

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

GLOBAL NUCLEAR ENERGY PARTNERSHIP
PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
PUBLIC HEARING

The public hearing in the above matter was held on November 18, 2008, at 6:30 p.m., at Hood River Inn, 1108 E. Marina Way, Hood River, Washington.

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2

3 MR. BROWN: Good evening and welcome to
4 this public meeting on the draft Programmatic
5 Environmental Impact Statement for the Global Nuclear
6 Energy Partnership. The development of the
7 Environmental Impact Statement for this project by the
8 Department of Energy's office of Nuclear Energy is
9 required by the National Environment Policy Act.

10 My name is Holmes Brown and I will serve as
11 the facilitator for this event. My role is to ensure
12 that the meeting runs on schedule and that everybody
13 has an opportunity to speak. I'm not employed with
14 the Department of Energy, nor an advocate for any
15 party or position.

16 At the registration table, you should have
17 received a participant's packet. If not, please raise
18 your hand so staff can bring you one. It contains
19 important information on the following presentation
20 and is a convenient place to take notes during the

21 briefing that will follow in a few minutes. We've got
22 one over there. We've got a couple up here. I hope
23 your hands don't get too tired. We're trying to get
24 to you quickly. We've got a couple up here, thanks.

25 There are three purposes for tonight's

2

1 meeting. First, to provide information on the content
2 on the draft Programmatic Environmental Impact
3 Statement, or PEIS, and on the National Environmental
4 Policy Act, NEPA, which governs the process; a second
5 purpose is to answer your questions on the draft PEIS
6 and NEPA; and, third, to receive and record your
7 formal comments on the draft PEIS.

8 The agenda for tonight's meeting reflects
9 these purposes. We begin with a presentation by Ray
10 Furstenau, who is Deputy Manager for Nuclear Energy
11 for DOE's Idaho Operations Office. To answer your
12 questions, project staff will be available throughout
13 the evening at the display tables and the posters in
14 back. They can discuss the draft PEIS and NEPA

15 process, the contents of printed material on display,
16 and the contents of Mr. Furstenau's slide show.

17 Following Mr. Furstenau's presentation, we
18 will recess briefly so that you can -- we can set up
19 to receive your comments and so that you can pursue
20 further questions with available project staff.

21 Once we reconvene, the court reporter will
22 be available to receive your comments and suggestions
23 regarding the GNEP draft PEIS. All your comments will
24 be transcribed and made part of the permanent record.

25 I'm now pleased to introduce Mr. Ray

3

1 Furstenau, who's DOE's Idaho's Deputy Manager for
2 Nuclear Energy. He will discuss the background of the
3 project and the purpose and basic element of the draft
4 PEIS.

5 (Slide presentation given.)

6 MR. FURSTENAU: Good evening, and I
7 thank all of you for coming. As Mr. Brown said, I'm
8 the Deputy Manager for the Nuclear Energy -- is that
9 better? I'm a little taller than him. The Deputy

10 Manager for Nuclear Energy in the Department of
11 Idaho's Operation Office, but tonight I'm representing
12 DOE's office and the Global Energy Partnership
13 Program.

14 It's nice to be back in Hood River. I was
15 here for the public scoping meeting in 2007 and it was
16 great that time of the year. It's a wonderful time of
17 the year, fall as well.

18 My primary purpose tonight is to hear your
19 comments regarding the draft Programmatic
20 Environmental Impact Statement, or PEIS, which became
21 available October 17th for your review.

22 The GNEP PEIS provides an analysis of the
23 potential environmental impacts associated with the
24 various alternatives for expanding nuclear power in
25 the United States. My presentation may include some

4

1 terms you're not familiar with, such as open or closed
2 nuclear fuel cycles. Hopefully, I will be able to
3 explain some of those terms during my talk.

4 I want to thank all of you again for coming
5 to this public hearing. It's important that the
6 public participate in this. That's what the process
7 is all about, and it's important that we hear from
8 you. Your participation will help DOE make a better
9 document, which will in turn make better decisions.
10 After my presentation, we'll begin the public comment
11 session.

12 Those of you who wish to provide oral
13 comments will be given an opportunity to speak, or if
14 you prefer, you can provide written comments. And
15 after those who have wished to provide oral comments
16 have been given the opportunity to do so, we will
17 adjourn.

18 This is an outline for my presentation.
19 First, I will briefly discuss the National
20 Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, process. Next, I
21 will discuss the GNEP PEIS, reviewing various aspects
22 of the document, such as changes to the scope of the
23 document as a result of the scoping process, the
24 purpose and need for agency action, the alternatives
25 addressed, international GNEP initiatives,

1 environmental analyses, and key conclusions regarding
2 the alternatives.

3 Remember, this is a programmatic EIS. It's
4 looking at impacts at a national level using generic
5 sites, and therefore does not enable a siting
6 decision. A siting decision would require a future
7 proposal, a future NEPA action, and there would be at
8 that time an additional opportunity to provide public
9 comment.

10 I will also discuss the Record of Decision
11 process and how decisions based on the GNEP PEIS may
12 be implemented.

13 Finally, I will address how you can help
14 DOE make a better decision and the many ways in which
15 you can provide comments on the draft GNEP PEIS.

16 The NEPA process is designed to ensure that
17 Federal agencies consider the potential environmental
18 impacts of proposed actions and alternatives. A
19 fundamental aspect of any NEPA process is public
20 participation. Under NEPA, an Environmental Impact
21 Statement, or EIS, is required for any major federal
22 action that may significantly affect the quality of
23 the human environment. A programmatic EIS is
24 generally used to address broad programs such as GNEP.

25 In looking at the slide to the right, it

1 kind of shows the process. During the Advanced Notice
2 of Intent back in March of 2006, we received 800
3 comments and then we proceeded to the scoping -- the
4 scoping process in the spring of 2007. That's where
5 we came to Hood River in late March of 2007.

6 During the scoping process, we received
7 over 14,000 comments. And considering those comments,
8 then we produced the draft Programmatic Environmental
9 Impact Statement which was released in October, and
10 now we're doing the public hearing process for that
11 draft PEIS.

12 As I mentioned, the Notice of Availability
13 of the draft was published on October 17, 2008. That
14 opens the public comment period which closes on
15 December 16, 2008.

16 There has been a request to extend the
17 public comment period and consider additional
18 locations for the public hearings. The Department of
19 Energy is currently looking at both these requests.

20 As I mentioned earlier, DOE has made
21 adjustments to the scope of the GNEP PEIS based on

22 public input during the scoping process.

23 In response to public comments and further
24 analysis, DOE determined that decisions regarding any
25 of the three originally proposed facilities would be

7

1 premature. As a result, no project-specific or
2 site-specific proposals are being made at this time.
3 Based on future decisions regarding GNEP, DOE or
4 industry might propose new facilities which would be
5 subject to appropriate NEPA review.

6 These three facilities reflected on the
7 slide there, those were the ones we talked about
8 during the scoping process. We're not considering
9 site-specific facilities at this time.

10 It's important that DOE return to each site
11 that was initially considered for GNEP facilities.
12 You will see in the Federal Register that we're
13 visiting all the same places that we visited during
14 the scoping process. Though this PEIS will not
15 include decisions on siting, these sites are not ruled

16 out from future consideration.

17 Four programmatic alternatives were added
18 to the analysis. The first two are "closed fuel
19 cycle," or "recycling" options, and the last two are
20 "open fuel cycle" alternatives that use fuels or
21 reactor technologies that are different from the
22 existing U.S. nuclear fuel cycle but do not recycle
23 the nuclear fuel resources.

24 I'll briefly discuss each of these
25 alternatives later. For more details on these

8

1 alternatives, I encourage you to visit the posters at
2 the back of the room. There's handouts on the table
3 there. There's DOE representatives in the back of the
4 room who can help answer your questions.

5 The draft GNEP PEIS consists of a
6 stand-alone Summary and the main volume, which
7 contains the documents as well as analyses and
8 technical appendices that support the analyses, along
9 with additional project information.

10 Chapters 1 and 2 present a background of

11 the GNEP program, of the history of spent nuclear fuel
12 recycling in the U.S., the purpose and need for DOE
13 action, an overview of the PEIS, and a detailed
14 description of the alternatives.

15 Chapters 4 and 5 discuss the potential
16 environmental impacts, including cumulative impacts of
17 all the alternatives.

18 Chapter 6 includes the statutes,
19 regulations, Executive Orders, DOE orders, and other
20 regulatory requirements that may affect implementation
21 of any of the GNEP alternatives.

22 And Chapter 7 addresses international
23 initiatives under GNEP. There are several additional
24 chapters and appendices that include supporting
25 technical information and a summary of scoping

9

1 comments and responses.

2 DOE's underlying purpose and need is to
3 support expansion and domestic and international
4 nuclear energy production while reducing the risks of

5 nuclear proliferation and reducing the impacts
6 associated with the disposal of future spent nuclear
7 fuel or other radioactive waste; for example, reducing
8 the volume, thermal output, or the radiotoxicity of
9 the waste requiring geological disposal.

10 This purpose and need for this PEIS has not
11 changed since the scoping meeting. To meet its
12 nonproliferation goals with regards to spent nuclear
13 fuel recycling, DOE will assess, as reasonable
14 alternatives, only those technologies that do not
15 separate or use pure plutonium.

16 As part of the PEIS, we looked at a number
17 of alternatives. Some met the purpose and need and
18 some did not. For example, there's been a lot of talk
19 about interim storage. DOE does not have the
20 legislative authority to accept commercial spent
21 nuclear fuel for interim storage at this time.
22 However, DOE is not -- given that, DOE is not
23 analyzing interim storage.

24 However, this does not mean that DOE is
25 taking a position against interim storage. Storage

1 alone doesn't meet the purpose and need, and therefore
2 is not a viable alternative being evaluated under this
3 PEIS.

4 On the other hand, process storage at a
5 recycling facility which provides inventory to support
6 recycling operations is considered as part of this
7 PEIS.

8 The slide and cartoon kind of depicts the
9 basis of nuclear power operations. A typical nuclear
10 power plant -- this is depicting the type of reactors
11 that we use in the United States today at 104 power
12 reactors, and as you can see on the -- let me get this
13 to work right here.

14 If you can see on the -- right there,
15 that's the reactor, and that reactor has nuclear fuel
16 in it which is a very dense power source, and that
17 provides the heat source to heat water which is then
18 run through a heat exchanger which causes water to
19 boil. You run the steam through the turbine and you
20 generate electricity via the turbine.

21 The back end of this is the same as most
22 other types of large power operations, like a coal
23 power plant works the same way on the tail end to
24 produce electricity.

25 Right now in the United States today, about

1 20 percent of our electricity is generated using
2 nuclear power. After completing an operating cycle,
3 which lasts between 18 and 24 months, some of the
4 uranium fuel is considered used up, which we refer to
5 as spent. After the fuel is spent, it must be
6 replaced with fresh fuel.

7 There are two approaches to the management
8 of the spent fuel. The current approach that we use
9 in the U.S. is called the open cycle, or the
10 once-through cycle. That's referred to in the GNEP
11 PEIS as the No Action Alternative. I'll talk more
12 about that in a moment.

13 The other approach is closing the fuel
14 cycle, which would mean recycling the spent fuel for
15 additional use. Now let's look at the alternatives
16 that's explored in the PEIS.

17 The GNEP PEIS assesses alternatives that
18 would reduce the volume, thermal output (heat), and
19 the radiotoxicity of spent nuclear fuel, and the
20 wastes requiring geologic disposal. None of the
21 alternatives addressed in the GNEP PEIS change the
22 need or planning for Yucca Mountain.

23 In addition to any new alternatives, NEPA
24 regulations require an assessment of continuing with
25 the existing situation. This is known as the No

12

1 Action Alternative. For purposes of this PEIS, no
2 action means to continue the current fuel -- open fuel
3 cycle using light water reactors and uranium fuel.

4 Two additional open fuel cycle alternatives
5 were explored in the PEIS. Thermal reactors are so
6 named because they use a moderator, such as water or
7 graphite, to slow down or thermalize neutrons. Light
8 water reactors that we use in the United States today
9 are considered thermal reactors. Heavy water
10 reactors, which are one of the alternatives of the
11 open cycle, is also a thermal reactor, as is high
12 temperature gas cooled reactors. They're also thermal
13 reactors.

14 The PEIS examines three closed fuel
15 alternatives that include recycling used fuel and
16 thermal reactors, fast reactors, and a combination of

17 the two reactor types.

18 Each of the alternatives are described in
19 detail within the GNEP PEIS, and the basics of each
20 alternative are available on the posters that are
21 displayed in the back. There's also a good summary
22 handout on the table near the window.

23 Currently, all reactors in the U.S. use
24 this open fuel cycle. This is basically where uranium
25 ore is dug out of the ground and processed. It's

13

1 enriched slightly so the reactor can operate enriched
2 cycling and fabricated into light water reactor fuel,
3 which is then used as a fuel in the light water
4 reactors. That fuel is used once, moved around within
5 the core, but once it's used up that first time, it is
6 then put into storage until a repository is opened.
7 So that's the once-through fuel cycle.

8 Under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982,
9 spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste
10 must be disposed of in a geologic repository at Yucca
11 Mountain in Nevada. DOE recently submitted a Nuclear

12 Regulatory Commission license application for the
13 Yucca Mountain Repository that has been accepted for
14 review. Under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, Congress
15 established a statutory capacity for the Yucca
16 Mountain Repository as 70,000 metric tons of heavy
17 metal of spent fuel and high-level radioactive waste.

18 DOE estimates that the amount of spent
19 nuclear fuel in storage from commercial reactors
20 around the country will reach the statutory capacity
21 limit for the Yucca Mountain Repository by
22 approximately 2010.

23 This slide shows an example of a closed
24 fuel cycle alternative. This is a continuous recycle
25 of light water spent fuel to produce a mixed oxide

14

1 uranium/plutonium fuel for use in fast reactors. As I
2 showed in a previous slide, the difference here, where
3 I showed you around -- where the light water reactors
4 produce electricity and then the spent fuel is stored
5 for eventual repository. In this case, the light

6 water reactor fuel can be taken to a separations
7 facility and the uranium can be separated out and
8 fabricated into fast reactor fuel that can be then
9 used in a fast reactor.

10 So basically taking some of the
11 constituents of light water reactor fuel that provide
12 high radiotoxicity and thermal heat load for a
13 repository that takes those out of the light water
14 reactor spent fuel, and then uses that. It makes good
15 fuel for a fast reactor, basically using that
16 resource.

17 And then a fast reactor can be used to
18 create -- generate electricity as well, and then the
19 fuel from the fast reactor can be recycled multiple
20 times into fast reactor fuel. So that reduces the
21 high-level waste, a heat load, or radiotoxicity on the
22 repository.

23 The benefits of a closed fuel cycle are
24 depicted here. At this time, DOE's preference is to
25 support a closed nuclear fuel cycle, although a

1 particular alternative or opinion has not been
2 selected. Closing the fuel cycle meets the purpose
3 and need objectives. It would support sustainable
4 expansion of nuclear power. It would support the
5 United States nonproliferation objectives. Recycling
6 would also improve waste management by reducing the
7 volume, heat load, and radiotoxicity of nuclear waste,
8 as well as better utilization of our uranium
9 resources. Further, because nuclear power plants do
10 not emit greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide,
11 they would not contribute to climate change.

12 In addition to the domestic programmatic
13 alternatives, the GNEP PEIS addresses international
14 initiatives that DOE could support in the future. At
15 this time, none of these initiatives have risen to the
16 level of a specific proposed action.

17 Under the Reliable Fuel Services Program,
18 nations agree to refrain from pursuing uranium
19 enrichment, and reprocessing programs would be assured
20 of the availability of nuclear fuel for their electric
21 power generating reactors. The fuel would be provided
22 by a fuel cycle GNEP partner. Spent fuel -- spent
23 nuclear fuel generated by the recipient nation would
24 be returned to the supplying nation or other fuel
25 cycle GNEP for reprocessing, storage, or disposal.

1 GNEP -- excuse me. DOE also supports the
2 development of grid-appropriate reactors, which would
3 be well suited to the capabilities and needs of
4 developing countries. These reactors would be
5 designed to achieve high standards of safety and
6 security and would be sized to suit those countries
7 with smaller and less developed power grids. The
8 successful deployment of these reactors, coupled with
9 the Reliable Fuel Services Program, would provide an
10 attractive energy solution to many countries and
11 reduce the incentive for them to develop the more
12 sensitive fuel cycle technologies that could be
13 misused, specifically uranium enrichment and
14 reprocessing.

15 The global partnership aspect of GNEP is
16 now a separate activity that has grown rapidly since
17 the scoping process. It now consists of 25 nations
18 that have signed the statement of principle that
19 commits them to safe and secure nuclear power. It
20 also has in place a management framework that includes
21 separate working groups on infrastructure and
22 development of assured nuclear fuel services.

23 The analyses of these international

24 initiatives in the PEIS is very general. It is not
25 intended to support any particular decision.

17

1 Currently, we are only considering activities that
2 could impact how we manage the U.S. domestic nuclear
3 fuel cycle. If, in the future, we were to prepare --
4 excuse me, we were to propose significant
5 international fuel cycle use, that could impact it,
6 but the U.S. -- probably we would address that in
7 future NEPA action.

8 This slide includes the resources and
9 factors assessed under GNEP PEIS. Again, because this
10 is a programmatic level analysis, a number of the
11 resources evaluated are at a general level that does
12 not provide significant discrimination between the
13 various alternatives.

14 If future project-specific and
15 site-specific action is proposed, an Environmental
16 Impact Statement for that site would provide more
17 substantial discrimination where you would be provided

18 an opportunity to comment in that site-specific
19 process.

20 Spent nuclear fuel is hazardous and must be
21 isolated and managed to protect the public and the
22 environment. Although all of the alternatives
23 addressed in the GNEP PEIS would generate spent
24 nuclear fuel and/or high-level waste that would
25 require disposal in a geologic repository, the closed

18

1 fuel cycle alternatives could significantly reduce
2 future repository requirements. The fast and
3 thermal/fast alternatives provide the greatest
4 potential to reduce radiotoxicity, thermal load, and
5 volume of wastes requiring geologic disposal.

6 The closed fuel cycle alternatives would
7 allow for the recovery of energy-bearing materials
8 such as uranium and transuranics, which can be made
9 into new nuclear fuel to generate more electricity,
10 where these would just be disposed of under the open
11 fuel cycle.

12 In general, the closed fuel cycle would

13 require a greater number of shipments and miles
14 traveled than the open fuel cycle alternatives.

15 Radiation exposures to workers and the
16 public under any of the alternatives would be very low
17 and well within regulatory limits. Estimated impacts
18 from some theoretical accidents that may be evaluated
19 through a design and licensing process are also
20 comparable between alternatives.

21 Finally, land use would be comparable for
22 all alternatives, since the total land use is
23 primarily driven by the number of reactor sites and
24 all of the alternatives including the reactors.

25 At the conclusion of the GNEP PEIS process,

19

1 DOE will make a decision to support any of the
2 domestic programmatic alternatives addressed in the
3 document, including the No Action Alternative. The
4 decision could be to support any one or some
5 combination of the alternatives.

6 The decision could influence the direction

7 and scope of future research activities. Ultimately,
8 any decisions based on the GNEP PEIS assume that the
9 U.S. nuclear industry will ultimately pursue similar
10 fuel cycles for the generation of electricity. DOE
11 could influence the decisions of the commercial
12 utility sector by providing proposals for grants,
13 contracts, or financial arrangements to implement
14 approaches supported by DOE.

15 In making its decision on which alternative
16 or combination of alternatives to select, DOE will
17 consider the potential environmental impacts along
18 with other relevant information, such as the agency's
19 mission, national objectives, technical feasibility,
20 and cost.

21 DOE will publish in the Federal Register a
22 detailed record of decision documenting any decisions
23 based on the GNEP PEIS and the supporting rationale.
24 The Record of Decision would be issued no sooner than
25 30 days following the publication of the final GNEP

2 right now.

3 Now, how can you help us make a sound
4 decision? Well, first you can provide comments on the
5 PEIS and identify any issues that are significant and
6 should be considered in the final PEIS and any
7 additional information that should be considered.

8 You can also continue to be involved and
9 informed about the status of the GNEP PEIS and what
10 the DOE is doing. DOE has established a GNEP Web site
11 shown on this slide and in your handouts, which we
12 will continue to update. You can also sign up to
13 receive the final PEIS when it is issued. You can
14 sign up for that at the desk here.

15 You can make your comments on the GNEP PEIS
16 orally at this or any other public hearing or in
17 writing here at the public hearing. You may also
18 submit a written comment by using the comment sheets
19 provided or a plain piece of paper or your own paper.
20 You may submit written comments to any DOE
21 representative at this hearing or at the desk in the
22 back or leave it in the box on your way out at the
23 reception desk.

24 If you choose to submit your written
25 comments by mail, please send them to the address

1 shown on this slide. You may also submit written
2 comments through the internet or by fax. All comments
3 are considered equally, regardless of how they are
4 submitted. Please bear in mind that the closing date
5 for comments is December 16, 2008.

6 At this time, as I mentioned earlier,
7 though, there has been a request to extend the public
8 comment period and consider additional locations for
9 public hearings and the Department of Energy is
10 currently considering both of those requests. This
11 concludes my presentation and thank you for your
12 attention.

13 MR. BROWN: Thank you very much. We're
14 now going to recess for a few minutes so we can set up
15 to receive your comments. We'll also allow you an
16 opportunity if you have any further questions to
17 discuss those with the DOE staff at the posters in
18 back.

19 I will make an announcement when we're
20 about to resume the formal portion of the meeting and
21 begin taking formal comments. If you would like to
22 provide oral comments and are not yet signed up to do
23 so, please go to the registration table and add your
24 name to the list. Again, we will resume in just a few

25 minutes. Thanks very much.

22

1 (Recess was taken.)

2 We have a lot of folks signed up to speak
3 tonight, so if you could take your seats, we'll get
4 started. It is now time to receive your formal
5 comments on the scope of the draft PEIS. This is your
6 opportunity to let DOE know your response to the draft
7 and offer other suggestions and additions to the
8 document. The court reporter will transcribe your
9 statement. Our reporter tonight is Linda Kennard.

10 Let me review a few ground rules for the
11 formal comments. These are listed on a sheet which is
12 part of your participant's packet. Please step to the
13 microphone over there when your name is called.
14 Introduce yourself, providing an
15 organization/affiliation where appropriate.

16 FEMALE SPEAKER: Where?

17 MR. BROWN: To that podium over there.

18 If you have a written version of your statement,

19 please provide a copy to the court reporter after
20 you've completed your remarks. Also, please give the
21 court reporter any additional attachments that you
22 would like to see made part of the formal record.
23 These will need to be labeled and submitted for
24 inclusion.

25 I will call two names at a time; first is

23

1 the speaker and the second is the person to follow.
2 In view of the number of people who indicated an
3 interest in speaking tonight, please confine your
4 remarks -- and I apologize for this -- to just three
5 minutes.

6 We have over 50 people signed up to speak,
7 so if you can capsulize your statements. A staff
8 person is sitting in front of the podium over there,
9 and rather than my interrupting you with letting you
10 know how much time is left, he's got a sign that
11 indicates that there is a minute remaining to your
12 time. So once you see that sign, again, if you can
13 sort of quickly summarize your statements because I do

14 want everybody to have a chance to speak in a timely
15 fashion.

16 Mr. Furstenau will be serving as the
17 hearing officer for the DOE this evening, but he will
18 not be responding to any questions or comments during
19 this session.

20 So with that by way of introduction, let me
21 get started by calling our speakers. The first person
22 is Dirk Dunning.

23 MALE SPEAKER: I have a question. It
24 seems to me, if you have a problem with the amount of
25 time that's available for people to speak, then there

24

1 should be an opportunity given to extend this hearing
2 so there's adequate time for people to speak.

3 This information that you provided is
4 substantive and there should be an opportunity for it
5 to be substantively addressed, not in three-minute
6 increments. So again, if you wish to accommodate the
7 public, then I suggest that you lengthen the time for

3 as we proceed with the public comments, if there are
4 folks who are running into time constraints and
5 concerned with having to return to some place other
6 than here, just let me know and I'll -- if people
7 agree with that, I'll try to move people up and allow
8 that to happen.

9 But the other thing is with this number of
10 speakers and even with certain time constraints, we're
11 looking at going close to midnight. And one thing I
12 know is that we have attrition, that people end up
13 leaving. They end up not being able to speak because
14 we run too late into the evening, and it's one of the
15 reasons that I feel that I would like for people to
16 try and summarize their statements within three
17 minutes.

18 I will try to allow a little leeway here
19 and some folks are going to be running over, but let
20 me ask for the bulk of the people that are speaking,
21 if you can try and stay within the three-minute limit,
22 I think that that will allow everybody an opportunity
23 to speak in a timely fashion. Yes?

24 FEMALE SPEAKER: Why can't you hold
25 these on a weekend when people can come all day?

1 MR. BROWN: Well, I think that's a very
2 good suggestion. As I mentioned in my onset -- I hope
3 I'm not dumping the question -- I don't work for the
4 Department of Energy, so I don't get to schedule --
5 I'd love to have these on the weekend as well. But
6 anyway, that's a good suggestion, and if you're kind
7 enough to speak, why don't you add that to your
8 remarks.

9 Let's get started, see how this goes.
10 Again, I'll just -- if you feel that you can make your
11 key points within the three-minute limit, we'll try
12 for that. So let me start with Dirk Dunning.

13 MR. DUNNING: Right here.

14 MR. BROWN: Fine. Well, we're saving
15 time, and then Kathy Fitzpatrick will follow Dirk.

16 MR. DUNNING: Okay. First, am I on
17 here?

18 MR. BROWN: I turned it on, but -- I
19 think that this -- let me trade microphones with you
20 because I think this other one -- is this one working
21 at all? See if that's --

22 MR. DUNNING: Good evening. I'm Dirk
23 Dunning. I'm a chemical engineer with the Oregon
24 Department of Energy. That's State of, not Federal
25 Department of Energy. I'm providing comments on

1 behalf of the State of Oregon tonight.

2 Oregon and Oregonians have a longstanding
3 interest in Hanford, and we appreciate this
4 opportunity to provide comments directly to the U.S.
5 Department of Energy.

6 I want to thank the Department for
7 returning to Hood River to conduct tonight's meeting.
8 We're also pleased the Department is considering our
9 request for a meeting in Portland. However, we wish
10 that a decision on the Portland meeting had been made
11 early enough so that the Portland folks who are here
12 tonight could have possibly saved themselves a trip.

13 I want to thank all of you as well for
14 coming out, once again, to provide the voice of Oregon
15 citizens and Columbia River area residents to this
16 process. I think I counted earlier and there's over
17 140 of you.

18 The State of Oregon provided oral comments
19 on the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership scoping

20 meeting in March 2007. We followed that up with
21 written comments in June 2007. Our message then was
22 simple and remains unchanged.

23 Oregon has strong objections to using
24 Hanford facilities and the Hanford Site for Global
25 Nuclear Energy Partnership activities. Hanford is a

28

1 cleanup site and we'll be involved with cleanup for
2 decades to come. That must remain the focus at
3 Hanford. Bringing more waste and creating more waste
4 at a site that has the immense environmental problem
5 that still exists at Hanford would be a detriment to
6 the cleanup.

7 The draft Environmental Impact Statement
8 raises as many questions as it answers, and it is not
9 clear that closing the nuclear fuel cycle through
10 reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel would result in a
11 significant reduction of risk to the people and the
12 environment. We hope that the final Environmental
13 Impact Statement will provide more clarity on the
14 issue. However, at this point, we are choosing not to

15 comment on DOE's preferred action to closed fuel
16 cycle.

17 Our concern is importing or producing large
18 volumes of new waste at Hanford when Hanford still has
19 many decades to go before it resolves its current
20 waste problems. We don't even yet know the cumulative
21 damage and impact that has already occurred at Hanford
22 because of past waste activities and disposal, not to
23 mention added impact yet to occur because of DOE's
24 plans to bring additional waste to Hanford for
25 disposal.

29

1 Some of the alternatives presented in the
2 draft Environmental Impact Statement generate fairly
3 significant volumes of high-level waste,
4 Greater-Than-Class-C waste, and low-level waste.
5 Speaking from the perspective of Hanford's down-river
6 neighbor, adding any of these Global Nuclear Energy
7 Partnership waste streams to Hanford is unacceptable.

8 One last point. Nearly a decade ago, DOE

9 designated Hanford, along with the Nevada test site,
10 as sites for the disposal of low level and mixed
11 low-level waste from throughout the DOE complex. That
12 designation occurred through a Programmatic
13 Environmental Impact Statement in which site-specific
14 impacts were not assessed.

15 What concerns us is that after the
16 selection of Hanford, subsequent site-specific
17 environmental analysis was conducted to validate the
18 choice of Hanford, not to compare proposed sites to
19 determine whether in fact Hanford was the best
20 alternative or even an acceptable alternative.

21 Given that the draft Global Nuclear Energy
22 Partnership Programmatic Environmental Impact
23 Statement does not contain any site-specific analysis,
24 we strongly encourage that no site, including Hanford,
25 be selected prior to a comparative analysis of every

30

1 proposed site. I look forward to hearing everyone's
2 comments this evening. Thank you.

3 MR. BROWN: Kathy Fitzpatrick and Gerry

4 Pollet will be next.

5 MS. FITZPATRICK: Hi. I'm Kathy
6 Fitzpatrick. I'm representing the City of Mosier.
7 This statement was approved for remittance at a
8 council meeting held April 4, 2007, by unanimous
9 consensus.

10 The City of Mosier opposes the GNEP's
11 proposal to truck high-level nuclear waste through the
12 Columbia Gorge and our community. We agree with
13 Governor Kulongoski's and Senator Wyden's concerns
14 about the safety of the proposed trucking routes, the
15 storage facilities' proximity to the Columbia River,
16 and the effectiveness of the reprocessing or recycling
17 procedures.

18 Last year, Governor Kulongoski joined a
19 lawsuit against the Federal Government charging that
20 it has failed to adequately address damage by nuclear
21 contamination to natural resources around the Hanford
22 nuclear reservation. Until the U.S. DOE and the
23 Hanford contractors clean up the mess that still
24 threatens to contaminate the Columbia River Gorge and
25 our community, the City of Mosier feels that the

1 GNEP's proposal to add more nuclear waste to the
2 Hanford facility should not be considered. Thank you.

3 MR. BROWN: Gerry will be followed by
4 Lauren Goldenberg.

5 MR. POLLET: Thank you all for coming
6 tonight. I'm Gerry Pollet with Heart of America
7 Northwest. It is vital that your voices be heard
8 tonight and I encourage people to stay, to comment,
9 and to insist that we have another hearing in
10 Portland, as well as others around the Northwest.

11 Our energy future, as well as Hanford's
12 future, simply is too important to be relegated to two
13 hearings when the Energy Department tries to create a
14 record favorable for dumping the nuclear power
15 production in the United States and creating more
16 waste to be dumped at Hanford.

17 There are citizen guides available. If you
18 haven't gotten one, please get one. And there's also
19 a sign-up list being circulated to be on our mailing
20 list. Right back there.

21 Don't be fooled. This proposal is based on
22 government nuclear power in the United States by
23 reprocessing the spent fuel, not recycling. Recycling
24 is what you do with your paper and your glass and your
25 yard waste. It is not what you do with nuclear waste.

1 The Energy Department has played this game
2 before. It renamed highly radioactive plutonium waste
3 from remote transuranic waste which it tried to ship
4 to Hanford, to Greater-Than-Class-C waste, which in
5 this proposal, the vast increase will be created and
6 shipped to be buried at Hanford.

7 Now they've taken the word "reprocessing"
8 out of the dictionary. That's what created the liquid
9 high-level nuclear waste sitting in leaky tanks at
10 Hanford. We have 53 million gallons of the deadliest
11 material ever created on the planet for reprocessing.
12 That's taking the fuel rods and putting them in acid,
13 extracting the tiny amounts of plutonium and uranium,
14 and the rest is liquid high-level nuclear waste.

15 This EIS fails to address how much of that
16 liquid high-level nuclear waste would occur. And it
17 says we have, quote, options, unquote, for solidifying
18 that waste before burial. But those options don't yet
19 exist. We're eight years behind schedule and \$8
20 billion over cost for the solidification or

21 classification of the plant at Hanford for that waste.

22 Then the Energy Department gives a
23 presentation tonight which it ought to be ashamed of.
24 It doesn't mention that this proposal will result in
25 800 failed cancers from trucking the waste. Much of

33

1 that will be through Portland and up I-84 on the east
2 side. Eight hundred fatal cancers in adults. They
3 don't even count the children. They don't count
4 women. It's based on adult males.

5 And it doesn't count the fact that the
6 trucks may leave the Interstate Highway and go within
7 20 to 40 meters of your schools, your communities, and
8 your libraries. And those trucks are going to be
9 causing radiation deaths because the wastes are so hot
10 that the cannisters cannot contain the radiation and
11 still be light enough to travel. Eight hundred and
12 sixteen fatal cancers is their estimate. Eleven --
13 five to eleven times more low-level and highly
14 radioactive wastes to be buried is their estimate.
15 Did you see that in the slide show tonight? Shame on

16 you.

17 What kind of presentation are you giving
18 where you stand up and say, "Here's our environmental
19 impact statement," and you don't even mention that the
20 summary itself says up front that every one of these
21 proposals to double nuclear power in the United States
22 to reprocess will result in greater environmental and
23 health impacts than even your existing nuclear power
24 program? What kind of malicious information campaign
25 are you running?

34

1 What kind of misinformation says -- you
2 have a slide that says there are no latent cancer
3 fatalities from these proposals. And then you look at
4 page --

5 FEMALE SPEAKER: Fifty-seven.

6 MR. POLLET: Fifty-seven, thank you.
7 Look at page 57 in here and you see LCS, that's latent
8 cancer fatalities, 820 from trucking the wastes. But
9 that's an estimate based on, as I said, no children,

10 no accidents, no terrorist attacks, and without
11 disclosing how much liquid high-level nuclear waste is
12 produced, where it's produced, and where it's buried.
13 And don't be fooled.

14 You folks have an obligation to disclose
15 that you claim that you already chose Hanford to be
16 the national mixed radioactive nitrous waste dump. If
17 you've already chosen Hanford in the EIS that Dirk
18 Dunning from the State of Oregon mentioned, the waste
19 management programmatic EIS, then you need to disclose
20 that up front.

21 Throw this document out, come back out in
22 the new administration with a new proposal, one that
23 compares the cost of doing -- doubling nuclear power,
24 doing alternative energy based on conservation and
25 solar and wind and renewables, and one that is honest

35

1 and says, "You know what? We can do an energy future
2 in the United States that doesn't have additional
3 cancer fatalities." We can have an energy future in
4 the United States that doesn't increase the waste to

5 be dumped at Hanford when you are proposing to delay
6 cleaning up Hanford by 20 years. Thank you very much.

7 MR. BROWN: Mike Clement will follow
8 Lauren.

9 FEMALE SPEAKER: What was his name?

10 MR. BROWN: Mike Clement? Okay.

11 MS. GOLDBERG: Thank you very much.
12 Thank you. My name is Lauren Goldberg. I'm the
13 conservation director for Columbia Riverkeeper which
14 is based here in Hood River.

15 Gerry is a hard act to follow. Thank you
16 so much for your tireless efforts on behalf of
17 informing the public on this critical issue for
18 everyone here in Oregon and Washington.

19 I'm going to keep my comments very short
20 because Columbia Riverkeeper will be submitting
21 extensive comments on the draft PEIS. The first
22 comment I'd like to make is on the purpose of the
23 National Environmental Policy Act so that everyone
24 here knows that this Act is supposed to provide
25 transparency to the public so that we can understand

1 all the alternatives that are in front of our Federal
2 decision makers.

3 This Act is for us, and as each of you come
4 up to speak this evening or submit comments to the
5 Department of Energy, remind them the purpose of why
6 we have this important decision making Act, so that we
7 have transparency from our government so that we know
8 the alternatives are in front of them so that the
9 public can give feedback. That's not what we have
10 here this evening.

11 The second point I would like to make is
12 what I spend most of my day doing which is looking
13 over documents that relate to Hanford and the nuclear
14 waste legacy that we have there. I look at documents
15 that involve the impact on salmon, on tribal members,
16 on little tiny species we don't even think about that
17 much.

18 And the bottom line is that we don't
19 understand. We do not understand how we can fix these
20 issues and what it will take to get us to a true
21 cleanup. And until we understand that, this
22 particular proposal that the Department of Energy
23 brings to us today is really quite laughable and
24 that's what it comes down to.

25 The last point I'd like to make is the

1 point that Gerry conveyed quite eloquently. Shame on
2 you, Department of Energy. Shame on you for failing
3 to have a public meeting in the Portland metropolitan
4 area and the Seattle metropolitan area and other large
5 metropolitan areas. The Department of Energy's
6 failure to have any meetings in these large
7 metropolitan areas is simply an invasion of public
8 opinion of the Pacific Northwest and we will not stand
9 for it. Thank you.

10 MR. BROWN: Mike Clement and then
11 Roberta Lapp.

12 MR. CLEMENT: Nice to see some familiar
13 faces here once again to address these issues. Thank
14 you, everybody, for coming.

15 I'm just a citizen of Hood River, but I am
16 totally 100 percent against any kind of increase in
17 nuclear production for energy or really any other
18 purpose. There are, of course, multiple reasons for
19 that. If I heard this gentleman correctly, he said
20 that the Yucca Repository, which would be with the
21 breed it's already created, would be filled by 2010

22 and it's not even open yet. There's no guarantee that
23 it will ever open. If those people are smart, they
24 will not ever open it. So that's just a lose-lose
25 situation.

38

1 And the other thing is that when you talk
2 about cleanup, it's a total euphemism. There is no
3 cleanup of nuclear energy. You cannot neutralize it.
4 All you do is sweep it up and store it someplace else.
5 It's always toxic for tens of thousands of years
6 anyway and it's a ridiculous statement to make.

7 I totally concur that any city on the
8 routes of any truck routes where this materials are
9 going to be transported, wherever they're transported
10 to, should have the courtesy of a public meeting.

11 Hanford is already contaminated beyond its
12 contained capabilities, and more should not be added
13 until the government fulfills its promises to
14 decontaminate or at least -- decontaminate or contain
15 it. The river is -- already carries nuclear waste.
16 We do not need more nuclear materials stored at

17 Hanford.

18 I understand that it sounds like a good
19 idea when you're going to recycle your nuclear rods,
20 but you're going to create in the process a lot of
21 high-level nuclear waste and this is what the problem
22 is. I mean, again, it doesn't go away. It's a unique
23 material. You don't have to touch it, just be near
24 it, you can't see it. You can't taste it. It's a
25 very, very -- when you equate or when you make a

39

1 statement that nuclear energy generates no CO2, that's
2 a diversionary tactic.

3 It's a diversionary statement because
4 nuclear waste is so much more toxic and so much more
5 dangerous than CO2. Yes, we have a CO2 problem. I
6 don't know if that will be dealt with either with
7 people that are in government. But at any rate,
8 that's just a bogus issue, a bogus comparison.

9 I guess that kind of concludes my
10 statement. Thank you.

11 MR. BROWN: Roberta Lapp is next and
12 Jerry Igo, I believe, is the name. You can correct
13 me. You'll be next. Roberta?

14 MS. LAPP: I'm Roberta Lapp. I'm not
15 one of the 816 truck drivers. I have a little scar on
16 my throat. I grew up in Iowa and found out when I was
17 51 that I have a little lump in my throat that turned
18 out to be thyroid cancer.

19 Now, I'm one of these little girls that
20 didn't -- that licked ice cream that was on the
21 presidential election advertisement for why we should
22 vote for President Johnson instead of Goldwater, only
23 I got cream from the lady next door and we made
24 ice-cream and drank our milk.

25 And radiation is the only known cause of

40

1 thyroid cancer. It happens ten -- for every ten
2 people that have thyroid cancer, nine of them are
3 women. It happens usually around the age of 21 or
4 around the age of menopause, which I passed when I was
5 51. And so I'm very concerned about nuclear power.

6 And I think that -- I call myself not just
7 a housewife but a just housewife. And my home is this
8 earth that we live on.

9 If we -- if we were looking at whether we
10 wanted to live in a place where they said it will all
11 be cleaned up in 2007, and then they say, "Oh, no. We
12 need until 2011." And now it's not going to be 2011,
13 we're eight years behind and it's 2019, should we
14 bring another mess to dump on them so that they can
15 clean it up, too?

16 It begins to sound like my bedroom when I
17 was a teenager and sometimes right now while I'm
18 moving. So it just doesn't make sense.

19 Although I -- one of the reasons I was
20 willing to move here as I -- as I retired was I
21 thought, well, I already had thyroid cancer once, and
22 so if I take my pill every day, I still am alive.

23 I can tell you when you were reaching that
24 milestone of 1999, I had a two-year supply of thyroid
25 pills even though they're only good for one year

1 because I didn't know whether we would continue to
2 make thyroid. So everyone that's alive that has had
3 thyroid cancer needs to take a pill every day to keep
4 alive and I'm one of them. Thank you.

5 MR. BROWN: Audrey Bauman will follow
6 Jerry.

7 MR. IGO: I'm Jerry Igo. I've met one
8 or two of you before, I believe.

9 I'm going to forego the rundown of the
10 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement analysis
11 for right now and send it in by snail mail to the
12 address given because my comments are quite extensive
13 and some of them have already been given here. Sort
14 of surprising how sometimes common sentiments seem to
15 flow through a group.

16 I've been on the Columbia River for more
17 than 75 years. I knew the river before there were any
18 dams on it, before Bonneville Dam, even the first of
19 them. I've known the river for a long time.

20 Of course, we're talking now about a
21 programmatic thing that doesn't really speak about any
22 specific sites. It could be anywhere in the United
23 States. Could be anywhere all over. So it's sort of
24 a static shock thing, and maybe there are people from
25 other places that have a very special thing in their

1 hearts about a site that will be considered where they
2 may dig some ditches to bury some highly active fuel
3 waste for, oh, just for a few years, maybe a hundred
4 thousand or so.

5 But, while I've been on the Columbia River,
6 I have watched it go through a lot of different
7 things. I was here before -- before the Hanford
8 nuclear reservation was built. I was here when it
9 was -- I was here when it was just a wild sagebrush
10 covered the area where the knapweed didn't glow in the
11 dark. I have seen -- in fact, well, I was living
12 downwind from it for a while in the '50s and I've --
13 in recent years, I've traveled up and down the river
14 hundreds of times from Astoria all the way up to the
15 mouth of the Snake, and up the Snake to -- into Hell's
16 Canyon hundreds of times.

17 And that man on the cruise ship who tells
18 people what they're looking at -- I'm a National
19 Geographic representative with Linblad Expeditions
20 cruising up and down the river. And you know, one of
21 the questions that the people on those cruise ships
22 keep asking time after time is, "How are you doing?"

23 How's the progress going for the cleanup at Hanford?"

24 And my response reluctantly is that it's
25 moving more slowly. But what am I to tell them if it

43

1 should be, "Well, we've sort of forgotten about that
2 and what we can do now is just store more waste there
3 until a later date when we're not really sure what
4 will happen." I hope I never have to say that. Thank
5 you.

6 MR. BROWN: Lloyd Mabot will follow
7 Audrey.

8 FEMALE SPEAKER: Marbet.

9 MR. BROWN: Marbet? Thank you.

10 MS. BAUMAN: Hi. My name's Audrey. I
11 work with Heart of America Northwest.

12 Some of the comments that I have -- first
13 of all, from a business standpoint, this plan is
14 expensive. It's not cheap. And we would have to put
15 a lot of resources into this plan. It's expensive.
16 It's going to take a really long time.

17 We've seen with Hanford over the years that

18 there have been continual delays and delays. People
19 have talked about that. And with the EIS that we have
20 seen, there's not enough research to be able to pick
21 one facility. Until we have enough time to do the
22 research, the money and the time and the resources
23 that we put into that could have been spent in other
24 types of renewable energy. We can do wind, solar. I
25 know we're not specifically on Hanford, but it's a

44

1 perfect place for wind and solar energy and hydro.

2 So the things that are expensive, we have
3 to build a lot more new facilities. There's more
4 reprocessing, fuel approximation, and repositories.
5 And then there just needs to be more research. We're
6 not ready to make a choice.

7 And then, let's see -- the idea of reducing
8 CO2 emission and clean energy, all of these things may
9 be true. The clean energy -- there's so much waste,
10 it's a joke. Like that cannot be called clean energy.
11 And I ask, at what cost? If we are reducing CO2

12 emissions but creating a lot more waste, then
13 endangering the environment in other ways, what are we
14 really fixing by reducing one problem and creating
15 more?

16 I feel that this plan is irresponsible and
17 negligent and that I don't want to see my future,
18 because the next 30 years, if this ever gets built in
19 the future, I won't be around for that. And actually,
20 please do not rush this initiative through the next
21 administration. Please do not double nuclear in the
22 U.S. I won't have it. Thank you.

23 MR. BROWN: Mindy Stone will follow.

24 MR. MARBET: Who do I give this to?
25 That's part of my statement.

45

1 Actually, I assumed that this would happen,
2 that you would attempt to limit the comments that are
3 made on a document that's basically the size of a
4 telephone book and you have to take an exercise class
5 to lift.

6 MR. BROWN: Now, let me just say

7 that --

8 MR. MARBET: Let me just finish what I
9 want to say and then you can comment because I want to
10 comment first on this proceeding.

11 You had -- you had prior hearings and
12 people came to these hearings similar to what's
13 happening now. You knew from the list of people that
14 signed up at those prior hearings the distance that
15 they would be coming. You knew the volume of material
16 that we would be addressing.

17 The Department of Energy, if it was
18 interested in seriously getting your comments on
19 issues as serious as this, could have looked at where
20 the predominant body of people were coming from from
21 their addresses and held the hearings in those areas.
22 I traveled 140 miles to come here, 140 miles. And I
23 know that there's people here that came further than
24 that.

25 MALE SPEAKER: That's right, Lloyd.

1 MR. MARBET: And we deserve -- we're
2 citizens. We deserve to be heard and not interrupted
3 and I intend to give my testimony. Did you want --

4 MR. BROWN: Yes. The only question I
5 want to make is that there are a number of ways of
6 offering comments, and both of your comments are
7 verbal or e-mail or written and everything else, they
8 are all considered equally so that if you don't have
9 an opportunity to finish your statement tonight or if
10 you want to add things, you can send them in and they
11 will be weighted equally.

12 I'm just saying that there are reasons why
13 some time limits are in place on speaking so that
14 everybody has an opportunity to speak, but it's not
15 intended to limit people's comments. The EIS process
16 -- these meetings have been held for years and years
17 and there always have been comments. So just by way
18 of introduction, you're certainly welcome to make your
19 comments.

20 MR. MARBET: I appreciate that, so you
21 don't need to put up the warning sign.

22 The other thing -- the other thing that I
23 want -- I want to also offer some -- I have attempted
24 to read this document and I have waded through quite a
25 lot of it, not all of it. And I have three statements

1 to make about concerns that I see.

2 MR. BROWN: Let me remind you, he's
3 representing the Department of Energy.

4 MR. MARBET: That's fine. If I'm
5 speaking this direction, it's from experience. Okay.

6 I have four very short concerns that I want
7 to speak to you about this document. There's no
8 comparison with renewable alternative energy and
9 conservation. There's no economic analysis of
10 projected costs. Nothing. There's no in-depth
11 analysis of available uranium supply under protected
12 domestic and world consumption. No way to get an
13 appreciation for whether the uranium supply is going
14 to support what's being projected here or even the --
15 the recycling of the transuranic out of the waste to
16 be burned in reactors. Finally, looking -- I've been
17 very concerned about terrorism which I'll address in
18 my speech.

19 What happens here in this document is that
20 you have an analysis of the reasonably foreseeable
21 accidents -- I always love that word, "reasonably
22 foreseeable accidents" -- that takes place in these
23 varieties of installation. And then, when you go to

24 the appendix that deals with what are called the
25 "intentional destructive acts," it basically says what

48

1 they do is they take what appears to be the worst of
2 the, quote, reasonably foreseeable accidents, and
3 factor that in as the intentional destructive acts.

4 In my mind, that's not how terrorists
5 think, nor does it provide an assessment of the damage
6 and, I believe, the ultimate radiation release that
7 could happen from the way terrorists might think and
8 the kinds of parameters they might introduce into an
9 intentional accident. So I don't think this
10 document's credible just looking at those four items.

11 Now, I'd like to go to my testimony. My
12 name is Lloyd Marbet and I am the executive director
13 of the Oregon Conservancy Foundation. And by the way,
14 over your exit sign on the table are copies of
15 documents I'm going to reference and also my testimony
16 of what copies I could make before I came here.

17 On March 26, 2007, I appeared before you
18 testifying on behalf of Don't Waste Oregon and stated

19 the following: "It always amazes me how you can
20 witness significant events in history and yet fail to
21 get the message, especially when it impacts your
22 economic aspirations or threatens your global image.
23 A group of men filled with hate take over commercial
24 airplanes, and instead of flying into nuclear power
25 plants, which they actually considered doing, fly them

49

1 instead into two towers that were not supposed to
2 collapse. We wake up in a world of terrorism, and now
3 what we are proposing to do is build more nuclear
4 plants, producing more nuclear waste, creating more
5 potential acts and terrorist targets, and through
6 reprocessing (designed to prop up the continued
7 operation of existing nuclear plants and its backed up
8 nuclear waste) create even more weapons grade material
9 for a world that competes preemptively to see who will
10 self destruct first. If this is addressing
11 nonproliferation, then we are all in Alice's
12 Wonderland."

13 Upon reading the draft Programmatic
14 Environmental Impact Statement, my conclusions have
15 not changed. What we have is a document designed to
16 promote the increased reliance on nuclear power in the
17 most favorable light, free from rigorous comparison,
18 quote, with meeting future electricity demands by
19 non-nuclear means or conservation, unquote, while at
20 the same time using nuclear waste reprocessing as a
21 justification for exporting nuclear power throughout
22 the world.

23 The issue of nonproliferation is not even
24 addressed, having been separated from the GNEP PEIS
25 and placed in a Nonproliferation Impact Assessment

50

1 that we are told is being prepared by the National
2 Safety -- Nuclear Security Administration and
3 available to be used by the U.S. Department of Energy
4 for its Record of Decision, but only after these
5 public hearings are over.

6 This is highly objectionable, considering
7 the need to formulate government policies that

8 actually stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons and
9 our right as citizens to provide informed public input
10 on the underlying foundation of these proposals.

11 But I forget the forum that I'm in, for the
12 controlling factor here is not so much what we have to
13 say, but who is in power and how they will manipulate
14 the outcome. It is obvious what the current
15 government administration seeks to do. It is not so
16 obvious whether the next government administration
17 will adopt or reject its legacy.

18 I believe our job as citizens is to bypass
19 this process and go to the source. Our economy is in
20 shambles, our world is in conflict, and the last thing
21 we need to do is spread more nuclear power around.
22 This GNEP PEIS isn't reflective of current domestic
23 and world economic conditions, nor does it grasp the
24 seriousness of the crisis we face in the need to
25 immediately reduce global warming gases while at the

1 same time banning the use of nuclear weapons from this

2 planet and protecting ourselves from terrorism. It
3 instead seeks to isolate itself from full
4 accountability while at the same time acting as the
5 fait accompli. We cannot let this happen and we will
6 not stop it here. Our chance, if any we have, is in
7 helping to shape the decisions being made by the new
8 political administration, along with how we
9 individually choose to live our lives.

10 We need to increase the effectiveness of
11 the anti-nuclear movement. We need to join nationally
12 with others in our political lobbying capability. We
13 need to protect ourselves from becoming isolated from
14 each other and help those who also confront this
15 problem. It is not enough to stop this proposal from
16 being implemented at Hanford. We must stop it
17 worldwide. Instead of a Global Nuclear Energy
18 Addiction (GNEPA), we need a greening of the planet
19 and we are only going to have that when we create our
20 own Environmental Impact Statement.

21 And it is being done as we speak. In
22 Idaho, Snake River Alliance is bringing Dr. Arjun
23 Makhijani, president of the Institute for Energy and
24 Environmental Research, to testify on November 20th
25 before the U.S. Department of Energy in Idaho Falls.

1 Dr. Makhijani has written an important book,
2 Carbon-Free and Nuclear-Free. I like to always bring
3 show-and-tell items. Carbon-Free and Nuclear-Free is
4 a detailed analysis -- by the way, this book is
5 available for free on the website of IEER which it is
6 -- again, I have it here, the web location. You can
7 download it. It's a detailed analysis demonstrating
8 how we can achieve a zero CO2 U.S. economy within 30
9 to 50 years without using nuclear and without
10 acquiring carbon credits from other countries.
11 Imagine that.

12 It really needs -- it should be a part of
13 this EIS. It's not, like a lot of the other
14 criticisms that are so well referenced in this
15 document. They really are not addressed in my mind.
16 This Web site also provides the Executive Summary from
17 Dr. Brice Smith's book, Insurmountable Risks: The
18 Danger of Using Nuclear Power to Combat Global Climate
19 Change. Again, you can get the substance of this book
20 for free just by going to that Web site, ieer.org.

21 There are also important publications that
22 are available on IEER's Web site, and I brought with
23 me this evening some written materials from IEER that
24 describe their work and that's located on the end of

20 and I'm a new citizen of Portland, Oregon.

21 And I want to speak tonight about the
22 Price-Anderson Act. In 1957, the Price-Anderson Act
23 was signed into federal law to aid the nuclear power
24 industry in protecting nuclear energy companies from
25 financial ruin in case a nuclear accident occurred.

54

1 According to the legislation, it says that
2 the purpose of this Act is to, quote, ensure the
3 availability of a large pool of funds to provide
4 prompt and orderly compensation of members of the
5 public who would incur damages from a nuclear or
6 radiological incident no matter who might be liable.

7 A question to ask is if the nuclear energy
8 industry is so safe to generate, then why do the
9 nuclear power companies need and demand to have
10 protective legislation which allows them to avoid
11 taking full responsibility for any negative impact
12 their product or service could have on the public?

13 According to the Price-Anderson Act, the

9 corporation that exploits for profit, "Just Don't Do
10 It." Thank you.

11 MR. BROWN: Barbara Robinson is next
12 and Chuck Johnson will follow her.

13 MS. ROBINSON: I have a request for
14 Jody to speak before me because she has to leave
15 immediately and that's fine with me.

16 MR. BROWN: Okay.

17 JODY: I'm a full-time student at CGCC
18 and our whole class has come this evening.

19 My focus at the college is to be an
20 environmental teacher to children. I've spent every
21 day -- every Tuesday for the last eight weeks at the
22 Parkdale Elementary school educating the children on
23 recycling, composting, picking up trash, what we can
24 do to conserve our water, our energy, all kinds of
25 stuff.

56

1 But when I go home tonight, I'm a mom. I
2 have three little boys at home and one of them has

3 autism. Our community here has the highest rate of
4 autism anywhere in Oregon. There are one to five.

5 My little boy, when I go home at night,
6 cries because his brain won't shut off. I have to
7 give him sleeping pills because he can't calm down and
8 go to sleep. I have to give him medicine in the
9 morning because he cannot focus, because he cannot
10 control his anger, he cannot control his mouth. He is
11 being removed from Kindergarten. This little boy is
12 six years old and he lays in bed at night with his
13 hands up and says, "Mommy, my head won't stop. How do
14 I make it turn off? How do I make it stop?"

15 I don't want him to get cancer and me have
16 to deal with his crying because there's pain or
17 because his brothers are in pain. We have enough to
18 do within this community dealing with this kind of
19 issue already. Please don't bring anything else to
20 us. Please. We beg you.

21 MS. ROBINSON: I'm Barbara Robinson.
22 I've lived in this community a long time. I live in
23 Mosier, probably about 5 or 600 feet from I-84. And I
24 would like to urge this council to take the No Action
25 Alternative.

1 One of the things, if you -- if you
2 increase or double the nuclear power plants, and also
3 if you use the closed system, both of these will
4 increase the demands for transportation for nuclear
5 power.

6 You say in your documents that the closed
7 requires more than the open. That means everybody
8 along every transportation route for nuclear power
9 should comment on this. I urge you, as some others
10 have, to have hearings in Portland and Seattle because
11 wherever the transportation routes are.

12 And if you also stick with the open rather
13 than the closed because when you increase the
14 transportation for nuclear power, you are increasing
15 dramatically the chances of both accidental accidents
16 as in -- if you look at the truck over the edge near
17 Wishram right now because they have to go an alternate
18 route. They can't go I-84 because the Biggs Bridge is
19 closed and the trucks can't negotiate the curves. And
20 so we've had several semi accidents there. This kind
21 of thing happens all the time. You can't predict
22 that.

23 Also, increased transportation increases
24 the chances of terrorism opportunities a great deal.
25 That's in addition to just the radioactivity coming

1 from the trucks in the normal operation. So this is
2 relevant to all of us along the transportation routes.

3 Again, delay these hearings. Please have
4 an extension to the public input period, and have
5 input from both Portland and Seattle as requested.

6 Also, please, don't use Hanford. Hanford,
7 besides all the comments that have been given, is
8 along a living thing, the Columbia River. It has
9 fish. It has all kinds of life in it. If you've got
10 radioactive incidents in the river, which it already
11 has, the cleanup now has been unsuccessful. What
12 you're asking is a lot more. The river will become
13 polluted. The river -- everybody downstream is going
14 to be heavily impacted.

15 If you're going to store nuclear waste,
16 store it not near a big river, not near one of the
17 major rivers in the country. That is not a good idea.
18 I think I'll just leave it at that. Thank you.

19 MR. BROWN: There are still 40 people
20 scheduled to speak. So, again, as a courtesy to all

21 those who signed up and those who will follow, try to
22 summarize your key points to allow everybody to speak
23 in a timely fashion. Chuck, you're up, and Chris
24 McKenzie will follow you.

25 MR. JOHNSON: I'm Chuck Johnson. I'm

59

1 from Portland, Oregon. I'm on the board for Columbia
2 Riverkeeper.

3 Just one quick observation about this --
4 this plan. It seems as though there's almost some
5 sort of state of denial, what we'd have to get into in
6 order to think this is a good idea. And it's already
7 been said but I'm going to say it again, but the whole
8 idea of reprocessing or recycling that's referred to
9 in this document. You know, we haven't had any
10 experience with this and we still haven't been able to
11 figure out what to do with those wastes.

12 And just briefly, one of the problems you
13 have with the waste there is it's hundreds of isotopes
14 in an acid bath. And then the isotopes are constantly

15 changing because they're radioactive. And the
16 percentages of each isotope changes because the fuel
17 rods that were put in were each unique in and of
18 themselves depending on how close they were to the
19 center of the core's reactor or if they were on the
20 outside or how long they were kept in the reactor.

21 So basically, the problem the scientists
22 have in trying to figure out what to do with these
23 tank wastes is incredibly complex and constantly
24 changing. The -- depending on the half lives of the
25 different radio isotopes that they have and what they

60

1 break in -- what products they break into.

2 So just given this experience that we've
3 had with these tank wastes, why on earth would we want
4 to create another system that would create a whole new
5 generation of these; and as I understand it, possibly
6 additionally more complex because the separation
7 methods are actually more complicated than the ones
8 they've been using in the past. It just makes no
9 sense. It does take a certain state of denial in

10 order to do this.

11 And I had a different experience. I went
12 to Pasco last night for the hearing that we had on
13 this same topic, and all the local people were giving
14 testimony in favor of it. I think there was one
15 person who said the economic costs haven't been
16 considered, but that was this -- but he didn't, you
17 know, go the final step and say, "Therefore, this is a
18 bad idea. Don't do that." But that was as far as any
19 local person was willing to go, and here we are at
20 this meeting and I don't think we've had a single
21 person speak in favor of it.

22 What strikes me is that we have communities
23 that are not communicating with each other and that is
24 something that we have to resolve and fix. We have to
25 get -- having a real dialogue with people in the

61

1 Tri-Cities about what the energy future of this area
2 is, what we want for our river, because it's their
3 river, too.

4 I personally think that because of the
5 amount of time that people in that community have put
6 into developing nuclear energy, that it's very
7 difficult for them to let go of psychologically. Most
8 the people who spoke last night were retired. They're
9 people that spent their entire lives developing
10 nuclear energy. For them to turn around and say,
11 "Well, this is a dead end. We don't need to be doing
12 this anymore," that's very, very difficult
13 psychologically. And I think we need to recognize
14 what they've done, that they did the best they could
15 with something that they thought was worthwhile, but
16 their knowledge is extremely useful right now for
17 dealing with the legacy of it.

18 The cleanup mission is not a -- it's a
19 completely worthy mission. It's not some secondary
20 mission or reject mission that it's sort of been
21 treated as in the past. It's an incredibly crippled
22 one that we'll need to have for centuries.

23 And so I think we need to have real
24 communication and dialogue with our brothers and
25 sisters up in the Tri-Cities and we need to think

1 about how to do that. That's all I have to say.

2 MR. BROWN: Robert Hedland will follow
3 Chris McKenzie.

4 MR. MCKENZIE: My name is Chris
5 McKenzie. I live in Hood River. I've been here for
6 19 years now.

7 I'm not really as up to speed as my wife is
8 on this subject, but I am pretty familiar with the
9 computer business. And we used to have something we
10 call "paperwork" that people that produce software
11 would come out with and tell you all the great things
12 that they were going to do in the next few years.

13 I look at this chart here, this whole lower
14 half here would be considered paperwork. None of it
15 really exists. It's all something that is going to be
16 developed and they project when they're going to
17 develop it, and generally speaking, it never happens
18 in that timeline. It never happens for the cost that
19 they talked about. Is anybody familiar with
20 Microsoft's Vista? That's an example of some of this
21 that we're looking at here.

22 Obviously, the history that we have to
23 work with does not support the idea that any of this
24 stuff is going to happen at the time or for the cost
25 that they're projecting. They had Hanford in

1 operation for over 60 years. It was put there for
2 production of plutonium for the Manhattan Project, and
3 ever since then, its situation -- well, it's there.
4 We might as well keep using it for whatever we can
5 dream up next. And that's what this is in.

6 If there was good faith here, then I would
7 expect that all those millions of gallons of liquid
8 waste would be in glass box by now. That hasn't
9 happened and it probably never will. That's all I
10 have to say.

11 MR. BROWN: Chuck will follow Robert.

12 MR. HEDLAND: My name's Bob Hedland.

13 You know, what Lloyd and the rest of you
14 guys have said tonight is right on track. You know,
15 I've worked around nuclear and I'm tens of thousands
16 of dollars in debt. I want you to remember that
17 Price-Anderson. You know, I'm sitting in \$250,000 of
18 debt. You know, I paid my own debt -- dental work,
19 hospital bills, every other thing -- as a result of
20 nuclear exposure to toxic chemicals, you know. Bull.

21 Let's clean up what we have to start with

22 before we make any more messes. Let's take care of
23 these people that have autism, the people that we know
24 that deliver release from Hanford going back to the
25 '40s that's caused people to die and stuff. The 28

64

1 families around Hanford up there, their kids born with
2 no brains, no eyes. You know, out of 200 calves, they
3 destroyed 80 of them because they had extra legs or
4 heads one year.

5 You know, I worked at Trojan down there and
6 I left there in '80 and I was pretty damn sick. I
7 lost my hair, my teeth. I had two cancer operations.
8 I got to go in next week for a heart deal. I had a
9 heart attack about a year and a half ago. You know,
10 hey, bull. Now let's just clean up our mess and do
11 what we can to spread the word. Thank you.

12 MR. BROWN: Bob Johannsen will follow
13 Chuck Grigsby.

14 MR. GRIGSBY: Thank you very much. I'm
15 a recent import into the area. I moved in Pasco

16 within the last three months because we've been living
17 at a high elevation and needed to get down to a lower
18 elevation for some health issues. My wife was having
19 trouble breathing.

20 But my comments are -- I've got actually
21 three comments. First of all, I believe that the
22 purpose and need is perhaps improperly limited.
23 Nonproliferation is one of the major issues here. But
24 if nonprolif -- if proliferation went away, if all of
25 a sudden magically we no longer had that issue, we

65

1 would still have the need to reprocess spent nuclear
2 fuel because if you look at the energy usage, not just
3 here in the Northwest, but if you look at it globally,
4 if the demand for energy is rising so rapidly, the
5 amount of carbon generation that's coming on line from
6 both China and India and other parts of the developing
7 world are swamping anything that we're doing in this
8 country.

9 We can't -- we can't take the U.S. domestic
10 energy decisions out of context for the whole world as

11 the world is developing. So I don't think that
12 nonproliferation is an important component of nuclear
13 security.

14 I think more important is energy
15 independence, the ability to provide energy -- stable
16 energy supply in this country. That is a national
17 security issue.

18 And another important thing that one of the
19 slides did touch on -- but I think this is a really
20 key part of any decision that needs to be made -- is
21 sustainability. Our current energy's generation
22 process is not sustainable. We have coal fired power
23 plants that generate a tremendous amount of CO2. We
24 need to be able to offset those with systems that do
25 not generate CO2.

66

1 FEMALE SPEAKER: That's not the only
2 reason.

3 MR. GRIGSBY: Right. We need a mix.
4 I'm not saying that nuclear is the only thing, but I

5 am saying simply that we need to mix all kinds of
6 renewables and other systems. Nuclear is a key part
7 of that.

8 I think another thing that is really
9 important is that the DOE has really missed an
10 opportunity to properly educate the public. There's a
11 lot of things that have been stated tonight that are
12 just simply factually wrong. And the DOE has -- has
13 not done a good job of bringing -- bringing to the
14 public what the real issues are and what the real
15 plans are.

16 Some of that has to do certainly with
17 failure of budgets to pass so that the cleanups can go
18 on schedule and can stay on schedule. Some of it had
19 to do with complexities of the processes but there's
20 misconceptions here.

21 I have been on the design team for part of
22 this process, and there's no radioactive liquid waste
23 -- no radioactive liquid waste that is planned for
24 these reprocessing. All of that is handled as part of
25 the processing. So there's been information or

1 misinformation that has been given to you based upon
2 fears, and those fears come from lack of knowledge and
3 lack of information. I think that the DOE needs to
4 expand its education processes so that people have
5 access to real information rather than to some
6 opinions that are being pushed.

7 If people want information and if they're
8 not getting it from reliable sources, they're going to
9 get it from unreliable sources. Thank you very much.
10 I appreciate it.

11 MR. BROWN: Bob Johannsen is next and
12 Gordon Sturrock follows.

13 MR. JOHANNSEN: My name is Bob
14 Johannsen. I'm a federal taxpayer and from that point
15 of view, I'd like to comment on the -- this draft
16 proposal.

17 In reviewing the draft proposal, I find
18 that there's some fatal flaws in it. It's poorly
19 thought out. And as a taxpayer, I would suggest that
20 before going forward, the report needs to be made
21 complete and credible.

22 Looking at the conclusion in the report as
23 it stands now, it looks like of the six alternatives,
24 that all but two need further research and development
25 to be made workable. And the estimate on the cost of

1 the research and development is five to ten years,
2 five to ten years. So I think what we need to know
3 first, is it five years? It is ten years? Is it 20
4 years or a hundred years? You know, if this is going
5 to be an estimate for the taxpayer to make because
6 it's throwing good money after bad money that we've
7 already sunk into this thing.

8 So what are the two viable alternatives
9 left? It's the all heavy water reactor and the no
10 action option. And according to the DOE, the all
11 heavy water reaction would result in higher
12 radioactive -- radiotoxicity, higher spent nuclear
13 volume. So, the result -- the DOE's conclusions
14 themselves in this report is that there's going to be
15 no workable alternative except for doing nothing.

16 Let's say that the premises of this report
17 are fatally flawed. It's just not the right
18 alternatives. What is suggested here is to create --
19 expand the nuclear industry, upgrade more
20 radioactivity, more chances for accidents, and it's
21 going to lead to just simply further cost, further
22 proliferation.

23 The report says that the initiative is
24 intended to provide a safe, secure, sustainable
25 nuclear energy, and that the GNEP program would

69

1 promote technology that's more economic to sustain
2 production. The fact is, nuclear energy is not
3 economic, even with normal subsidies provided by the
4 taxpayer. So what this report -- to even be
5 considered, it needs to have a full presentation and a
6 credible presentation of what the real costs are.
7 Okay?

8 Someone mentioned the Price-Lawrenson [sic]
9 Act. If the Price-Anderson nuclear is to defend the
10 Act, first of all, it must be repealed. I mean, we
11 need to go back to a free market. The United States
12 of America does not need to follow that path. We need
13 to have a free market for nuclear. If the industry
14 feels nuclear's safe, let's repeal the Price-Anderson
15 Act. Let's get it, you know, back to the free market
16 and see if nuclear can stand on its own feet. Thank

17 you.

18 MR. BROWN: Lucile Wyers will follow
19 Gordon.

20 SPEAKER: Hi. My name is Gordon
21 Sturrock. I'm speaking on behalf of myself tonight.
22 I'm from Eugene, Oregon. I'm a member of Veterans For
23 Peace. I'm also the cofounder of Veterans Against
24 Torture.

25 The greatest feats of mankind has always

70

1 been and always will be prone to unforeseen conditions
2 which will cause cataclysmic failures. The Titanic,
3 the Hindenberg, the New Orleans levee failure, Apollos
4 1 and 13, the space shuttles Challenger and Columbia,
5 the Union Carbide Plant in Bhopal. You didn't talk
6 about that. And, of course, Chernobyl and Three Mile
7 Island.

8 In each of these disasters, teams of highly
9 talented and skilled humans crafted technologies to be
10 as foolproof and safe as possible. And in each of
11 these events, they ultimately failed due to human

12 error.

13 Do Hanford scientists think they are so
14 much better that they can guarantee no nuclear
15 disasters will occur as a result of directing nuclear
16 waste through our highways and railways to its
17 containment in a reprocessing plant? Do they have so
18 much confidence in themselves that they are going to
19 put millions of people and many future generations at
20 risk if the unforeseen should happen? I sure hope
21 not.

22 At last night's meeting in Pasco, I heard
23 complaints that America doesn't have a nuclear energy
24 policy. I disagree. We do have one. We're energy
25 addicts. That's our fault. Everybody here. We need

71

1 to change that. Until we do, we're going to keep
2 invading other countries and our soldiers are going to
3 keep dying. Oh, yeah, and the innocent -- lots of
4 civilians, over a million of them. That's our fault.
5 All of us.

6 Let's use our human resources and limited
7 fossil fuel supplies to create a sustainable economy,
8 one that puts humans first before corporate profits.
9 And let's arrest Bush and Cheney.

10 MS. WYERS: My name is Lucile Wyers and
11 most of you have probably heard me speak before.

12 I don't pretend to give a lot of statistics
13 and facts. They've already been presented and I'm
14 sure there will be many more tonight. I just have the
15 same position I've had so many times. Don't start
16 anything new over at Hanford until we clean up what's
17 there already.

18 I had hoped to live to see some substantial
19 progress made in the cleanup. Sometimes you hear
20 encouraging words and the next thing we know, we have
21 a new program to make more nuclear waste. So I'm
22 still against it. Thank you.

23 MR. BROWN: We have some folks who are
24 on a bus that are having to depart fairly soon, so I'm
25 going to try and call names of some of the folks on

1 the bus and give them a chance to speak. Confirm with
2 me if these are the right names. Is it Nancy Matela?
3 Matela? If you're a member of the bus party, please
4 go ahead and speak. I think, is it Guy Berliner also
5 on the bus? You'll be following Nancy.

6 MS. MATELA: My name is Nancy Matela.
7 I'm a citizen of Portland and I have traveled up here.

8 I think what I can say to add to this, to
9 talk about the statement, the EIS statement, and was
10 going to talk about the fact that there is no
11 consideration of a potential accident.

12 With these talks coming through Portland --
13 and I remember when they started coming through in
14 2004 -- very, very scary. I live not too far from
15 Interstate 84. The Heart of America people put
16 together the scientific study -- and I don't remember
17 all the details -- but basically, if there was an
18 accident of just one of those trucks, a pound of
19 plutonium, et cetera, et cetera, that 300 square miles
20 of Portland would be uninhabitable. One truck, one
21 accident, be it a malicious or accidental.

22 I could go on and I could have brought my
23 notes up here, but then I suddenly realized as I sat
24 here that we're all getting sucked into talking about
25 this most ridiculous proposal that is illegal. This

1 proposal about putting more waste up there is totally
2 illegal.

3 The Tri-Party Agreement which was, what?
4 How many years ago? Seventeen years ago? This is a
5 contract between the U.S. DOE and the people of
6 Washington to clean the site up. And what we're
7 talking about tonight, we're getting sucked into
8 something that is not -- that is contradictory to that
9 contract. Is the government's word no good?

10 I would suggest that we put our energy
11 rather than talking to this person -- and I recognize
12 he's just doing a job just like the rest of us, trying
13 to get by, getting a paycheck and so forth -- that we
14 actually put our energy into talking to
15 President-elect Obama. And people brought up to my
16 account on the bus on the way up here that there is a
17 Web site. Is it "change.org"? Okay, change.gov where
18 Obama says that he wants to hear from us.

19 So let's all 140 of us tonight or tomorrow
20 morning write a letter and say, "Come up to this site.
21 It is the most toxic site in the Western hemisphere.
22 Come here and straighten this out and make the U.S.
23 government accountable to the Tri-Party Agreement."

24 This is just a sham. This is ridiculous.
25 And I just shake as I'm thinking about it. And I hope

74

1 that we can keep our sights above what they're talking
2 about, that we're just being led down a rabbit hole.
3 That's all I have to say. Thanks.

4 MR. BERLINER: My name is Gary Berliner
5 and I'm a resident of Portland, Oregon.

6 You know, it's a pretty profound irony when
7 the one gentleman, obviously a very intelligent man
8 who has actually worked on some of the technical
9 issues surrounding projects like this -- I think he
10 said he was involved in studying reprocessing -- when
11 a man like him comes up here and says, "You folks in
12 the Department of Energy, your arguments don't make
13 any sense."

14 He actually supports the program he's
15 working in today. This doesn't makes any sense. I
16 mean -- and, you know, it doesn't even take a
17 gentleman as smart as that to see, and I hope -- I

18 kind of regret that he's saying that because it might
19 give you folks a little more basis for coming up with
20 a better argument of what they want to do.

21 But, you know, take out the business of
22 nonproliferation. For crying out loud. I mean, I can
23 see how in some very twisted fashion you can imagine
24 that, you know, trying to get countries on board by
25 saying, we're going to give you this, you know,

75

1 enriched nuclear materials and we're going to make
2 you, you know -- yet, you can imagine that that might
3 promote nonproliferation.

4 You know, a government that on the one hand
5 is saying that it wants to develop an entire new
6 generation of many nuclear weapons, many nuclear
7 weapons. And on the other hand says that it wants to
8 develop this GNEP thing that somehow would promote
9 nonproliferation, it doesn't make any sense. No one
10 is going to trust the motivations of a government like
11 that.

12 No country in the world is going to say,

13 "Oh, gee. Now we can get these pretty cheap nuclear
14 materials from the U.S. or someone through GNEP, and
15 now we don't have to develop nuclear weapons." It
16 doesn't make any sense.

17 You know, you cannot promote
18 nonproliferation if you yourself are going to abide by
19 the GNEP. How do you say that you're abiding by the
20 GNEP when the government is saying it wants to develop
21 an entire generation of nuclear weapons, bunker
22 busters.

23 What the people don't realize -- very few
24 people in this country realize this, but the GNEP
25 actually belongs to the U.S. Government which is one

76

1 of the first things it does. Why doesn't this
2 government get rid of their own nuclear weapons?

3 They're talking about building new nuclear
4 weapons. They're talking about, you know,
5 reprocessing spent fuel and how that's going to reduce
6 or diminish the waste. But as everyone has stated,

7 practically what everyone has said, they have got
8 existing problems in Hanford. And we're going to
9 adjust them with stockpiling large additional amounts
10 of fuel to reprocess? None of this makes sense.
11 There's a huge message in this problem.

12 So I would advise -- the first thing the
13 DOE needs to do is they need to revamp their message
14 because even the, you know, simplest-minded people in
15 this audience do not buy into this argument. So
16 here's the problem. Those are my remarks.

17 MR. BROWN: Greg DeBruler. And let me
18 ask the first person for the bus if you can come up
19 here, if there is one. Where are you?

20 FEMALE SPEAKER: I'll save my spot for
21 someone else instead of a comment.

22 MR. BROWN: If you can come up here, I
23 just need to find out --

24 MR. DEBRULER: Good evening. My name
25 is Gary DeBruler and I'm sorry I'm going ahead of the

77

1 bus people, but it's my wife's 59th birthday so I'm in

2 deep doo-doo. I just got back from Seattle.

3 Anyway, facts: Hanford is the most
4 contaminated site in North America. Four hundred
5 forty-four billion gallons of chemical waste is in the
6 ground. The Department of Energy for the last 50
7 years has been trying to analyze what does that really
8 mean? They have never done an impact analysis never,
9 ever, ever, ever, and they don't have an answer.

10 So how is it that this group over here,
11 GNEP -- remember, it's 25 nations they say. No, it's
12 not. It's a boy's club. There's a few women, but
13 mostly a boy's club around the world consisting of
14 nuclear scientists and people who really want to
15 create more. It has nothing to do with us. It's
16 their idea that they can go on and do these things
17 they call reprocessing is safe and all this stuff, and
18 we all know it's actually incorrect. So, they propose
19 to take boys to Hanford so the logic is stupid.

20 You can't even get to that point. You
21 can't put more waste in a site that you don't even
22 know what the cumulative impacts are. And then if you
23 look at their draft PEIS, we haven't solved the waste
24 at Hanford. It was supposed to be coming out for the
25 last three years. It hasn't come out, but they're

1 going back to redo it. It's approximately about this
2 thick what they're trying to get out.

3 This EIS, if you want to give it a rating,
4 is an "E" for excellent for the worst thing I've ever
5 seen. It doesn't do anything. It doesn't test
6 anything. It doesn't tell you anything about this
7 whole field of cost. It doesn't talk about the
8 cumulative waste impact. It doesn't talk about how
9 long you're going to have to pay for long-term storage
10 or reprocessing goals or safeguard security goals but
11 for what? A thousand years? No. Two hundred fifty
12 thousand years or however long you want to go out in a
13 million years.

14 They're proposing to make more waste. The
15 problem is is that time and time again, I remember
16 when you said this -- you never created the solution
17 for your biggest problem which is waste, and yet
18 they're here wanting to propose more. Interesting.

19 They -- they're proposing to reprocess
20 spent fuel. The cost of that is \$700 billion. That's
21 the bailout, folks, for the first day of our mess,
22 trying to get that out. And these people coming here
23 will beg America. No, they're not going to America.
24 They're going to select cities around the country.

25 Where are they going? Every coal prone nuclear city

79

1 that they have sites at, except the river.

2 Oh, we're blessed. Thank you. We're
3 blessed because they had to pick some place -- this is
4 the nucleus that Lloyd said about the movement that's
5 going to radiate the world with "No." No!

6 You want a war? We'll give you a piece of
7 war that will show you the total cumulative impact of
8 -- what? This ridiculous proposal that has failed to
9 do one thing: Alternatives.

10 FEMALE SPEAKER: Talk about
11 alternatives.

12 MR. DEBRULER: Oh, we have the biggest
13 alternatives. The no action. Do you know what the no
14 action is? It means we're still going to keep doing
15 this shit and it won't get better. Make more waste
16 and build some more nuclear products by stinking
17 greed.

18 FEMALE SPEAKER: No. Stop.

19 MR. DEBRULER: A No Action Alternative
20 means what?
21 FEMALE SPEAKER: Stop.
22 MR. DEBRULER: And you do something
23 else. You take all the other potential
24 alternatives -- solar. Oh, wow. Five hundred
25 meetings were allowed at Hanford and we don't have one

80

1 solar collector. Whoa! Something's wrong with this
2 story. How come we don't have 582 square miles of
3 solar collectors in Hanford? How come we don't have
4 500 windmills at Hanford? How come we don't have a
5 thousand windmills at Hanford?
6 We're talking about the interests of
7 nuclear. We want to create alternatives to our
8 cravings of energy? Yeah. Okay, cool. Let's do it.
9 Hey, Portland, State of Oregon's university has
10 created this beautiful wave thing but now we can't
11 find a company who wants to buy it. One of those up
12 and down waves creates power for 35,000 homes and then
13 creates a little dent in the impact of the ecosystem.

14 So your PEIS is terrible. Please continue
15 with it because when we get done with our comments and
16 we actually write it up, we will have a really good
17 basis for a lawsuit to stop you completely throughout
18 the whole country. I'm sorry. It's a joke.

19 Let's talk about the government, what
20 they're proposing, what they do. They take the
21 nuclear power plant people -- oh, oh, we can't talk
22 about that. So you over there, you do this study over
23 here, but nobody can talk about us. Oh, by the way,
24 it's \$26 billion a year they want us to pay for
25 building those nuclear power plants that are safe and

81

1 clean despite the fact that we don't have any waste.
2 But it's not in this analysis.

3 So, we have 700 million and \$26 billion a
4 year and they don't want to talk about it.

5 MR. BROWN: I've got some bus people.

6 MR. DEBRULER: I'm almost done.

7 MR. BROWN: Okay.

8 MR. DEBRULER: In 1997, U.S. begins
9 reprocessing. In 1981, Reagan says, "Lift the thing."
10 In 1998, Bush says, "Close it. No more reprocessing."
11 Yet, you say, "Oh, we're just going to go ahead and do
12 it because 25 nations are standing in support of
13 GNEP." That's a bald-faced lie.

14 There are people in countries that support
15 this process. There are not 25 nations that are
16 standing up and saying, "GNEP's great." The U.S.
17 hasn't even said it.

18 So what I'm suggesting is one thing really
19 simply. Go back and go all through the cumulative
20 impacts. I will write them up. Go back and do it and
21 make sure you do an act that's actually credible.

22 And by the way, when you want to give
23 public comments, every man in America has a name.
24 Let's say, www.blah blah blah blah manager of PEIS.
25 You know what this one says? I just had to read it.

82

1 It's just a joke. It says, www dot information gov
2 dot ies public dot com comments dot meeting question

3 mark dot meeting dot comma comma 644444562 add
4 comments. What?

5 If you want me to give you comments, I want
6 to see your name, I want to know who the records
7 manager is, and I want one simple e-mail address that
8 says, "Bob Smith at DOE Headquarters, GNEP processing
9 something." That's what I want.

10 MR. BROWN: Lisa Melyan.

11 MS. MELYAN: Well, I have some comments
12 but I scrapped them, too.

13 So I have just been trying to understand
14 the logic of the program and why the DOE wants to
15 pursue the program, and I'm trying to see how -- well,
16 if we're going to build this many nuclear power
17 plants, we can either do it with new fuel or the
18 reprocessed fuel and it will create less waste and
19 we're bumping up against this requirement for storing
20 it underground. We're bumping up against this 1984
21 requirement.

22 So I'm trying to understand the logic
23 behind that, and it reminds me of what happened -- I
24 ran for political office, it's a district, nothing
25 huge. And I ran against a project to filter the

1 Willamette River and use it for drinking water. And I
2 have a lot of concerns with the safety and I'm just a
3 citizen -- I'm a musician for a living -- and I had a
4 lot of concerns about, you know, the health and safety
5 of not just the source water, but of the finished
6 product that was coming out of the plant.

7 And after I was elected to this office, of
8 course, I had a lot of contact with these engineers,
9 and a lot of them were saying something similar to
10 what the fellow said before about people being
11 uneducated. And the citizens are just uneducated
12 about the efficacy of this plan, the treatment plan.
13 And they're uneducated about how clean the water
14 really is in the Willamette River at the point where
15 it's being extracted.

16 And so, during this process, we even hired
17 a independent laboratory to test the water. And as it
18 turns out -- and, you know, there might be some local
19 considerations, seasonal swells and fluctuations in
20 the contaminate -- but it turned out it really wasn't
21 what we expected. Actually, there were really quite
22 safe levels. And when I learned more and more about
23 the water treatment plan, I learned how
24 over-engineered this plan really was and how it really
25 could remove a lot of these contaminants.

1 I also traveled around the country. I went
2 to New Orleans and saw, you know, what they were
3 drinking from the Mississippi River and some of these.
4 So comparatively, it really wasn't, you know, as bad
5 -- it really wasn't as bad a project necessarily
6 technically as I thought it was. But then, when I
7 really thought about it and I spoke with another
8 engineer on board -- and he really seemed to come to
9 agree with me on this -- was that the citizens just
10 didn't want it. They just don't want it.

11 And we're in a water -- we're in a
12 plentiful situation here in the Northwest when it
13 comes to other options, and so the Department of
14 Energy has done a lot of great work on renewable
15 energy. I attended a peak oil conference in Spokane.
16 Somebody from Yellow Springs, Ohio, someone from the
17 Department of Energy talked about a zero energy house
18 that produced -- that produced, you know, the rayon
19 zero energy. It was really some amazing stuff that

20 the DOE has been pursuing and can pursue.

21 And the bottom line is everywhere you go,
22 you're going to find opposition. Maybe technically
23 everything could go perfectly well, but the bottom
24 line is that -- well, it's very, very expensive. And
25 there's the opportunity cost. If we're doing this,

85

1 we're not doing something else. And the bottom line
2 is that the citizens just don't want it. We just
3 don't want it. Let's do something else.

4 MS. BARNES: Thank you, Lisa. Perfect
5 segue. My name is Judith Barnes and I live in
6 Portland. I'm a member of the local Portland chapter
7 of the Alliance for Democracy.

8 And while I could go over a lot of the
9 things that have been said before about how dangerous
10 nuclear energy is and -- I won't. What I want to do
11 is focus on -- first of all, a prompting of our
12 moderator. I will reiterate my plea for having these
13 kinds of critical public hearings at a place and with
14 sufficient time and on a day that most people can

15 attend. And that's a weekend. Please.

16 And I want to focus on the -- there we go,
17 on the premise on which this EIS is based. And that
18 seems to be the idea that we need more nuclear power
19 in this country -- not only in this country but all
20 over the country -- but that we need it to sell to the
21 rest of the world and that the rest of the world needs
22 to produce more nuclear energy. And I don't believe
23 that premise is true.

24 Yes, we need more energy because the
25 population will grow and we need to replace the energy

86

1 that we currently get from fossil fuels with nuclear
2 energy with something else. And what my Department of
3 Energy would have done is to evaluate how we might get
4 there with other means. And there are other means of
5 doing this and one never hears about it in this
6 country. It's being tried in other countries very
7 successfully. Germany, Denmark, Spain, and 46 other
8 countries are adopting a way of deploying renewable

9 energies faster and more widely than we are in this
10 country.

11 And the irony is that they got this idea
12 from California in the '70s, okay? And here's the
13 idea. It's called feeding tariffs, otherwise known as
14 renewable energy payments. And what it does is it
15 opens up the grid so that anyone -- you, me, a
16 nonprofit, a school district, a municipality -- anyone
17 who can generate renewable can sell that energy to the
18 grid for a good, fixed attractive market price. Okay?

19 If you have the opportunity to put up solar
20 panels on your roof or put a window up in your
21 backyard and earn good money to create a secondary
22 income stream, wouldn't you try to do that? How many
23 people in this room would think about it? Okay.

24 Well, imagine that multiplying around this
25 country. If we were to open up the grid like they're

87

1 doing in other countries, there's a clear track
2 record. Germany is surpassing their goals for
3 renewable deployment. If we were to open up to the

4 ingenuity, the imagination, unleash the competitive
5 spirit of the citizens in this country.

6 Imagine this. Imagine a school district
7 that if it could plaster its school roofs with solar
8 panels and generate an income stream for its school.
9 Can't you see the PTA members getting up there and
10 knocking out those roofs? Okay, that's just one idea.
11 Open up the grid to Americans. Let us solve this
12 problem ourselves. That option hasn't even been
13 looked at.

14 We say, "Oh, solar can only produce this
15 much. Wind can only produce that much." That's using
16 the model that requires huge amounts of investment
17 capital to create centralized large dollar solar rays
18 and huge wind farms. And yes, you need that. But
19 there's another option that isn't even being
20 considered, and that's opening up the grid to you and
21 me. And that option -- in Germany, when they tried
22 it, it eliminated the need for several nuclear power
23 plants to be built.

24 So let's look at other options, please.

25 MR. BROWN: Martha Perez is next and

1 she will be follow by Jurgen Hess.

2 MS. PEREZ: Hi, good evening. My name
3 is Martha Perez and I'm a general political activist
4 and I'm also a member of a federally recognized tribe,
5 but I'm speaking here as just a regular person. I'm a
6 single parent. I am a former employee of Bonneville
7 Power Administration under the Department of Energy.
8 I'm very proud of my service with the government.

9 I'd like to thank Mr. Frank Shwartz. Thank
10 you, sir, for just being here and listening to all of
11 our concerns. Just a few -- I'll limit my comments to
12 the following statements.

13 I'm concerned about the indigenous issue
14 being affected at Yucca Mountain. I won't go into
15 that. And I'm not here to speak on behalf of any
16 tribe, just as an urban Indian. I support at this
17 time the No Action Alternative with provisions for
18 effective community retraining.

19 I question -- I know that this project will
20 have to go through some sort of a general all
21 permitting process in addition to EIS, the impact
22 statement, so I encourage all of you to challenge that
23 permit process. You can also question the licensing
24 and design process that told us this limited scenario
25 of what happens with terrorism affecting -- but you

1 can also -- I think it's more likely that we'll see
2 human error affect, you know, something of that
3 outcome.

4 Also, I learned through my service at BPA
5 that the existing electrical grid is fragile and
6 vulnerable. And also, I liked the lady's comments
7 about, you know, energy ownership by the general
8 public. How can our fragile grid handle additional
9 energy sold to it when we haven't even addressed the
10 fragility of our energy grid as it exists?

11 I also ran for City Council in Portland,
12 Oregon, and a suggestion one of my constituents made
13 to me was they thought the idea of nuclear power was
14 good for space travel, for fuel and space travel, but
15 they weren't sure about other uses for it. We should
16 put a cap on the 104 existing nuclear facilities that
17 are there.

18 Thank you, I have one more minute. Future
19 nuclear fuel contracts and grants should continually
20 be subject to transparency, of course.

21 And again, just really -- you know, I don't
22 want to see this situation boil down at a Supreme
23 Court, you know, level. And I don't want to see that
24 happen because that's taking a lot of time from
25 solving the real problems that exist.

90

1 And I just want to thank you and encourage
2 all of you to learn all you can and decide for
3 yourself what you think the best alternative should
4 be. Thank you and good night.

5 MR. BROWN: Jorgen will be followed by
6 Mark Juander.

7 MR. HESS: Thank you. I'm Jorgen Hess.
8 I live in Hood River.

9 Eleven of the 13 hearings for this proposal
10 are in nuclear facility cities like Pasco. It's a
11 very biased, unfair process. You'll get maybe 14,
12 15,000 comments again. The result will be predictable
13 just like the last time.

14 The Programmatic EIS says there can be
15 secure, safe, and sustainable expansion in nuclear.

16 Let's talk about those three elements. In terms of
17 secure, high-level waste will increase the risk of
18 terrorist attacks. Security will be decreased.

19 In terms of safety, transportation through
20 my city of Hood River is just too dangerous. No way.
21 We do not want to be collateral damage, part of those
22 860 cancer deaths just from exposure to those trucks.
23 How many drive I-84 in the winter? There are a number
24 of truck accidents every winter.

25 In terms of sustainability, this is a

91

1 blasphemy of the word "sustainable" and I work in
2 this. That's my profession. How can something with
3 thousands and thousands of years of waste be
4 sustainable? It's not clean energy. Coal gives off
5 carbon dioxide, but until the waste issue is solved,
6 nuclear power is far, far, far worse.

7 Some of your own statistics, three to six
8 billion gallons of water a year for this proposal.
9 Six hundred thousand acres will be disturbed. That's

10 an entire national forest.

11 And the nuclear powering industry just
12 couldn't exist without federal subsidies. How can
13 that possibly be sustainable? Of course, the nuclear
14 industry will want to export this to third world
15 countries for profit.

16 The GNEP proposal steals from the Hanford
17 cleanup. It takes those funds that must be used
18 there. We've watched -- we've sat through all those
19 budget battles. Basically, there should be no
20 additional waste until Hanford is cleaned up a hundred
21 percent.

22 I want to give the DOE an award tonight,
23 though. This is called "the understatement of the
24 decade award." In your document, page -- this is the
25 Summary Document, page SS-37. I'll read it: "The

92

1 following spent nuclear fuel and waste streams do not
2 have a clear path to disposal at this point." You won
3 that award.

4 The alternatives that were discussed

5 already, I add in conservation. Our houses are too
6 big. Our lifestyle in this country is unsustainable.
7 You should be pushing building smaller houses. Create
8 tax exemptions to do that. You can do it. Wind and
9 solar -- there's so many alternatives. So, please, do
10 the right thing. Thank you.

11 MR. BROWN: Mark Juander, and Keith
12 Harding will follow Mark.

13 SPEAKER: I'm Mark Jaunder from Bend.
14 I used to be from Gig Harbor. My -- being a teacher
15 like that, I'm more like yelling to you out here.

16 I would like to suggest, sir, that in the
17 future -- in the future you have an abstract, maybe a
18 500-word abstract. I know a lot about nuclear power,
19 but there's a heck of a lot of information you
20 provided. And just an abstract, I think, would be a
21 good idea, too. And it's not a putdown at all, just a
22 teacher encouraging you to do that.

23 I would encourage you, sir, running the
24 meeting, you've done a wonderful job. I would suggest
25 that you alternate for a time statements. I think it

1 would help. We started late in the evening and most
2 people have left. I have some statements that might
3 run counter to most of those heard tonight.

4 I'm in the Sierra Club, cascade region of
5 the branch/chapter. I'm on the energy committee. I'm
6 pursuing the title committee sheet proposal that's --
7 or I should say, I took an energy proposal down to
8 Olympia. But I promise you that I'm not speaking for
9 the Sierra Club. I'm not speaking at all from the
10 knee jerk part of it.

11 I'm a UU, Unitarian Universalist. I was
12 out there in the Vietnam war protest in Washington
13 like you wouldn't believe. I was anti-nuke and an
14 engineer in the '60s.

15 I became a teacher of physics and
16 mathematics in high school and my kids' questions
17 prompted me to maybe tell me I needed to learn
18 something about nuclear power, and I need to learn
19 something about coal power because they go hand in
20 glove in a different sort of way.

21 I became quickly an anti-coal person, which
22 meant in effect I was sort of a pro-nuclear. And
23 certainly, the record for the nuclear power industry
24 in the last 20 years suggests I was right there.

25 Let me say, while we're speaking,

1 Centralia, over this next 24 hours, will put out a
2 mile and a half coal train of coal converted to carbon
3 dioxide. As you all know, 30,000 tons. And at the
4 same time, ten railroad cars of ash waste. That ash
5 waste has in it arsenic. It has lead, mercury, all of
6 which have infinite half lives, infinite half lives.

7 MR. BROWN: Can you step back just a
8 little?

9 SPEAKER: I'd be glad to. I'd be glad
10 to. In fact, I could yell like this.

11 Infinite half lives. They are in such
12 failure they are putting it out to a company that puts
13 in it wall board. So that -- those heavy metals are
14 in the wall board of the contractor who buys them.
15 Some of it goes into landfills, otherwise known as
16 strip mines, back in Appalachia. I learned that from
17 the coal power superintendent. I learned a lot about
18 coal power from that coal power superintendent in
19 North Hampton, Massachusetts.

20 The mortality -- and I say this somewhat
21 facetiously -- but I think, sir, it really applies.

22 And I think you should put this in your salad bag.
23 The oncologists will tell you that the mortality rate
24 of cancer in the Western world, the industrialized
25 world, is dropping at one and a quarter percent, plus

95

1 or minus, per year. If you work that out, that's a
2 half life of the mortality rate of cancer of about 45
3 years.

4 Oncologists will also tell you that the gen
5 -- genome research with stem cell research and the
6 vaccines coming out for cancer, that rate is going to
7 be improved enormously in the next generation. I say
8 it facetiously but it's true, and we do not have to
9 worry as much about cancer in the future as we did in
10 the past.

11 But one other point. I came from an island
12 my teenage years in the Chesapeake Bay. Tangier
13 Island with a sister island straight down into
14 Maryland will be the first town to be inundated by the
15 water rising from the loss of the ice caps, and it's
16 probably going to happen.

17 My grandchildren, the little wife, similar
18 to mine, the cars will be smaller, they'll have
19 blueberries instead of blackberries, they'll have
20 zPods instead of iPods. But in one respect, their
21 lives differ from mine because they will be unable to
22 say to their grandchildren that your life is going to
23 be like mine because according to the global warming
24 people -- and I trust them, I think they know what
25 they're talking about -- we have about one generation

96

1 to reverse the buildup of carbon dioxide. You've all
2 heard this. You've heard it.

3 And some of the comments I've heard tonight
4 are -- I'll be honest with you and I'm being unbiased.
5 I think I'm a very well-educated person in this
6 regard. I've heard a number of things tonight that
7 are absolutely false. Absolutely false. And it
8 bothers me because this is the first kind of meeting
9 of this nature I've ever been in.

10 And I see the reaction here. I'm sorry to

11 scold you, but if you want to convert me, you are not
12 going to convert me by giggling in the background, by
13 this gentleman who had spent a lot of time up here
14 ranting. Some of his facts were definitely absolutely
15 false.

16 And if we're going to approach this -- this
17 problem of heating up the permafrost and methane
18 coming out in great gobs, which is far worse than
19 carbon dioxide, the ice caps of the Arctic melting and
20 in fact disappearing, and the ice caps of the
21 Antarctic and Greenland inundating us, we're going to
22 have to rebuild -- I'm kidding now, because if we
23 build every ferry bought in the Puget Sound if this
24 continues, in about a hundred years, say, we won't be
25 here.

97

1 But you were talking about 10,000 years,
2 these people were, and we're applauding. Two hundred
3 fifty thousand years. Think about how ridiculous that
4 is. Think about it. Let's get down to the next
5 generation. We have to reverse the carbon dioxide

6 buildup. Reverse it. Otherwise, Tangier Island, my
7 hometown, will go under. It will go under. Thank
8 you, sir.

9 MR. BROWN: I was asked to make an
10 announcement that the Portland bus is leaving and they
11 want to make sure they didn't leave anyone behind
12 since it's a long walk down river. So if anybody is
13 on the Portland bus, it's time to head out. Okay.

14 Are Keith Harding --

15 MALE SPEAKER: Yep.

16 MR. BROWN: And Sabine Hilding will
17 follow Keith. All right.

18 MR. HARDING: I'm Keith Harding. I
19 live in the upper Hood River valley.

20 Lots and lots of different comments tonight
21 and I've made lots of notes. I've been attending
22 these meetings for about 18 years now. My kids were
23 both raised coming to these meetings, and after
24 hearing the last fellow speak, it set off a whole
25 bunch of different thoughts. So I'm going to try to

1 come up with something that's unique that hasn't been
2 said or may not be.

3 I don't even like the nuclear language. I
4 don't like -- the words hurt my ears. Every word that
5 comes out of the nuclear technology irritates me. My
6 sensibilities -- my education is more in ecosystems:
7 forest and zoology, botany, pathology, things like
8 that. So I'm going to shoot out a few thoughts.

9 One thing I have become in my life, which
10 the fellow might appreciate, is somewhat a student of
11 history. And what I've gathered from reading history,
12 particularly in forestry, is the world has been under
13 reforestation since humanity turned to agriculture.
14 What's happening in the environment now happened in
15 the fertile crescent 2,000, 3,000 thousand years ago
16 and in Europe, so they have virtually no forest left
17 there.

18 And an interesting thing is all along the
19 way, there were people speaking against the
20 predominant money-vested interest. The nuclear
21 genies, from what I can gather, should have never been
22 opened up back 60-something years ago. We would be
23 better off.

24 In the last couple of years, we hear the
25 occupants of the White House talk about the great

1 threat of Iran. Iran wants to develop nuclear power.
2 And the people in the White House are saying it's just
3 another step to nuclear weapons. Well, as far as I
4 know, the United States is the greatest purveyor of
5 military armaments around the planet. And here we are
6 developing even more of this stuff just a click away
7 from military purposes.

8 Another thing I would suggest is -- the
9 Department of Energy used to be called the Atomic
10 Energy Commission. And it seems to me if it's going
11 to be true to its name, Department of Energy, it
12 should be way more comprehensive across the board
13 researching and promoting.

14 And conservation is a humongous item. I
15 see incredible waste in America. People just pissing
16 precious petrol chemicals away in recreational
17 vehicles, vehicles that make terrible gas mileage,
18 ATVs. No problem if it's for work, like on a farm or
19 ranch, but there ought to be some large guidance from
20 the federal level about where one could use our
21 energy. Ski jets and motor boats and on and on and
22 on, snow machines, et cetera, et cetera, should end.

23 Conservation is big. I think we in the
24 United States have a huge latitude in our energy
25 consumption right there. I'm driving a 1982 Toyota

100

1 diesel pickup, running it on bio diesel. We need a
2 lot more movement that way.

3 Another thing I would suggest is -- I've
4 been talking to the Department of Energy Ph.D.'s for
5 16, 18 years here. And my sense is these guys know a
6 lot about their realm, and they're so, so ignorant
7 when it comes to the rest of the web of life.

8 If the nuclear had never been let out of
9 the bottle, we'd all probably be better off. And if
10 you guys would accredit us with the rest of the web of
11 life and get reconnected with it, I know -- I forget
12 your name right now, but I suspect you do that back in
13 your land in Virginia. And everyone needs to do that.
14 We need to get reconnected with the web of life.

15 I don't think any fresh air, water, soil
16 comes from technology. It comes from the wild world.
17 Seven years ago, there was a group of scientists that

18 wanted to figure out what the wild world does for us
19 for free. And the median estimate they came up with
20 on the conservative side is something like \$36
21 trillion per year. At the same time, all the gross,
22 and that's gross national products of the entire
23 world, came up to about \$16 trillion.

24 So what the wild world, this beautiful,
25 gorgeous blue green planet does for free in addition

101

1 to awe-inspiring is create our drinking water and our
2 air that we breathe and the soil from which all the
3 food comes from. Everyone in every field of study
4 from art to zoology ought to apprentice with nature
5 before they're allowed to diddle around in whatever
6 realm they go into. Thank you.

7 MR. BROWN: Sabine Hilding will be
8 next.

9 MS. HILDING: My name is Sabine
10 Hilding. I'm from Portland, Oregon and Hanford Watch.

11 And yes, existing waste must be dealt with,

12 but this is not the way. Yes, the U.S. can deal with
13 global warming without nuclear power. I'd like to
14 again refer everyone to the pursuit for energy and
15 environment. Arjun Makhijani's work, Carbon-Free
16 Nuclear-Free knows the basic premise regarding
17 expansion of domestic and international nuclear power
18 is wrong. It's clearly a corporate nuclear and
19 nuclear corporation of -- deal.

20 Just because it doesn't make CO2 doesn't
21 make it clean. That's a logical fallacy. To batch
22 CO2 and coal and then present nuclear as an
23 alternative is ridiculous. In this global warming
24 hysteria, we have to steer the course. We can't just
25 present nuclear and ethanol, awful forms of energy

102

1 both, as what we must turn to.

2 I'd like to, as far as GNEP and the folks
3 that are sitting here tonight, consider the source.
4 They are representing a policy decision by the Bush
5 administration. They gave us GNEP; Bush did.
6 Hopefully, Obama will scrap the entire GNEP project.

7 Obviously, Bush -- obviously, Bush was clearly driven
8 by nuclear corporations and especially nuclear
9 munitions corporations.

10 Lastly, I hate to quote a movie but I'm
11 going to, I.O.U.S.A. Last year's major exports
12 according to that movie was number one, electronics.
13 I think that was number one, but I know two and three.
14 Two was nuclear technology and three was scrap metal.

15 Now, I say nuclear corporations and nuclear
16 workers who have a clear vested financial interest
17 should not have equal say as regards to the overall
18 health of communities generations down the line. This
19 is -- this is where the government has to step in with
20 a sound policy. The Bush administration's policy
21 decisions as regards the environment have been
22 abysmal.

23 Finally, the question I have is, do we have
24 the water? At this level for the water, we should
25 think more of the implication of foreign nuclear

1 waste. I mean, don't we have enough American
2 corporations polluting America already? Do we need
3 foreign waste to do it? Do we need foreign
4 corporations to pollute America, too?

5 And think about the rivers. The Columbia.
6 This is a national issue for us here in the United
7 States, but it's an issue worldwide. We sold India a
8 bunch of nuclear power plants. Our Congress approved
9 it. The Clinton administration sold a bunch of
10 nuclear power plants to China. They're going to ruin
11 that. Do we have the water in the United States
12 without the Columbia, the Snake aquifer, the Ogallala
13 aquifer, that's New Mexico, Hobbs, Roswell, the other
14 sites considered, the Ohio, the Rio Grande, Lake Erie,
15 both canals? The -- I believe it's the Clinch River
16 to the Tennessee River. We just don't have the fresh
17 water. We don't have the water.

18 And we don't have the oceans, either. The
19 North Sea is a terrible mess as a result of the
20 Superphoenix in France and the -- what is it in
21 England? That corresponding plant in England?

22 FEMALE SPEAKER: Sellfield.

23 MS. HILDING: Sellfield. Worldwide, we
24 don't have the water for nuclear.

25 MS. CHUDY: Hi. My name is Catherine

1 Chudy and I live in Vancouver, Washington and I work
2 in Portland, Oregon.

3 So I also come from New York state, and my
4 father worked at Union Carbide in Tonawanda, New York,
5 which was part of the Manhattan Project. When -- in
6 1944, they were trying -- it wasn't that they knew
7 that these wastes were unsafe or they didn't -- it
8 wasn't that they knew -- it wasn't that they thought
9 that they were safe. They knew they were unsafe.
10 They knew they were unhealthy.

11 The decision on where to dispose them in
12 that act in 1944 had to do with where the lawyers
13 thought it would be best to dispose of them so
14 liability couldn't be traced back to Union Carbide.
15 So, my dad worked 37 years at Union Carbide in
16 Tonawanda walking around that soil. They dumped the
17 waste in wells on the property of that plant in
18 Tonawanda. My dad didn't get to say no.

19 Fast forward to 1980 and I was part of the
20 initiative that got passed in Oregon. The initiative
21 process in Oregon was definitely hit. But back in
22 1980, the rise of informed citizens of Oregon said,
23 "We won't build any more nuclear power plants in

24 Oregon until the waste disposal issue has been
25 resolved." Guess what? The waste disposal issue has

105

1 not been resolved.

2 Safe, secure, sustainable nuclear power
3 language. We hear it over and over again. We just
4 came through an election cycle where the sound bites
5 on both sides attempted to say "safe nuclear power;
6 secure, sustainable nuclear power." Well, saying it
7 doesn't make it so.

8 There's -- page 58 of this Environmental
9 Impact Statement summary refers to unavoidable adverse
10 impacts. Well, the adverse impacts are avoidable. We
11 can say no to nuclear power. It's unconscionable not
12 to say no to nuclear power.

13 MR. BROWN: Jim Buelte is next and then
14 Brett Vandenhommel will follow him.

15 MR. BUELTE: Good evening. I drove down
16 here from Richland, Washington earlier this evening to
17 kind of gain some additional perspective, and it's
18 been quite an educational process here for me. And I

19 appreciate it, but I am a proponent of nuclear power
20 and I'm a proponent of closing the nuclear fuel cycle.
21 Let me give you some reasons why.

22 First, with nuclear power, one of the
23 primary drivers is really with the current issue. I'm
24 very concerned about the growth of carbon in the
25 atmosphere. The atmosphere -- the carbon in the

106

1 atmosphere is about 380 parts per million and growing.
2 It's higher than it has ever been throughout human
3 history. The grand experiment is under way.

4 And our emissions worldwide are such that
5 the carbon concentrations are increasing about two
6 parts per million per year. And in about the same
7 rate as we'll be in Portland. Experts agree that by
8 applying all of your carbon free energy sources,
9 including conservation, including renewables,
10 including nuclear, we'll be able to assess the chief
11 stabilization; not reductions, but stabilization of
12 carbon in the atmosphere, somewhere between 450 and

13 550 parts per million if we begin to act now. So I
14 think our solution before us include a system of
15 carbon free energy processes including nuclear.

16 As far as the closed fuel cycle goes, I'm
17 not in support of the closed fuel cycle for -- that
18 includes fast reactors. The utilization of fast
19 reactors has the ability to transmute long-lived radio
20 isotopes -- long-lived radio isotopes into
21 shorter-lived efficient products, and also at the same
22 time by extracting a greater amount of the energy
23 value than other alternatives proposed in the PEIS.

24 And so I would just like to also conclude
25 that these -- that the closed fuel -- closed fuel

107

1 cycle approach would also be done without the
2 generation of liquid waste, that these wastes would be
3 manufactured into an engineered form such as glass
4 that would be designed for safe geologic repository
5 disposal. Thank you.

6 MR. BROWN: If you can hold just one
7 minute, the court reporter asked that we take a quick

8 break so that she can stretch her fingers at the
9 two-hour mark right there. So we'll take about -- I
10 think she's done a terrific job. We'll take about a
11 three-minute break now if that will give you enough
12 time, and we'll resume with Brett VandenHemmel and
13 Mimi Samkow will follow.

14 (Recess was taken.)

15 MR. BROWN: Folks, if you'll take your
16 seats, we'll resume. Brett has final information on
17 the use of fuel. If you'll take your seats, we'll get
18 on.

19 MR. VANDENHEMME: Thank you. I'm
20 Brett VandenHemmel. I'm the staff attorney for
21 Columbia River research right here in Hood River.

22 The Department of Energy was telling us
23 they want to build more nuclear power plants. Our
24 organization got its start up at Hanford trying to
25 encourage cleanup and better cleanup of the Hanford

108

1 nuclear reservation in order to protect water quality

2 and protect the salmon, protect the wildlife, protect
3 the people who were getting cancer, who were getting
4 sick, who were dying getting harmed by radioactive
5 waste.

6 So now looking at this 20 years later, here
7 we are asking them to not build more nuclear waste at
8 Hanford, to not build more power plants. They come in
9 today and say they want to build additional nuclear
10 power plants at Hanford and across the nation. That
11 is an absurd proposition after all we've been through
12 at Hanford and other nuclear plants across this
13 nation.

14 Their purpose and need -- and in NEPA, they
15 have to have purpose and need. And they define it
16 very narrowly. They said to expand nuclear power
17 plants. That's not the need here. The need, if
18 anything, is more energy. Where are we going to get
19 that energy? Why are we tied into only nuclear power
20 plants? That's such a defeatist attitude to say the
21 only way we can get more energy is through a dirty --
22 through a harmful energy source that we don't know how
23 to clean up.

24 There's tons of sources of energy that we
25 can turn to. People have mentioned over and over in

1 this room -- it's a very intelligent room, but it's
2 not hard to see. We have solar resources, we have
3 wind resources, we have ocean resources. That should
4 be alternatives that are being analyzed here, not just
5 how many more nuclear power plants to build and what
6 kind of -- what kind of processes in which to process
7 the waste.

8 So if GNEP needs renewable energy, in this
9 age, this green job economy, to be sitting up here and
10 having to spend all of your energy, all of the
11 intelligent people in this room who could be putting
12 your brains and your energy to other resources doing
13 positive things, for all of us to come here tonight
14 and have to fight against additional nuclear power
15 plants is just such a frustrating process. So I'm
16 glad to see everybody here. This fight is far from
17 over, but it is a fight we're going to win.

18 You know, we need to continue. There's a
19 lot of great ideas here today. It starts with us
20 individually, what we can do to reduce our energy use.
21 You know, I have a lot of hope in the new
22 administration. All of these things.

23 But our energy future is not nuclear. It's
24 really not. Nuclear power and nuclear waste is

25 dangerous. It's -- it's a dinosaur fuel source, just

110

1 like coal is, just like oil is. And we need to move
2 on away from these dinosaur sources.

3 So what we'd like to do is ask the
4 Department of Energy to step back, just slow down. We
5 know it's your job. We know that your into nuclear
6 energy, but it's just not the way that people want to
7 go. We want you to reevaluate this and throw out the
8 deal for more nuclear and evaluate it more in the
9 broad sense of what's best for America and what's best
10 for our energy future and it's not nuclear.

11 I'm going to just real quickly, we run some
12 canoe trips on the Hanford region of the Columbia
13 River every summer and I would encourage any of you to
14 get in touch with me if you want to go along. It's a
15 very interesting trip where we float right by the
16 different reactors.

17 And we'll just -- for one, we float by,
18 you're having a beautiful stretch of the river. The
19 sagebrush, much of it hasn't been grazed. One of the

20 advantages of a nuclear -- I think the only advantage
21 of the nuclear reservation at Hanford is that it's
22 pretty much -- as far as the habitat value, there
23 hasn't been grazing. It hasn't been developed.

24 So you're floating past this beautiful
25 landscape and you come around the corner and you come

111

1 to some of the reactors, this hulking rust of
2 reactors. And then you see the one that produced the
3 bomb that we dropped on Nagasaki and your heart just
4 sinks. You think of that, of our nuclear legacy.

5 And now we think that we're -- and then you
6 paddle on and you look at maps and you look at some of
7 the levels of radioactive waste that are currently
8 leaking into the Columbia River, and your heart sinks
9 again and says, not only have we used these as weapons
10 to kill people, we're continuing to do it today.

11 And you look down and you're in your canoe,
12 and you look down and the water is crystal clear. You
13 can see the gravel 10 feet under your canoe with just

14 beautiful salmon farming habitat. And you think, you
15 know, the legacy of the Department of Energy should be
16 -- should be how are we going to clean up these past
17 mistakes? How are we going to do it as fast as we can
18 to make this area safe for the salmon and for the
19 people who live downstream?

20 But that's not the path they're choosing.
21 You know, they're giving us likely 20 years where it's
22 going to be at least cleaned up to a reasonable level,
23 the best that we can do. But what they've decided to
24 do is import more nuclear waste, produce more nuclear
25 waste at Hanford and other places, and we have no idea

112

1 how to clean it up. And that cannot be the legacy the
2 Department of Energy wants to leave and we as a
3 society want to leave.

4 So we need to refocus. Think about we
5 don't need more nuclear power. We need other sources
6 of power, other technologies, and the will to conserve
7 our energy. And at the same time, to focus our energy
8 at Hanford on the cleanup, not producing more nuclear

9 waste. Thank you.

10 MR. BROWN: Mimi Samkow is next. Paige
11 Knight will follow. Again, let me remind you for all
12 the speakers, it's getting late. We've had lots of
13 people. So if folks can try and quickly summarize and
14 maybe stick to the three minutes, that will allow
15 everybody to speak to the audience. Thank you. Mimi?

16 MS. SAMKOW: I'm Mimi Samkow. I'm
17 Michelle Samkow. I go by Mimi. I'm a student at
18 Portland State University in the masters program.

19 So I'm just going to say a couple quick
20 things. There is no such thing as a permanent
21 disposal of transuranic waste. And I think he left,
22 but the effects of the elements of the upper part of
23 the periodic table compared to the lower periodic
24 table and human-made element is very significantly
25 different. So the carbine effects cannot be compared

113

1 to the nuclear effects. The nuclear radioactive waste
2 is anti-sustainable because of the basic physics

3 involved in how it works. It's not sustainable in the
4 nature effect.

5 Also, additionally, if the carbon and other
6 elements can be prepared within one generation, if we
7 have a generation to fix it and plant the trees as
8 part of the solution, it's a very different scene than
9 elements that we cannot touch or be close to. If we
10 are relying on robots that use artificial
11 intelligence, we're involving systems that we don't
12 understand how they react to nuclear energy with
13 artificial intelligence. I don't know about the tests
14 that have been done on that.

15 So, also the system with such high levels
16 of uncertainty should be avoided at all costs because
17 catastrophe is inevitable. It's inevitable sooner
18 than later, and the reasons stated for renewing the
19 nuclear energy process are very weak. Other countries
20 are doing it and we should be involved in it, that's
21 not a good reason. It's going to increase the need
22 for energy, but we need to be more conservative with
23 our needs. And the recycling is not realistic.

24 Okay. So let me finish up -- shorten it
25 up. So these decisions will follow us. This has your

1 name on it, your name on it, and it will be thousands
2 of years that this will follow. We can't mess with
3 the elements that are beyond our understanding. They
4 just are beyond it. They do not occur in the universe
5 naturally, so we should hold back on it. Find other
6 ways to live. And I think that's intimidating to the
7 whole system in general because it threatens profit
8 and industry that won't continue if we promote more
9 nuclear energy.

10 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Paige will be
11 follow by Donna Hippert.

12 MS. KNIGHT: Thank you. As we wind
13 down for the night, I'm Paige Knight but I am the
14 president of hanfordwatch.org in Portland. They have
15 a great Web site. They have an e-list that you can
16 sign up, too, that has a lot of information. So I
17 welcome you to do that.

18 Welcome to the global comments. I love
19 that term. I mean, seriously love that term that was
20 in the Summary Documents. We are the global comments
21 and I take that very seriously, so I say welcome to
22 the global comments. We, as we've proven tonight, are
23 here to help. I think that is really exciting, okay?

24 One of the things that came up tonight was,
25 you know, the time it's taken us to comment. But I

1 have to say, I have said this to our wonderful
2 facilitator, we're here to hear each other. I have
3 been coming to these for almost 19 years now, and we
4 learn so much from each other. And that's what this
5 forum is. We're here to educate ourselves with
6 everybody else. And yeah, some of our facts may, you
7 know, conflict with someone else's facts and I get
8 very, very, you know, frustrated when people talk
9 about the right facts and the wrong facts. You know,
10 there are many cites in science. Science is not a
11 closed loop.

12 However, I think nuclear power should not
13 only be a closed loop but sort of a done deal about
14 what are we going to do with any more waste. I think
15 that the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership -- and I
16 like Lloyd Marbet's new acronym but I can't remember
17 it right now -- it's a bailout --

18 MALE SPEAKER: GNEPA.

19 MS. KNIGHT: GNEPA, thank you.

20 It's a bailout. It's another bailout when

21 we've been going through these right now these last
22 couple of months on a huge scale, and this is another
23 huge scale.

24 Enough people here brought up that we have
25 always had cost overruns with anything nuclear. You

116

1 can give us the price of a nuclear power plant and it
2 will cost two to three to how many other times more
3 than that. You can do the same thing as Yucca
4 Mountain. Yucca Mountain has been in the making for
5 20 years. It was based on bad science.

6 A good friend of mine in the back here has
7 told me that some of the best geological formations
8 for depositing nuclear waste for the sometimes six
9 billion years that some of those radio nuclides will
10 have to decay is in the northeast part of the country.
11 And they don't want it. They think, you know, the
12 west is wide open spaces, you know. Nevada, Hanford,
13 just send it to the deserts, but it doesn't work that
14 way. I mean, we're all in this together.

15 The global nuclear -- GNEPA is about
16 expansion. It's always about expansion of nuclear
17 power, and we can't handle what we've got right now.
18 According to this document, recycling spent fuel would
19 generate relatively large quantities of low-level
20 radioactive waste compared with the present open fuel
21 cycle. And yet, this program is being sold on the
22 premise that it would purportedly reduce smaller
23 volumes of radioactivity. But it's going to produce
24 more waste and we have no viable repository or science
25 to neutralize the waste and whatever.

117

1 I teach high school and my kids always say,
2 "Can't we just send it up to the moon?" And I just
3 remind them of how many space ships have crashed. And
4 where do they crash? In our oceans. And so we get
5 contaminated that way, too.

6 One of the major intents of this proposal
7 is to expand the number of future repositories or
8 graveyards for nuclear waste. And I am really
9 concerned about nuclear from Class C. And I'm

10 concerned not only about Hanford, which I have worked
11 on all of these years intimately, I am concerned about
12 every nuclear site in this country. We have 103
13 nuclear power plants, all that spent fuel by them and
14 there's nowhere to go. And we have at least -- and I
15 think I'm way off -- but at least 20 defense sites. I
16 know there are more than that. Okay? And we have
17 nowhere for that waste to go.

18 We have not cleaned up our sites. We have
19 not cleaned up any of the military sites. We have not
20 cleaned up nuclear sites in this country. I think we
21 have two or three that are sort of clean -- Rocky
22 Flats, but that's not clean clean. We still have
23 water tables being contaminated by things they can't
24 see down deep enough to get.

25 One of the benefits in this proposal or

118

1 these proposals by the DOE is that recycling fuel will
2 limit the spread of enrichment and reprocessing
3 activities. I won't go into my whole thing because

4 enough was said tonight. But I keep thinking about
5 North Korea and Iran and our stance that we don't have
6 to follow any treaty, and yet we can go create these
7 possibilities for nuclear bombs, which you can -- when
8 they're extracting the plutonium, but that is a
9 possibility.

10 And yet, we tell them, "You can't do this.
11 You got to do it our way." You know, this is one of
12 the things that has really taken down our standing in
13 this country in particular in the last eight years.
14 And I know that a lot of the world right now is
15 relieved that the people of the United States have had
16 to listen to those in a different way of thinking.

17 MR. BROWN: Can you wrap it up? We've
18 still got 12 people to go.

19 MS. KNIGHT: Let me just find -- I want
20 to say that the U.S. DOE is unwilling to spend the
21 funds necessary to clean up the waste that has been
22 made over the last 60 years, so why should we allow
23 new missions?

24 And then finally, the most profound
25 argument against continued nuclear energy production

1 is the lack -- and I will repeat this again -- of
2 viable solutions for what to do with the lethal
3 wastes. It will be deadly for 250,000 years at least.
4 Is this what we leave our children and our
5 grandchildren? I think not.

6 MR. BROWN: Donna Hippert is next.
7 Rachel Larson will follow.

8 MS. HIPPERT: Good evening. My name is
9 Donna Hippert and I'm speaking tonight on behalf of
10 Oregon Toxic Alliance and I will try to keep my
11 comments very brief. Thank you for coming here
12 tonight in Hood River.

13 I would like to echo the call for hearings
14 in the major metropolitan areas, not only here in the
15 Northwest, but it is especially pertinent here because
16 we're dealing with the prospect of the radioactive
17 waste being transported through our cities but also in
18 all the major metropolitan areas in the country.

19 We in the public sector and the nonprofit
20 center know that we have a tough battle in stopping
21 nuclear expansion. And the indomitable Woody Allen
22 said that 80 percent of success is just showing up.
23 We'd like for you to give us the chance to at least
24 show up.

25 And also, I'd like to echo the call for an

1 extension of the comment period. I believe that you
2 all went over quite a bit in your time frame in
3 preparing the EIS, the draft EIS, and we'd like for
4 you to give us a chance to hear our comments fully as
5 well.

6 I want to state that I don't believe that
7 there is a valid No Action Alternative in this EIS.
8 All of them assume a massive expansion of nuclear
9 power. And even if you want to leave the alternative
10 assessment aside for there to be a No Action
11 Alternative, you have to assume no expansion of
12 nuclear power. So let's do that, and we need to do an
13 alternative assessment in another EIS and then we can
14 hold them up against each other and study the two of
15 them together.

16 And let me give you one side note
17 suggestion for the alternative energy EIS page that
18 just refers to the bailout. One of the reasons that
19 Ford and GM are saying they need to keep their
20 assembly lines going is because maybe they need to
21 gear up for a war machine or something like that. How

22 about let's forget the automobile gas guzzlers. Let's
23 forget the war machine and let's put them to work
24 cranking out wind turbines and solar panels. If we
25 have to bail them out, let's have them do something

121

1 good for us.

2 And last but not least, I'd like to address
3 the waste problem. Thirty years ago, I cut my teeth
4 as an activist in Texas with the nuclear weapons
5 freeze campaign and the STNP, which was the South
6 Texas Nuclear Project. And at that time they were
7 saying, "Don't worry. We'll figure out what to do
8 with the waste." Well, I didn't buy it then, I'm not
9 buying it now, and I think I'll sum up with the words
10 on this issue of Albert Einstein who said that
11 insanity is doing the same thing over and over again
12 and expecting different results. And that's what
13 we're doing here.

14 MR. BROWN: Rachel Larson is speaking
15 now. Dave Bybee will follow.

16 MS. LARSON: You late night warriors.
17 Thank you so much for staying around. I really
18 appreciate it. I'm Rachel Larson.
19 I'm speaking on behalf of Oregon Physicians
20 for Social Responsibility, as well as the national PSR
21 and the International Physicians for the Prevention of
22 Nuclear War. Our mission is to focus and educate and
23 stop the egregious threats to our public health, which
24 includes global warming, nuclear anything -- power,
25 weapons -- and environmental degradation. So we think

122

1 that in our education, we're taking the holistic view
2 of all the things that are threatening our health.
3 So, really quickly, I want to read an
4 abstract which is on our Web site at oregonpsr.org.
5 Not the whole abstract, just a little teeny piece of
6 the abstract from Rudi Nussbaum, who is a physicist
7 for Portland State University, and I would say an
8 international expert on nuclear power. He's in our
9 backyard in Portland, Oregon. Bless his heart. He is
10 responding in this abstract. Please look it up. It's

11 amazing.

12 It's about a study in 2002 that the nation
13 of Germany took up with the federal childhood cancer
14 registry. They did an independent study of 16 nuclear
15 reactors in Germany, and they also had an independent
16 procedures review committee of 12 scientific experts,
17 five epidemiologists, two pediatricians, two Senate
18 statisticians, and three physicists. It's too late to
19 read all that.

20 But the International Journal of Nuclear
21 Power said it represents a decisive progress in the
22 assessment of health effects in the vicinity of
23 reactors. What they thought was if you are a child
24 living 5 kilometers or less from a German safe nuclear
25 reactor, you have a 27 percent chance more than a

123

1 child living with -- out of that boundary of getting
2 leukemia; a significant correlation. And this study
3 to Dr. Nussbaum's recommendation was the most
4 meticulous health study done of any residential

5 population on nuclear installation.

6 So facts, nuclear facts. Here they are.

7 It's not okay. It's not green. And then, even though
8 global warming is just as much a threat, we can't get
9 there with coal or with nuclear power. Thank you very
10 much.

11 MR. BROWN: Dave Bybee. Is Dave here?
12 Jack Dresser? Jack is here. You're up. Jack will be
13 followed by Jeremy Huffman.

14 MR. DRESSER: I'm Jack Dresser from
15 Eugene. I'm a Veteran For Peace and I'm also a
16 psychologist. I was thinking psychologically about
17 some of this, as I have a habit of doing.

18 First of all, those of you who e-mailed and
19 invited Obama, I might suggest you bring a glass of
20 water. And I was thinking about all these
21 accusations, that the Department of Energy here is
22 irrational, insipid, crazy and insane, and those are
23 discouraging. We might say the Department has an
24 institutional cognitive disorder. And I would like to
25 suggest that in addition to that, the Department has a

1 moral disorder. And the partnership that creates
2 moral disorder is not GNEP; it's the Department of
3 Defense partnership with the Department of Energy.

4 And this is something that no one else has
5 talked about tonight, the 99 percent of nuclear
6 products that are left over from the official
7 materials used for energy production for weapons which
8 is called U-238, mainly uranium. And nobody's talked
9 about the disposal of that. And this document talks
10 and says nothing about the disposal of U-238, which is
11 99 percent of the stuff they get.

12 And U-238 is -- one place it's disposed of
13 is at the weapons industry. It's an extremely hard
14 substance. It penetrates steel. It penetrates armor.
15 It's very popular with the weapons manufacturers
16 because it's very cheap. It's virtually free. It's
17 given away to them. And it's very popular with the
18 Department of Defense because it's very deadly and it
19 penetrates enemy armor very easily.

20 And when Israel first used this against the
21 Egyptian army in 1967 -- the United States first used
22 it in 1991 in the Gulf War. Three hundred fifty tons
23 of this stuff were deposited on the hapless population
24 in Iraq during 1991. During the "shock and awe"
25 campaign that we recently inflicted on the hapless

1 people of Iraq, there was 22 to 2400 tons of this
2 stuff dumped on them at that initial attack, and who
3 knows how much during the two assaults on Fallujah.
4 In Afghanistan, the Department of Defense has dumped a
5 thousand tons on these people.

6 Now, 70 percent approximately of the
7 plutonium uranium in shells is used for shell casings,
8 and it's used almost universally in all our weapons
9 now because it's so effective. And it is the gift
10 that keeps on giving because the half life of this
11 stuff is four and a half billion years. And we have,
12 as I said, we've probably dumped about 3,000 tons in
13 Iraq alone.

14 And 70 percent of it aerosolizes on impact
15 because particularly it's breathed and it gets in the
16 water, it gets in the soil, it gets in the food crops,
17 and it's produced in horrendous rates of cancer and
18 birth defects throughout that population. The rate of
19 cancer and deaths involved in hospitals for 1988 was
20 about a couple dozen. The -- ten years later, 17
21 years after we attacked them, the cancer deaths were
22 400.

23 Iraqi parents no longer ask if their babies
24 are going to be a boy or a girl. They ask if it's
25 going to be normal. The birth defects are absolutely

126

1 hideous. I brought pictures if any of you would like
2 to take a look at them. There are babies born with
3 Cyclopiian eyes in the middle of their forehead. This
4 stuff is in the soil, it's in the water, and it's
5 there for good. Essentially forever.

6 This is a monster war crime against the
7 people of the Middle East, and it is probably the
8 greatest war crime ever committed on any country in
9 the history of man. The Department of Energy and the
10 Department of Defense together are implicit in this
11 war crime.

12 MR. BROWN: Jeremy Huffman.

13 MR. HUFFMAN: Hello.

14 MR. BROWN: Hi.

15 MR. HUFFMAN: Well, thanks so much for
16 taking the time and going over the two-hour allotment.

17 Well, you know, I know this may sound a bit
18 depressing, but what's been going through my mind to
19 listen to this presentation is the Springfield nuclear
20 power plant, Homer Simpson, and a bottle of Duff beer
21 in his hand. And he's not smiling. He's got the
22 eyeballs going a different direction and -- you know.

23 Anyways, so that's kind of, you know, an
24 issue of the whole issue of nuclear power is who's
25 controlling it? Whose -- are these scientists truly

127

1 -- do they have all the sides accounted for?

2 And I think when we go back to one of our
3 speakers tonight, you hear a lot of sort of
4 progressive ideas. But I think what's missing is the
5 other side of that coin that says how much energy
6 really goes into producing all these alternative
7 sources of energy, such as wind, solar. Do you
8 realize how much pollution goes into that and how
9 inefficient that really is, and shouldn't we be
10 spending more money on the research of that and making
11 it more efficient?

12 And a gentleman on the other side of the
13 aisle -- actually, there are a few that brought up the
14 issue of the amount of carbon dioxide that's in the
15 atmosphere. Then we have nuclear sitting here waiting
16 to be used. Well, you have to weigh things hand in
17 hand. You can't just rush to conclusions. I'm sorry,
18 but that's not real democracy. You need to hear both
19 sides, okay?

20 So, which brings me to my final point which
21 is I'm not going to speak for this entire Pacific
22 Northwest region. So let's go back to what Ralph
23 Nader's been preaching ever since he's done his
24 campaign which is let the people speak. So what I
25 would call on your organization to do is to take time

128

1 and truly get everyone's opinion on this matter. This
2 is not a matter of black and white. This is pretty
3 big.

4 And so I really strongly encourage you to
5 continue these forums, and if this is taking up too

6 much of your time, then organize -- select at random
7 in the region that would be affected by this work that
8 you're proposing.

9 I, for one, don't agree with it because I
10 think there's a lot of risks associated with it, but I
11 do appreciate you taking the time to present here.
12 Please continue to do that and try to hold everyone's
13 opinion equally and don't just -- it's a lot of
14 whining, okay? And we're taxpayers. We deserve the
15 right to have a voice on this. And I'm looking
16 forward to the next four years. I'm hoping that Obama
17 breaks a few of those promises.

18 MR. BROWN: Okay. Our next speaker is
19 Jan Castle. George Hutchinson is next. I'm reminded
20 that the Gettysburg address took less than three
21 minutes, so if that appeals to your inner Lincoln, if
22 you can try to keep it to two to three minutes.
23 Thanks. George.

24 MR. HUTCHINSON: Thirty years ago, so I
25 listened to a wise woman, a very concerned physician

1 named Dr. Helen Caldicott. And she said something --
2 I think it was her that said it. There are a couple
3 of historians in this room, some who know a hell of a
4 lot. But I think it's Helen Caldicott I heard say,
5 "Nuclear power and nuclear energy is a future
6 technology whose time has passed."

7 I spoke last night at Pasco after I
8 listened to a lot of people who were in favor of
9 nuclear and in favor of the industry to speak, and I
10 listened to a lot of people -- a few people, almost a
11 balanced number, who were very skeptical or
12 questioning or very negative or very alarmed by it.
13 And I felt like I learned a lot.

14 I feel like I learned a lot more tonight.
15 I'm glad you let folks talk as long as they need to
16 talk because we are here to listen to each other. So
17 thanks for not being, you know -- you're going to give
18 me a one minute so I need another minute and I'll
19 actually go, but I don't have much that I want to say
20 because I've already said it.

21 I was a school teacher for a long time, and
22 one of the things that I thought was my mission for
23 children and young adults was to teach them the
24 concept of critical thinking, of taking as much
25 information of facts and learning how to do their own

1 research and things that would not believe anybody and
2 question authority.

3 You're a good guy. Lots of those men that
4 worked and -- well, worked up in Pasco at the plant
5 are good people. They're just doing what all
6 Americans want to do, which is make a living and have
7 a family and live happily ever after until it's our
8 time. But we can do so much smarter things if we
9 think of the bigger picture and if we think more
10 critically than we have been if we don't become
11 dominated by large industry and small minds and greed.

12 I guess my question is about this, to get
13 right to the point of this thing is as a critical
14 thinker, I taught economic students about economic
15 choices. I don't think this EIS has done that. It
16 hasn't told us what are our economic choices, what are
17 the bottom line costs, what are the true costs:
18 social, environmental, et cetera, political costs.
19 Who wins and loses on this? I don't think the general
20 American public wins with reprocessing. I don't think
21 it wins with nuclear power.

22 Environmental costs -- boy, those have been
23 explained by so many of you wonderful speakers tonight

24 and many have gone. My bus floats further back than
25 the Portland bus does, but, hey. How much will this

131

1 program and policing and monitoring of the
2 implementation cost us? How much more energy? How
3 many more jobs? How many more times might the
4 economic multiplier affect over to reality if this
5 funding that you folks are proposing is invested in
6 solar, wind, tide, geothermal? There's lots of
7 renewable and clean energy sources out there that
8 aren't up there.

9 How much more democratic might it be when
10 millions of us, the world citizens, are allowed and
11 engaged in electrical and other energy issues that are
12 just a relatively few governments and large
13 corporations instead are doing it.

14 I think the economic and political gains
15 which this proposal entails -- the economic and
16 political gains are very short term. The negative
17 consequences are huge and they are immediate and

18 long-term. Thank you.

19 MR. BROWN: Laura Feldman. Kathy
20 Carlson? Kathy's here. Brent Foster will follow
21 Kathy.

22 MS. CARLSON: Hi. My name is Kathy
23 Carlson and I live here in Hood River. And I guess I
24 just represent me and my family and my community and
25 I've been coming to these meetings forever.

132

1 And I want to talk about pirates because I
2 read in the paper that the pirates grabbed hold of a
3 ship over by Somalia or something by Somalia, and they
4 grabbed a ship that had rocket launchers and bombs,
5 all kinds of things. They still have that ship. It's
6 been weeks. They still have the ship and the crew.
7 And then yesterday or today, some more of these
8 Somalian pirates, they grabbed a huge oil tanker with
9 millions of gallons of oil. Now, if you're going to
10 do this as a global project and you've talking about
11 shipping nuclear waste across from other countries,
12 now what's to stop the pirates from grabbing the

13 nuclear waste?

14 It seems to me this whole thing is
15 absolutely ludicrous. You have an Environmental
16 Impact Statement here that is not site specific and
17 it's not project specific. But the idea of an
18 Environmental Impact Study, the way I understand it,
19 is that you're supposed to look at all the things
20 around it that's going to be impacted, like the water
21 and people and the trees, whatever. And how can you
22 do that when you don't even have a specific site that
23 you're talking about?

24 You're talking about waste. The Yucca
25 Mountain -- in 1982, they said they'd create this

133

1 thing. It has yet to be okayed and move waste into
2 it. It's 26 years later. We've been talking -- we've
3 been coming to these meetings for the last 18, 19
4 years and then talked about -- we've been through --
5 oh, my gosh, I don't know how many meetings on
6 vitrification. That's where we're going to take this

7 nuclear waste and turn it from liquid into glass. And
8 you talked about the millions of dollars that will
9 take and the billions of dollars that it's going to
10 spend.

11 And the last meeting that I came to, I
12 think it was the last meeting where they told us, "Oh,
13 we're a little behind schedule and this plant probably
14 will be finished in 2040." We have yet to make any of
15 this stuff into glass, and yet you guys are talking
16 about creating more of it. And even when it's glass,
17 it's not going to be -- it's still going to have
18 nuclear emissions coming from it. It's just, I guess,
19 the idea is it will be easier to handle and it won't
20 leak into the water. But the whole idea of creating
21 more of nuclear waste before we can -- ever decided
22 how to fix what we've already done is ludicrous.

23 And I do believe that these meetings should
24 be held in major cities. The people from Portland
25 shouldn't have to come all the way over here. People

1 from Seattle ought to be able to give their input. I

2 just -- I just think that you're trying to slide
3 something under the -- and get away with something.
4 And at least, I would give the Environmental Impact
5 Statement an "F." Thank you.

6 MR. BROWN: Brent Foster.

7 MALE SPEAKER: He left.

8 MR. BROWN: Okay. Sasha Cornellier?

9 MALE SPEAKER: She left.

10 MR. BROWN: Daniel Lichtenwald. Daniel
11 is here, and Pat Morgan will follow.

12 MR. LICHTENWALD: Well, there's a lot
13 of stuff to tolerate so I earmarked here.

14 I think just one thing to take up is a
15 Global Energy Partnership is based on some notion of
16 cooperation with prospective locations to inject
17 nuclear energy into economies. What's in the foreign
18 policy record in our dealing with these states?
19 Pakistan. Do we have Pakistan under control? Do we
20 have India under control? Are we hoping we will?
21 Iran? Yeah.

22 What are these third world like Mogapi, who
23 are we going to send to -- maybe Mogapi will be our
24 man and we'll have him looking after the stuff.

25 I would just like to start one -- every

1 place with the phrase "requiring ventral disposal in a
2 geologic repository," which is that's plugged in --
3 just kind of placed -- just kind of placed artifacts
4 here. Every place it appears, there should be you're
5 going to bury it somewhere. You don't know where.
6 And it's going to be man made. You don't know how
7 that's going to be done. You can hope for the best.
8 That's what "required ventral disposal energy in a
9 geologic repository" means. That's all it's -- looks
10 forward to. You have no idea what's going to happen
11 to this stuff. No idea.

12 Every one of these little -- these little
13 pictures are filled with monopoly tokens moving around
14 the page. Every one of them begins with uranium ore.
15 There's going to be more mining. There's going to be
16 more incursions on indigenous lands.

17 Where is the thorium? You had this
18 thorium possibility. Where's that coming from? What
19 third world country is going to take the hit for that?
20 Let's see. So much in here.

21 Well, this has already been covered.
22 Anyways, the list that you've mentioned is the
23 don't-know-what-to-do-with-it list. You have no idea
24 what you're going to do with it. I guess the analogy

25 I can only come up with is if your toilet backed up,

136

1 you couldn't dispose of the stuff, you know, what
2 you're trying to dispose of. Your toilet's backed up
3 and it's starting to come into your kitchen. It's
4 starting to come into your bedroom. And now you want
5 to put more stuff into the toilet. That's what this
6 is all about.

7 Hanford is mentioned in here, so I think
8 Hanford deserves to be focused on, even though that
9 supposedly is not the purpose of this hearing. The
10 people of Washington have spoken. The people of the
11 region have spoken. There was this unholy dream back
12 in '43 to build a bomb to end the war. And from there
13 on, it's had a life of its own.

14 And that -- I don't want that. I want to
15 be able to go camping on Hanford, but that's illegal.
16 We want Hanford restored. That's it; cleanup,
17 restored. If you want to make more bombs, you want to
18 make more -- develop schemes for making yet unknown

19 kinds of reactors to experiment with them, that's
20 something else. But Hanford or I don't know where --
21 I was in Colville, Washington by the way, so my
22 region, my bio region. And I want Hanford back to the
23 way it was. You build one bomb. That was the deal.
24 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Pat will be
25 followed by Dave Berger.

137

1 MS. MORGAN: Hey, I want to thank
2 everyone for sticking around. I'm glad she's not
3 around.
4 You know, it's over 22 years ago, I
5 believe, that I was at the Bonneville Power
6 Administration auditorium. I think there were over
7 900 people in that auditorium. Is that about right,
8 Lloyd? The place was packed and they tried to cut us
9 off then, too, but I wouldn't let them. Twenty-two
10 years ago. It just keeps going on and on. No plans
11 except to maybe keep producing more nuclear power.
12 I also spent a few years watching Lloyd
13 work very hard on shutting down Trojan nuclear power

14 plant. He tried to do it the proper way through an
15 initiative process, but what was interesting, I
16 believe, was the Department of Defense doesn't allow
17 states to pass laws that shut down nuclear power
18 plants. It was the Department of Defense that
19 prevented us from doing it.

20 Lloyd passed initiative after initiative,
21 and finally he made it so at least no more nuclear
22 power plants can be built in Oregon. He finally
23 chained himself to the fence to shut that plant down
24 because somehow we found out that there was like 250
25 busted crack seam pipes in the plant, and they were

138

1 going to start refueling that thing and start fueling
2 it up again. They didn't care. I mean, if the rule
3 was you couldn't run it with more than two cracks in
4 the seam pipe, and this was the Department of Energy
5 and the Department of Defense were defending them,
6 hopping in there and starting it up and keeping it
7 rolling.

8 And Lloyd went to jail to prevent that.
9 And he won because he won on a legal thing of the
10 lesser of two evils, you know. He finally convinced
11 the judge that they had to release these documents
12 from PGE to prove that there were 250 cracks in the
13 seam pipe and they shouldn't be starting it up. So
14 PGE backed off and said, "Oh, no. We're not going to
15 release these papers. We'll just shut down Trojan."
16 And finally, Trojan was gone. But it took him half
17 his lifetime to do this.

18 One of the things -- I think, I -- 22 years
19 ago, I wrote a big, huge, long thing and you tried to
20 cut me off so I didn't even write anything. I've just
21 been scribbling down notes here today. I'm not a big
22 brain like other people here. It's just a basic
23 feeling. It's dangerous here and you don't keep doing
24 it. So you don't need a big brain about it.

25 I spent four and a half years living off

1 the grid completely. I ran a business living off the
2 grid, all solar power and wind power, built a house

3 that was environmentally sound and, you know, all
4 three walls and everything. I did end up leaving the
5 area, partly because it was a little bit -- didn't
6 build a lot of community down there.

7 But I proved to myself that we can be
8 efficient. We can live in a manner that isn't
9 consuming everything we had. And a couple people
10 brought it up a little bit, but that's one of the
11 things that absolute gets to me is the level of
12 consumption. Instead of the government, "Oh, what are
13 they going to do? Give us another stimulus check so
14 we can spend more money on more garbage that we don't
15 even need."

16 You know, the Department of Energy should
17 be encouraging people to think about, you know, do
18 they need all these plastic gadgets and all this crap?
19 You know, we need to really, truly educate people
20 about what -- what -- really what we need to live. We
21 don't need 5,000 square foot houses and multiple cars
22 and on and on and on. I mean, there should be some
23 regulations be put into place that restrict people,
24 that tax them through the kazoo if they want to have a
25 house that's bigger than so many square foot per

1 people.

2 There's many, many things that can be done
3 besides creating more nuclear waste. There shouldn't
4 be any nuclear waste, and we know it's connected to
5 more nuclear bombs, too.

6 So, I'm hoping Obama does something
7 different. I'm hoping that we can solve this off to
8 get Bush out of this administration as quick as
9 possible.

10 I do think that just as it was clear 22
11 years ago, that 900 to 1,000 people wanted to speak in
12 Portland. They still want to speak and they shouldn't
13 have to come to Hood River to be heard. And every
14 single major metropolitan area here needs to be heard.
15 This is serious, serious stuff. Everybody that's
16 still in here, I think, knows it's still serious
17 stuff. But I thank you all for sticking around long
18 enough to listen to me, and now, Dave Berger gets to
19 talk. The time's up.

20 MR. BERGER: I wish there was a way we
21 could end this with music, and you know who it would
22 be for a nuclear event? The Grateful Dead.

23 But anyway, you know, it's -- I look at
24 this, and I'm kind of old so I've got to use my
25 glasses now. But first of all, the best way to get

1 rid of waste is not to create at all, okay? I have a
2 couple engineering degrees. You can throw them in the
3 garbage. Logic says don't create it at all.

4 The second piece of logic is, as the state
5 of Washington has wanted, clean the shit up before you
6 make more. And Ben's analogy of the toilet goes right
7 to that.

8 And also, we got a new Congress. We got a
9 new President. Stop the lobbying. End the game.
10 January we start again. Let's start a new discussion
11 then. Let's make it a more national or international
12 discussion. Let's send the thing -- take every major
13 newspaper in the country, put it on the front page
14 with, "Do you want nuclear power or don't you?" Put
15 pros and cons on both sides, put an envelope in there,
16 put a Web site in there. Let's not get 200 hundred
17 people in a room, let's get 300 million people to
18 respond. If you want public comment, then go get it
19 because it ain't that expensive to go get.

20 And as far as, you know, continuing the
21 stuff, when I think about the Columbia River, okay,
22 look at nuclear power. Who's going to insure us when
23 we have a spill? Oh, the government because no
24 insurance company would insure us. Besides, we're all
25 going bankrupt anyway. So now we're going to insure

142

1 this stuff with the government. Get this. The
2 Columbia River isn't a river anymore. It's just a
3 bunch of lakes. So something spills and it goes into
4 the lake. You know?

5 These trucks -- remember the trucks that
6 were only going to kill 800 people in 40 years,
7 provided we don't have any accidents at all? Suppose
8 we have an accident, and it ends in one of these
9 lakes, okay? Guess what? Now you've got a contained
10 disaster. Talk about fish passage. Forget about fish
11 passage. Talk about wind surfers and wind
12 developments. Forget about that stuff. Okay? But it
13 ain't going to happen. I guess I have one minute left
14 to go. Okay.

15 Continuing on, okay, accidents and
16 disasters. I can only be very thankful when I think
17 about stuff like accidents and disasters that Browning
18 is gone. Praise the Lord, Browning is gone. We may
19 have a different FEMA under a different
20 administration, other reasons to slow the process
21 down.

22 As far as the cancer rate going down,
23 that's the best thing I've heard, the cancer rate is
24 going down. And Lloyd tells me maybe it's because we
25 haven't built a nuclear in 20 years. Oh, and if it's

143

1 going down one and a quarter percent a year, we're
2 going to be cancer free in about -- what? Thirty
3 years? I'd like to believe that, too. And I'd like
4 to believe that they're going to clean up the lakes.

5 The men -- military and monetary. The
6 military and the monetary get together. Whenever they
7 think it's necessary, they turn the planet into a
8 cemetery. This is about money and not about

9 greenhouse gases, and it never was and it never will
10 be. And this is a wake-up call. Thank you.

11 MR. BROWN: Well, Dave has had the
12 privilege of giving a valedictory address. So we'll
13 give him an honorary degree of some sort. I think
14 actually everybody who's stayed here for this long
15 deserves a credit.

16 So I appreciate your participation in this
17 and we are officially adjourned. Thank you.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATE OF OREGON)
2 County of Clackamas) ss.
3

4 I, Melinda L. Kennard, do hereby certify that
5 at the time and place heretofore mentioned in the
6 caption of the foregoing matter, I was a Certified
7 Court Reporter for Washington and Notary Public for
8 Oregon; that at said time and place I reported in
9 stenotype all testimony adduced and proceedings had in
10 the foregoing matter; that thereafter my notes were
11 reduced to typewriting and that the foregoing
12 transcript consisting of 144 typewritten pages is a
13 true and correct transcript of all such testimony
14 adduced and proceedings had and of the whole thereof.

15 Witness my hand at West Linn, Oregon, on
16 this 28th day of November, 2008.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Melinda L. Kennard
WA CSR No. 3185
Notary Public of Oregon
Commission No. 421665
My commission expires: 9-24-11