TAPE 1-SIDE A

LP: Good evening. My name is Linda Page and I am a professional facilitator working with Triangle Associates out of Seattle, Washington. And I have been contract with to run this series of Refocusing and Restoration Disposal Facility Public Meetings. We are glad to see all of you here. I hope you all got an agenda as you came into the back of the room. I will just run through it quickly with you so you know where we intend this meeting to go tonight and where your chances will be for comments and questions and answers. We will start with some agency presentations and with Doug Sherwood presenting the Environmental Restoration Refocusing. And then we will here from Pam Enise with the Restoration Disposal Facility and briefly from Norm Heppner. Also talking about the Restoration Disposal Facility. We will then hear from some of the stake holders who represent some of the interests groups who have been actively involved with the Hanford Project and they will, Page Night will make a presentation and then some of the stakeholders will join with the panelist up-front and there will be an opportunity for you all to ask questions and answers. Right before that we will have a short public comment period that those of you who need to leave and aren't able to wait until the longer public comment period or wait until after the informal question and answer session can give your formal comments on the record and then the panel, then at 8:30 we will go into the formal comment session. And I would like to introduce Dick Belsey who is going to welcome you on behalf of Oregon.



DB: I am Dick Belsey, I am a member of Oregon Hanford Waste Board and again I am delighted that you all are coming to visit us here in Oregon. We are impacted by what is going on at Hanford. Particularly things in and around the river and we are delighted to be able to have a hand in helping to shape what is going on up there. Hopefully to help DOE and the agencies to get it right the first time. Thank you.

LP: Thank you. I would like to ask the panelist to each introduce him or herself. Starting down at the end.

NH: I am Norm Hepner I am with Washington State Department of Ecology. I am working with Pam and Owen on the restoration disposal facility.

PE: I am Pam Enise I am the project manger for the restoration disposal facility for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

OR: I am Owen Robertson and I am with the Department of Energy. I am the project manager for the ERDF for the Department of Energy.

RS: I am Roger Stanley I am the Department of Ecology's Project Manager and I acted as team leader during our recent negotiations with DOE Restoration Program.

MT: I am Michael Thompson, I am a hydrologist by training I work for the Department of Energy at the Hanford Site and I served as a negotiator for the Department of Energy for the Restoration Refocus.

DS: My name is Doug Sherwood I am the Hanford Project Manager for the Environmental Protection Agency and the lead negotiator for the restoration refocusing negotiations.

LP: Doug is going to be our first presenter tonight.

DS: I would like to welcome you again tonight on behalf of the three parties. We are going to try something a little different this evening. Instead of essentially listening to each of the three of us get up here and talk about roughly the same thing. You are going to get to one of them. Fortunately or unfortunately that is me tonight. The purpose of the meeting tonight is really twofold to discuss

the restoration refocusing negotiations and our tentative agreement and receive your comments on those agreements and to also discuss the proposed plan for construction of an environmental restoration disposal facility. These two efforts are very closely tied. And essentially for us to speed-up cleanup along the river and in the 100 and 300 Areas we need a place to put the waste. And the restoration disposal facility for this program is going to be that place. So tonight we are here to discuss to obtain your comments on those two efforts. I would like to briefly go through the negotiation process, the scope of the milestones we discussed. A little bit on the status of the cleanup activities and then I would like to lead into Pam's discussion on the restoration disposal facility. The restoration refocusing negotiations really got started in 1993. During the tank waste remediations system negotiations last year we received a lot of good input from the public in terms of values and principals on which we should focus Hanford cleanup efforts. As a result of those initial discussions we started several new initiatives on the Environmental Restoration Program. Ground water initiatives and other initiatives along the Columbia River. When we looked at those new initiates and the context of what the program was we were previously carrying out. They didn't fit together very well and it made sense to all of us to go back and take a real look at the base program or the program we were working on. And as a result we decided back then to have an ER refocusing effort over the year to make those new initiatives and the base program really fit with the public and stakeholder values. And so as a result of that process we also learned something that the public input was tremendously valuable for the cleanup program. Our cleanup program before had milestones to do work, but it really wasn't focused on doing the work that reflected the values we heard during those negotiations. So during the negotiation process this year, again we came out early during the process of negotiations to get public input and

more public values. We met with the Hanford Advisory Board and we met with the Indian tribes throughout the process to try to get your input and kind of a realty check for us as negotiators on what you would like to see as a restoration program. What I would like to do now is go through the milestones that we dealt with during these re negotiations. The view graph that is on the screen right now discusses essentially the two cleanup processes that could be used to cleanup past practice waste sites at Hanford. First is the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act process, the second is the Comprehensive Response Compensation and Liability Act process. What I would like you to focus on is the milestone numbers on the far left and the goal on the right. The milestones that we dealt with were really in this part of the process milestones 13 which is actually the initiation of investigations or preparing work plans that outline what kind of investigations and what kind of remedial alternatives would be investigated for cleaning up waste sites. The second set is actually the milestones governing the investigation process, that is milestone 15 which characterizes the sites, evaluate alternatives, select the remedy, and then milestone 16 is after the remedy has been selected and a proposed plan has been prepared and tonight the proposed plan we are talking about under CERCLA process would be similar to the proposed plan to the restoration disposal facility. And then the final segment of the process is really to select a remedy and set a schedule for the cleanup process. The other milestones that we dealt with in this renegotiation were the M 20 milestone which deals with closure of the RECRA regulated treatment storage disposal units. We made in this renegotiation an effort to streamline the regulatory process and consolidate the past practice cleanup efforts with the treatment storage and disposal unit cleanup efforts. So what you will see in this package is milestones in M 20 that are very consistent with the milestones for starting investigations and preforming investigations under milestone M 15. The last milestone

that we dealt with was another effort at regulatory streamlining. It was the N Area pilot project where we looked at integrating the efforts to deactivate the N Reactor facility in conjunction with the cleanup efforts that dealt with cleaning up the waste sites adjacent to the N Reactor facility. So those were really the milestones that you will see in the package. What I would like to discuss now is a couple of other important aspects of this effort and how they relate to the on-going site cleanup activities across the Hanford Site. This particular view graph or map shows the areas of the Hanford Site as they were defined by the Hanford Future Site Uses Working Group. This was a good way to think about cleanup activities on the site and it was essentially the framework provided to us by the public for doing that through a process that was carried out in 1991 I believe. What I would like to do is go through kind of each of the areas there and tell you the status of the cleanup activities in those areas. The arid lands ecology area or the area in green. Cleanup decisions for that area have all ready been made as part of the 1100 Area record of decision. Cleanup of those waste sites was completed in the end of September, early October of this year. So that part of the site is essentially cleaned up. Although there may be restoration activities that still need to be preformed there. The area north of the Columbia River, referred to as the North Slope. The area in yellow is an area where we have all ready performed a cleanup action and right now we are getting the data back on how well we did in the cleanup action. The hope is that we will not have to do further cleanup actions north of the river. And that the cleanups that have been preformed to date are sufficient to allow that area to be used for other uses. The all other areas portion of this site or the areas in blue, those areas include the 300 Area for which a couple records of decision will be out this year and we have set a date for completing investigations in the 300 Area of essentially the end of the century or 1999. The other areas

that are in this all other areas section are small isolated units that, isolated waste sites that for the most part were present prior to Hanford operations. Some of them are from the old Hanford town site and the old White Bluffs town site. The areas that we really dealt with most specially in these negotiations were the 100 Areas and the 200 Areas. Actually the central plateau and the area called reactors along the river. Those two areas is where our negotiations focused. And that is because these are the two areas of the Hanford where there is most of the cleanup activities to be preformed. I just wanted to put this up here so you could see an example of the types of problems we have to deal with along the Columbia River. Prior to these negotiations the commitments in milestones under the past practices portion of our agreement, dealt simply with cleaning up the waste sites, that is for instance these are cooling water basins, there is also some land disposal sites and some very large trenches that are out here next to the facilities. That was really all that was included in the original Tri-Party Agreement for cleanup. Today we have a commitment not only to cleanup those facilities or those waste sites that received contaminates but also to cleanup the facilities themselves. The one exception in this is the reactor buildings themselves that would be K East Reactor and K West Reactor. We have set a schedule for cleaning up or for setting a schedule for cleaning up those facilities by the end of December 1996. In this effort to kind of make an all inclusive cleanup we have also allowed the Department of Energy if these facilities are of continued future use then we may not want to tear them down. We put this one up here because this is an example of the effort that we see a future use for. Currently they are rearing salmon and other game fish in some of these facilities. There are water treatment facilities that never contained radio active material and right now they are serving a very useful purpose. We think those efforts should continue. So in this cleanup process we are not mandating that they remove

absolutely everything. If something still has a beneficial use we want it to continue. The other area in which there has been quite a lot of effort is the N Reactor area and this is photograph of the N Reactor area. We have really looked at trying to set a stable funding level and continue work first on stabilizing and deactivating the hazards inside the reactor facilities and concentrating on some near term efforts in terms of a pump and treat and wall to keep contaminates from entering the Columbia River through N Springs. This effort really looks at coordinating the CERCLA cleanup activities and the cleanup activities for the RECRA treatment storage and disposal units and the deactivation of N reactor kind as a whole project. In conclusion I would like to say this agreement that we have forged or this tentative agreement does meet many of the values given to us by our stakeholders and the tribes. It really does emphasis cleanup along the Columbia River and in a manner of speaking it addresses those problems much earlier in the process by some deferral of work in the 200 Area. There is some very high costs investigative work that needs to be done in the 200 Area. Right now we are finishing about 15 investigations in the 100 Area and the question is do we continue to invest a large amount of our funds in continued investigation in the 200 Area or do we put that effort towards cleanup along the river. I think this program puts the effort where the public values have been given to us. What I would like to do now is to give you a little bit of information about what kind of wastes might go to the restoration disposal facility and then turn it over to Pam Enise. The picture that you are looking at is an excavation of what is called a pluto crib. It is a waste site where liquids from the F Reactor were disposed to the soil column. This is pretty much vindicative of the type of material that we would be putting in the restoration disposal facility. It is primarily contaminated soil, currently we have done an excavation of this site to determine the types of contaminates we might find there. We

were concerned with this site because we felt it may have high levels of plutonium which may not allow us to dispose this waste here in this type of facility. After the analysis we have determined that this waste is acceptable candidate for going to the awn restoration disposal facility. Currently this material is being stored in large boxes. One of the problems we are going to have in excavating these contaminated soils and deciding at what point we stop digging is we are looking a variety of techniques to look at cleanup levels to try to analyze them remotely or at the site so we do not have to go the very expensive laboratory analysis that may hold up our cleanup efforts and may slow them down. This is just an example of the types of equipment that is available for doing that. But the important thing is really, if we are going to speed up cleanup along the Columbia River we need a place to put the waste. I would like to have Pam go through the information that is in the proposed plan and give you some more insight into the restoration disposal facility and the options that we examined.

PE: Good evening everyone as Doug described changes are underway that could lead to an earlier cleanup of the areas along the Columbia River. Cleanup which would likely require to remove a large contaminated soil. We believe that a facility is needed for a disposal of Hanford cleanup waste. Tonight we would like to here your concerns and comments and answer questions about the proposed plan of this facility. This proposal is for a circle landfill that protects human health and the environment provides for timely cleanup, gets contamination away from the Columbia River. Allows disposal of only Hanford cleanup waste and the size to support initial cleanup activities. To provide you a framework for where we are now I would like to start briefly by going through the process that we have been working with. The information that it will cover is provided in the handouts that are located in the back of the room. Originally we

were working with two regulatory processes. The Resource Conservation Recovery Act or RECRA and the Comprehensive Awn?? Response Compensation and Liability Act or CERCLA. In order to provide more timely cleanup we selected the CERCLA process for the ERDF. We have prepared documents to evaluate the options for disposal of Hanford cleanup waste. The RIFS or Remedial Investigation Feasibility Study provides the evaluation of these options. It also provides additional information about the need for the facility and discusses the proposed site and the waste that may be going to the ERDF. The proposed plan provides a summary of the RIFS and proposes a preferred option. As part of this effort we have integrated two regulatory process, CERCLA and the National Environmental Protection Act or NEPA. The proposals reviews and considers the elements found normally in the NEPA impact statement. Throughout the development of these documents they have asked for input from the public, tribes, the Hanford Advisory Board and Natural Resource Trustees and consider recommendations from the Hanford Future Site Use 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 documents and give us your comments. Sighting the landfill was not an easy task. We are proposing that the landfill be located in the central plateau of the Hanford Site. That is the two gray boxes in the middle of that picture, between 200 East and 200 West. As shown in this figure the location is within the area that the Hanford Future Site Use Working Group proposed for waste management. We looked at other sites but we believe that this site is more protective of ground water and the Columbia River and provides for more timely cleanup. The site we are proposing would be available for cleanup waste in 1996. Unfortunately putting the landfill and the support at this proposed site could destroy up to 1.6 square miles of mature sagebrush habitat. This habitat is important to wildlife such as a logger hedge shrike and sage sparrow 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 this habitat. We have developed a range of mitigation options for the loss of this habitat including restoration, creation of more enhancement of a similar habitat by seeding, planting nursery stock or transplanting mature sagebrush. These options will be evaluated as part of the site wide mitigation program. The cleanup waste disposal options that we looked at are option one, double line trench. This option proposes a landfill that would be built using a standard RECRA compliant double line trench. The liner could collect any liquids that were generated during operation. The double liner would provide an additional more reliable system for protection of ground water. Option two, is a single-line trench. This option proposes to landfill with a single liner in the trench. The liner would collect any liquids generated during operation. Option three is the unlined trench. This option proposes an unlined landfill. And option four is no action. This option consists of not constructing a landfill at Hanford and examining transporting waste offsite or using existing Hanford facilities. Other than the no action option, each option includes the use of a RECRA compliant protective cap over the completed landfill and requires that waste going to the ERDIF meet specific waste exceptions criteria. At this time I would like Norm Heppner to discuss those waste acceptance criteria.

NH: The proposed option is a double lined trench. This is a very protective unit, provided that the waste we place we in it are limited. What I would like to share with you are what are the wastes we are placing in it. The waste that we are going to be taking from along the river consists mainly of soil, 75% of that waste will likely be soil another 25% would be garbage. Basically some clothes that may have been contaminated, some steel pipelines, machinery, equipment.

The contaminates present in this soil and garbage is basically your regular nuclides, you organics and your heavy metals. The ones we are most concerned with would be Strontium-90, CCM-137 and Chromium-6. What we are proposing is the waste placed in ERDIF would be limited to Hanford Site waste only. Hanford cleanup waste. In addition, we would not allow any outside waste, we would not allow transuranic to be placed in this facility or high-level waste. We are only going to allow what is termed CERCLA waste. That is the waste that we are trying to place in this facility. It would consist of low-level radioactive and it would consist of hazardous waste or a mixture of the two. We are going to meet what are called land disposal restrictions. We have a set of guidelines of what federal government and the State of Washington limit of what can be disposed of land units which is this landfill. We are going to make sure that those wastes are treated to those standards so they are protective of the environment. In addition one of the things we are exploring is a soil washing to minimize the volume of waste that we place in this facility. This is where you wash the contaminates from the waste and you dispose of those contaminates. And this facility would be able to accept that waste. Before I would like to close I would like to stress one thing. This is for Hanford waste only.

PE: As you can see we have a variety of waste we need to handle in a protective manner. Again we looked at the four different options for waste disposal of Hanford cleanup waste. The options were evaluated using 8 of the 9 CERCLA criteria. These are provided in detail in the handout in the back. Again, the final criteria is community acceptance and that is the reason we are here tonight. Our proposed alternative for the Hanford site cleanup waste is a RECRA compliance double lined trench with a leach and recovery system. We believe this option protects human health and the environment and follows the law by complying with

applicable or relevant inappropriate requirements and provides long term protection of ground water in the Columbia River. The proposed landfill would only provide capacity for Hanford cleanup waste for the next 6 years. We would consider expanding the landfill only if there were justified need and only after public comment. Again tonight we would like to hear your concerns and comments about our proposal for Hanford landfill. Copies of the proposed plan for this landfill are located in the back of the room. Linda.

LP: Next on the agenda is Page Knight who represents one of the stakeholder groups here in Oregon. When we were designing these meetings there was a request from a number of the active citizens that you get here perspectives that included the agencies as well as some of the citizen groups that have been following this process closely. There is also a number of other people in the audience who are members of the Hanford Advisory Board, in addition to Page. They will probably be happy to talk with you about their perspectives on the process.

PK: What I would like to begin with is the presentation that I am going to give to you tonight will be brief and some of us will be sitting on a panel to respond to questions and comments from the other agencies up there. These comments and this slide presentation that I am going to present were put together and agreed upon by several organizations in the northwest that are citizens and public interest groups. These include the Washington Council, part of America NW, Hanford Watch which is the group I represent, Hanford Education Action League, Hanford Action which is a Portland-based group, Sierra Club, Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility, and Columbia River United. So we have spent a lot of time over the last few years working out some of these issues and working together to try to come up with a strong and unified voice on what we want. I just have two

slides. The key issues to us public interests groups are first of all the completion of cleanup, the remedial action along the Columbia River is not expect accelerated from the existing TPA milestone for the year 2018. We don't think that this plan has, is speeding up the cleanup along the Columbia River to the extend that it needs to be speeded up. We also believe that the draft agreement would not reduce the current high radiation and chemical exposure levels to the public or wildlife along the Columbia River. And what I want to show you is a slide of the N Springs area that was all ready shown to you here in pictures. I am going to go up here a little. In this area, right here, where all of the little squiggles are. This is where the N Springs area is and the N Springs area are the trenches for over 23 billion gallons of waste have been dumped over the years. And that waste which contains a lot of strontium which is a bone-seeker, is flowing into the Columbia River to the rate of as much as 24 times the drinking the allowable EPA standard of strontium and other radionuclides. This is all gama radiation that is picture in here. Right now studies are finding that 15,000 times the level of acceptable radiation is flowing into the river. They are still detecting that amount of radiation, excess radiation in that area of the river. This is a fifty-mile stretch along the Columbia River that Hanford sits on. There is a lot of wildlife in this area, people boat here, people fish here, workers of course working in this area. So we are very concerned that the proposal does not include reducing the levels of radiation in any foreseeable way. Anything that we can determine that benefits us. So just to go on with that and to repeat current radiation levels along publicly used shorelines are as high as 24 times what is allowed by law. The public and wildlife must be protected from such exposures while using the Hanford Reach. The commitment to complete remedial action along the river by 2018 is actually weakened by the draft agreement to allow the huge contaminated reactor buildings to remain in place after that

date or later if ever for later decontamination or removal to the 200 Area. This raises the potential for recontamination of cleaned areas and destruction of restored habitat. This is also controversial point you are going to hear some things that you need to think about from the Oregon Department of Energy tonight. The question of whether you include in this cleanup plan taking down those eight reactors or if you leave them to stand. Some people think they would be good history standings and there are other points of views as well that favor keeping the reactors in place and the reactor buildings in place even after the area is cleaned up. TPA milestones for completing investigations of contaminated areas in the 200 Areas. The high-level waste tanks, the PFP Building which we have a hearing on next week and the PUREX Plant is delayed for 2 years. This may be delay completing the remedial actions by 2018. So once again we are afraid here that the milestones are actually slipping and we are not going to get the work done while there is money in the pot to do the work. Then finally the report required to determine what Columbia River sediments shorelines and islands will get cleaned up is still left in the hands of Battelle which has a conflict of interest as a potentially liable polluter and a legacy of covering up impacts to the river. And we public interests groups have been working this and hounding the agencies that Battelle can not be doing the studies of the river and telling us how our contaminated or uncontaminated is when they are one of the polluters. So these are points that you need to consider when you are making your comments tonight and you need to get some answers from the agencies. Thank you.

PE: Before we go to the panel and the question and answer session. We wanted to have an opportunity for you that might have to leave early and came here to make formal comment on the record to do that now. Is there any one that needs to make a comment at this point on the record? Please

identify yourself and you will be given five minutes to talk and I will let you know when four minutes is up. Unless you are representing a formal organization.

LS: I am Lynn Simms and I live in Portland, Oregon. Since these problems that we are seeing are so far reaching and so complex and so expensive I would hope that all of what we are doing now, that we have forward vision before we act and I would just to encourage everyone in this room to call up your legislators and please ask for a special blue ribbon commission to review, clarify, coordinate and update all of our country's nuclear waste policy before we run into more problems by doing a little bit here and a little bit there and not having a coordinated policy that is also allowed to have input by an independent scientists and other public groups that have equal weight as much as the governmental agencies and the contractors who are involved in the cleanup. I also must admit that I am a little bit skeptical when I hear some assurances that all of this business is going to be for Hanford Waste only. This particular project might be. But next year when the nuclear waste policy act is opened up there may be a lot of political pressures that change the whole scene and everyone I think has to be very vigilant and take on all kinds of possibilities that might happen. I think the public is a little bit skeptical. When we see so many problems coming from what we had thought was being handled before by smart scientists and planners in the government. We would like to see comprehensive coordinated plan. Thank you.

LP: Representing the state of Oregon Department of Energy has a comment to make before the panel.

UV: The state of Oregon has been examining the ERDIF facility for a fair amount of time now. The State of Oregon along with the State of Washington and the tribes and a number of other federal agencies are members what is known as the

Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council. The trustees are the chairs of the tribes, the governors of the state, the President of the United States. And through them there are representatives delegated through the cabinet levels and various agencies within the states and tribes. What I just wanted to read to you was a little bit of the first part of our comments. Our total comments so far are 10 pages and I don't think you would really want to listen through all of that. So I wont bore you with it. But there are some points that you will find of interest. The public health threats from radioactive and hazardous materials exists in the 100 Areas of Hanford Site. Oregon supports early work to reduce these threats. The process used by the Tri-Partys to resolve these threats is inadequate in our opinion. We are troubled by many aspects of the planning, sighting, engineering and consultation process used by the Tri-Partys for the environmental restoration and disposal facility. The sighting of ERDIF was based predominately on engineering needs and expediencies. The setting process gave little consideration or weight to tribal treaty guaranteed rights, the sighting processing failed to consider the impacts of the proposal or support facilities, ??? material areas or transport routes. Critical habitat, species of concern, eco systems or areas designated as important for preservation were also inadequately considered. The ERDIF facility is proposed to be sited in the last of the high quality shrub step habitat. This habitat is home to at least 11 species of special concern. Washington State identifies this habitat to be of particular importance for preservation. The natural resource trustees were not formally notified and consulated for the planned activities as required by the Comprehensive Response and Compensation and Liability Act. When the trustees learned of the Tri-Party's plans we requested that the Tri-Party present their plans to and consult with the trustees. That presentation by the Tri-Party has raised even more serious questions about the sighting process. The trustee suggested that it might be

necessary for the Tri-Partys to reopen the sighting process. This predominately was because of the size of the facility after public review was reduced from six-square miles to 1.6. The Tri-Partys responded that reopening the sighting process would delay opening of ERDIF and cleanup of the 100 Areas by two years. It also could jeopardize funding of Hanford cleanup by Congress. We can't encourage the destruction of a large area of rare habitat needed by the Logger Head Shrike and Sage Sparrow, the Whiptail Snake and eight other species of concern. In a role as trustee we cannot endorse the Tri-Party's plans at the same time we cannot reasonably oppose the ERDIF facility without placing other habitat and human health in further jeopardy. The U.S. Department of Energy, the Washington State of Ecology and the U.S. Awn?? Protection Agency must make trustees an active part of all planning which could result impacts to the eco systems and species in Hanford. On Monday I was part of a group of trustees that went out and toured some large sections of the Hanford Site. And one of the things that we were doing is looking particularly for the habitat and the sensitive species areas and what we could see in terms of what was on the site. Washington State Department of Ecology has some lovely maps of the vegetation and habitat on the site. And one of the things that we found is that the data of those are based on is inadequate. If you look at those maps you would get the impression that there are some fairly large areas of roughly equivalent habitat of large shrub ???. That is not the case. The large shrub ??? is limited to a fairly narrow ban in the center of the site. There is a new road that has just been cut in that goes from state route 240 to the 200 West Area. And one of the most disturbing things on our tour was to find that road goes directly through the heart of the best of the shrub step habitat. Yesterday I was standing under a 7-1/2 foot sage. All of that or a large portion has been destroyed. That road will act as a conduit for noxious weeds and other species. Like wise the ERDIF facilities sits again in the

center of a large section of prime habitat for a lot of these species. So we are very disturbed and concerned about what is happening, that those areas need to have a very comprehensive plan in place in order to protect them. That doesn't seem to exist at the moment. Thank you.

UV: Panel, Page is going to join the panel and also ___ Paullete from Heart of America NW. And we will start with oh, sorry, I thought we had them counted correctly. There is one in the back there. I hope there are some of you out there that have some questions and comments that you would like to ask the panel and make to the panel and hear some informal response from them as opposed to all the formal comments on the record. Or maybe some of our panelist have some things you would like to add. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to get this started?

PR: For the record my name is Paul Richmond. I walked into the media room today at about 6:30 and I saw a nice flyer that had been apparently circulated to most of the community telling us that this hearing was happening. Now the problem was before I walked into that room, I hadn't seen that flyer. I am someone who goes to a lot of meetings follows the news very regularly, and involved in production of a lot of the news. I hadn't heard of this meeting. I find that very disturbing proposition especially given the toxicity of a lot of the chemicals involved. Obviously I am not in any position to have done any type of thorough analysis nor could I expect anyone in the room to be have done any type of thorough analysis and I feel that this really shows a lot in terms of why you do not have a large portion of citizenry here at this point. This meeting was not something which the public were aware of. And I feel that there should be additional meetings and additional opportunity for public input and for members of the public to be informed upon. I will hold it at that.

UN: Any of the panelist have a comment on that? It wasn't really a question but OK Roger.

UV: My understanding was that they were pretty extensive avenues where the we did what we could to make sure that announcements were out in time. I was going to ask Annette Carlson to list the different methods. I am sure we can always do things

TAPE 1-SIDE B

... to the Hanford cleanup mailing list.

UV: So obviously they should have had you on their list.

UV: How many are on the mailing list?

UV: I believe 5,000.

UV: I guess one point to consider is that although we are taking comments tonight there is also an open comment period where we will be receiving written comments until December the 8th is the date.

UV: December 8th is correct.

UV: So tonight is not your last opportunity?

UV: Does that answer your question?

UV: ???

UV: The tentative agreement was sent to the highly interested mailing list which includes about 1,500 folks on the Hanford cleanup mailing list it was sent to them.

UV: In Seattle a hundred some odd people showed up from a similar effort plus the citizen group effort and I think it is usual I think it is often the citizen group that end-up getting people to these hearings and that shows the difference between what we didn't do the effort tonight that we did in Seattle when we have about a 1/5th less people, a fifth as many only. But the other thing is that you should make sure to get your comments to us in the citizen group community and other about what you think of the ads and because I think there was a lot of ads for this. I know they were in the Oregonian and etc., and Annette just went

through them. Whether or not someone saw those ads they would understand that we are talking about whether or not the Columbia River shoreline will be safe to use in your lifetime is a different question. And those are the types of things I think the agencies need to hear from you.

UN: Were they notified and served with this calendar section ???

UV: Excuse me I need to interrupt because we are trying to get all of this on tape and so that the record will show what you have been saying, so if you wouldn't mind using the mic.

UV: Were the calendar sections of the different newspapers notified?

UV: No. But that is an excellent comment and we will certainly remember that the next time. OK go ahead

UV: I wanted to address that same issue cause I have also been critical of that in the past. My name is Ross ??? and I think that this time you did a somewhat better job then publicizing it in the past, it was even worse in the past. The thing is because I did hear it on the radio and I also got, one thing that was really good was that I am on the mailing list. And I got multiple reminders of it. So that really helped a lot. So I wish you would continue that but besides the suggestions that he was making I think that there is kind of a area that you kind of miss out on. And I think a lot of the people who are most interested in this tend to listen to or read some publications or radio stations that are not necessarily the main stream types. Such as KBOO or Willamette Week. I think if you did more of a effort in those kinds of areas is that you would get more people involved that were really interested in it and so I think you made some progress but you still got quite a bit of a ways to go there.

LP: My name is Lynn Porter. I live in Portland and I am a member of Hanford Watch. I would like to hear more about what this new agreement is going to do for reducing groundwater contamination. Can you give us some idea, all I heard from the presentation that you are going to build a wall at the N Reactor and do some pump and treat there. I am wondering what about all the other plumes of contamination in the groundwater and how much of an impact do you expect to have what you are doing at N Reactor to have it just seems real vague at this point. And I would like to hear some more about that.

UV: Lynn I would be glad to start to address that for you. If you recall back in last year in 1993 when we did the renegotiations we started five groundwater pump and treat operations at the Hanford Site. It was an attempt to get on with cleanup and not to do so much in terms of drilling and monitoring, but actually get into pumping to see if it is effective. Those operations will continue under this. We will continue to evaluate, continue to optimize and if they are successful, continue to upgrade those systems. The only new thing in terms of these negotiations in terms of active groundwater remediation start is what you see at the strontium-90 plume at N Springs. There are several things we are going to start there. One is a barrier wall to try to contain the flow of Strontium-90 and we will also, I hope that is not a tank. And also serve as barrier so if pump and treat is successful it will keep fresh river water from coming into the pump and treat system and will get the Strontium-90. If the wall is successful the groundwater will have a longer residence time in the sediments that are contaminated and the Strontium-90 levels should increase in the groundwater thus making the pump and treat more effective. You get more of the Strontium-90 out of it. Another thing that you will see in there is that there is one work plan that is required in the next year. We decided to hold off on work plans for about three years.

Essentially to focus our resources on cleanup as opposed to investigations, but the one investigation that we decided needed to go forward with was a investigation of the large groundwater plumes that you see on the Hanford Site, emanating out of the PUREX Area. That is the big nitrate and tritium plume you will see the 200 what is the number Doug PO 1 work plan is the one that is required to do and that will address the major groundwater plumes at the Hanford Site. So to recap we are going to continue what we started last year in the five pump and treats we have a new active pump that has been on the minds of the interest groups for quite a number of years and we have a work plan to address the major plume in the 200 Area.

NV: I would like to add one more thing to Mike's statement and that is and I probably should have mentioned that during my little introduction was at this same time and should have received a notice there is also a proposed plan out for groundwater cleanup activity at the 200ZP1 operable unit it is the carbon tetrachloride contamination problem in the 200 West in the groundwater. That action is I believe the public comment periods ends today, thank you. So far we haven't, we have received comments that says you better do that one right away. So that is one that has a set a schedule for a larger cleanup action.

NV: From the N Springs from this plan you have got right now. How much of a reduction to you expect to get from the follow of Strontium-90 into the river

NV: There is a wide range of opinions in the technical community about how effective the pump and treat will be. We feel that right now there is approximately .2 curies per year going into the Columbia River which is not a lot of contamination compared to what it was in the years we were actively dumping water out of the reactor into that facility. So the reduction, the actual reduction of

Strontium-90 going to the river is rather small in terms of mass of strontium because there is not much going in there right now. But the key part of the cleanup there is that the Strontium-90 levels in the groundwater are at least 3 order of magnitude. OK a 1,000 times above drinking water standards. OK So what we are doing there is more to address the groundwater pollution and make the land suitable for uses to cleanup the land, to cleanup the groundwater, then it is actual reduction strontium going into the river. Shutting down the reactor, shutting down the discharge which, by the way, we did a year ahead of the TPA schedule. Actually slowed down the Strontium-90 flux to the river tremendously. What we are trying to do under these negotiations is more to cleanup the groundwater than it is to reduce what is going into the river. There will be a reduction because if the wall is successful, if we can construct a 3,000-foot wall that will serve as a barrier that will slow down the flow, create a longer pathway and will allow for the Strontium-90 to decay before it gets around the outside of the wall. It will actually create, we hope, a stagnate pool, and then if there is any thing that gets around it, it has a much longer pathway and will allow for decay of the Strontium-90. So we do feel there will be a reduction but the amount going to the river right now is considerably less then it was a few years ago when the interest groups were very highly interested in N Springs and reduction of the Strontium-90 there.

NV: Roger and then Page.

NV: Mike is certainly right there is a wide range of opinions. Including opinions of the adequacy of the information that has been used or the adequacy of the information that we have now on the level of contamination. At the two cribs that have been the source of the N Springs. The modeling results that are that I have seen that estimate the overall reduction, overall reduction efficiency as a result of the

wall are on the order of about 93-94%

NV: I would like to differ with you Mike because according to Todd Martin who is a researcher a staff researcher for the Hanford Education Action League up in Spokane has found in his work that data taken more recently has shown an increasing trend in strontium contamination to almost 1,500 times the drinking water standard. And Todd has pretty impeccable research when it comes to this stuff. So I differ with what you are saying.

NV: The levels of concentration of Strontium-90 in the ground water is going up, I won't argue with that. And the reason why it is going up is because the groundwater is not moving through the system as fast and if the groundwater stays in residence with the contaminated soil the concentrations will go up and I believe that is what Todd is probably referring. What I was referring to was the actual mass of Strontium-90 going into the river. Mass is a function of groundwater-flow and concentration, concentrations are going up because the groundwater flow is being reduced.

NV: Jerry.

NV: I would like to return to the first question because I don't think that you got an answer. Your question was tell me if I am misphrasing it. What are you doing other than the N Area which actually was announced a year ago that expedited response action would be taken to the strontium plume, it is not part of this negotiation. What else is being done to accelerate the cleanup of groundwater all along the river. And in reviewing the draft agreement for the public interests groups, Cynthia Sartoo and I went through milestone by milestone comparing the draft with what exists and what the current work plans and schedules are and in fact what you have is no acceleration whatsoever of cleanup along the Columbia River in this draft from what we

were all ready expecting. You do have a deferral in the 200 Area of two years, but you do not have any new deadline saying that number 1 you will finish remediation along the Columbia River of either soil or groundwater before 2018. This is what a year ago and throughout the course of the past year the public was promised in document after document produced by the three agencies they said that they were going to renegotiate the restoration portion of the agreement to accomplish remediation before 2018 along the river. And I have one quote from this year, where the agencies wrote that this renegotiation was to "hasten cleanup along the Columbia River in the 100 and 300 Areas." Columbia River milestones will be achieved sooner and land can be ready for new uses. These are quotes from September of this year. For March we have revised milestones to cleanup contamination in the groundwater in Columbia River's shoreline, islands and river beds." This will allow us to cleanup faster." In fact in reviewing milestone after milestone, what you potentially have is fewer work plans being required under the new agreement on average over the next five years than you did under the existing agreement. You had a milestone in the old agreement that said that you had six work plans a year done. Now, the average under the new plan is slightly more than four. So you have reduction in work plans well maybe that is good if you put more money into remediation, but the Department of Energy has capped its restoration budget at its current level which is basically only funding studies. And DOE's own internal budget building block documents called activities data sheets say "the target case which is the plan budget request does not provide for remediation at the waste sites after the record of decision. Large scale remediation is not funded, completion of remediation by 2018, milestone 16 of the TPA is in jeopardy." And that is repeated for every area along the river in every budget document. And as long as number one, they have a tap on their restoration budget and basically preserve the preexisting priorities of the

site they can't move into remediational along the river in a major way. Number two, they have not negotiated a definable goal to tell you about that says we will have groundwater and soil cleaned up along the river and the areas along river available for unrestricted public access prior to the year 2018 which is the existing deadline.

NV: These negotiations will allow the three agencies to come to records of decision within the next year for the groundwater and the majority of the source terms in 100 Area along the river. That was the goal of these negotiations is to come to a record of decision. A decision on what the cleanup is going to be. Once we decide what the cleanup is going to be, by the way there is a lot of public involvement in that record of decision process. Then we can do the remedial design and remedial action phase. That is do the engineering necessary to meet the decision for cleanup. With that we can set milestones and plan to set milestones, but at this point in time we do not have a decision on what the cleanup will be. We do not have a decision or the engineering done on how that will be achieved. So therefore, at this point in time we do not have milestones for cleanup other than the 2018 milestone. It is the intention of the Department of Energy to work with the agencies when we get a record of decision to do the engineering and then come up with the appropriate interim milestones to assure that cleanup is achieved along the Columbia River in a timely and reasonable manner. And if we are allowed to focus our resources on those cleanup efforts along the river and not to the characterization in the 200 Area if there is a short hiatus there we should be able to achieve cleanup in the 100 Area a lot sooner than if we did not have these negotiations.

NV: I just wanted to give you a little more insight on the groundwater activities along the river because we did emphasis N Springs so far. Of the 15 proposed plans in

records of decision that will be issued or out for public comment in the next few months. All of the groundwater operable units in the 100 Area or sets of groundwater contamination from 100 Area sites will be completed. So there is rightfully so no acceleration in those schedules. Because the investigations are all done, they are producing the final reports, some of them have all ready come in. We haven't refined the proposed and got them out to public comment. So the groundwater work in the 100 Areas is effectively done with the exception of N Area where we are taking this early action. So there wasn't any cleanup, any acceleration in that particular schedule. Because basically we are at the end of the investigation process right now. One the issue of whether there is overall acceleration in the 100 Area cleanup, I differ with Jerry. DOE had no commitment on the books to cleanup any of the contaminated facilities in the 100 Areas. None of them. Including the reactor buildings. The only commitment the Department of Energy had made prior to these negotiations on cleaning up the reactor buildings was in the EIS where they said they would do this work within the next 75 years. The issue of the other contaminated structures those are included today. Our milestone 16 before this only included the waste sites themselves. I believe that is a significant acceleration and the only way to meet the future site uses goals and objectives is not simply to cleanup the waste sites. It is to cleanup the waste sites and the contaminated facilities. So I think we did get some acceleration and its because we added more to the cleanup problem. We added more sites and facilitates to be cleaned up.

NV: You were looking like you might want to ask another question before I go to Jerry. No. OK Jerry.

NV: I respect that you have a different opinion in that. Rather or not you are going to accomplish more I think there is no contesting fact that what you and Mike have just said is

that the work plans are all ready due under the existing agreement, under the existing agreement and under federal law, 15 months after a record of decision we must begin active remediation and right now the Department of Energy's internal budget document show that they can not move into active remediation at these 15 locations because they have a self imposed cap on this type of funding called restoration. Now overall, I think we have a difference of opinion because I think that time after time history has shown us working with the Department of Energy that if you do not set a deadline for the Department of Energy you will not force action. And the only thing that has forced action to date is deadlines and milestones even though they be ever shifting like grains of sand on the Columbia River shoreline. The setting of a deadline for final remedial action, completion of remedial action and unrestricted public use of the lands along the Columbia River is essential if we are going to force the Department of Energy to overturn its own internal budget caps and start active remedation when these work plans are complete, you have made a record of decision in the next several years you say let start doing active work. And I guess I would like to ask Mike, you know I think everyone agrees that remediation is more expensive than study. So Mike, can you do active remedial action at 15 operable units given your current budget cap for restoration.

NV: During these negations the Department of Energy took a good hard look at the financial requirements that these milestones have imposed on us. We feel that the scope of work that is necessary to meet the milestones that are in the negotiations are achievable within the funding levels that we have. We also took a look at the long term funding requirements that will be imposed because of additional studies when they come back on line again, but also for remedial actions. We looked at the assumptions that were behind those cost estimates and we went over those

assumptions with the two agencies, the two regulatory agencies were very helpful in helping the Department of Energy define assumptions for cleanup in the future. And based on the assumptions that we currently have for what the records of decision will be in the 100 Area we feel that there is a very good chance that we will be able to meet the requirements of what will be imposed on us when the record of decisions come out within a reasonable funding scenario that we can project in the future. The confidence was high enough that it went up to the assistant secretary and got a blessing while signing the negotiations and that was based on our estimates of scope of work and budget requirements for both the next fiscal year and as you look out into the future, but keep in mind as you look out into the future the amount of uncertainties are very high. But in order for the Department of Energy to meet these expectations we will have to become a lot more efficient in the way we do business at Hanford. The cost of business right now is very high at Hanford, we are taking productivity challenges to be able to fix that. If we cannot meet our productive challenges, if we cannot become more efficient the Department of Energy will not be able to meet the expectations of cleanup. So it is upon our shoulders to be better at our job, to be able to meet the expectations.

NV: ??? Edmonds I had a question related to Page your comments because you mentioned some areas that your groups were particularly concerned about. And one of them was transportation of the soil and I have forgotten what some of the other ones were. But I would like to have a little more understanding of those and maybe some discussion or response from some of other members of those particular concerns.

NV: Do you want to repeat some of those Page?

NV: I don't recall anything about transportation of the soils in here. I am just trying to, we were talking about

remediation of the soils. The draft agreement would not reduce current high radiation and chemical exposure levels to the public or wildlife along the Columbia River that was one of the contentions and the map up there showed that the levels of gama radiation in that N Springs area are in some places 24 times what is allowed by law. And the public and wildlife must be protected this is our contention there. The commitment to complete remedial action along the river by 2018 is actually weakened by the draft agreement to allow huge contaminated reactor buildings to remain in place, although Doug just responded to that a little while ago. I am going to have Jerry go into a little more detail there because he is the technical detail guy.

NV: Well, on the radiation levels conservatively estimating based on Department of Energy's own data. The radiation levels along publicly used shorelines in the N Area are approximately as high as 240 milirem above background radiation. That is 24 times what EPA allows the public to be exposed to in a year. The standard is 10 milirem per year under the clean air act. Do I need to clarify something.

NV: What regulation are you quoting?

NV: It is out of the clean air act and I can quote the, I wrote it up in here with a footnote. I can tell you what it is, 40 CFR 61.92 and interestingly enough 40 CFR 61.92 is sited in the Hanford Report as the applicable law and the standard. But then ignoring the fact that thousands of people use the Columbia River the Hanford annual report done by Bettelle every year for the Department of Energy says that the maximum exposed hypothetical individual get something like .02 milirem of radiation from Hanford. Well you would get that in a very short time along many of the islands that 100's of people use on a summer weekend, if you are salmon fishing, you would get that in a very, very short

time. Given the fact that you are out there for a day, you are basically getting one full milirem, which is three orders of magnitude greater than what the Department of Energy says is the maximum exposed individual gets in a year. Now what kind of risk are we talking about? The EPA standard for DOE facilities 10 milirem per year, is based on a risk estimate of inducing one additional fatal cancer per 10,000 people exposed. Again the radiation level is 24 times that. Now I was just informed that also out in the N Areas, that is not something that is in any of the publicly released documents, official reports that there is a major gama radiation source that was not counted in the sky shine which is what they call the radiation along the shoreline, was not counted out there but a source of gama radiation measuring 75 milirems per hour also right along the shoreline that is publicly assessable. A few years ago EPA rated some expedited response actions. One of them included for example, the need to go in and remediate discharge pipes through which mercury had been disposed of in the past and which was actively leaching into the river environment. You will not here word about that, in terms of any presentation now though from the Department of Energy. That mercury is still out there, mercury as everyone knows is a major hazard. Its still out there and again what the public interests groups are saying is we need to set a firm deadline, we are suggesting the year 2000. That gives you plenty of time to reduce to no greater than the legal standards, you remember you out to be in compliance now. But to year 2000 to reduce to no greater than the legal standards the radio active and chemical exposures along publicly assessable areas of the Columbia River. In the meantime EPA should act on this eminent health threat and put up warning signs at all major access points to the Hanford Reach and at each island that is yet not been full investigated in each shoreline area with radiation or chemical exposure hazards. And thirdly, those should be put up within a month and there needs to be a milestone to do

that and within 6 months those shorelines need to be fenced until remediated and that standards are met. It is unconscionable that we can be in such serious violation of the Clean Air Act and it isn't even an agenda item for these negotiations. This is the major public health risk along the river. More than the major long-term risk of the groundwater which is serious. Lets not forget that the skyshine from these N Area cribs these half-mile trenches where 23 billion gallons, as Page said, of contaminated liquid was poured into the soil, they are now so hot there is something like 25 curies of plutonium alone in these cribs. They are now so hot that they are giving off this radiation that you get when you walk along the shoreline even the opposite shoreline of the Columbia River. Now, what about the workers? People who are being exposed through the workforce if we don't do something about capping the skyshine. And this is cheap. That is what is really amazing to me is that this is an embarrassment to the Department of Energy. It is not costs that are stopping them from remediating these hazards. Getting soil on top of this trench and capping it and reducing the radiation level is not a high-cost issue. It is a high embarrassment issue that it has gone for so long. And Dick Belsey was just showing me a document in the back of the room showing that in 1988 the levels of radiation along this area of the shoreline, I guess DOE can take some credit because people force them to shutdown the N Reactor and back in 1988 the N Area shoreline rad levels were apparently as high as 500 milirem per hour. Now, that is just a fancy figure to the public but that is pretty astounding. That is half a milirem per hour, that means 4,380 per year or 438 times EPA standards for public exposure. 438 times. That was not very long ago.

NV: Jerry why don't we give way we are about ready to take the formal comments. Lets give the other panelist a chance to comment on what you have been saying.

NV: I would like to respond in two parts. I would like to respond to the applicable limits that can be applied to the skyshine and also reply to the remedial action and activities that you find in the negotiated package in front of you. I would like to do the positive part first which is what you will see in the green package in front of you. What you need to look at is the N pilot project, TPA change requests and in that N pilot change requests the Department of Energy and the two regulator agencies have decided essentially to put all the priorities in the N Area in two areas. One is the deactivation of the reactor. That is bring the reactor down to a stable and safe shutdown condition. There is no fuel in that reactor right now but there is sludge and contaminated water and hazardous materials. And over a three-year period we planned to take that out and bring it to us cheap to keep condition. That doesn't apply to any of Jerry's comments. But the other part of it. The other 25,000 million dollars that we are going to spend this fiscal year, has been dealing with key problems that the stakeholders including Mr. Paullete has pointed out to us that they would like to see addressed. And we are doing several things out there. First of all we are going to address skyshine. Secondly, we are going to put the wall in the pump and treat to try and address the awn groundwater contamination that we have there and we are going to characterize cribs that are a source of these contaminates. The contaminates for both the skyshine, the affluence at N Springs and groundwater contamination. So the agencies have agreed to focus half of the resources that are available which is more than 1/10 of the total ER budget. On the skyshine, the pollution, the groundwater in N Springs from these two cribs, I think you are going to see a very aggressive program on the part of the Department of Energy to go forward and address this problem. So there are no milestones for cleanup in there. Other than get started with the pump and treat and get started on the wall. But there are milestones for doing the characterization to

figure out what is in those cribs so that we can do the engineering necessary to remediate it. So there is a lot of focus on the problem that you see before you. And in the past five years we have been unable to proceed with cleanup very well in the N Area. It was one of the first operable units out of the block and we were not able to proceed because basically the Department of Energy had split the management of the reactor from the restoration. And now the reactor is with the restoration so we can manage the entire project and we can get on with it. In terms of skyshine, I don't argue that skyshine is acceptable or unacceptable. Right now if you spend 24 hours a day, everyday on the shoreline you would get approximately 200 to 250 milirem exposure, half of that is background. The DOE limit is 100 milirem per year. One thing to keep in mind is that one cannot spend a lot of time on the shoreline at Hanford at this point in time, it is posted as no trespassing. It is posted as being a radiological control area. So the general public, if they obey the law can only be on the river in that area. And if one spent 8 hours today each day of the weekend of the entire year, fishing in the area they would receive about 8 milirem per year dose, from the area. Mr. Paullete has quoted a 10 milirem per year applicable standard from 40 CFR parts 61 subpart H, checking into that particular standard is for airborne emissions and does not include gama radiation from a fixed source. So that is somewhat of a miss use of the regulation. So you will see in recap, you will see some actions started under the Tri-Party Agreement, some aggressive actions, I think we are getting along with it. I will leave it at that.

NV: I will be glad I think that Mike you ought to be embarrassed by number one saying, DOE has its own limit of 100 milirem per hour a year which is the old self regulation EPA and state requirements are what you should be meeting. Number two, you say we are going to address the skyshine. Well, correct me if I am wrong that report that I just saw

recommended that you do not address the skyshine in the near future. And your characterization plan is to drill exactly two bore holes in the trenches which in fact is like it may tell you that it is worse than you thought, but it cannot possibly give you enough meaningful data to tell you what is in the trenches in terms of characterizing. We are talking about a half mile long trench. Putting in two holes into the ground to characterize is not characterization in any meaningful way shape or form. So do you have some plan to address the skyshine that you can share with us. That you are going to say, will reduce it to 10 miliram or some other level by a fixed date Mike.

NV: The budget that we have in FY-95 reflects approximately 700,000 dollars that has been set aside for skyshine work at these cribs. The thinking that when we negotiated that when we a agreed to the entire package was that we would probably be needing to put something over the crib to be able to do the characterization. By characterizing in the hottest part of the crib, we would be protecting the workers and reducing the overall skyshine. The report that was submitted does recommend that we do not do additional work based on the 100 milirem per year requirement of the Department of Energy. We have not entered into negotiations with the regulatory agencies on this so there has not been a decision made. We do have money left in the budget, set aside to do characterization work, we feel that two bore holes and the most highly contaminated part would give us the vertical distribution of contaminates which is the key data objective that we have in front of us to be able to decide where to go from here.

NV: One hundred milirem per year, means in terms of their five data for additional cancers per 10,000 people exposed not including children, I don't think I can do that off the top of my head.

NV: I can. It is five for males and six for females per 10,000. That is premature cancer deaths, premature deaths from cancer per 100 milirem exposure 10,000 individuals. Now, do you think that is acceptable? I don't and I don't think the public does and I think at least we ought to be telling people keeping people out of there actively. We have a photograph in our newsletter of what happened last time EPA when we raised issues about public using uninvestigated hazardous waste areas to launch their boats north of Richland, EPA told you to put up fences and put up warning signs. And I have a picture in my newsletter of your warning signs that were placed facing away from the river. So you had to walk through the potential hazardous waste sites to get to the other side of the sign to read it. I think we have a serious problem and I think that the public is telling you that they want that action and not hiding behind DOE self-regulation and limits that got us here in the first place. Limits that I might add, the Department of Energy has waived in the past along the 100 N Area.

NV: I need to check with the audience because we are at the time at which we said we would take formal comments. And I want to do that if there is anybody that is waiting to make a formal comment. We can come back to the panel if there is a desire to ask more or different questions of the panel. I have noted there hasn't been any questions or comments about the ERDIF facility to this point. But right now is there anyone in the audience who wishes or needs to make a formal comment.

NV: I have three comments with two hats. I am Dick Belsey and I am chair of the Waste Cleanup and Site Restoration Committee of the Oregon's Hanford Waste Board. And we considered the the refocusing package when we had our meeting in Portland last week and we came to an agreement on recommendations. The Oregon Hanford Waste Board agrees in principal with the general refocus of the October 1994 tentative Tri-Party

Agreement on environmental restoration. Tri-Party negotiators followed recommendations of the Hanford Future Sites uses working group and the tank waste task force. In particular, the Future Site Uses Group identified protecting the Columbia River an immediate priority. The Board commends the Tri-Party for heeding that advice. However, the Board has serious concerns that the budget short-falls will delay critical cleanup activities despite the assurances to the contrary by the Tri-Partys. The Board will continue to monitor the manner in which refocus Tri-Party Agreement carries out the commitment to Hanford cleanup. The Board insists that the U.S. Department of Energy meet legal obligations under the Tri-Party Agreement and will assist in seeking adequate funding the congress. My other hat is that I represent Physicians for Social Responsibility on the Hanford Advisory Board. And in looking at the package...

END OF TAPE 1-SIDE B

TAPE 2-SIDE A

...the thing that everyone is talking about in this document it says that the letter report and schedules to Ecology and EPA documenting alternative proposed to abate 1301 and 1325 N crib skyshine. That was due October 31st. It's very hard to evaluate this particular key section. It's one of the hottest topics on the shoreline and also around the room. And I think that there's no way that I can evaluate anything about this because I got only this evening handled the letter but I don't study things as quickly as Jerry does and it's going to take me some chewing to really understand what that's about. The complete implementation of the skyshine abatement actions selected under M1612 is to be established November 1994. We've just missed that milestone or will very shortly. Count that on your watches.

NV: Dr. Belsey we do have the date for that.

DB: What?

NV: We do have a date established.

DD: Okay. But in terms of what it is you're proposing. Have you agreed on the dates and the approaches or do you have a date in the proposed letter. I mean, I don't want to get into semantics Mike, it's just the fact coming here this evening and looking at this, this week, I called around to try and get a sense of what was coming down and they told me I would be able to see it tonight. I saw it all, 27 pages of it, and it sort of got me going around. I think we need to look at that and look at that critically in order to give you a fair reading on what we think about it. The real issue is the bottom line. I just this week stumbled across something that I had been looking for for all other kinds of

reasons ever since the beginning of March when it was distributed to the Hanford Waste Board and this is the exit interview of John Tuk from being under Secretary of Energy during George Bush's administration. Tuk said that his department knew there wouldn't be enough money to obey its' clean up contracts with Colorado and other states. Tuk said that the compliance agreements including a 1990 pact covering Rocky Flats was signed largely to preserve bomb making capabilities which really didn't pan out anyhow because they had other safety problems, but they got into this because of this and not to meet environmental promises. We got into the compliance agreements in my view because we had to stay in production to produce the requirements for the military he said. Tuk's admission strikes, this is reading the newspaper article, admissions strike at the heart of the Energy Department's credibility. As Rocky Flats opens talks with hopes of persuading the United States Protection Agency and Colorado Health Department to renegotiate its' clean up agreement. We have had renegotiation after renegotiation and there's the constant worry particularly now with the reduced funding that in fact the department will not be able to meet the milestones if not in 95 that there will be degradation in our ability to meet the out year milestones that are coming down. And it's critically important to the health of the river and the health of the Northwest that there should be no taint associated with the quality of the Columbia River. And so I think that tackling efficiency challenges is fine if you have a chance of meeting the mark with the reduced funding. That's fine. I'm not in favor of spending more than you need to, but sometimes you squish so much that in fact it doesn't work. There's a story about the peasant who was starving but he's feeding his horse and he goes to his neighbor and says what should I do. He says well the horse is doing fine, your family's not doing so fine, so take some

of the food from the horse and give it to the family. So he cut his horse's rations by one half and it worked. The horse still plowed away. He said hey this is a good idea so he took another half off and it kept on working and he did it a couple of more times and things didn't work so well. His neighbor came over and says how's it doing. So this fellow told him the story. He says just as I was getting it really tapered down, the horse died and I'm afraid with clean up we're going to keep on screwing down the diet, the support for all of this, the food for clean up so much that we're going to hurt the Northwest by image and by possibly by hurting the health of its' economy and possibly by hurting the health of the people living in and around Hanford. The skyshine issue is mostly from my perspective even more a worker health issue. We need to do something about that. I remember riding through there with Oregon Hanford's Waste Board on the road between the two cribs, we were seeing fluxes of 600, 650 nearly 700 microrem per hour. People are going to have to work in that. We've got to make sure that we minimize their dosage. Thank you.

LP: Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to make a formal comment at this time?

LP: Yeah, I'm Lynn Porter. This discussion was very interesting. I'm not sure how much of it I understood. It's been a long day. What I think I was hearing from Doug was that on the ground water issues is that the studies have been done and the decisions aside from the N Springs, decisions have not been made about what to do about it and what we need to hear is, we need to hear milestones with definite deadlines and them that can be enforced rather than milestones which just say studies will be made by this date and so on. There's not a real high level of trust. Okay, we're kind of the public police or something. We really

need something real definite to look at and I hope it will be coming along soon.

LP: Did you have a comment?

NV: Yeah, I actually prefer speaking back here. I'm Paige Knight. I'm representing Hanford Watch. I'm the Chairperson of the organization here in town. I would like to ask a couple of questions about ERDF, get a couple of answers then I have some comments to make.

LP: Hold it just one second. We're in the formal comments, so ask the questions and then they'll answer them when we move back to the workshop session. Okay? We have to make arbitrary distinctions for the law.

NV: That's weird. Okay, our group has a tremendous amount of faith in the Oregon Department of Energy with people like Dirk and Ralph Patt working for us and I would like to say for our group that we support wholeheartedly Dirk's comments tonight that we see that there is a crucial need for the ERDF landfill, but we feel that Dirk has hit upon some really important elements that this hasn't been done in the most efficient and most conscientious manner and that we would like this whole thing relooked at in an as expedient way as possible. We are interested in our group in having the wastes at Hanford have a home there. We are really supportive of not having other wastes brought into that landfill. We're going to have enough of those issues to face in this nation with the spent fuel and other things like that. I also would like to say that we support wholeheartedly that in the redeciding or redesigning or relooking at ERDF we too support the trustees must be made a part of the decision in the planning and construction of this. That is paramount otherwise the trust continues to

erode us of the Department of Energy and the agencies involved. In terms of the environmental refocusing, I have been grappling with this issue since it was presented to the Hanford Advisory Board which we have a seat on, and I still when I hear people talk about it, when I read the literature that comes out and tonight it came through very very clear again in some of the answers that were given to us in response to people's questions. This seems like a shell game and I say that because it seems like we are having Washington press down on us in terms of taking the money away part of that with good reason because there has been no really obvious clean up since 1989 and this is still being reported in the papers. My parents just sent me articles from Lewiston, Idaho. I get them from all over the country and there is no faith that anything substantial has been done with the billions of dollars that have been spent thus far. So I would like to say that I think first of all that the ER seems like a shell game. I hope it isn't but I don't have ultimate trust yet. We're interested in our organization in the Columbia River, so we're very concerned about the pump and treat program that's part of the ER plan and some of the talks that we've had with Pat indicate that pump and treat isn't being done on a serious level, and there may be many, many reasons for that, but this needs to be expedited. We also feel very, very leery of there being enough money in the budget which is something that Dick Belsey all of us are talking about that fear of the budget and I have to tell you that since the elections on November 8th, I am fearful that we are going to see a harder, meaner Congress when it comes to clean up because they aren't seeing a product. Okay and I'm not talking about great buildings for, I can't remember who just had their fancy wonderful building finished out there, but somebody just did and buildings are necessary, but they don't need to be extravagant. We need other things. We are concerned about

our health and safety. We're concerned about the health and safety of our children and we want these issues addressed. We want this money well spent and we want you to ask for enough money but you're going to have to do the work and you're going to have to do the work in an expeditious manner in order to get that money coming in. So in general we agree with some of the things that are happening in the environmental restoration, but I fear that it's a shell game. We're being told here's how much money we have, now you have to pick and choose where you think your highest priorities even then when we ask questions about is there enough money in the budget, we get these commitments, and some words I heard oh from Mike tonight that we will need to be more, to do a better job. I want to hear, we are doing a better job, not that we will need to a better job because we will need to do a better job sounds to me like you're dreaming and that you're not really committed, heart and soul, yet. So I want to hear the language change and I want to hear from your gut that you really mean it and that you really know it. I'm not getting that in the talks that we've had with all of you yet. I'm not getting that feeling like oh yeah there's a change taking place. So those are the things that we want from our group. Thank you.

LP: Would you like to put your questions about ERDF on the record?

NV: Well some of the questions I have about ERDF are, what is the projected life of the double-lined trench, option #1, the supremo landfill? What is the projected life of that? Is that an easy answer?

PE: Yeah it is. The projected life of a double-lined trench is typically around 30 years. That generally covers the operational period. The operational period of the ERDF will

be of this part of the ERDF will be five to six years before we consider putting a cap over it.

NV: Okay. What is the cost of option #1? The super whammy landfill.

PE: Including the anthyoid facilities which are decontamination facilities, office buildings and such $65,000,000 over the next five years.

NV: Okay. That's important to us because first of all we still have the question going around the country of the miss definition of low-level and high-level in this country. So you say high-level and TRU waste will not, transuranic waste, will not go into this landfill, only low-level waste and some low-level waste is much more toxic, much more radioactive, much more longlived than some of the high-level and transuranic wastes. I have a concern about that because this waste will be in that landfill beyond it's operational time, beyond the 30 years. And I know that there are enough life forces going on in this planet right now that there's going to be some leakage so that's a real concern for me. And then the cost, is there, if we say yes we want this landfill the one with the double-lined trench and the cap and the blah, blah, blah, is there going to be money for it or is this once again been a pipe dream? So those are my questions, those are what we want answers to.

LP: Thank you. Is there anyone else in the audience who would like to put a formal comment on the record?

JL: My name's Jim Lockhart. This has all been pretty confusing. All these dry facts and everything so I thought I would get us down to something a little bit more familiar. Like the Oregonian for the past year. Patient injected with

plutonium, a forties experiment. Probe of radiation tested on human beings vowed. Report reveals the secret release of radiation in the U.S. after World War II. Documents show that the government deliberately conducted a dozen tests in three states. Studies of Hanford hazard. A U.S. Senate report says five processing plants might hold the potential for a deadly explosion. Since it's inception, the production of nuclear energy and nuclear weapons has left a trail of deceit and duplicity and has disregarded the well being of precisely those who these agencies here before you are proposing to protect and serve. The Department of Energy is a renegade agency. Far from being in the forefront of reform and truth as it pretended to be here tonight with promises of getting the media aware of what we're doing here. Instead of being in the forefront of reform and truth, they established a pattern of behavior in harmony with the nuclear industry and their lack of consideration for nature and humanity. And these are just a small example of what has been done in the past. Fifty years ago, the lives of pregnant woman and their children were recklessly and unknowingly endangered. Students at a state school for the retarded were given a radioactive isotope and today we have Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary saying that current testing is being conducted properly. Is there proof of this? Are we supposed to believe this? We also read about the fumbling during the extremely sensitive and hazardous operations at Hanford recently. And the ground water is becoming contaminated with radioactive waste. We also read that no solution has been found on how and where to store this radioactive waste. Something that might have been asked thirty or forty years ago. Yet the nuclear industry and their lackeys continue to operate nuclear reactors and intend to import some of this stuff into this country for storage. It doesn't sound like anything's changed in fifty years to me. And it seems like

you people are refusing to take seriously the utter horror that is being unleashed on our future. You think because you plug up a few holes here and there, the stuff is getting into the Columbia River. What are we doing about it? You're talking about a couple of things here and there, when the whole place is a shambles. It's not Russia, but it would have been, if it wasn't for the people. If it wasn't for Paige Knight, if it wasn't for Mr. Pelay there. And what about the time between the forties and today? The largest radiation disaster in U.S. history occurred in 1979. Not at Three Mile Island, but at a place called Rio Puerko, Arizona. Has anybody heard about that? Ninety five trillion gallons of water containing 1,100 tons of huge uranium tailings flooded the river. Eventually the Navajo people were forced to drink the water, even though they were told not to. They were forced to feed it to their cattle and their sheep who nobody would buy because they were poisoned. It caused massive sickness. Oregon cancer 15 times the national average. Throughout Indian country, this has been the case. We know about Hanford. I don't know the levels, the names and numbers, but people up there are dying. Much higher than the national average. We know that. Throughout Indian country, Pine Ridge. The Nevada Shoshone have been bombed 300 times with atomic weapons. I haven't heard their name mentioned once. Where's Karen Silkwood's name? From then to now, there's been one breach in this pattern. A pattern that any individual was to exhibit they would have been brought up on charges a long time ago. People are committed to institutions for less crimes than the nuclear industry has committed. If a man or woman was to conduct their lives towards their families or their property, even their own person, with as little regard to the future as all the nuclear industry and the watchdogs supposedly, the watchdogs of the nuclear industry, and all those who stand on the profit margin crying for more, they

would have been found mentally incompetent and their lives would have been taken away from them. They would be in jail. They would be in an institution because they cannot look to the future which is what you folks have been paid to do. Where were you when they decided to put radioactive waste, how far is the Columbia River from that, why did you need to have the public involvement period to tell you that you don't put stuff that leaks near the third largest water shed in this nation, in this continent, but it was done. Now you talk about it. You talk about it. You talk about it. And you get us talking about it as if it's not going to do any good. By our power, strictly because of our power, we are stewards of this land. We have the power to destroy it so we must have the power to take care of it. There's no greater gift from God than nature. There's no greater evidence of this grace than each other. And there's no greater travesty in the slight of hand that renders this earth upon to be exploited and cast aside heedlessly. Whether that's timber, mining, uranium, it doesn't matter if we save the earth, if we poisoned it with radioactive wastes and things that we now have the power to control. We have had the power to control it. No one has stood up. Those who haven't been marginalized. I would like to tell this Department of War, the Department of Energy and the Department of Defense that there is one other eye that is upon you at this moment, this moment, strategic and important for all future children. Thinking, swimming, crawling and I was brought back from the brink of extinction at the 11th hour. I'm speaking about the eagle which almost disappeared. If it wasn't for a few activists again, they probably would have disappeared. People were too busy with their televisions. People were too busy worrying about this, worrying about that. The eagle almost disappeared and he's back right now. He's here to put an eye on you sitting at this table right now. I'm ashamed of what we do in his

name. Ashamed of Nagasaki, ashamed of Hiroshima, ashamed of uranium tailings poisoning Navajo children, ashamed that we create this poisonous substance anywhere, anywhere for any reason. Thank you.

LP: Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to make a formal comment on the record?

NV: Ross go first please.

NV: I just have three comments or areas that I wanted to address.

LP: Would you mind saying your name?

RT: My name's Ross Tuxberry. Now first I wanted to reiterate what I was talking about earlier about publicizing meetings and I think that you should do more in alternative media such as KBOO radio and Willamette Week paper and also getting in the calendars in the Oregonian and I do want to say that you did do a better job than your mailings. People that were on the mailing list were getting more multiple reminders of meeting and I think in the ads in the paper you need to put the key issues in the ads besides just the technical language because anybody looking at some of the ads that I've seen in the past would be very hard to really get a grasp of what was happening and it would look extremely boring. Now, one of the main points I want to discuss and something that just recently upsets me a lot, well first of all, I want to say that the main goal in cleaning up should be protecting people and the rest of the environment from health and safety risks and radiation and toxic waste. It should definitely not be cleaning up the areas so that they can be used for other uses. This is completely wrongheaded and is an example of the old ways of

thinking that have gone for decades and you can't tell me that after more than fifty years of spewing out radioactive and toxic wastes in the air and water and land that any of these areas that are immediately surrounding can be declared completely safe. This is just absolutely ludicrous and dangerous. For example, there's a lot of suggestions for growing potatoes in some of these areas. Well, this is the kind of thing that once it's allowed to happen that years later it will be determined that well there was really more radiation around in there than we thought and now some of these things that we've been doing here has been causing some level of cancer. Of course, somebody will declare that to be acceptable probably. Now, in general this type of thinking I think is a perfect example of what people 100 years from now would consider to be a grievous mistake just as now we realize that many mistakes were made over the last 50 years, but at the time it seemed like it was okay, seemed like the best thing to do, but now we realize that it was definitely the wrong way to go. So I just want to say that no one will be able to say 100 years from now that they didn't know any better back then because we do know better. Now the next area I want to address is the issue of several people were mentioning about limiting this to Hanford waste only. I think that the whole thing that is happening at Hanford has to be looked at as a whole, not just in some little narrow areas here and there. Because what's happening there is like some person digging a ditch in one side and they're shoveling the dirt out while at the same time somebody's behind them shoveling dirt right back into it again. So it never really gets anywhere because this program you're talking about here tonight is not operating in a vacuum or hermetically sealed box where it's just happening all by itself separately. And I don't really see how you can keep talking about environmental restoration without addressing the continued additions of great volumes

of various radioactive materials such as the Trojan Power Plant remains, medical science waste and foreign wastes that are coming in of various types of nuclear reactors from naval ships and God knows what else that will be coming in, in the future that I don't even want to know about. How many nuclear power plants are going to be sent there after decommissioning? That never seems to be addressed. In reality when you think about it, what is going to happen in the future? Hanford is the only place to put a lot of this stuff. You either have to leave it where it is or put it some place and where else is stuff going to go, radioactive stuff. You know think about it. There's just no where else basically because either the other areas don't want it or don't have any ability to take care of it except Hanford and I really think that you need to plan for this and not just have to figure it out as it comes up. Each episode at a time. And I think that's all I have to say.

LP: Thank you. Anyone else have a comment for the record?

NV: For Heart of America Northwest, I want to add some things for the record and start by, I would like to make sure that the record reflects the precise questions and responses in this panel discussion tonight. I think that would be very important. I think it's very important to have on the record what the Department of Energy's response was to what is acceptable to radiation exposure to the public. And I want to summarize Heart of America Northwest's requests. Number one, it's not sufficient to post warning signs, but they must be posted and soon along the Hanford Reach of the Columbia River. They're only a stop gap. They should be posted within a month. Within six months, areas that have not yet been surveyed or which have been surveyed and show either a chemical hazardous or a radiation hazard must be fenced. EPA and Ecology should use their authority to act

on imminent health and environmental threats require this. This ain't got to be a TPA even, you guys should just go and require it. It's unconscionable this, I keep looking at other states superfund sites and talking to other people and this is the only unfenced accessible hazardous waste site that anyone knows about. We need to act and we need to act quick. We need a milestone for reducing radiation and chemical exposures to no greater than appropriate, relevant legal standards by the year 2000 including 10 millirem per year with in addition to that the continuous air monitoring required under the clean air act for any potential source that could add sufficient radiation release to bump the public exposure to anything in excess of 10 millirem per year. These facilities do not have that continuous air monitoring and it is required by law. We need to not only deal with skyshine in the N Area, but apparently also other direct radiation sources. We need to deal with chemical exposure hazardous not just the radiation sources. We need to deal on the basis on process knowledge as well for instance over the years we have repeatedly testified about the fact that it has been known for 30 years that reactor fuel chips, some the size of half dollars, went into the river and landed on the islands and sediments and shorelines down stream. We are talking about highly radioactive pieces of the actual spent fuel. No one's ever gone back out and looked for them except for in several classified documents in the 1960's or if they have the documents are still classified and I sure haven't seen them. There needs to be an independent survey of these risks and an effort to make sure that the public is not exposed to them as well as remediation of them. We need to make sure that the promise given last year that D Island was not just an example, an isolated example, but that D Island was the first example of islands that would be surveyed and remediated is lived up to. On skyshine, we need to have response to whether or not

the Department of Energy actually believes in the principle of as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA). I find it again, I think on behalf of our membership, unconscionable that for all the talk about ALARA and for the fact the Department of Energy gives bonuses to the Westinghouse Hanford Company for reducing areas of exposure but at the same time can sign off on a report that says we don't have to worry about achieving as low as is reasonably achievable radiation exposures to the public, never mind of course to the workers in the N Area. The Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment which is another part of the environmental restoration milestones. As Paige noted on behalf of the joint comments from public interest community, it is not acceptable to have Battelle do this report. One reason should make imminent sense to everyone in the room. That report ought to suffice for natural resource damage assessment purposes. We ought to only do one report on natural resource and ecological damage to the river from Hanford operations. However, Battelle cannot possibly meet the criteria for an independent entity under EPA and Department of Interior requirements for doing an NRDA assessment. Why are we wasting money by having to do it over again. Battelle has a conflict of interest. They are liable polluter. They are being given $20 million to do a study to limit their own liability for past discharges and releases damaging the environment. A study that would be in direct irreconcilable conflict with their past reports. For instance the Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment has a specific comment must address the risks such as reactor fuel chips, skyshine, direct radiation from facilities such as the 100 N dump tank and chemicals exposures along the Hanford Reach. Not one of these risks were willingly discussed by Battelle in the Annual Environmental Reports. Battelle has a history of covering up these specific risks. Perhaps or not perhaps by order of

the Department of Energy. It is irrelevant for this purpose. They're not qualified to do the Columbia River Impact Assessment. Lastly about the Columbia River Impact Assessment, this document isn't going to be worth the paper it's written on for $20 million bucks if you can't deliver the openness initiative drafted by the state of Oregon and adopted by the Hanford Summit II which would guarantee the public not only declassification of all relevant documents showing what went into the river, but also all relevant documents have to be made accessible for public review. You've failed miserably on this openness initiative and this document is not going to be worth anything in terms of public credibility unless you immediately live up to that. Lastly, on ERDF, you will note a warning to pick up pens for ERDF you haven't had to do that much tonight. This is in addition to previous comments and we've been thinking about the comments we gave in Seattle regarding the potential for other non-Hanford wastes to be sent to Hanford which we said ought to be taken into consideration here. We respect the fact that the agencies have made an effort to insure that non-Hanford wastes will not go to ERDF, but in reviewing the history of this issue we realize that this process for the landfill was supposed to be a test of integrating the National Environmental Policy Act and State Environmental Act with the superfund law which has different requirements for doing a study of alternatives and impacts. And in essence there's no environmental impact statement under this test. In doing the test the public was promised that the NEPA values would be met and incorporated into the superfund documents. Therefore, you must address, let me take a step back, NEPA requires that you address the cumulative impacts and the impacts of related actions in the one document for the action you're proposing this landfill. Since the lead agency is the Department of Energy taking the action, apparently has plans or is considering other actions that

are related which would bring similar wastes from all over the country, perhaps the world, to landfills at Hanford including we've just learned defense low level wastes to be brought to the region including wastes under the federal facility compliance act from other nuclear weapons sites. Therefore, whether or not these wastes are off limits to ERDF, you must fully disclose what those wastes are, where they are going, what the cumulative risks and impacts are. This is what would be required under the NEPA. I know that EPA and Ecology may have trouble obtaining this information as it has been closely held. I would suggest that you must force the Department of Energy to fully disclose this information otherwise we cannot meet the promise that everything that would be covered under NEPA would be covered under the ERDF CRCLA documents and it is imperative that the public see what the Department of Energy is considering to bring into another landfill at Hanford. That closes Heart of America Northwest's comments. Thank you.

LP: Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to make a comment on the record?

NV: I would like to extend ours just a little bit. I'm Dirk Dunning with the State of Oregon Department of Energy. Two other comments associated with the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility. In touring the site on Monday, one of the things that was impressive about the old growth sage and the road that had been cut through was the very large piles of tumbleweed that had built up along it even though there's been no traffic on that road yet. And one of the concerns I have is particularly associated with ERDF since it's a larger perimeter area that's going to be involved is it poses a fairly large jeopardy for fire to this very pristine habitat. And I think that's something both for ERDF and for the road and any other areas bordering those facilities

needs to be very carefully considered and preventive measures be put in place to insure that that doesn't happen. And I've forgotten the other comment unfortunately. That will do.

NV: Can I ask ??? or Ecology a question about that road?

LP: Can we get off the record and back to workshop before we're going to do Q and A? Or do you want it as a question that has to be answered in? Is there anyone else who wants to make a comment on the record otherwise we'll flip back into workshop format for a few moments here and I did want to respond to Jerry. I was, after you asked would the workshop questions and answers be in the record, I did confirm that with the people that are creating the record and the answer is yes. So all these workshop, they'll be in the record. The difference is I don't think they have to write a response to the comment document on everything that's in the workshop part. Is that correct?

NV: ??? that workshop part be reviewed for specific comments.

LP: Oh, okay.

NV: And that they respond to the specific comments in the workshop part.

LP: She's nodding her head yes. Okay. All right. Back to workshop format. Jerry?

NV: We were approached a year ago about this road and at that time let's just say a most senior official at the Westinghouse Hanford Company asked us if we would have any problem if that road was built without delay for SEPA or NEPA and I just about fell out of my chair. We never

received any, I didn't think that road got built. We never received any SEPA or NEPA notices about that road and I would like to know if anyone reviewed it for SEPA or NEPA and why there's no EIS on it? Anyone know?

NV: My answer is no. We weren't asked about it at all. So we didn't have any insight as to the road being constructed.

NV: From my perspective is the same as Doug. I'm not aware of any. I'd have to go back and talk to Jeff Talent. I don't know if you know Jeff to see if he might have been involved with it.

NV: Of course comments we received about the road issue was from the Yakima Nation and who was very concerned about it. Other than that we didn't receive anything from the Department of Energy.

NV: Mike are you aware of what DOE did to comply with NEPA or SEPA on this road?

NV: Jerry, I apologize but that's outside of my cognizance and I have to plead ignorance on this.

NV: And you know in what's also appropriate here is the fact that this road was built at what cost? And at what priority when we've got milestones that are in jeopardy. We've got spent nuclear fuel next to the river that can't be moved away on the path identified because of funding constraints and we have a road built through old growth sage habitat which when we were approached about it, it was clearly identified as being a significant biological habitat and almost laughed at. Can you believe old growth sage habitat, what will be next? Was the way it was presented to us. So I'm really concerned about it and I would like if someone

could get back to us about what was the SEPA and NEPA compliance.

NV: We'll have to do that because the road was there when I came. I don't know where the road come from.

LP: Are there other questions or comments from the panel, from the audience before I close the meeting?

NV: One minor one. It doesn't need a response. I hate to go back to the sage again but one of the things that was particularly striking to me is I've been through a lot of the areas on the site and I saw a lot of amazing things on Monday. Among them I saw something that's apparently as rare as a white buffalo which is a one point doe. Bald eagles out along the river and a number of other things. But with the sagebrush, you go out through a lot of the site and you see the sagebrush is about a foot tall or maybe a foot and one half tall or two feet tall or three feet tall. There was something about walking out into sagebrush that's taller than I am. That you can't see around and you can't see over. It has an effect on you that's just hard to explain. It's like walking into a grove of old growth forest on the westside of the mountains here. It's has an absolutely stunning impression and to go into that and see it as badly destroyed in a straight line across the site as it was, was very painful to see. Another part of the problem that's going to be associated with this is there are some roads that lead off from this main road that are the old Army Loop Road and a couple of other minor services roads and it's going to be very important to those be blocked so people don't easily access off of that road into some of this area. It is really hard for me to describe what we all felt and I know for the trustees in general we, I think everybody was impacted and we did have one DOE

person with us and I won't say who that was but one of the things that was striking he talked with one of the trustees later was trying to understand...(tape ended)

**TAPE 2, SIDE B**

LP: Do you have another question or comment?

JL: Just a couple questions. You were talking about Strontium-90 is that how it's pronounced and it gets into your bones and I don't know exactly what that's all about, but it sounds pretty dangerous to me and we were being told it's leaking into the Columbia River. All right. But it's not dangerous because it's going to be diluted right? Is that everybody's pretty much position here? Since it's going into the Columbia River, and down the road about two miles, it's going to be so diluted it's not dangerous, it's acceptable? That's the sense I get from all this.

LP: Is that a question?

JL: Oh I'll get to that. I was wondering, pardon? It's not acceptable. What is being done about it?

NV: I believe your comment probably stems from some discussion I had and the point I was trying to make is that the justification for doing the work is if you look at the controversy going on for this decision of putting in the wall. There's a very wide ranging controversy about why are you spending the money versus why don't you get on with it. The full spectrum is out on the table on this issue. There has been a significant amount of press saying that we should not be spending the money and not be proceeding with this. The point I was trying to make is that if you look at the ground water contamination, that alone justifies putting the

wall in.

JL: And that wall is to keep it from getting to the water?

NV: Yes it is. And to enhance the pump and treat system.

JL: How long has this been leaking?

NV: When did we first see break through, I can't recall the date?

NV: 63.

JL: So you're just now talking about putting a wall up? I don't think I even need to ask the question about that one. How much sewerage are we allowed to dump into the Willamette River down here? I know it overflows and goes in there when the drains overflow, but isn't there some kind of regulation. I don't think they allow any do they?

LP: I don't think these people monitor sewerage locally.

JL: They don't have to monitor it, I'm just talking common sense.

LP: Okay, but I can't ask them to give you an answer that question.

JL: You are the monitor that's right. Okay. I think I have one more. It had to do with the, well last year I wanted to give testimony, I was lucky because I heard about it the day before it happened and a lot of people talked about I guess it was the Department of Energy at the time were not giving people notice and apparently everybody's claiming they had a little bit of notice this time, not enough, but it's getting

better. I was wondering what the separate agencies do here. If they call up any of the agencies, news media and or perhaps flop out your database so these people can be reached, you know with your money possibly since it's our money. Does any of the separate groups here, what is it, Environmental Protection Agency, Washington Department of Ecology, do any of you folks care enough about the constituency to let them know what's going on or do you just depend on the Department of Energy to pass the buck?

NV: Three of us work together to try and make sure that the word gets out.

JL: Right, so did any of your agencies take out advertisements in the paper?

NV: You bet.

JL: Good because I didn't know. I wanted to know. And also I've noticed that there's a lot of paperwork here. Nice maps and colored graphs and all that, I wondered if perhaps next time we could get a colored graph on much energy is spent, how much money is being spent, on I don't know sound people, maybe I don't know different places I've seen buffets and waiters walking around, all the different money that's being spent renting this place. How much money is being spent notifying the public? You know if you could even get that little sliver on that pie compared to everything else it would be interesting. So that really wasn't a question, that was an answer to something that was given earlier when people were talking about what should be done. Thank you.

LP: Your welcome. Thank you. Did you want to make a comment?

NV: Well I could say that in newspapers.

LP: You might want to identify yourself?

MW: I'm Mark Wallace from the Department of Ecology and I know personally that the Department spent $21,000 on newspaper advertising alone for these series of meetings so it was well distributed all across the State of Washington and in Oregon through the Oregonian.

LP: Are there any other questions or comments? If not, I want to thank all of you for coming and providing the questions and the comments and thank the panelists for a lively, but still well-mannered discussion and with that I will close the meeting. Thank you.