. Say it right now. OK if you would just go to this mic right now. This is on the record of the formal comments. I will be timing. We are going to give all the speakers 5 minutes maximum except for those people who are on the formal representatives of an organization they will be given 10 minutes to speak. I will let you know when it is 4 minutes, 5 minutes speaker, 9 minute speaker and 10 minute speaker. And if you dont get everything said that you need to put your comments in

writing or you can wait until everyone who came here tonight and wants to speak is finished and we will go through it all again until everybody feels satisfied that you have had on the record everything that you need on the record. So we could be here a long time. But for the first round you get 5 minutes. Thank you.

NV: Real briefly, I guess it is a question about where these names come from in the Enviromental Restoration Disposal facility. It is a good name for something but given the congress now and the whole political mood of this country and anything that has enviromental in it is going to get swept under the carpet. And I would propose, and I am quite serious about this, calling this the clean-up of the most posion, and toxic substance known to man. Now that is what we are dealing with here. We are not cleaning up the environment or restoring it. We are dealing with substance and products here that we have generated that has the capacity to kill people for thousands of years. I mean that is serious stuff and it needs to be addressed in a real scarey kind of way. Because it makes me real nervous.

NV: Thank you. Go ahead.

NV: I have a short comment to say.

NV: If you would like to say your name on the record that is fine, but if you dont want to you dont have to.

NV: My name is Isac Standen and I have just one short comment to say. Only 10 or 12% of the actual Hanford clean-up budget is being spent on enviromental restoration. The rest of it is being spent on jewelery and chaeffers and pizza delivery. And I think that is just ridiculous. This is our tax money and we should make sure our tax money is being spent on the real thing.

NV: Thank you.

NV: Could we respond back?

NV: I think we are in the formal comment period. And so I want to get the formal comments on the record and then you will all get a chance to respond to the formal comments.

NV: I am Pat Herbert and I represent the Coho Coalition. We are a group of people in this state and sometimes we are joined by people in other states. We do civil disobedience at Hanford. And we have encampments there every year. We make sure that we are there for the Nagasaki commemoration each year and there is a couple things that I would generally like to say about the agreement. I think first of all something really unfair has happened to the public and that is that we are not really talking about clean-up. The DOE is not talking about clean-up. Its talking about a more effective way to treat and store wastes for the country and possibly from other parts of the world. We don't know yet. I know tonight they said that this was only Hanford waste but that was only for the disposal facility. We have to keep that in mind. And I think that it is really unfair that they haven't made that very clear to the public. Also, I think our group is concerned about the money that we are spending, when this country needs money in other areas. The largest amount of unemployed and homeless now in this country I think is literally a crime. A crime to be spending the money we are spending at Hanford because if it was not being wasted but a lot of it is being wasted. We are spending endless amounts of time with reports and monitoring and pulling from all different people and different areas. It all takes money. It is not going into clean-up. And it is a waste and it is a crime. It is a crime. I think generally we would say that decommissioning the building is a good thing. There is a lot of water in

the N reactor. I guess there are stored rods there. There are other things that need to be taken out of that area because it is so close to the river. But I am totally against tearing down the buildings. Our group is not so sure that we think that we should be worried about the soil.

Tearing up the soil and bringing it to another area. The Hanford has been used for all kinds of dumping for years. The river has been dumped in for years. We shouldn't be suprised the figures that we are seeing now. I imagine that they were much higher many years ago. I think we should not try and put anything dangerous near the river that we know that there are underground streams that are going to carry it into the river. We need to be concerned about that. Maybe that is why we need the disposal facility to keep some of this stuff away from the river, but I am very much against removing the soil that is all ready there, spending the time and the money to do that. To put it into this facility. I think that a lot of the buildings we are talking about not in the 100 areas but in other areas of tearing down and removing. We could consider using those buildings for storing drums, other kinds of materials. I dont think because they are contaminated we should be tearing them down. Also, I would like to comment on restoring the area for enviromental beautification. A lot of this is a waste of time. This area is never going to be considered an area where people can come and where it is going to be clean. It will never be that way. This area is being cleaned up for treatment and storage of wastes. And the money that we spend to try and clean something up, to beautify it to the public is a waste of money. All the surveys, all of the reviews, all of the additions of plants, all the use of herbicied to control the edible plants in area that is suspect is a waste of money. Also there are areas that we are concerned about things that are going on that we are not hearing about. We should be getting enviromental in pact statements on things like the microbacteriological lab that

has been started. There is a third lazer unit that is starting to be built there. The public doesnt know a thing about it. How is this going to effect the enviroment? How is this experiementing with this bacteria, besides trying to get rid wastes what else are you going to do with these? How is it going to effect the enviroment. We havent heard anything in this state and I dont think any where else in this country, very little does the public know about these. So these are our major concerns with this agreement. Thank you.

CH: Hi. My name is Cloey Harris and I just wanted to say that you guys are not just hurting us, you are hurting the streams, you are hurting everything all wildlife. You are hurting everything and you guys need to wise up. Get cracking and start doing some work.

NV: I have a question for the person from Heart of America.

NV: Just one minute please. We are in a formal comment period so

NV: Can I ask a question?

NV: You can when we get to the question and answer period, but we are in a formal comment period. I just want to be sure that anybody who has to leave and needed to make a formal comment on the record get to do that and we will go to Q & A. We are going to do a lot more formal comment as soon as we finish this panel discussion.

NV: It is on the record isnt it?

NV: Yes, it is taped and everything. There are a lot rules when you are in all of this federal process. They are not suppose to be answering during formal comment period.

BS: I am Barbara Supeda and I am speaking for the Washington Democratic Council. And we have repeatedly brought up at these hearings requests, as Mr. Paullete did for independent audit. We have been listening to the new congress talk about welfare, but the defence department at Hanford have been a corporate welfare program without any real outside auditing and objective information. You have got these people Westinhouse, General Electric, Bechtel making more money the more mistakes they make. And until you can set up an accounting system that a bookkeeper working for \$7.00 has to have where you balance the books and their objective. That this PR is a pure fraud and fraudulent contract with the people of America. It is a much worse welfare fraud system than any mother getting welfare and feeding six kids on \$300.00 a month.

NV: Is there anyone else who would like to speak in the formal comment period right now? OK. We will close that period and we will open question and answer and have the panelists here to do that. When it seems that we are done with that we will go back to another formal comment period. OK so go ahead.

NV: Gentlemen from Heart of America you stated a bunch of different data facts that you have but most of them seemed on the chart that you showed where it said responses to comment. I am wonder where the data that you have gotten differs from the data that EPA and the Department of Energy have and where it came from. Because it says response from comments. I am not doubting the fact that your data is not valid. I want to know where you data came from.

NV: Last year we went through a renegotiation process with a public comment period just like you are having tonight. And during that comment period Heart of America Northwest said we like the shorelines and islands cleaned up and we are

concerned about what are the levels of radiation. Not only near the N area, but up and down the entire Hanford reach. What are the levels of radiation and at page 4-10 of the official tri-party response to comments which I happen to have. The three agencies and I believe the response was written by, this response was written by the US Department of Energy contractor, responded with the data I referred to. That it is also in the most recent published Hanford Environmental Report of DOE, that they do disclose now what the N area average radiation level is. And I have another slide from that report that I didn't put up. It shows that it is about 360 milirad per year and the average background radiation level up and down the Columbia River away from the reactors is about 80 to 90 milirad per year. The difference being 240 milirad minimum and.

NV: So you are saying response to comment is DOE data that is validated.

NV: I don't know if it has been validated this is DOE and the State Department of Health has a very limited data base from one location I believe that indicates similarly high levels of radiation.

NV: This is not validated data?

NV: Validated is a tough thing ???

NV: The most recent data that I have available on the N area in question from Mr. Paullete indicates that a person would receive if they stayed at the shoreline 24 hours a day all year long approximately 200 to 250 milirad per year. Approximately 100 milirad of that is natural background. For instance if my wife would let me fish 8 hours a day, both days of the weekend through the 190 and some day fishing season that we generally have there for fish. I

would get about 10 miliram dose.

NV: And that would exceed the clean air act allowed limit. May be we should ask the EPA what they allow under ??? Clean Air Act?

NV: It is 10 miliram. The issue is whether we are going to do anything about it. That is the issue that we really have all been talking about tonight. We are planning to do something about it. It is covered in the N area pilot project set of milestones. There has been a letter report submitted by DOE this month, or the end of October and we have this month to make a decision on when we can complete an action to abate the Sky Shine issue that Jerry is discussing. We havent set the schedule yet, he is right. But are we going to do something about it and the answer is yes. It is something that is a concern to us and so we are going to address this issue and we do have milestones and M-16 12 and M-16 12A which discusses this very problem. And those reports are available.

NV: Because I want to make sure she got her question answered about do you know what the response to comments is and then we can get into the substance which I know you want to debate. It is important to know these technical response and comments. Now go ahead.

NV: I guess Doug I am encouraged by your response and I hope that the public speaking tonight will encourage vigorous action when you decide next month what you are going to do. But does M-16 12 and 12 A go anything beyond just the N area Sky Shine. Sky Shine by the way is the term that DOE uses for the radiation that bounces off atmosphere and comes back down from these trenches and it is one cause of the irradiation of someone standing on the shoreline that Mike talked about. So I guess my question Doug is are you going

to set some goals and deadlines for up and down the Columbia River, the Hanford reach of the Columbia River not to exceed 10 milirams save, excess radiation dose or is it just N area?

NV: Well the N area is the worst problem now Jerry. I dont think we have all of the information needed to identify what other actions needs to be taken along the river. We have started doing some sampling this summer or actually in the last couple of months. There was sediment sampling of the sediments at the bottom of the Columbia River that had gathered behind the dams. There is some data but it is not all back yet. There is some additional information that we need to look at to evaluate the other areas. There is no doubt about the problem in the N area it is a significant problem.

NV: It is very easy to get the readings of ambient radiation levels along the shoreline and we know that there is an area near K that is a problem, the arieal radiation survey from which that slide that I showed was done. It was done a couple of years ago but it shows very clearly gama radiation levels that are quite high up and down the area. I mean it shouldnt be hard to get this data. It ought be a lot easier than trying to find out what is in the sediment. It ought to be very easy to go out and measure if the agencies require DOE to do it. DOE has been pushed and shoved into doing any of these measurements and they didnt even report it until a year ago in the Annual Enviromental Report.

NV: I will give one more response I cant answer for the whole entire river. Jerry showed the area around N reactor and area in the D area which was the area just adjacent to that area on the map. Those two areas the N area we are covering by these actions I just described and the clean-up of the

contaminated soils around the D area is one of the proposed plans that will be out in January for public review and we will be then coming back to the public and asking for your comments on how to clean-up the D area. So the D area is in the next set of clean-up decisions that are going to come out. There are clean-up decisions that are going to deal with the D area which is one of the areas Jerry is concerned about. The K area which is the other one that Jerry has just discussed will approximately 3 months after that. We are trying to remove the sources from along the river and those clean-up decisions are going to be made in the next 6 to 9 months. We have because of the size of the site and the size of the problem, had to divide these problems up into what is called operable units. Like I have discussed earlier and what we are trying to do is make those decisions on an individual operable unit basis. It doesn't always make sense, it sounds a little piecemeal, but otherwise we have to investigate the whole thing before we make a decision and that doesn't seem like quite the right approach either.

NV: Let's alternate. Let's get a question over here. Question right? And if you whether it is about environmental restoration in general or about the ??? any of you if you would say that then it would be easier to sort all of this out later. If you don't know it doesn't matter.

NV: OK I have several questions about environmental restoration. Last year we were promised certain clean-up activities on D island. Removing large particles of uranium or fuel rod chips and such that the DOE had previously denied the existence of until Heart of America showed them their own documents claiming that a 9 year old boy had found one of these things out there. And the Department of Energy said that it would go out to D island, remove that stuff, remove the plumbing system, the pipes that had carried the waste there. And it would I believe also survey D island to find

out what other forms of contaminants were there and also survey the other islands in the Hanford reach. So I would like to know what has been done. If this clean-up action was done, how many chunks of uranium did areas 9 year olds leave behind? What did you get out there. What remains to be done, has D island have the other islands been sampled to find if there are serious hot spots out there. If there is not when will it be done. Doug Sherwood thank you for assuring us that the clean-up will be done but Lord the Manhattan project assured us that the clean-up will be done. It is not a matter of will it be done, but when and for how much money. I would also like to know what is going on right now both with the islands and the shoreline areas in the way of warning people off. The status a year ago was that the islands in particular were wide open to public access there was nothing to tell boaters or other recreationist that this is not a picnic area. Have the areas been signed? Have the areas been fenced off where appropriate?

NV: Fred thank you for your questions. In response to the one issue the ??? pipes, yes they have been removed. For those in the audience who arent familiar with the situation. There is an island in the middle of the Columbia River adjacent to one of our reactors and the out-fall pipe was generally, these reactors brought water from the Columbia River in treated the water went through the reactor itself not like todays generation of reactors where there is a separate cooling loop. But it was actually in contact with the fuel and then was discharged back to the Columbia River and that practice went on for quite a period of time for the first eight reactors that were built. N reactor was not constructed or operated that way. But because the out-fall needed to go in the deepest part of the river, that was on the opposite side of the river from this island. The pipe had to go across this island so there was a higher piece of

elevation in it than the rest of the pipe. You get air bubbles in it so they put a series of vent pipes in that. Those vent pipes we believe are one of the sources of contamination that were found on the island. We had a commitment to remove those pipes the Department of Energy and its contractors did that work this last year. That is done. We have also done a survey of the island and in that survey we removed a 147, I believe is the number discrete particulates of radio active material. None of those particulates of radio active material however were pieces of fuel rods. What they are, are primarily activated metal. That is metal that has been in contact with high radiation field and the metal itself becomes radio active. It is not part of the fuel it is pieces and parts of valves and that sort of thing. We did find and remove something like 147 of those. We sent most of those into the laboratory for an analysis. We have determined what the levels of radiation are on that and we have been talking with the regulatory agencies about what to do further in terms of work out there. Doing some rather simplistic performance assessment of what we found there. The Department of Energy feels that the radiation levels because these are short lived radio nuclides with a half life of about five years. That it appears that the levels will be safe for general public use, unrestricted use in about 10 years. So we would feel that there is not a need for a large remedial effort to send a crew of a number of people out there looking for these specs. These discussions have been made with the regulatory agency. The agencies have not given us response yet, it is still being discussed and we haven't received any word back from them. Yes, we have done the survey, yes we have done the pipes, and in terms of signs on the islands there is no signs on the islands. The probability of encountering a radio active chip of a high level of radio activities extremely low. And we haven't felt a need to sign those islands.

- NV: You are telling me that an island that you dont feel should be open for public use for 10 years that there is no reason to put a sign on it? Is it open or is it not?
- NV: It is open.
- NV: How much does it cost to put a sign up? Fifty bucks may be? Isnt that a good idea?
- NV: It is the embarassment price not the dollar price.
- NV: No it is not the embarassement price. It is a exposure analysis. It is not a lack of concern either sir.
- NV: OK so this island that is now effectively open to public use there is no indication to Joe boater that there is anything wrong with having a picnic there. And boy when I was a kid when we went on a picnic down to the beach we brought shovels and we dug. I dont know if your contractors brought shovels and dug or just picked up the stuff that was on the surface. But if there was wierd stuff out there when I was 9 years old, I would have found it too. I dont think 9 year olds are that much different these days. I think that you are in effect openly inviting people to picnic in a radioactive sewer of your own making. And that is unconsciousable. I also asked about surveys of the other islands. Have surveys of the other islands been done and throw in the area across the river on the far side from N reactor which on the map Jerry had on the screen there it showed levels of gama radiation above background. Has there been any sampling of that to find out how extensive that contimination is. I have also requested that at the same hearing previous hearings last year. And was told at that time there had been no studies done of groundwater or soil samples on the north side of the river at all.

- NV: The Department of Energy and its contractors are continuing to do surveys on the island and I would imagine as long as we are doing clean-up work we will continue to do those.
- NV: Is that just on D island?
- NV: No, it is up and down the river. It will be a continuing effort through out the clean-up effort to do that.
- NV: Is this going to go on for decades then or cant you just go out and have the surveys done in a year or two? Is it that hard to do a survey and find out at least in a rough way how contaminated these islands are.
- NV: It is one of the prime considerations we have to do in our comprehensive study of the Columbia River that we have agreed to do with the agencies. Last item that Jerry has in a list of concerns that he is concerned that we have P&L doing the work.
- NV: Yeah, last year we similiar questions were asked and I have the responses and comments in front of me. And I turned to this page. The response to comments to these concerns, now remember ??? is entering the Columbia River at levels 1,500 times the drinking water standard. Chromium, I dont know Doug what is the chromium level?
- NV: It is about 25 times that of the enviromental standards which is called the fresh water chronic ??? criteria.
- NV: You know up and down the river you have all sorts of springs, seepeages with this type of problem and here is what the response was. There is not warning about the water and fish because they do not pose any special hazard. There are postings on the shores and on the islands which I would dispute for the islands. Even if the islands do have

radiological warnings and most neither need nor have them. People should stay off the islands. That is not because of contamination but because they are "environmentally fragile and wildlife some endangered or threatened use them for nesting." Well I would suggest that for wildlife purposes this is one of the prime wildlife habitats slated for acquisition by the US Fish and Wildlife service, the Hanford reach and the north side. For that reason alone the public should be discouraged from using more actively, but we have documented in the citizens guide that we published how the signs are place so far back from the shoreline that you have to walk through the contaminated area and through the seeps before you find that you can read the sign and the sign do not say dont drink the water, dont dig in the soil, up and down the Hanford reach those are what the signs should be saying. And they ought to be very clear about what the hazards they are from and shouldnt just say no trespassing US Department of Energy Hanford Reservation which is what most of the "postings" say and they are ignored by everyone. And I think that is absolutely criminal and I am sorry I just got to say it is absolutely criminal not warn the people about these hazards and to take active steps to say you cant use it until we clean it up. And then go out and set a goal that by the year 2000 we will have reduced the hazard so that you can use the Hanford reach shorelines and islands. That is the point we are trying to make. Just one other thing on these fuel reactor fuel chips. We are not surprised that you didnt find them by doing a surface study. They have been in the sediments of shifting sand islands for 20 years, but they are there. Back in 1962 a DOE classified report said that the public was getting "potentially, significant radiation exposure" from using the islands back then. And scientists warned that the management ought to refuse to allow people to fish or to use the islands and management said we cant do that. That was back in the early 60's.

NV: May be we should switch topics unless Mike has something more to say. Is there someone with another question?

NV: I have two questions. I think they are short. The questions are short, but I dont know about the answers. Is ERDF's site the same site or near the site which was once proposed by Waste Management Incorporated for a location of an incenarator. And is that incenarator project dead?

NV: Oh boy. That was a tough question even if it was short. I think the site proposed by Waste Management for the incenarator was on the leased land that is now held by the low level waste site US Ecology site and its about 1/4 of a mile east of the ERDF location.

NV: For the panel is going to take some pictures of the room I dont want you to worry about what is going on behind you.

NV: There is a proposoal apparently I just saw this in the budget when we got briefed two weeks ago. There is a line item for thermal treatment facility for out of non Hanford mixed wastes listed in the budget and there is a budget item for a national low level waste facility at Hanford. So I dont think the inceterator is dead, Wast Management commerical proposal may be dead for being put on state leased land. That may be dead but it is clear that people are looking to send other DOE mixed wastes to Hanford for inceneration and burial.

NV: If I could.

NV: It might help to remind people who you are each of you.

NV: My name is Roger Stanley with the Washington Department of Ecology. And at least from our personal perspective the proposal that was made by waste management is dead. It has

been gone for quite some time now. There is always somebody that has got some sort of an idea about a possibility. Some of the ones that Jerry mentioned, some that are in some peoples minds, but there are not any proposals at this time.

- NV: The other question and I was glad to find something in the green booklet that I could sort of follow. On pages 21 and 22, there it states milestones for, it states several milestones for the 100 N area and all the dates for these are past by now. So I was just curious if all of these milestones have been met.
- NV: The milestones are met at the end of the mile. So yes we have our work cut out for us. The ones you are reading from are setting schedules for the investigations or as Jerry has described as the paperwork. Plus making some decisions on whats in the milestone called the Sky Shine problem but it is actually the excess radiation field that comes from the ????. So those are things that are on our plate for this month in addition to having public meetings.
- NV: So as of the end of November all of those 1994 milestones stated on those two pages will have been met?
- NV: Well we will have a proposal date for completing them. As you see the milestone date says to be established November 1994.
- NV: There are some earlier than that though.
- NV: I am sorry. The other ones have been met.
- NV: All right thank you.
- NV: One more suggestion for the audience if somebody throws around an achronym or something you dont know what they are

saying, raise your hand to get it explained dont just glaze over it OK? Because there is a lot of stuff here that is pretty complicated. Go ahead.

NV: I wanted to know a little bit more about the environmental restoration negotiation process. I have a two part question about that for the regulators especially. At what point did it become apparent in the process supposedly of eccelarating, negotiating to eccellerate the clean-up along the Columbia River that the previous milestones were underfunded by DOE and were not going to be met and as a second part of that do you feel that indiciates good faith in the negotiations process for DOE to not be upfront about not meeting their old milestones.

NV: You know from my perspective when an ER program has been over this last year in a state of flux, still is in a state of flux. There is also a question about, well two questions about first of all how much money would be aportioned to that DOE clean-up program. I want to caution people from automatically equating the term enviromental restoration with Hanford clean-up for purposes of this discussion... end of tape.

TAPE 2-SIDE A

NV: ...the environmental restoration program is around 10 to 12 % of the budget. The question is how much work ought to be ought DOE and its contractors be able to perform for that amount of work. That ER budget is not likely increase significantly although when you look at the level of funding for DOE's ER program you have to keep in mind the level of funding for all the other programs as well that also deals with Hanford clean-up. But as we went through these negotiations we knew that DOE's budget is under greater and greater pressure. It is harder and harder to push that budget up. And frankly pushing DOE's clean-up budget up overall the whole clean-up budget is not the answer the answer is trying to get product out the door. Lets try and get the bang for the buck. I don't think it was an issue of good faith during the negotiations. There is no doubt that the ER program has been and still is in a state of flux as we try and focus those dollars where they can do us the most good.

NV: I would like to talk a little bit about the budget process as it relates to our negotiations. Yes, there was a clearer understanding that DOE had told us up-front that we had some very serious budget concerns on this program. That was clear from the very start, but we on the regulatory side said we are going to decide what the best program is and if cant afford the best program, you are going to have to prove it to us. We are going to go through and look at how you have developed your budgets, what are the assumptions you used to say that these activities are going to cost x number of dollars. And if you recall about a month ago in the paper there was a big issue of what it was going to cost to do the environmental restoration program that was negotiated. There we were about 69 million dollars from what we thought a very good program was to what DOE and their contractors said it cost. Part of that was the

problem of they just gotten a new contractor, Bechtel Hanford and there had been some carry over of assumptions from the previous contractor. And when you put those assumptions together and took a look at they had projected for cleaning up some of these areas in 100 areas which led to their statements of we are not going to start clean up once the investigations are over. We found what we thought were faulty assumptions there. And I think what we have done is looked at how we can reduce the cost of doing the cleanup to less than what was previously projected by the previous contractor. We found some real significant things in the budget that we thought were not correct. And they were based on very, very conservative assumptions. Let me give you a couple of examples. We have information about how much contaminated there is in some of these waste sites now. The previous assumptions and projections projected waste volumes that very, very much higher than what the real story is out there based on the investigations that we have done. They may have overestimated the amount of contaminated soil out there by as much as 80%. So four or five times what the actual soil cleanup might be. That was an incredible cost. It drove the cost of this program to be very high. And we are working now to get better assumptions for costing the remediation programs. Another area that we have found very significant concern in is the plan included about 40% of all remediation costs for these contaminated soil sites would be analytical work. Analyzing samples of the waste you are cleaning up, 40% of the clean-up budget in their assumptions went to those activities such as analyzing the waste coming out of the site. Those were tremendous overkill. And we are going back now and looking at how we can lessen those costs. Us from the regulatory side and the DOE and the contractors from their side. So I think in the negotiation process we did push back on DOE and said wait a minute you are going to have to justify these costs much better if you expect us relax milestones.

NV: And the actual reductions in the projected costs over the

coming federal fiscal year for the first year of the new program that was being proposed actually wound totaling about 100 million dollars. The initial estimate that Bechtel used when they were first coming on site was just over 300 million dollars and through the next month, month and a half or so as there is more and more scrutiny on those costs and looking at each different aspect those estimates started to come down and there was very real tendency to say you are just going to have to do the same amount of work for less. The bottom line to make a long story short, there is a lot of pressure that is mounting on these programs to focus on the actual clean-up costs rather than just automatically throw more money at them.

- NV: You seemed to have said that your bottom line is that you are relaxing milestones when you went into the negotiation process intending to accelerate milestones.
- NV: Let me give you a DOE prospective of ??? negotiator through this. The regulatory agencies of course would not look at costs in the negotiations they would only look at what is the right thing to do. We did essentially the same thing. I did not ask my contractor how much is this going cost, until towards the end of the negotiations of when we had a package that appeared to be a good package in terms of meeting the objectives of the environmental restoration program. I kept a qualitative accounting myself the best I could but I didn't ask the contractor to come up with a sound estimate until we got a package that looked like it would be a tentative agreement between the three agencies. At that time the first very quick estimate came in about 300 million dollars. And knowing that our budget for next year would be closer to 200 million dollars we balked. We just so happens the same time we Hanford Advisory Board meeting. Being very honest with the Hanford Advisory Board meeting with the Hanford Advisory Board I had to come

forward and tell the Board that we were having troubles agreeing to the tentative package because the cost appeared to be so high. At that time the Department of Energy and the regulators and our contractor sat down together in went over the assumptions that went into that cost estimate. We worked those very hard over about a month, six weeks something like that. We brought in some experts from outside, some industry experts who have experience in it. And right now it looks like the scope of work is closer 230 million dollars worth of work in fiscal year 1995. We have about 201 and a half million dollars worth of funding. So that means that our funding level is less than the scope of work estimate is. But we are willing to sign up to those milestones. The milestones have not changed at all. And the reason why we are willing to sign up to those milestones is that the Department of Energy and its contractors as well as everyone sitting in this room know that the cost of doing business at Hanford is to high. And we if sign up for doing 230 million dollars worth of work knowing we have 201.4 million dollars worth of funding. That is what we call a productivity challenge. If we meet those milestones with that level of funding that means we are doing work for less money than we have in the past. And that give us the incentive to do it. We can get find and we can go to jail if we don't meet the milestones. So we are willing to take the productivity challenge of nearly 30 million dollars out of the 200 million dollar program and we have not changed the milestones from what the original tentative agreement was.

NV: So it is DOE's internal decision then to take the productivity challenge or to reduce the overall funding levels. It is your decision?

NV: It is our decision to sign up to the milestones that appear to cost 230 million dollars worth of work. To sign up to milestones that appear that would cost 230 million dollars to complete with only 201.4 million dollars worth of money.

NV: You have only 201.4 million dollars. Who is making that decision?

NV: That is what we have been allocated from our headquarters organization.

NV: Mike didn't you have 203 a month ago?

NV: Yes.

NV: And so let me get this right you have to submit to the productivity challenge. This is the first time that I have heard that you have only 201.4. You had been 27 million worth of productivity challenge. Now you are saying we are at 30.

NV: Yes.

NV: Did DOE shift that? I mean I heard a rumor that DOE shifted a million dollars out of environmental restoration coming for Hanford to Oregon National Lab for reactor programs. Is that...

NV: The difference between 203 and 201 the majority of that money went to the Idaho site and it was to fund an ongoing remediation activity there. It is called Pit 9. It is a real clean-up action that is going on in the field that needed a couple more million dollars. That too was the headquarters decision to shift that money over. The Department of Energy.

NV: There is the Washington D.C. the decision making group and then there is the Hanford decision making group. Headquarters is D.C.

NV: I think that what you have heard from the three agencies

here. Is pretty good news. As a result of some public examination and renegotiation work that DOE had said we can't do because it will cost 300 million and basically one out of every three dollars wouldn't have been as productive if this process hadn't happened. That is good news. The bad news though is we are talking about fiscal year 1995, with this cap of 201 million dollars. And were mostly in studies and if these guys had been as successful as they claim in scrubbing the numbers, stepping up to the productivity challenge and all of that. Once you get out of the studies and start trying to do real clean-up we have a problem. Unless DOE decides that environmental restoration should get more priority in the budget than Westinghouse overhead, for new highways and Hanford you know again legal fees, chauffeurs and we are paying 15 million dollars out of our Hanford clean-up budget this year to safe guard plutonium at PFP because the defense program that owns the plutonium refused to pay it. Those types of priorities are backwards I would say. And we have got a problem if these folks have really scrubbed the numbers and we are going to get 230 million dollars worth of work for 201 million dollars that is great. But once we start getting into real clean-up milestones they have a real road block ahead. Unless DOE decides to reprioritize its funding at Hanford.

NV: I need to check with the audience again. We were on the agenda to have the next formal comment period at 8:30 and it is way past that so this probably seems pretty funny to you, but the formal comment period is when you come on record that is when the agencies have to create a response to comment document for everything that you say on record they have to give a response on their record of decision or ROD. As it was explained to me. So that is why we are shifting back and forth between informal questions and answers and a chance to talk with the panelist and this piece of formal comment. So we need to shift to formal comments so that those of you that needed to make a formal comment and would have to leave without getting to do it, get to do it. Then

we will come back to Q & A. And I will just keep ruling it back and forth like that until everybody has got to ask a question or make a formal comment. So if you want to make a formal comment on the record come forward to the mic. I see one woman who thinks she wants to do that.

NV: Excuse me I don't think I belong up here during the formal comment.

NV: You probably don't Jerry. That is true.

NV: But I do hope that the recording of this would be on the record as well.

NV: This is on the record but it changes the response to comment.

NV: Well I hope that the agencies will respond to the comments that were issued in the last hour. I think there was some important issues raised by the audience in dialogue and I hope that would be responded to. I think the questions are really ???

NV: So moving into the formal comment period if you are willing to say your name and if you would like to be on the mailing list you need to say your address. Lets start with the woman over here.

NV: ??? Ceriello, PO Box 95913, Seattle, 98145. The Columbia River and the Hanford is beautiful and scenic it is also a natural salmon spawning ground. The Columbia River and shoreline unbelievably in the Hanford reach are used by the public, boating, fishing, picnicking, swimming, water skiing and wind surfing. I know someone who is an avid wind surfer who wind surfs with friends in the popular gorge area which is not too far from Hanford. She knows a person who has

experience clumps of hair falling out, following a long day of wind surfing there. I don't know the time period in which this happened, as far as I know this isn't documented in a study yet, but that is systematic of radiation exposure. As mentioned before I think in 1975 and documented in a newspaper article, there was a family picnicking on one of the islands and one of children, I think a nine year old did find a piece of a fuel rod that kind of accidentally floated away. And within the last couple of weeks a deer was killed within the boundaries of the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, I know which is Idaho's version of Hanford. This deer was found to have numerous fists size warts or papilloma, two stomachs, three lungs and two tails. This can not be a singular instance in that area. Hanford is older and larger what has happened there? Why is it that comprehensive studies of health effects on wildlife in and around Hanford haven't been done? Animals after serious exposure to radioactivity of various types at Hanford may travel quite a distance and expose other animals or humans. If this is happening to the animals what is happening to the humans? What is happening to those under eighteen that are using this area that aren't being counted. I think it is outrageous, horrifying and completely unacceptable that the public continues to be allowed to use contaminated areas for recreational purposes. Actual clean-up must happen and soon. It is time to stop stalling. Thanks.

DA: My name is David Anderson. My question I guess is could you please state the risk reduction or risk changes by the clean-up in some understandable units. Such as costs of decreased risk for the clean-up that you are going to do. For example, what is the costs for the 10 changing the 10 miliram per year exposure that was discussed earlier. What was the cost of cleaning that up in costs per number of lives saved or cost per life saved. Can you compare that to someone walking across the downtown street in Seattle, riding a bicycle in Seattle in order to get exercise which

is what I do or driving a car in Seattle or what kind of relative risk are we looking at saving? And how much is it per life saved? When we include the costs, the transactional costs, the studies, the legal fees, and then the actual clean-up costs together. Are we talking several hundreds of millions of dollars per life saved or are we talking in 10 of thousands of dollars and how does your prioritization of clean-up costs relate to the actual cost per life saved?

NV: Thank you.

NV: I did have a few questions. I noticed, I went to the Tri-Party Agreement hearing here in Seattle, the last one. And I noticed then that the TPA priority and budget they listed environmental restoration as last priority. And think that is the problem. Out of your 1.6 billion dollar budget, there is only 12% going to environmental restoration. You guys have enough money. It is just going to inappropriate areas. The citizens are saying they want the clean-up done, they want actual clean-up done on the environment which includes the water, the ground water supply and the soil. That is what they want done. They don't want new buildings being built. They don't want unnecessary programs being spent on chauffeurs. You guys are going to have to start think about where the money is going. Secondly, the public has said in the past, that they want radiation levels reduced by the year 2000 and this milestone will not be met and it should be and I don't think that any proposal should be accepted without that being part of it. And the other things are, the disposal facility they have said there are existing facilities that could be used as storage and what I don't know is what are the existing facilities and also what has not been talked about is the price of this disposal facility and what part of the budget would it becoming out of? I didn't here that. And we you say no outside waste

will be included in this disposal facility at Hanford there is no guarantee and until we have a guarantee it will probably not be looked upon kindly by the public. And also, why isn't this disposal facility being dealt with in a separate EIS? That I don't understand. And that is it. OK thank you.

HO: I am Harry Olsen. I am long past the age of 80 came down here with three lovely women from Edmonds area. I am going to make this short statement. I wonder if the splitting of the atom is something that helped society in the world. Did it help me? Did it help you? Did it help the United States, Europe and the whole world? I just happened to be in San Juan, Puerto Rico the day the first atomic bomb was falling at Hiroshima. And my gut feeling is it seems to me that it is too expensive to monkey this up. You cant control it, it has to be done in secret. I really quite to feel how you all feel about that but I think we could find another source of energy it is a very dangerous thing to use. The United States has been one of the first nations that ever has dropped it. Thank you.

NV: Thank you. For those people who would like to make a comment on the record. Please if you do just cue up at the mics and I will just move back and forth.

EA: Hi, my name is Edgar Albricht, I am representing both myself and a small group of people that we call ourselves the river hermit project.

NV: Are you asking for ten minutes?

EA: No I will keep it short. The new human vocation is to heal the earth, we can only heal that which we love, we can only love that which we know, we can only know that which we touch. I think one of the ways that we could save a lot of money is if the Bechtels and I assume that they have set up a private corporation or separation corporations that is now

separate. I think of them as California. Isn't it Bechtel Hanford now. Probably limited liability. Probably, huh? But be that as it may wouldn't it be nice if all these suit type people since its not really a big thing doing this clean-up. They showed us pictures of how people are just out there in there ??? back suits. Why don't all of the supervisors get out there and do some clean-up? That way they could really come and touch with what needs to be done. And that goes back to my statement we can only heal what we love. We can love what we know, we can only know what we touch. And it would be real nice may be the whole panel would go out there with a tie-back suit and start doing up some clean-up because we are running some wastes into the river and that is not a good thing. The other thing that I will tell you is that part of our project were doing a fasting and I don't know some of you, I know we are not in this politically, we are not suppose to talk about religious things. I imagine that some of you are Christians, some of you are Buddhist, some of you are whatever some of you even believe that you have a mortal sole. I don't know if very many in the panel do, but imagine that one of you do. And for the one person I will tell you I am fasting one day a week because I realize that some day you will have to get up before your God and you will say, well I did a real good job, I worked for this bureaucratic outfit. I hid behind all the bureaucratic stuff that I am supposed to hide behind. I followed all the rules and you know God we fucked up badly. And I am sorry.

PB: I am Phyllis Begee and I don't know I am not an expert on any of these things but just here to learn and I see several things happening. One we have a regulator group that I understand must be from Washington States Department of Ecology and the Department of Environment.

NV: Actually it is the Federal Environmental Protection Agency

but it is the regional.

PB: And then we had the Department of Energy who is here this evening in effect representing the contractors too. But I see several things happening one is I don't know how much, who is doing the regulating and how careful the regulating is. I always assumed that most of the money or all the money was being used to clean-up Hanford and to clean-up the environment and then of course the Spokane Review article hit the press recently and we learned other things are being done with that money. I think one of the, we all want that place cleaned up. It is unforgivable that it is still continuing to put peoples lives in danger and the least you can do as someone said is to put signs around the river and on those islands that say danger, Keep Out. Not private property but this is hazardous to your life. Put those signs up because when you go over to Hanford and along that river it is beautiful as someone else said, it is lovely you have no idea that there is any danger there. It doesn't smell, it doesn't make you itch none of those things at the time you are doing it. And for a child to be exposed to that amount of radiation is very, very dangerous far more than it would be for me who is as old as I am. So please keep in mind if you would put your child there for 24 hours or 5 hours would you be happy. So think of your own children in that situation and do your best for us at Hanford.

NV: Thank you.

FM: Again, my name is Fred Miller during the question period I asked something about D island. I want to make some comments on that and also on other subjects. I don't want to leave the impression that I am a D island fanatic. Frankly, D island is not all that important to me, it is tiny and far away. D island and E island and F island and G island, the whole Columbia River, the whole Hanford mess I am honing in on that particular topic so that I can make the

point because my understanding from what I know about Hanford the whole place is in the same sort of shambles and is being treated in same sort of lackadaisical through money at it fashion. You asked for my values. I think you could go out to all of the islands in the Hanford reach and put big mean ugly fences around them. That should be done right away to keep people out. The assumption should be given Hanford history that those islands are all ready contaminated and right now dangerous for people to go to. Then as you go about cleaning them up you can take the fences down when they are clean, when they are safe. And not until. This would have negative consequences. It would make a very beautiful place a lot less beautiful. I think that would provide stimulation and motivation for the contracting companies and for the Department of Energy and the regulating agencies. It would be a very obvious symbol that you haven't done your job yet. And as you get that small portion of your job done you would be deserving of a little bit of a celebration. In addition to fencing off the islands, you should put up signs at the entrances the boat launch areas, with maps and maps that people can take with them showing where they are going to be exposed to levels of radioactivity or levels of other toxic materials that could effect their health and their children's health. This is basic. This is done in many, many water ways for many different purposes ranging from controlling weeds to controlling liter it is cheap. There is no reason why you cant do it. There is no reason why you haven't done it long ago. Away from the islands, onto the clean-up of the river general still there is a large amount of data that has not been made available to the public. There aren't any bomb secrets lurking in the Columbia River or on the north slope. All that information should be made available to the public. Heart of America had a nasty time trying to get the Department of Energy to share its budgeting information that should be made available as soon as it is written, not when

it is almost too late so the people have to do an all nighter cramming trying to be able to get word into congress, the congressional staff to make some kind of a difference. Get that information out in the hands of the public, it belongs there. On ??? I want to say thank you for being emphatic that this is not going to be open for non Hanford waste, please make sure it stays that way. There will be pressure to keep on digging those trenches longer and longer and solve a lot of other peoples problems. The Department of Energy in dealing ERDIF, dealing with environmental restoration needs to quit hiding behind the old section 1-13 H needs to have very specific language in any future agreements with the state and the EPA saying what consequences it is subject to. How it is going to be hurt, how it can be sued if it fails to meet the agreements. And again I am not just talking about D island. I am talking about the 100, 200, 300 area all of Hanford and the down winders. Thank you

CC: My name is Carey Canfield. I want to start by quoting from an article by Dave Tabit the Washington Environmental Council. There is a danger paralyzing delay when the agencies demand to know from the public exactly what clean means. Especially when that question is asked before any action takes place. The Department of Ecology must aggressively and creatively use the state Model Toxics Control Act. The regulations under MTCA anticipated the danger of bogging down on the question of how clean is clean. The regulations set clean-up standards that will allow for unrestricted use of sites with minimal reliance on institutional controls. These standards are not to be negotiated on a site by site basis. They must be met if technically feasible. They are not negotiable because of cost. MTCA also anticipated that in complex sites there might not be adequate information at the start of the clean-up to plan the remedial action that will obtain clean-up standards. There for it is possible to embark on a phased clean-up or to adjust the time of compliance. This

flexibility was intentional to encourage action to start while preserving the clean-up standards. With Hanford the public can not allow the agencies to bog down in the question of how clean is clean. We must resist any attempt to weaken the MTCA standards before remedial action even begins. We must keep the focus on the fact that the site is high contaminated and we must insist that clean-up start immediately. I continue now with my own thoughts. Thanks for tonight's presentation, it was fairly direct and clear. I do think however that the distinction between environmental restoration and clean-up is at best a bureaucratic one and in a holistic one not valid. I tired to read this booklet, this one here, but I just couldn't follow it. May be I should try harder. But it strikes me the document is simply not very meaningful and this causes me to wonder about the agreement itself. Not that any of these documents are meaningless, just that they comprise such highly evolved bureaucracies that I wonder who really understands at all. I had a very hard time trying to tie things together to get some sense of the true process. Of course it is not my job. However, I have an equally hard time believing that someone executive person or body whose job it is, is actually keeping track of what all this says and insuring that it is internally consistent and really mean something. And this is just one little pamphlet. I suppose there are rooms full of paper regarding these matters. Is this why clean-up progressing so slowly? Because the major portion of everyone's job consists simply of simply figuring out what myriads of documents like this are actually saying or suppose to be saying. Then as far as I could determine most of the so called milestones seem to consist merely of making assessments, reports, or plans. If I understand correctly tonight we are commenting on a plan, for a plan. Very few of these milestones, at least up to the point to which I read, seem to indicate achievement of real physical act of clean-up. Why? Even the assessments,

reports and plans seem to be not due for another one to four years. Why again? I am sorry I just don't get it. I am sorry if I am ungenerous but I'm even moved to wonder if the concerned departments are simply biding their time, banking on the new republican congress to call the whole thing off and put Hanford back in the defense production. I put it purely and simply. Do we have problems or don't we? Is there contamination or isn't there? I have the overwhelming impression that there is. If this contamination poses as a hazard, the actual numbers are irrelevant, why are we still going around and around on this two years after the first Tri-party Agreement was signed. Why are negotiating? Isn't that an activity antagonists? As I have said at other times if a particular proposed change and policy or procedure will render conditions more hazardous or dangers then they are at present, why should anyone consent to that proposal? If a proposed change would decrease the hazard or danger, why would anyone object? Is this clean-up somebody's full time job? If it is I suggest (a) closing the various departments of obscuratation at their various locations, recycling all of this damn CYA paperwork and (c) doing that job. Thanks for listening.

CS: I am Cnythia Sartooth, Staff Attorney for Heart America Northwest. I know all of you all.

NV: Is this the official?

NV: Yes this is my official ten minutes. Well I think Jerry is going to give the organizational statement. I will just take five minutes I don't have that much to say. But I would have to agree with Jerry that we have talked about on HAV public involvement committee that you should put this into a readable form and you all got an F. It is not in a very readable form, it is not understandable, in fact it took me a long time to put together a summary of what the heck was going on. So you all, need to work on that a little. I am going to hit first on my pet peeve which is

the lack of integration in the 100 area. I still don't understand how you can do environmental restoration if you haven't integrated the milestones for D&D. I know you are going to negotiate most of them by 1996, but it is still no planned that D&D will be completed by 2018 which is the date on which environmental restoration of all those areas are suppose to be completed. And I hope that I am wrong, but I am very concerned about it. Because I am really still not clear on how, you know, or why you want to go vacuum the house before you pull down the plaster. It just doesn't make sense to me that you can fully clean-up an area when you haven't even removed the buildings which the people in D&D tell me are going to again contaminate the soil that has all ready been cleaned up. So it is sort of a double whammy on money. Second of all I would like to adopt Jerry's quote of Dave Tabits on how clean is clean? I am very concerned that the Hanford Advisory Board was asked so early to try to answer the question of how clean is clean. I think DOE, presented some figures that were highly exaggerated. That were not based on actual work that they had done. That were highly inflated in terms of analysis and I also feel that there is a serious problem when you start a clean-up all ready trying to compromise the clean-up standards. I think that there is a point which you can show that something is technically feasible or something that is technically infeasible. But I don't believe that you should start a clean-up saying we cant clean it up to that standard. When you really don't know. And as to cost, I have a serious problem with that question. I realize that in the abstract it is easy to say that x amount of money is too much to save one human life. But if that human life is my father or my mother or my child, I think that is very serious. And I am not sure that I wouldn't spend that much money to save the life of my mother, my father or my child. And I know a lot of people who have spent a lot of money trying to save their family. So I would say that the cost is really irrelevant

at this time. And at some point it may become relevant but after you provide concrete proof that you cant clean it up. That you can not in fact meet the standards that are required by law. And finally I have some comments on ERDIF. I mean we have no problem with the existence of the facility. We do think that it should be limited to Hanford waste. I have been told that you know that because it is CAMU it will be limited to Hanford waste. At least I was told it was a CAMU, but may be that has changed.

NV: It has changed over ??? landfill. So it does limit it to Hanford waste. What is a CAMU?

NF: Don't ask me. They could tell you.

NV: Well he asked me.

NV: He wants it on camera. What is a CAMU ? A corrective Action Management Unit. I am sorry sometimes these things slide past me.

NV: But when it is the stakeholder that does it, it makes them all really glad.

NV: But I know that there is also a possibility that there will be a resource conservation and recovery act permit applied for by this facility, which may not be limited to only Hanford waste. At some future date. So I just want to put on record that we are very concerned about off-site waste. I am also concerned about what I have understood is the potential for proposal for a new disposal facility for off-site waste in the 200 west area, in the north corner. That is a serious concern especially since stakeholders have said, over and over again, that they do not want off-site waste. I realize it is DOE's plan to start playing a shell game with DOE's waste from ??? and Rocky Flats etc. But we don't accept the premise that just because we are large we should take all of their stuff. Second of all we want to

insure that strict acceptance criteria are in place. We also want to have some public input into that process. We feel it is important enough for the public to be able to work with you on that and give you input on it. And finally I want to ensure that there is plenty of monitoring around this facility. That there is air monitoring and other monitoring to make sure that nothing goes off this site that you are all now thinking will not go off the site. And I guess that is about it for now. Thank you very much.

FD: OK my name is Phyllis Davis, I live in Menwood and I work for a couple in Edmonds and this couple has a one year old daughter, or granddaughter Cloe who is growing up in the Tri-Cities and hope tomorrow when I go into work that I can tell my bosses that next summer when Cloe is two years and definitively at that dig and taste stage. That next summer when she is enjoying the Columbia River shoreline and island. That the three gentlemen that are facing me right now, really listened and did take the corrective action of posting signs. I could sense that, next summer those signs will be there for her protection. I hope I am correct.

KC: My name is Kathryn Crandel and I certainly support those statements and I also wanted to lend my support to Cindy Sartooths comments. And I just want to say that I am really disappointed because last year you had promised us . . . accelerated clean-up along the Columbia River and my assumption was that was being negotiated and instead what I see is less clean-up, slower and that is not what the public asked for. And we have regulatory agencies that are rolling over and relaxing milestones quote unquote, because the DOE is setting internally lower funding levels for clean-up of the Columbia River while they are simultaneously spending over a million dollars on chauffeur service. That is ridiculously. I want to ask you to please set limits that make it safe for people to use the river in the unrestricted

way that they are all ready using it by the year 2000. With the ERDIF facility, I feel like you guys haven't got many comments, I want to say that I am glad that you have made a commitment not to accept waste from outside of the Hanford site, everybody agrees that would be a bad idea. Obviously you have to make some commitments to that in writing that you are going to stick to. And the other thing I am concerned about is how you are going to do monitoring at the site. I was asking somebody about monitoring and nobody seemed to know about that. Monitoring is obviously been a serious problem, the high level waste tanks. I think that we need to learn from that example and make this a safe facility.

HH: My name is Hillary Harding and you can put a ditto after Cindy Sartooths comments with my name. I also looked at the green book and I am a very visual person and my explanation of what I perceived to be happening was sort of the scales of justice and I have been attending a lot of these meetings. I felt that I would be seeing a delay balanced by an acceleration and I was looking for that. What I saw in my head was the scales of justice with a delay, no acceleration, a delay, no acceleration a delay, And Kathy picked up on the same words I did, laxing of the mouth

TAPE 2-SIDE B

...it didn't seem to be an acceleration so I started to say well if it is suppose to be an acceleration it is not an acceleration than it becomes a delay. So my scales got tipped pretty heavily. But I did have a hard time going through that book and deciphering all that was being said. So I am very delighted to see that this is called tentative agreement. It is late, I am tired, my pithy summery here is I don't accept this renegotiation. This tentative agreement as a member of the public. I have been participating these hearings. This is not what I expected. And at meetings before we have been asked tell us what to do, don't just complain give us something you want us to do. I want you to

go back and do this right. I don't think this is ok. If it is I think it needs to be more attention paid to what the public is saying instead of just meeting what it seems they are saying and you can sort of get away with saying well we have listened to you now we want to show that we have done what you want. And then hiding it behind a booklet it is hard to see what's been done. My short order is that it is not ok as an agreement at this point I would like to see further work, I would like to see it go back to the table and address again some of the same issues that we asked for and may be try to meet our requests of it better.

LA: Hi my name is Lorretta Ahouse. I want to go on the record saying that I too found the green booklet pretty unreadable. Pretty much got nothing out of going through that. I also wanted to go on the record saying that the fact that there are no signs, warning signs on these islands especially when it has been acknowledged that these are not going to be safe for 10 years is immoral and chancier and I thought that the idea of putting fences around some of the islands is a great idea. If that is the only way we are going to keep people off. I think that the main point is safety to wildlife and to the public. People are using this area and that has to be our number one priority and I think it is clear from everything that has been said tonight that the public feels that and we are very concerned that is not what is being covered in this proposed action.

NV: We are going to close the formal comment period if there is no one else.

NV: For the record I would like to make sure that we request on the record during the record time that the presentation I did is part of our records on comments, that I don't have to bore everyone by trying to do it again. And that the panel discussion which I think was very valuable and a real

so complicated that you don't put it out on bid.

NV: I have been waiting patiently to get in these questions and first I would like to start by saying that we have been here a long time and we must all be tired. Mike for the Department of Energy I would just like to know when the gentlemen ask you how much is too much radiation exposure. You weren't able to quote the EPA standard. Instead you went around and gave your personal view on how much is too much. How come you cant give him a straight answer or didn't give him a straight answer.

NV: In CERCLA generally what we look at is risk of 10 to the minus six, to ten of the minus for increased cancer risks. There is also some environmental risks that we deal with. There are appropriate relevant requirements that we have to deal with that are set by statute. It is very complex and it is specific by each individual nuclei or toxins.

NV: Ok that is good enough. You just didn't do that, that's all. When he asked you didn't respond that way in which I think would have been more correct, but thank you. When it comes towards the moving of the reactor cores, who ever would like to answer this. They are concerned about the soil movement of pulling those reactors. But isn't that soil going to be displaced and put into the disposal facility that is going to be set-up because wont that be contaminated soil any ways?

NV: The issue with the timing of the reactor removal and when whether it could recontaminate the site, is an important issue and we don't want that to occur. But in these negotiations we did not set dates for removing each reactor. Part of that is related to establishing clean-up schedules for the individual waste sites. But what we like to do is to do them together. Right now we are in the process of making decisions for certain operable units that contain the reactor buildings. In the very near term in the previous

budget projections had us spending between now and the year 2000 about 250 million dollars developing this 280 wheel cart that Jerry described. That is effectively a years worth of the Hanford clean-up budget in the next four years just to develop a cart to carry the reactor.

NV: Oh, it is not all ready developed?

NV: Oh, no. This was not to build it. This was to engineer and design the biggest car.

NV: You should put that out for bid.

NV: All I am saying is between now and the year 2000 we can make much better use of these funds cleaning up actual waste sites then we can spending it on a 200 million dollar design option for the reactor block movement system. DOE's previous commitment to move these reactors away from the river was they will do it over the next 75 years. That is what their EIS record of decision says. They have never said they would do the 2018. We haven't given up not doing them by 2018, we have said that we cant set the schedule until about the end of December of 1996. That is when we should have some information on the clean-up schedules for the surrounding units. We haven't given up on that.

NV: I would also commend you on your attempt to give straight answers in this hearing that was very pleasant. The remainder of the question are for the disposal facility. My question is, is this disposal facility going to be addressed with the full EIS? I cant quite make the correlation between why it is not being addressed in the environmental impact statement situation.

NV: What we have tried to do with the RIFS in the back is to incorporate the values from the National Environmental

Policy Act. The NEPA values into that RIFS and kind of combine the two regulatory processes. They are fairly duplicative and we want to eliminate that duplicative processes. There wont be an environmental impact statement for the ERDF. What we would be doing is writing a record of decision for the proposal facility.

NV: Let me just say that was something that the State Advisory Council and the Oregon Waste Board, and citizen groups encouraged integration of the two. I am not sure that it has worked perfectly. I mean the biggest difficulty is that under NEPA the number one values to produce the readable document and I am not sure we met that. Quite honestly in terms of value.

NV: I would like to say one thing. We need to hear that. We need to know how readable that document is. OK that is what we need to here. And how was the proposed plan?

NV: What part of the proposed plan.

NV: That was the summary for the ERDIF.

NV: The green one.

NV: No not the green one.

NV: Oh, the other one, no I don't know.

NV: I would like everybody to read it. To see if we addressed the values of the NEPA analysis. Again we need to hear if we did it right. Or if give us some indication of what we need to change.

NV: The other question I would like to ask is I haven't heard anything in the presentations I haven't went to the document yet. On the amount of money being spent on this project and where the money will be coming from.

NV: The facility is the initial construction will cost 65 million dollars. Now that is for, that will give us capacity for the first five years of waste disposal. If the facility goes out as far as we think it might or could possibly go it would cost 750 million through the year 2018. And it is not going to be cheap.

NV: Where is the money coming from?

NV: The ER budget.

NV: OK I think that is all the questions I have. That is it thanks alot.

NV: I want to take this last question everybody is fading probably so are the panelists. So this it unless somebody cant stand to be cut off.

NV: I have a couple of questions the N Springs is that an actual spring near the N reactor or?

NV: Back when we were operating the N reactor and discharging great amounts of water there were very active springs there at the best today it considered a seep. You cant see flowing water there because of the low water. I would imagine some point in time we will see springs there again.

NV: I am concerned about there is two ??? that need to be cleaned up at least looking at that. Is that correct?

NV: There is one operpher, the unconfined operpher that is contaminated at Hanford. There is a number of plumes within the one operpher.

NV: Does the water flow back and forth to the Columbia or?

dialogue also be on the record. I have one additional comment for Heart of America Northwest on ERDF. Which is we are concerned that the waste acceptance criteria very explicitly include Washington State's management priorities as treatment standards. Washington state has in its law a set of waste management priorities that say you don't landfill unless you can treat and have attempted to treat and this is very important that we insist that these be followed. Now, second concern that rises from that is the fact that you said in the presentation either Norm or Pam that ERDF would follow ??? Washington State's law, but and that you would not accept any extremely hazardous wastes which is a Washington State term for a certain level of toxicity. And you wouldn't accept transuranic waste etc. I am concerned that apparently there is an effort to place a low level waste dump at Hanford or expand the current site to include both Hanford and non-Hanford low level wastes and what is very disturbing to us is that the Westinghouse Hanford Company has been using our tax dollars to lobby for an end to the regulation that creates the extremely hazardous waste category in Washington State law. And they have been lobbying to lower to 10% of the current standard what is a dangerous waste. That would mean that 90% of the wastes that are now expected to be dug up to go into ERDF because of their toxicity levels would suddenly be reclassified as low level wastes only and they be free to go from a RCRA compliant double lined trench and we are glad that you are choosing that option and now they be going instead to simple "random" disposal unlined trenches with no leach ??? collection system, no monitoring requirements, no regulator oversight by ecology or EPA. And we are very concerned about that and we would like a response on the record as to why Westinghouse Hanford Company has been allowed lobby for those two changes on our federal tax dollar which we understand is illegal. Secondly we would like responses to what the impacts would be of eliminating EHW as a category and lower the toxicity level to 10% of what it is currently is for dangerous waste in terms of

protection of human health and the environment as we clean-up Hanford and dig up soils that we need to dig up and remove. Thank you.

SS: Good evening my name is Scott Stunball. I am a Seattle resident. I am truly sadden to hear what I just heard about the Westinghouse Corporation going to lobby representatives to lower the standard for allowable hazardous waste and I hope that doesn't happen. So in that same vein, I think the ??? Toxic Control Act regulations for the clean-up standards at Hanford are the standards that ought to be used for the environmental restoration overall analysis. And they are good standards and they are there and they should be used. I think that DOE needs to demand reductions from Hanford contractors of the strodium levels in the groundwater which I guess are reported at 15,000 times the acceptable levels and if they accelerated negotiated agreement can be finalized as soon as possible. That is that much sooner that remedial action can happen and those high levels of strodium which are real health and safety threat to people and wildlife can be removed from the environment. I think it is important that the accelerated preventive steps that have all ready been approved by the contractors for the N Springs area of Hanford. And by those preventive measures, I mean the pumping out of the contaminated water and the treatment of it and also the constructing I guess of an underground wall preventing the contaminations from reaching the ground water. I think they ought to start the construction on those plans of action immediately. They sound to me like good first steps in a critical area which the N Springs are vital as far as any groundwater reaching the Columbia River and contaminating the rest of Hanford reach river area. So accelerate those actions environmental steps as soon as possible. Please. The issue of Sky Shine it seems to me like somebody suggested capping the N area cribs I think so to and the sooner the better. The

radiation levels along the 100 N area shoreline that is the area where the N reactor and its contamination discharge facilities are located. Well I guess they pose a real serious health and safety threat to the general public. This risk should be first and foremost addressed by the Modeled Toxic Control Act. I have to agree with some other speakers tonight ask that fences on the shores, hot areas on the shoreline if they are monitored and are giving off high levels of radio active gama ray particles that fences be erected as barriers keeping the general public from those areas. Finally, exposures to the public along the shorelines in various islands of the Columbia River certainly are containing heavy metals and toxic chemicals like mercury which are brought to this environment by all of these abandon reactors out fall pipes and I guess the N reactor, they are potentially lethal. You know somebody is constantly within probably a 1/2 mile of there everyday of the week fishing. Especially somebody under 18 years old. You are putting the public at risk and some positive stuff I would like to see this panel take under consideration would be to take the advice offered by the Hanford Advisory Board on the environmental restoration, please. Total funding of 1.5 billion to be used on environmental restoration and not clean-up. That is in my mind that is what clean-up means, total environmental restoration and it doesn't mean paper work. I don't want to see a cap on the environmental restoration funding. I am against any renegotiation of the scope of work outlined in the current agreement negotiation solely based on budget reasons and PS in closing let me say that I expect a commitment from the Department of Energy to reply to the public input from these hearings before the renegotiated agreement is reached.

TT: I am Tim Takaro with the Physicians for Social Responsibility this evening. In light of the interests by the agricultural community in the Tri-Cities to develop the north slope for agricultural use. I would like the public record to reflect estimates by the Department of Health

about Sky Shine and the far side of the river on the north slope and the variation that one would expect with weather conditions. Especially considering worst weather conditions scenarios. Thank you.

- NV: Is there anyone else who would like to put a formal comment on the record at this time?
- DW: OK I am David Wilson and I have a question. I have heard two remarks about the radiation at island D. Jerry gave a certain number that he said he would get as much as 10 times the radiation in one hour as the allowable limit for a year. And I think Mike you were geologist and you gave other numbers and I have heard a resolution of those. You said you could go there and fish as often as your wife would let and you wouldn't get that much more radiation. I am aware that radiation can change, if stay here in Seattle or if we go up in Mt. Ranier or go to Denver. If you go to Denver or Mt. Ranier that radiation is twice what you get here. So if we are splitting hairs over a few milirams per year it isn't worth putting fences around the island because if you are going to do that you better put a fence around Denver and don't go there because you are going to get twice the radiation there than you are here. So I have a question. What is the radiation level on D island.
- NV: OK when we looked at the chips that we picked up off of D island, 98% of those chips were 2 microrads per hour or less. That is very low level of radio activity. The majority of that radiation is caused by Cobalt 60 has a five year half life. What we determined was that level of radio activity for a casual use of the island is probably not harmful. Plus you may encounter one of those chips, my numbers amy be wrong, please excuse me if they are but I believe it is about 1 every 5,000 sq. ft. So the probability of your encounter is very low, the level of

radio activity is very low. You can sleep on top of one of these things for a week without exceeding the appropriate limits for particulate radio activity. That is the numbers that I have.

- DW: OK then you refute Jerry's accusation that the radiation is high on D island and that it isn't necessary to do any more clean-up on D island is that true?
- NV: High is a relative statement. There are a number community that feel that any radiation is inappropriate and for those that feel that any radiation exposure is inappropriate they would argue that needs to be cleaned up. If you look at the limits that generally are in our city or any of the ??? space limits use it is not that high. Plus it is decaying away 1/2 of the activity every five years. Now the issue that Jerry brought up and I am afraid we are confusing two issues. One is the Sky Shine, that other is the particulate radiation at D island. Sky Shine is the issue at N reactor which is radiation, gama radiation coming from the two crib disposal facilities that you saw on the photograph. And that is about 10 microrads per hour in terms of Sky Shine.
- NV: I would just like to add one more thing. We just got the report on the findings on D island in the last week. We have not had a chance to review those findings and we certainly haven't yet concurred one way or the other whether additional work is need on D island or is not needed on D island. So from the regulatory standpoint it is still an open question and a very good one. And so I don't think we are ready to give you a pat answer on whether we think D island is safe for the short term or not. I was giving a DOE perspective and what Doug is saying is absolutely true. We have not heard back officially from the regulatory agencies whether they concur with their assessment.
- NV: I think it is really important. I think you may have mixed N area and D island. N area the gama radiation levels are

and I have chart from the last annual report shows 24 times EPA allowable limit of 10 milirams per year. So 240 miliram extra radiation very significant levels of radiation and you are talking about a significant public exposure hazard. Now we sat levels of radiation exposure that are "allowable" in this country based upon a rational process called politics. And in that process we decide that it is acceptable for you to get certain doses of radiation that will cause certain number of fatal cancers per year for every 10,000 people exposed. Now EPA has its level which says that under the Clean Air Act the DOE can only emit from a nuclear facility 10 miliram per year. They are exceeding that grossly along the areas of the N areas shoreline. And I think there are probably some other areas as well. Now for the islands, I am really glad that we done some work on D island. We may have reduced the immediate public health risk on D island so that you don't need an immediate effort, but you also shouldn't be encouraging people to go out there. Because what they did was not detailed survey. What they did was not is required the Super Fund or the State Super Fund or RCRA to go out and say we know that 30 years ago, on the beaches there were reactor fuel chips. Where are they now. Do we need to go back? What is the risk of leaving it alone. Is it greater than one additional fatal cancer per 10,000. Is it greater than one in a million. If it is greater than one in a million or less than one in a million we don't need to clean up the island. If however, it is far greater and I suspect it may be in certain areas, for certain islands then we need to clean them up. Now what we haven't done is done the same work on the other islands that they did on D island. And the reason is this, we used to D island purely as an example last year because it happened to be on the slide I put up. And so work was done on D island and if I put up B island I can only think that may be the work would have been done on an island that was closer to the city of Richmond that is used by even more people with

the same risks. And that is the key here. We haven't investigated properly and thoroughly we have done a quick and dirty investigation that I hope means that people using D island tomorrow aren't going to get unnecessarily exposed more than they could with a very, very cheap sweep of the island.

DW: Now I have another question. Since there are other, we seem to have this may be there is a danger there and may be there isn't. But there are other places where there are danger and you project managers talked about 201 or whatever it is I don't care 201 million dollars and no one has ever in project managing there have refuted these claims and I don't know whether they are true or not. They say hey Westinghouse has spent more money on overhead then you have budgeted for clean-up. No manager has ever said that money that 201 million is going to be used for clean-up not for study. I have not heard that tonight and I would like to hear from a manager "yes, that is money that is going to be used to clean-up, it is not going to be used to make other studies." Can a manager tell me that yes we are going to use that money to actually do clean-up.

NV: First of all there have been a number of people that have had issue with the tentative agreement and I certainly understand that issue because I deal with this everyday of my life and it is hard for me sometime to get through the ??? what we write in the Tri-party Agreement. But we do live in litigious world and it is a legal agreement so because of the world we live in we have to write these things in the agreement such that they will stand up in a court of law. And everyone understands what they mean and it is not very palatable to the lay community and sometimes not very understandable by those of us who deal with it everyday. And I apologize for that. I guess that is something we have to live with. There was an attempt by some folks to put this out that may be a little more palatable but it may not do the job for you either. I

understand the issue there. Over the last two years just to give you my perspective of where we are in negotiations in 1993 and 94. We have done a lot to shot gun the clean-up of Hanford. We started about half a dozen with the new N Springs pump and treat, but a half of a dozen pump and treat operations to deal with groundwater at the Hanford site. Now we have done a number of expedite response action since 1991 to try to get some work done on the site. But until the Hanford site develops a disposal facility ERDF in particular and we have a milestone to have that operationally in September of 1996. There is not a lot of places we can put large scale remedial action clean-up debris for contaminated dirt and that sort of thing. So what this agreement does for us over the next year is that it gets us past the study phase for 3 out of the 4 NPL sites at the Hanford site. We will have decided what we are going to do. We will have records of decision on what the clean up is. When we get those records of decision we will sit down and we will go through a remedial design, remedial action phase. We will engineer the cleanup and set enforceable milestone for the clean-up after we decide what the clean-up is going to be. And this is a major improvement over what we had in the past. This will get us through the investigative phase in the next year for most of the Hanford site and it will get us into real clean-up. So that when we have an environmental restoration disposal facility that is open. We will have decisions made and engineering done and we will be poised and ready to do significant clean-up at Hanford. And we will be able to focus the dollars that we have that Congress sends us on clean up and not on study. And I think that is the key thing that this agreement has done for us and why personally I am proud of the work we have done.

DW: I don't think my question was answered. My question was how much of that 201 and you went on and on and on and on and you told

me you have to do these things. Yes, you have to make the study and yes you just cant get a shovel and start digging. You have to know where to dig, you have to know where to put it. I understand that. But what I am saying is can you tell me there must be some estimate that yeah, maybe the studies will take 10%, may be they will take 10 million dollars, but there is going to be a 190 or something. I put numbers out in the air that it will be used for actual clean up. Will somebody tell me that.

NV: I would like to give you the estimates as I know them from the last couple of years. If you look at the amount of money spent in say 1994 on studies versus clean-up on the ER program alone 200 million that we are talking about. About 65% of the money was spent on paperwork. 65% was spent doing environmental restoration investigations, preparing work plans, writing permit closure plans and permit applications. Doing that portion of the paperwork that needs to be done before we can move into remediation. About another 15% of that budget spent doing decontamination and decommissioning of facilities. That is actually tearing down buildings which gets us somewhere towards clean up. The remaining dollars were spent between clean up of the north slope in 1100 area which are clean up actions that we have all ready decided. And some other expedited response actions or clean ups that we decided to do. So if you include decontamination and decommission there was on the order of 25 to 30% of the budget was spent on those activities. Now some of that is included in management costs, for individual projects but in essence that is the balance we are looking at. The balance is changing as a result of this agreement. We are not going to be spending 65% of our money doing investigations. We are going to be spending a much higher percentage in 95 I would guess around 50% actually doing groundwater remediation and doing other clean-up actions. And as I think as time goes on in 1996 the percentage will go up. So that more will be spent on clean-up then is spent on investigations. Some of the

investigations we are doing in the 200 area are very expensive. One operable unit investigation for 9 soil sites called the 200 BP 1 unit cost 28 million just to investigate 9 waste sites. If we can move that money from doing the investigations to doing clean-up we can do a more effective clean-up in the near term. And that is one of the things I think this agreement accomplishes.

NV: My last question then. Can somebody respond to the fact that Westinghouse overhead exceeds the 200 million dollar budget over clean-up. Is that a true statement? Is this something somebody has picked out of the air. Can it be justified? Here we are you know and I haven't looked at it that way but I am certain that is probably correct. That is not justifiable. No that it is over 200 million dollars out of 1.6 billion.

NV: Let me go through the figures. Last year's figures we don't have this years. There are a couple of caveats. I shouldn't say caveats. There is a couple of interesting points. One if the Department of Energy refused to release Westinghouse Hanford Company's overhead charge to the environmental restoration waste management budget under the freedom of information act. Last year, this year and they finally the first time ever released it to the public on October 5th to the Dollar and Cents of the Hanford Advisory Board which I have those materials at and I am responsible for writing up the reports for the Advisory Board. Now, the figure for 1994 was that 22% of every dollar given for environmental restoration or waste management was taxed and put into Westinghouse Hanford Company's overhead and indirect funded account for overhead. Now that is different than another 60 odd million spent on program direction and administration which normally one thinks as overhead out at the site. Now that figure of 22% came to about 170 some odd million dollars and the budget for environmental restoration was 197

- NV: Yes it does depending on the stage of the Columbia River. At high water the river water flows into the bank and low water that bank stored water then flows back into the river. And that includes some contiminatees from the groundwater.
- NV: OK Do you know how much water that involves? How much is in the occerpher?
- NV: We have some estimates of that yes. I dont know the numbers off the top of my head, but we have looked at that yes.
- NV: I have read that the Idaho National Engineering Lab had 56 reactors or somewhere near that is that correct.
- NV: I dont know whether they can be expected to answer questions about Idaho.
- NV: I dont know.
- NV: It really is not their job.
- NV: I apologize I was not standing up there, but I will ask my quick questions here. I recognize that people are fading, but that is probably partly because of the airconditioning in this place. I noticed that it is kind of shut down and I realize that is part of saving the money and what not.

TAPE 3-SIDE A

NV: ...because they are always looking for little projects in order to study. Has there been any kind of cost estimates put together to try and figure out what kind of study it would take to come up with the right wording for these signs and how many dollars. I imagine that with there kind of thinking I am a project manger myself and I would start out with probably that would be a good 10 million dollars may be 15 million dollars little thing as to what the wording could be. Can anybody answer that? Has there been any?

NV: No sir, there hasn't and if it cost 10-15 million dollars someone should be hanged.

NV: No, I think if you think about the liability it would be cheap at half the price. The next question I have I mentioned the River Hermit project. The reason it got started was our leader was one of the people back about 20 years ago who was out there I don't know whether he was on D island or where he was. He mentioned he was out looking for arrowheads. Some of you are in that area probably know where the good arrowheads are, but he admitted that he was doing it. At any rate he go a little wound on his arm that he says now still has not really healed, some twenty years later. He said basically for about five years weeped quite a bit. The question is this, is there any place that you people keep statistics on that or people can report those kinds of things and is that being done?

NV: I am going to plead ignorance I don't know.

NV: Well I mentioned that to you earlier. That will be a good question. I hope St. Peter doesn't ask it of you. The next question I have is how many of you on the panel is familiar is familiar the PECO effect. I may be mispronouncing it, I

have only read it. I got a quick show of hands. How many of you have ever heard the word PECO effect? OK. I am not an expert on this. I have been studying this now for about three years and I do not consider myself an expert. I did mention I am a civil engineer by background, I have a masters degree. But the study that I have been doing and of course I have been reading some people who are not politically correct. People like Stearn Glass and some of those people. But the PECO effect basically says that when we have low level radiation, basically that there is two kinds of things that can happen. And one of the things is that when you get down into the lower levels, that actually where you get into the cell changes. And you actually get into mutations. And he did this study originally I believe fruit flys if I am correct, I may be wrong somebody who is more expert on this can correct me. But what happened was as they started doing these low levels what found out is the body when you start having this you start getting into genetic changes and of course there has been a lot more study done in the last few years on that. So therefore, these people who are out in Hanford, when you start talking about I know that the DOE for years has relied on the legal basis and far as what is considered a high level dose. But when you start getting into the low level doses, I submit from the study that I have done here actually getting more likely into having true mutation effects. And I think we are going to see a lot more things like this deer that this lady mentioned, I don't know if that was a real study or not, or something she read in the National Enquirer. But if it is real I think we are going to see a lot more of those things. And I submit gentlemen you better start studying about the PECO effect. Because I think that St. Peter is also going to ask you about that too.

NV: Just a couple of quickies here. In regards to something that I, the clean-up budget has a little bit coming out for

a construction of a highway and who would ever be in the know on this. I heard it was 12 million dollars is that the correct figure for this particular year. Anybody know about this at all?

NV: We don't regulate highways.

NV: It is not regulation. It is construction.

NV: I don't think they have the answer. Does Jerry have the answer. Jerry's version of the answer. I tell you what I mean, you are asking them and they are the agencies and Jerry is going to answer and it is not an agency answer.

NV: Unfortunately I think there aren't many people scrutinize the Department of Energy's budget. Unfortunately these folks may not have these answers. Ecology does have somebody who is very knowledgeable about it. And I think because, I know because of public pressure and some inquiries from the other Washington and some outrage. The funding for the highway that you are referring to, I think the expansion, the major expansion of the main route in north of the Y barricade has been referred from 1995 that is the good news. The bad news is that with a total estimated cost of highway and affiliated parking lot and everything else expansion you are talking 18 to 20 million dollars total costs. And it is still in over several years starting in 1996.

NV: Is that coming out of clean-up money?

NV: It comes out of your environmental restoration waste management dollar. It is part of what his budget for ER gets taxed and overhead. And its either in overhead or they take it out as waste management landlord dollars.

- NV: When I heard that thing about the highway construction and all the money that was coming out, granted the amount is pretty small percentage wise of the whole clean-up budget not so small to the ER budget. That really illustrates a problem with priorities here. I am sure a new highway is maybe need, maybe it would be nice. I don't know if it cuts the corner. Some how it will be a help probably. Man there is a mess out there and it is killing people and it is going to get worse. You know we have to start building these highways and doing this other stuff. I guess when I heard that 65% of the money is going to paperwork, come on. This really, this needs to be improved and there is no reason why that cant be improved quickly.
- NV: So you don't need the new highway if you don't build a brand new spanking new office out there.
- NV: That is where the highway is going to go?
- NV: With cherrywood panelling and old douglas fir paneling. Which the Spokesman Review just reported. You don't need the new highway if you didn't build the new offices instead rent space in Richland or use your existing federal building. But instead you have a got whole major construction program that costs scores of millions of dollars. The highway is just one part of it and so it looks like small potatoes when we say there is a highway and it costs 18 million but it is pretty big potatoes when you start adding up everything else in comparison to what Mike Thompson budget is for environmental restoration. That is I guess I think what you are saying.
- NV: There is a huge problem with priorities and I think it doesn't take a huge intellect to kind of figure out what the best thing to do is here. Start doing the right thing please.

NV: OK I am going to close the meeting.

NV: Now you ought to ask the question if anyone wants to ask another comment?

NV: OK would anyone else like to give another comment?

NV: I would if nobody else wants to. My name again is Edgar Albrect and we have been talking and we have been listening and it is good that we have these meetings. These meetings are important to get the public comment and it is good that we are doing it. And I wanted to say a couple of quick comments one is I really appreciate the format tonight. One of the things is that you people cut your parts down very short and allowed us to the public to actually comment and I really appreciate that. Instead of trying to wear us out, that we all get discussed and go home which I have seen in other meetings. We really appreciate the fact that you do. I also really want to appreciate the fact that each one of you individually do take an interest in this thing. I realize that all of you are fathers, some of you mothers, some of you may be grand parents and you all take your roles very seriously. We really appreciate that. We in the public know that some of our anger is directed towards you and it is really not meant that way. Some of it is just the frustration of system. We realize that the system is set up, the military of course we have all heard about their fancy planes and 500 dollar screwdrivers and things like that now that they have no place to go where they moved to is environmental clean up. And we realize that some of the anger that was really directed at the old military programs is now moved into the environmental field because you people are kind of the lightning rod for that. And we really appreciate the fact I am speaking, I am using editorial, but I think I speak for many of the public. We really appreciate the fact that you are willing to be the

lightening rods. Because this is really a very serious thing. Many of us are aware that probably took the old USSR was not communique perse. It was basically that they got so much junk nuclear waste Chernobal that basically there whole system fell down. I would submit that the US may be not that far away going the same route the USSR did if we don't start addressing and start really thinking about what we are doing with our nuclear waste. I know that many people fish in the Columbia River. Many people wind surf and they think it is really great, but I know from personal experience that unfortunately we are seeing more cases of birth defects and those kinds of things showing up. I myself some of you may be aware that I lived near Rocky Flats for a couple years. My wife and I had a daughter born with Downe Syndrome we do not put it down to Rocky Flats at the time that we had our child we were both over forty years of age. And we realized that was probably just cosmic rays that comes from living in Denver at the higher altitude and I do not put it down at all to the fact that we were less than two miles from Rocky Flats. But I will submit that when you start looking at the data around Selefieid when you start looking around the data and I realize that we as a people move our people around. There is a corporate policy to keep moving people around. You got good man what do you do? You move him every two years. So it gets real confusing and it gets real hard for people to know where they actually probably ran into the problems. The fact that our daughter was born while we were still living in Denver was probably just a fluke. I happened to work construction I have actually worked with Becthel and have a lot of respect for them and it was just really unusual that we happen to still be in Denver after so many years. Because normally we just move. And I realize that pattern is happening around the country. Most people move, therefore don't really realize probably what is going on. But the data is starting to generate there gentlemen, ladies it is showing up and it is showing up and it is

showing up. The data is showing up around 3 mile island what is happening there is showing up around Savannah River and I submit that it is going to be showing up around Hanford and I realize that all of you have a very tough job. I also think we are also looking at probably what is going to be one of the biggest scams that is going to make the banking and loan industry scam look very, very small. But I think this whole environmental thing is really ripe for a scam. And I would tell you, I know that some of you your politics actually say that is the way it should be, but that it is really what it is about. It is take the American people. Well I tell you there is a number of people who are very upset about it and you are aware and I am aware that there are people who are taking measures to deal with it and I think that we need to start thinking about doing true serious clean-up, not running scams. We cant afford them any more. We will go the same route as USSR did and they had their problems too and they had their sick scams. But I will tell you we are looking at something very serious. I will also tell you that there is a lot of people that don't believe in the PECO effect and what not. But the data that I am seeing tells me that it is real and I will tell you, all of you, you have a very serious job that you are doing. I thank you again for doing it we are counting on you. We are praying for you because if you don't do it right we are probably going to see ??? taking off the planet. That may not be the worst thing, I will tell you it is very serious time. Thank you again.

NV: Is there anyone else who wants to put a formal comment on the record? If not the meeting is closed. Thank you all for coming.

million. You subtract 22% from a 197 million and you realize that you spent more money on overhead than you did on environmental restoration. About 20 million dollars more on overhead than on environmental restoration last year. It is shocking and it stinks we have got to do something about this system. And we have to do something about the fact that DOE and Westinghouse got away with preventing disclosure of it for this long as well. And they are still stonewalling, the Spokesman Review if you saw any of those reprints of the series they are running. They could not get the Westinghouse Hanford Company and the DOE Richland to disclose things like certain portion of their overhead being charged as legal fees, the Westinghouse Hanford Company's president office costs and a whole slue of other things we were refused to the Spokesman Review when they tried to examine the Hanford clean-up budget. It is shocking, I am hopeful that we will move more money into actual clean-up, but unfortunately as we do this as I have said. Clean-up is going to be more expensive than doing the study. And if we are spending a 150 million dollars a year doing the studies right now. Once we actually hit the milestones for remediation in a couple of years we are not going to have the funds unless the priority change. And the last point is this. Doug said we are going to move those dollars into remediation because of this new agreement. I disagree. Milestones and the current schedules under the existing agreement all ready dictated and you have heard tonight that most of the work plans and investigation are all ready do under the existing agreement along the river. 20 out of 25 of the work plans are due or done for the 100 area. Now the new agreement in fact under environmental restoration instead of doing 6 workplans a year to speed up this process. They are now only required to do an average of 4.8 workplans a year. This new agreement has not sped up the movement of your tax dollars from study to clean-up. That was underway, and the question is whether we are going to accelerate that.

NV: OK. Then my last comment. What as I as a citizen who feels that the overhead is too much for Westinghouse and I want more money into the actual clean-up who do I see?

NV: A couple of things. One is make sure that you write a letter to the governor and the Director of the Department of Ecologies saying that you want real acceleration and renegotiation and renegotiate until you get real acceleration of clean-up and that you don't want the artificial cap on environmental restoration to block that. Secondly, we have a problem with the new congress. You know. Strom Thurman and Floyd Spence both of South Carolina are now in charge of the clean-up budget. They are the House and Senate Arm Service Committee Chairs. Now there is good news. Mark Hatfield who has been champion of full funding to meet the Hanford clean-up milestones, a senator from Oregon is going to chair the relevant appropriation committee in the senate. Write him a letter. Give him a phone call and can check the Heart of America Northwest office for those numbers because that is what it is going to take now some political pressure and I know the agency people cant say that as easily.

NV: I would like to make a just a follow-up comment on the indirect charges that the one good thing that we have been seeing over the last couple of years whether it is DOE or DOE contract indirect or other aspects of their budgets is that we are finally get better and more timely data on their budgets as they are building them for future years or as they are spending them. Not as fast as we like, not as timely as we like but the fact of the matter is as we start to get that budget information and it gets more and more scrutiny and we start to get the pressure and those overhead rates are going to start coming down.

NV: You do put it out on bid don't you certain things, or is it