Campaign A

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). *A1-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. *A1-2* And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. *A1-3*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. *A1-4*

Sincerely,

Christine Emmel
1374 S West Camano Dr
Camano Island, WA 98282

A1-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A1-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A1-3 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

A1-4 Vitrification of radioactive waste into glass is an attractive option because it atomistically bonds the species in a solid glassy matrix. Because radioactive constituents are bonded within the glass structure, the waste forms produced are very durable and environmentally stable over long time durations, yet they remain toxic. EPA has declared vitrification the best-demonstrated available technology for HLW.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting this campaign:

Ramona Abbott
Wendi Abbott
Joe Abdo
David Abernathy
Tiffany Abrahams
Yogi Nasser Abu-Jaber
Laura Ackerman
Geraldine Adams
Keith Adams
Linda Peterson Adams
Susan Adams
Valerie Adell
Walter Adelman
Camelia Ades
Mabel Adkins
Bob Aegerter
Bob Agopsowicz
Richard Agosto
Benjamin Agre
Lucinda Agre
Karen Aguilera
Donna & John Aha
Lin Ahearn
Kären Ahern
Brian Ahlers
Sky Aisling
John Ajamian
Will A-K
Katherine Akre
Srinivas Akula
Linda Alband
Staci and Burt Alberr
Anthony Albert
Colleen Albert
Lisa Albrecht
Susan Aldredge
Cindy Aldrich
Corey Aldrich
Frances Alexander
Margy Alexander
Michael Alexander
Mike Alexander
Cathryn Alexandra
Heidi Alford
Margaret Alic
Lynda Allan
Sharon Allbright
Pamela Allee
Ashley Allegro
Bette Allen
Caroline Allen
Julia Allen
Lori Allen
Michael Allen
Pamela Allen
Phil Allen
Toby Allphin
Jim Allyn
W. Thomas Almli
Amerinda Alpern
Jacqueline Alpert
Kate Aly
Carla Alzuro
Hector R. Amaro
Chris Anderlik
Derek Andersen
Lou Andersen
Marc Andersen
Beverly Anderson
Diana Anderson
Don Anderson
Erin Anderson
Helen Anderson
Jack Anderson
Jake Anderson
Joann Anderson
John Anderson
Julie Anderson
Kathy Anderson
Kip Anderson
Lynn Anderson
Mary Anderson
Rebecca Anderson
Reilly Anderson
Richard Anderson
Sasha Anderson
Terry Anderson
Terry Anderson
Christy Anderson-Crosen
Susan Anderson-Newham
Linda Andersson
Linda Andrews
Steven Andruss
Adam Angel
Shanna Angel
Gaylene Angelos
Michael Angevine
Jonathan Angle
Robert Angus
Danaan Annett
Hal Anthony
Carol Apperson
Judith Arcana
John Ardner
Kathy Arias
Chris Armstrong
Mary Armstrong
Dana Arnim
Diane Arnold
Jim Arnold
Susan Arnold
Tom Arnold
David Arntson
Richard Arper
Sarvenaz Asasy
Barbara Ashman
C.E. Ashman
Nova Askue
Joan Aston
Jan Aszman
Marissa Athens
Gwen Atkinson
Wendy Atmore
John Atshuler
Dorothy Attneave
Mary E. Aubert
Nicole Aue
A. Aurora
Jan Aust
Jamie Austad
Mark Austin
Yovonne Autrey-Schell
Jesica Avellone
Thomas Avery
Helena Avina
Elizabeth Award
John Aylward
Susan Babilon
Ginger Babin
Teresa Baca
Elaine Bachman
Elisabeth Bacigalupi
Frank I. Backus
Dominique Bador
MaryLu Baetkey
Z. Bahti
Brenda Sadie Bailey
Denise & Brett Bailey
Mary Bailey
Meredith Bailey
Monique Bailey
Christopher Bain
Dave Baine
Krystina Bair
Virginia Baird
Diana Baker
Kelli Baker
Marilyn Baker
Norman Baker
Sarah Baker
Doug Balcom
Jeffrey Bale
Samuel Balen
Bessie Ballard
Aaron Balogh
Robert Bamford
Elliott Bangs
Susan Pease Banitt
Carol Bankord
Wesley Banks
Billie C. Barb
Terry Barber
Jeanniemaria Barbour
Nick Barcott
M. Bare
Gloria Barello
Marie Barham
Josh Barinstein
Elizabeth Barkas
Monique Barker
Reginald Barker
Margery Barlow
Matthew Barmann
Catherine Barnard
Caroline Barnes
Erin Barnes
Lois Barnett
Randall Barolet
Heather Baron
James Baron
Maiyim Baron
Burton Barrager
Wm Gerrit Barrere
James Barrick
Vickie Barrier
Barbara Bartel
Kraig Bartel
Sheila Barth
Mary Bartholet
Faye Bartlett
John Bartley
Pam Bartling
Ellen Barton
Lois Barton
Mark Basham
Ben Basin
Maureen Basinger
Elizabeth Baskin
Dana Bassen
Fred Bassett
Kae Bates
Pat Bath
Karen Batroukh
Gerald Bauman
Marian Bauman
David Baumchen
Manijeh Baxter
Stuart Baxter
John Bayer
D. Keith Baynard
Rita Bazley
Jo Beall
White Bear
Andrea Beardsley
Carol Bearup
Bill Beattie
Susan Beattie
Sarah Beatty
Albert Bechtel
Gladys Penny Beck
Jean Beck
Anna Becker
Christian Becker
Dan Becker
Nan Becknel
Hema Bedasie
Alanna Beebe
Sue Beilke
Brian Beinlich
Brenna Bell
Carol Bell
Donna Belle
Steven Belzer
Tom Bender
James Benear
Elin Bengtson-Leiter
Donna Benjamin
Ed Bennett
Ernest Bennett
Gary Bennett
Henry Bennett
Roger Bennett
Irene Bensinger
Douglas Benson
Julie Benson
Sean Bentley
Coralie Benton
Brenda Bentz
Les Berenson
Miren G. Berezibar-Bennett
Naomi Berg
Rudy Berg
Charles Berger
Kelly Berger
Kristin Berger
Petra S. Berger
Elaine Bergman
Barbara Bergstrom
Sharon Berlin
Fred Berman
Doris Bernard
Barbara Bernstein
Karl Berry
Ron Berti
Cecilia Bertrand
Janice Berube
Robert Berwick
Teresa Bessett
Eric Bessette
Lynn Betteridge
Patrick Beurskens
Jeanne Bevis
Helen Bibelheimer
Michelle Biery
Patricia Bieze
Allison Bigelow
Scott Bigham
Jeanie Birchall
Joel Birchler
Geraldine Bish
Becky Bishop
Charles Bishop
Virginia Bivaletz
Michele Bivins
Gail Bjorkman
D. Black
Jan Black
Stacy Black
Steve Black
Barbara Blackburn
Jane Blackwell
Melinda Blackwell
John Bladek
Susan Blair

Campaign A (cont'd)

Sharlane Blaise
Anna Blake
Kelmie Blake
Susan Blake
Trina Blake
Dianne Blanchard
Anne Blandin
Eugene Blank
Rick Blank
Deidre Blankenship
Karen Blasche
Marla Blaser
Mindy Blaski
Michael Blazey
Cathy Bledsoe
Marilyn Blen
Hannah-Riley Blessing
Debby Bliss
Peggy Blomgren
Jamie Blouin
Robert Blumenthal
Susan Blythe
Doniella Boaz
Ken Bobrow
W. Michael Boe
Karen Boelling
Gail Boettcher
Jennifer Boettiger
Jessica Boettiger
John and Judy Bogle
Anthony Bohn
Marlen Boivin
Jay Bollman
Jack Bolton
Audré Bonadea
Lois Bond
Pamelab Bond
Ruth Bondinell
Mark Bonney
Patty Bonney
Antoinette Bonsignore
John G. Booker, Jr.
Darryl Boom
Darryl & Diana Boom
Diane Boone
Lynette Boone
Tabitha Borchardt
Melody Borcherding
Elizabeth Borges
Laurie Boroughs
Zenda Boss-Hall
Megan Bott
Christina Botterill
Leonard Bottleman
Christine Bourdette
Jenny Bowefield
J.C. Bower
David Bowman
Beth Bown
Andrew Boyd
Charlie Boyd
Eric Boyd
Larry Boyd
Roseanna Boyd
Karen Boyette
Brent & Carol Boykin-Hicks
Richard Boyles
Patricia Bozanich
Debra Braddock
Susan Bradford
Bill Bradley
Richard Bradley
Donna Bradshaw
Karen Cavalier Bradshaw
Peter Branch
Elizabeth Brandegee
Laurie Branson
Kirsten Branson-Meyer
Nanna Brantigan
John Brash
Jody Brassfield
Laura Brauner
Bonnie Bray
Susan Bray
Julia Brayshaw
Jerry Brees
Sarah Breeze
Casey Brehm
Wendy Breiby
Mardella Brekke-Hutchings
Crystal Brett
Roger Briand
Evan Bridges
Jerry Brines
Rebecca Brinkley
Richard Brisco
Ashley Briscoe
Matthew Briscoe
Gloria Briseno
Rebecca Britton
Sheila Broatch
Kathleen Brock
Mason Brock
Mark Brockway
Vickie Brodine
Dennis Brokaw
Robert Brook
Rob Brostoff
Aaron Brown
Anna Brown
Bruce Brown
Cherylann Brown
Christopher Brown
Diane Brown
Frances Brown
Kevin Brown
Lauren Brown
Susan Brown
TeriLyn Brown
Terrence George Brown
Warren Brown
Annie Brule
Cort Brumfield
Ed Brunell
Edward Brunell
Cheryl Bruner
Dominic Bruno
Lauren Bruschi
Shari Bruun
Anita Bryant
Christopher Bryant
Joshua Bryant
Katrina Bryant
James Bryner
Carlin Buchanan
Joshua Buchea
Lauren Buchholz
Jordan Buck
Sherman Buck
Maureen Buckley
Brian Bucknam
Jean Buckner
Paul Buckner
Thomas Budd
Carolyn Buhl
Barton Buhtz
Tina Bull
Gayle Bullingon
Sandra Bullock
Sarah Burch
Christian Burchard
Debra Burchard
Veronica Burden
Karolyn Burdick
Jack Burg
Carole L Burger
Michael Burgess
Kathleen Burke
Mary Ann Burke
Nancy Burke
R.C. Burke
Seth Burke
Jesse Burkett
DonKokko Burnaby
Gerald Burnett
Mary Burnley
Arlene Burns
Megan Burns
Shelley Burns
Tim Burns
Eric Burr
Richard Burrows
Dan Burton
Joelle Burton
Julia Burwell
Kate Busby
Kristen Busold
Ann Butler
Antoinette Butler
Diane Butler
Leonard Butters
Andrew Butz
Laura Buys
Grey Byrd
Luke C.
Chris Cade
Donna Caditz
Kathleen Cafiero
Andree Calandra-Shelby
Laura Caldwell
Terri Caldwell
Cristina Calhoon
Andie Calhoun
Mary Anne Callaghan
Callahan
Tim Callahan
Perry Callas
Mary Cameron
Shirley Cameron
Ericka Camp
Laura Camp
Lynne Campbell
Matthew Campbell
Susan Canedo
William Cantrell
Pam Canty
Carmena Capp
Thomas Caracciolo
Lynn Cardiff
Anne Carey
Dean Carey
Nancy L. Carey
Theressa Carey
Susan Carkin
Joy Carlsen
Cheri Carlson
Renee Carlson
Sharre Carlsson
Keith Carlton
Stephanie Carnahan
Pat Carneal
Amy Carpenter
C.D. Carpenter
Dorothy Carpenter
Greg Carpenter
Michael Carpenter
Casey Carroll
Glen Carroll
Jonathan Carroll
Katy C. Carroll
Niall Carroll
Ronald Carson
David Carstens
Kathleen S. Carter
Kathryn Carter
Mary Carter
P.J. Carter
Judy Caruso
Mari Cary
Guido Dalla Casa
Brendan Casey
David Casey
John Casey
Jennifer Casper
Karen Caspers-Curl
Carol Cassinelli
L. Casteel
George Castellani
Joyce Castilloux
Bob Castles
Lindy Cater
Rebecca Cathcart
Harriet Cavalli
Cecelia
Lubosh Cech
Julia Cechvala
Jacquelyn Cedar (Hunley)
Nina Celeste
Evan Centanni
Robert Centis
Bea Challstrom
Alyssa Chamberlin
Barbara Chambers
Christopher Chambers
Joni Chambers
Debra Champagne
Betty Chan
Colleen Chandler
Carmen Chane
Maddie Chane
Debra Chang
Terence Chapin
Caitlin Chapman
Mary Chapman
Brian Chappell
Bonnie Char
Stacey Cheairs
David Chell
Max Cherpitel
Debbie Chewning
Devin Chicras
Eileen Chieco
Victor Chieco
David Childs
Jeff Childs
Jerry Chilson
Lauren Chilson
Cynthia R. Chimienti
Pamela Chipman
Uma Chodron
Carol Christen
Kimberly Christensen
Sandra Christensen
Cale Christi
Renn Christison
Joy Christoferson
Cathryn Chudy
Holly Chung
Allison Ciancibelli
Kellie Ciochon
Anne Cipolla
Gary Cipparone
Donald Cisney
Kathryn Cissna

Campaign A (cont'd)

Kathleen Claire
Bruce Clark
Diana Clark
Gary Clark
James Clark
Michelle Clark
Milton Clark
Patrice Clark
Terri Clark
Tom Clark
Marcia Clarke
Judith Clark-Upton
Patricia Clayton
Ray Clayton
Matthew Cloner
Tom Cloud
Peter Clough
Mary Ann Clymer
John Coake
Martin Coatney
Sheryl Cobain
Ann Cobban
Naida Coburn
Rivkah Coburn
Joyce Cochran
Laurie Coe
James Coffman
Alicia Cohen
Brandon Cohen
Jeff Cohen
Marilyn Cohen
Warren Cohen
Judith Colbert
Gerald Colburn
Henry Cole
Jeff Cole
Jerry Cole
Robin Cole
Theodora Cole
Amanda Coleman
Elizabeth Coleman
Janet Elizabeth Colli
Dustin [Shane] Collings
Ernest Collins
Gordon Collins
Julie Collins
Lyle & Karen Collins
Maura Collins
John Colman-Pinning
Felicia Colvin
Connie Combs
Thoma Comfort
Ian Compton
Angela Cone
Irmgard Conley
Bonnie Frances Connel
Joy Connelly
Aimee Conner
Janet Connolly
Kathy Connor
Valerie Conrad
Jim Conroy
Spencer Consonantia
Lynne Conwell
Lori Cook
Sheila Cook
Theresa Cook
Will Cool
Alexander Cooley
Eva Millette Coombs
Barbara Cooper
Chris Cooper
Diane Cooper
Gretchen Cooper
Jon Cooper
Theodore Cooper
Sheri Copans
Abigail Corbet
Susan Corbin
Elizabeth Cordova
Gordon Corkrum
Lindsey Cornelius
Linda Cornell
Christy Cornelsen
Debbe Cornitius
Nancy Corr
Kristine Corrigan
Demelza Costa
Tony Costa
Lauri Costello
Kim Cote
Jane Cothron
Finn Cottom
May Cotton
Marilyn Couch
Stephen Couche
Joelle Coudriou
Catherine Couey
Huxley Coulter
Wendy Courtemanche
Susie Cousar
Jane Cover
Michael Cowsert
David Cox
Donna Cox
John Cox
Sharon Cox
Shaun Coy
Marc Cozza
C. Cory Craig
Edward Craig
Elise Craig
Jeremy Craig
Shannon Cram
Ginger Cramblet-Macklin
Ann Cramer
Ann Crandall
Daniel Crandall
Donna Crane
Terry Craven
Phil Crawford
Cindy Creager
William Creevey
Janet Cremin
Richard Crerie
Robert M. Cresanto
Mark Crippen
Lauren Crispell
Cheryl Crist
Dulane Crist
Brayden Criswell
Joanna Crocker
Scott Crockett
Aaron Crosetto
Deborah Crosetto
James Crosetto
Bonnie Cross
Merridy Cross
Angela Crouch
Genie Crouch
Thomas Crow
Rebecca Crowder
Mary Felice Crowe
Ian Crowley
Meredith Crowley
Chuck Cruise
Sally Crum
Deborah J. Cruz
Margie Cruz
David Crymes
Wanda Cucinotta
Maria Cuevas
Beth Cullison
David Culver
Heidi Cupp
Michael Curato
Joseph Curiel
Allen Curren
Jon Current
C. Currey
Charles Currey
Arden Currie
Janece Curtis
Sophie Curtis
Sheila Curwen
Stephen and Jacqueline Cutler
Denise Cutrell
Sandra Cutter
Elizabeth Daeges
Judson Daffern
Betty Dagg
Kassy Daggett
Michael Dague
Nancy Dahlberg
Shelley Dahlgren
Kurt Dahlke
Rick Dahms
Christopher Dailey
Felicia Dale
Lawrence Dale
Daniel Dalegowski
Todd Dalotto
Katha Dalton
Mark Dalton
Nicole Dalton
Paul Daly
Randall Dalziel
Judy D'Amore
Randy Dandurand
Dennis Daneau
Marc Daniel
Kathy Daniels
David Daniels-Lee
Carole Danis
Kathleen Dannenhold
Elizabeth Darby
Rebecca Dare
Wanda Darland
Carl Darnell
Kelly Darrah
Kathryn Darrow
Kari Darvill-Peterson
Shane Daugherty
Leslie Davee
Kelly Davenport
Kris Davenport
Robin Davey
James N. Davidson
Susan Davidson
David Davies
Gyllian Davies
Mark Davies
Valerie Davies
Charles Davis
Debra Pennington Davis
Denise Davis
Donna Davis
Dorothy Davis
Edward Davis
Elizabeth Davis
Galen Davis
Jacquie Davis
Judith Davis
Karmin Davis
Kimberly Davis
Linda Davis
Linn Davis
Mark Davis
Mark Davis
Michael Davis
Mike Davis, Sr.
Sandra L. Davis
Trish Davis
Virginia Davis
William Davis, Jr.
David Day
Dennis Day
James Day
Valerie Day
Jody De La Vergne
Yvonne R. De Miranda
Mary de Rosas
Judy De Santis
Linda De Sitter
Deborah Dean
Teddy Deane
Rebecca Deardorff
Douglas Deaton
Christine Deblock
Ana H. DeCastro
Susan Defreitas
Zora DeGrandpre
Darren Deibler
Nathaniel Deines
Lisa Deiss
John Deitch
Bernard Del Valle
Kristin deLancey
Colm Delaney
Brian DeLeon
Ashley Delepine
Lydia Delgado
Jennifer Delker
Christian Dell
Katherine Delleney
Jeanne Deller
Clinton deLongpre
Vicki DeLorey
Holly Delphinidae
Dominic DeLucia
Tara DeMaderios
Ben Demar
Douglas DeMers
Demian
Paul Demianew
Tom Denison
Lori Dennis
Matthew Dennis
Ronnie Dennis
M. Diane Denstedt
John Denton
David Depew
John Depue
Penny Derleth
Roger deRoos
Chad Derosier
Stephan Derout
Erin Derrington
Nora Derrington
Ineke Deruyter
Tom Devine
Paul Dewald
Sharon DeWees
Brigid Dezarn
D. Di Lucca
Melanie Dickson
Laura Dicus
Betsy Diedrick
Sheena Diehl
Rebecca Diehnel
Joseph Digman
Gena DiLabio
Mark Dilley
Alexandra Dilworth
Deb Diment
Wendy DiPeso

Campaign A (cont'd)

Ellen Dittebrandt
Leonard Dixon
Linda Dixon
Melba Dlugonski
Michael Dobbie
Bruce Dobson
Belinda Dodd
Linda Dodson
Steven Dodson
Sharon Doggett
Zachary Dolan
Phyllis Dolph
Marie Doman
Nancy Domini
Del E. Domke
Leah Donahey
Patrick Donaldson
Diane J. Donnellan
Amy Donnelly
Gabriel Donovan
Chris Doree
Elizabeth Doreen
Myra Dorsey
Carol Dotson
Joel Doty
Kathryn Dougan
James Douglas
Joan Douglas
Stuart Douglas
Joshua Dow
Cristin Dowd
Karen Downing
James Doyle
Danielle Doyon
Doug Draime
Beth Drake
Viki Draper
Eileen Drath
Bryan Dressler
Chas Dreyfus
Clara Mae Dross
Ernest Drown
Sophie Duba
Dinah Dubble
Ronald Duber
J. DuBois
John DuBois
Julie Duckworth
Davina Duerr
Laura Dufel
Jack Duggan
Darryl Duke
Eliza Duncan
John Duncan
Virginia Duncan
Dave Dunkak
Loy Dunkel
Ann Dunkin
Huelo Dunn
Maggi Dunn
Kenneth Dunning
Sraddha Durand
Libby Durbin
Sharon Durga
Carey Durgin
Holly Durham-Guckian
Scott Durkee
Tim Durnell
Mary Duvall
John Dwork
Anna Dyer
Howard Dyer
Mary Dyer
Jessica Dymsza-Volk
Ben Earle
Susan Eastman
Paul Eberts
Therese Eby
Bradley Eckerson
Marvin Eckfeldt
Marianne Edain
Carolyn Eden
Erica Eden
Daniel Edgar
Patricia Edgar
Craig Edgington
Ingrid Edstrom
Con Edwards
David L. Edwards
Karin Edwards
Nancy Edwards
Pete Edwards
Willie Edwards
Doyle Edwin
Siobhan Egan
Jon Eggers
Kimmel Eggers
Melissa Ehn
Maria Ehrhardt
Jeremy Ehrlich
Rick Eichstaedt
Shannan Eid
Judith Eigell
Cheryl Eiger
Lee Eisenberg
Kimberly Eisentrager
Lynnette Eldredge
Jules M. and Renee Elias
Tom Ellefsen
Christianna Ellingson
William Elliot
ER Elliott
Tracy Elliott
Wayne Clark Elliott
Elise Elliott-Smith
Jan Ellis
Michael Ellis
Cynthia Ellison
Mona Ellison
Adam Elson
Don Ely
Mary Lou Emerson
Heather Emery
Christine Emmel
Peggy Emptage
Margo Emrich
Melissa Endicott
John Endsley
Hal Enerson
Norman Enfield
Edward England
Ray Engle
Barry Englestad
Cynthia Enlow
Lori Erbs
Jamie Erdman
Alison Erickson
Ingrid Erickson
Michael Erickson
Pamela Erickson
Roddy Erickson
Sylvia Ericson
Karen Erlander
Robert Ernst
Jack Erskine
John Eschen
Velva Eskenazi
Glenn Esler
Pamela Essley
Janet Estep
Joshua Estrada
Robert A. Ethington
Lloyd Etters
Alice Evans
Alissa Evans
Jane Evans
Marsha Evans
Rebecca Evans
Robin Evans
Skyeanna Evans
Franklin Eventoff
George Everett
Ruth Everitt
Lisa F.
Keith Fabing
Laurine Fabrick
Benjamin Fackler-Adams
Gill Fahrenwald
Tim Faiella
Terry Faires
Karen Falk
Robert Falk
Tyler Falk
Brent Fall
Candace Fallon
James Fallon-Cote
Suzan Fant
Adriana Faria
Larry Farmen
Karen Farmer
Adrian Farnsworth
Karen Farnsworth
Mel Farnsworth
M. Farrell
Susan Farrell
Teresa Farrell
Sharon Fasnacht
Joy Fauth
Casey Faylor
Bonny Fazzi
Alexis Fecteau
Gordon Feighner
Glennie Feinsmith
Michael Felber
Michael Feldman
Mary Felkins
Paul Fellows
Jeff Felton
Lois Fenstemaker
Steven Fenwick
Mary Ferm
Jerry Ferraccio
John Ferrante
Rebecca Ferrell
Malcolm Ferrier
Jane Fetisoff
Sharon Fetter
Craig Feyk
Fred Fiedler
Sarah Field
Sheila Filan
Christina Files
Sally Filler
Jamie Fillmore
Lisa Finch
Suzann Finch
Joan Findlay
Karen Finkle
Sam Finkle
Andrea Finley
Daniel Finn
Ronald Firgens
Marilyn Firth
Karin Fischer
Robert Fishburn
Pat Fisk
Anne Fitzgerald
John Fix
Gary Fleck
Gary Fleck
Doug Fleming
Nicole Flessner
Tim Flewelling
Andrea Flora
Jozon Florence
Andrea Flower
Martha Flynn
Katy Fogg
Victoria Folker
Kathy Foote
Robert Foote
Micky Forbes
Nicole Forbes
Leeann Ford
Robin Ford
Rosemary Forester
Brad Forkner
Sarah Formica
Charles Fornia
Courtenay Forte
Eric Fosburgh
Kamiel Foskey
Annabel Foster
Bruce Foster
Caleb Foster
Carole Foster
Dianne Foster
Gordon Foster
Jim Fotter
Dawna Fowler
Diane Fox
George Fox
Howard Fox
Larry Fox
Nick Frackelton
Ray Fraga
Norm Frampton
Eileen Frances
Brannden Francisco
Douglas Frank
Marj Franke
Jeremy Franklin
Luther E. Franklin
Martha Franklin
William and Wanda Franklin
Paul Franzmann
Marilyn Frasca
Emily Fraser
Laura Fraser
Joan Frazee
Kathleen Frazier
Rachel Fredericks
Jerri (Geraldine) Fredin
Christina Fredrickson
Richard Fredrickson
Mike Freeman
Timara Freeman-Young
Harry Freiberg
Stanton Freidberg
Avis Frein
Wayne Frey
Nancy Friday
Norma Friday
Greta Fridlund
Larry Fried
Paula Friedman
Phyllis Friedman
Marvin Fries
Judy Friesem
Ann Frodel
Ann Marie Frodel
Arlene Fromer
Kathleen Fruge-Brown
James Frye
Kimie Fujimoto

Campaign A (cont'd)

Andrew Fuller
Lori Fulsaas
Nan Fulton
Mannfriedf Funk
Elizabeth Funsch
Cabot Fuqua
Kate Fuqua
Julie Furnish
Kathy Furtado
K. Fussell
Andrew Gach
Brenda Gaines
Malcolm Galatz
Nancy Gale
Justin Gall
M.J. Gallagher
Kelli Gallaheeer
Lisa Galvin
Sara Gamble
Matthew Gamlen
Ralph T. Gamon
Aditya Ganapathiraju
Sanjay Gangadhara
Veronica Gann
Mary Garbarino
Sandra Garcia-Pelayo
Michelle Gardiner
Carolyn Janko Gardner
Elizabeth Gardner
Peggy Gardner
Susan Gardner
R. Garfield
Anu Garg
Kathy Garrett
Richard Garrett
Kenneth Garringer
Midori Garrison
Kathleen Garrity
Oscar Gastiaburu
Volkmar Gaussmann
Sandra Gavutis
Kathleen Geary
Nora Gedgaudas
Eric Geisler

Lisa Gelder
Robert Gellert
Deborah Gengler
Elena Georgiadou
Renita Gerard
April Gerell-Stiles
Dan Gerhard
Delia Gerhard
Carol Gerl
Tyler Gerlach
Norma Jean Germond
Matt Gerrans
Linda Gerrard
Nina Gettler
Tracey Ghassaei
Vafa Ghazi
Ronald Gibbons
Chris Gibbs
Gary Gibson
James Gibson
Katherine Gibson
Stephen Gibson
Anna Giedwoyn
Paul Giering
John Gieser
Dana Giffen
Keith Gigliello
Robert E Gigliotti
Gary Gilardi
Bryan Gilbert
Dan Gilbert
Mark Gilbert
Bruce Gilbertson
C. Giles
Lisa Giles
Judith Gilles
Michael Gillis
Carrie Gillman
Fay Gilman
Laurrien Gilman
Blaine Gilruth
Beverly Gilyeart
Claude Ginsburg
Walt Giuffrida

Nancy Giuliani
Jackie Giuliano
Kat Gjovik
Shirley Gladish
Jim Glasgow
Michael Glass
David Gleason
Shelly Glenn
Troy Glennon
Julia Glover
Robert Kenny and Julia Glover
Richard Glynn
Allan Goldberg
Marshall Goldberg
Melissa Goldberg
Nancy Golden
Patricia Golem
Elinor Gollay
Karl Golts
Doug Gomez
Emanuelle Gomez
Aaron Gonsiorek
Sergio Gonzalez
Cory Gooch
Linda Good
Joy Goode
Jodi Goodman
Beverly Goodrich
Gaylee Goodrich
Whitsitt Goodson
Karen Goodwin
Pamela Goodwin
Lindsey Goodwin-Grayzel
Michael Gorby
Charles Gorder
Don Gordon
John Gordon
Roswell C. Gordon
Richard Gorringe
Shari Gos
Katherine Gosnell
Adam Gossett

Gene Gossett
Joan Govedare
Marianna Grabhorn
Bradley Grable
Janelle Grace
Leslie Grace
Ruby Grad
JoAnne Graf
Steven Grafe
Adam Graffunder
Becky Graham
Laura Graham
Linda Graham
Virginia Graham
Kaitlin Grammer
Alex Grande
Kathryn Grandfield
Julane Grant
C. Grant-Howell
Claudia Graver
Lizajane Gray
Rebecca Gray
James Grayson
Lee Ann Greaves
Holly Green
Judith Green
Leslie Green
Mitchell Green
Robin Green
Steve Green
Daniel Greenblatt
Arthur Greenlee
Linda Greenway
Danny Gregg
Wendy Gregor
Barbara Gregory
Ryan Gregory
Genevieve Greiter
Laura Gresham
Susan Gresia
Sharon L. Griepp
Rachel Griffith
James Grimard
Gary Gripp

Jo Grishman
Jim Groat
Suzanne Grogan
Jan Groh
Jenny Gronholt
Robert Gronhovd
Debra Gronning
Alicia Gross
Barbara Gross
Joan Gross
Sonnie Grossman
Jon Grout
Dena Grubaugh
Leif Grunseth
Jessica Guadagna
Mary Guard
Mark Guenther
Kristin Guest
Doug Guillot
Sherrie Guilmette
Jon Gulledge
Reece Gullett
Nate Gulley
Ellie Gunn
Gerri Gunn
Rand Guthrie
Jack Guyot
Judy Gwaltney
Abra Gwartney
Otto Gygax
E.H.
Corey Haan
Sylvia Haase
Lynn Hacklin
Barbara Haddad
Alison Hadley
Virginia Hadley
Darren Hadlock
Kim Haeg
Gail Hagen
Scott Hagen
Kale Haggard
Terry Haight
Travis Haight

Beth Hailey
Kyle Haines
Jana Hair
Melody Haislip
Mickie Hale
Adrian Haley
Ayron Haley
Sharon Haley
Jeremy Halinen
Alex Hall
David Hall
Jerilyn Hall
Jewel Hall
Walter Haller
Jesiah Hallford
Mary Hallock
Geoffrey Hamada
MaryEllen, Donald, Randall, Todd, Todd Jr. Hamblin
Barbara Hamby
Adama Hamilton
Cheryl Hamilton
Jesse Hamilton
Julie Hamilton
Patricia Hamilton
Steven Hamm
Alice Hammer
Sherri Hammond
Darryl Hammonds
Dorothy Hanes
Julie Hankin
Laura Hanks
Denise Hanley
Nancy Hannah
Steve Hanrahan
John Hansen
Linda Hansen
Marc Hansen
Mykle Hansen
Nancy Hansen
Duane Hanson
Lynn Hanson
Mark Hanson

Rod Hanson
David Haramoto
Marilyn Harbaugh
Keeley Harding
Carol Harlow
Elaine Harman
Heather Harmon
Kara Harms
John Harper
Ron Harrell
Kerrie Harrigan
Judith Harriman
Allan N. Harris
Pamela Harris
Saskia Harris
Stephanie Harris
Steve Harris
Christine Harrison
Deborah Harrison
Evelyn Harrison
Joanna Harrison
Kasey Harrison
Lee Harrison-Smith
Scott Hart
Susan Hart
Susan Hartford
Charles Hartik
Anne Hartley
Betsy Hartley
Linda Hartley
Karen Hartman
Lauren Hartmann
Lorraine Hartmann
Stewart Hartsfield
M. Harvey
Teri Harvey
Karin Hasselberg
Lynn Hatcher
Mary Hatten
Marna Hauk
Betty Hauser
James Hauser
Todd Hauser
Rich Havas

Campaign A (cont'd)

Corey Havens
Candyce Hawak
Kaleen Hawk
Indrani Hawkins
Rebecca Hawley
Phyllis Hayes
Russ Hayes
Frances Haywood
Richard Hazard
Colleen Hazelrigs
Paul Hazen
Deanne Hazleton
Pat Hazlett
Joe Healy
Sarah Heath
Hugh and Wilma Heber
Morgan Heckman
David Hedges
Gregory Heffron
Linda Heiartz, Jr.
Kenneth Heikkila
Margaret Heim
Albert Heimdahl
Jill Hein
Lisa Heinkel
Rita Heinz
Jill Heishman
Ms. Hekate
Bruce Hellemn
Ann Helmick
Geraldine Helwing
Joe Hendershot
Jeanne Henderson
Kathryn Henderson
Ronda Henderson
Susan Henderson
Sandra Heneri
Rosa Henritzy
Carole Henry
Marilee Henry
Frederic Hensen
Andrew Hepworth
Kirsi Hepworth
Michael Herbert

Paul Herbert
Jeff Herda
Eric Herde
Peggy Herlocker
Chris Herman
Jeanette Herman
Domingo Hermosillo
Wendy L. Hernandez
Sandra L. Herndon
Benedict Herrman
Orianna Herrman
Karen Hertz
Carla Hervert
Dan Hess
Steven Hess
Barbara Hetrick
John Hewes
Brittney Hewitte
R. Heyward
David Heywood
J. David Heywood
Jennifer Hiam
Jane Hickey
Gina Hicks
Matt Hicks
Arvella Hietala
Eric Higbee
Michael Higgins
Saralyn Hilde
Bonnie Hildebrand
Carole Hildebrandt
Todd Hildebrandt
Nita Hildenbrand
Bill Hill
Michael and Barbara Hill
Ryam Hill
Beth Hilliard
Mary Hills
Carol Hiltner
Ward Hinds
Bill Hinely
Debra Hines
Richard Hines
Sandra Hinson

Kristine Hinsvark
Jennifer Hintz-Romano
Melissa Hinwood
Joel Hirsch
Alex Hirsekorn
Michelle Hirsekorn
Rich Hladky
Diane Hobart
Marcia Hobart
Susan Hobbs
Kelly Hochendoner
Julie Hockett
Phyllis Hockley
Richard Hodgin
Terrance Hodgins
Hall Hodgson
Minerva Hodis
William Hoffer
Erica Hoffman
Jason Hoffman
Judith Hoffman
Kris Hoffmann
Sherrie Hoffmann
Bryna Hoffmeister
Lorene Hofstrand
Eugene Hogan
Renee Hoglen
Sam Holden
J. Greg Holder
Philip Holder
Sharon Holford
Katherine Holland
Brian Hollander
Lori Hollow
Kathleen Holloway
Ann Hollyfield
Lonn Holman
Richard Holman
Star Holmberg
Fran Holme
Catherine Holmes
Charlotte Holmes
Elizabeth Holmes
William Holmes

Nathan Holst
Chandra Holsten
Marcia Homer
Nikki Honey
Erin Honeycutt
Usha Honeyman
Billy Hooker
Merle Hooley
Hilarie Hope
Shannon Hopkins
Deborah Hopper
Julie Horan
Karen Horn
Judy Hornaday
Donna Hortsch
Ann Horwitt
Alexander Hosea
Helen Hossner
Abigail Houghton
Donna Houghton
Benjamin House
John House
Nathan House
Yelena House
Mandi Houston
Stephanie Houston
William Howald
Dale Howard
Helon Howard
Shawn Howard
Greg Howarth
Karen Howe
Fran Howse
Lester and Judy Hoyle
Brian Hoyt
Christopher Hoyt
Helena Hoyte
Noah Hubbard
Laura Huddlestone
Rosanne Hudson
Virginia Hudson
Edward Hueneke
Chris Huffman
Andrew Hughes

Linda Hughes
Pat Hughes
Stephen Hughes
Laura Hull
Douglas Humes
Geordie Humphrey
Robert Humphrey
Mary Ellen Hunner
Peter Hunrichs
Nancy Hunt
John Hunter
Katharina Hunter
Laurie Hunter
Sarah Hunter
Cherie Hunton
Jenn Hurley
J. Hurner
Jetta Hurst
Erika Huston
Anne Hutchins
Graham Hutchins
Bryce Hutchinson
Perry Hutchison
Dolores Hutson
Don Hutton
Phu Huynh
Stuart Hyatt
Kerby Hyland
Lauren Ice
Ben Ignacio
Mana Iluna
Leon Imas
Mary Ann Imkamp
Fred Ingram
Michael Iris
Heather Isaac
Nina Isaacson
John Isham
Matthew Iskra
Maxine Israel
Lenora Ivanek
Jeri Iversen
Amy Iverson
Gregory Iverson

Michael Iverson
Becky Ives
Aria Jackson
Carroll Jackson
Megan Jackson
William Jackson
Diane Jacob
Elizabeth Jacob
Ren Jacob
Todd Jacobs
Diane Jacobsen
Don Jacobson
Jane Jacobson
Mark Jacobson
Susan Jacobson
Callee Jaeger
Leonard Jaffee
Jef Jaisun
Annah James
Lenard James
Sandra James
Sibyl James
Jennifer Jamison
Mitchell Jancic
Susan Janelle
Alexi K. Jansen
Werner Janssen
Gayle Janzen
Pat Jarvis
Caroline Jauch
Nyla Jebousek
Eli Jemison
S. Jenika
Linda Jenkins
Brent Jensen
Richard Jensen
L. Jerene
Lisa Jester
Randal Jeter
Jane Jin
Fitzpatrick Jodi
David Johannsen
Kenneth Johansson
Marie Johantgen

Bryan Johns
Scott Johnsen
Ann Johnson
Becky Johnson
Carol Johnson
Diane Johnson
Harold Johnson
Iskra Johnson
Janet Johnson
Janet Johnson
Joan Johnson
Karen Johnson
Karen Rae Johnson
Lawrence Johnson
Lin Johnson
Loren Johnson
Lorraine D. Johnson
Maile Johnson
Mark Johnson
Mervin Johnson
Nancy Johnson
Randy Johnson
Robert Johnson
Stephen Johnson
Stuart Johnson
Wendy Johnson
Kristy Johnsson
Dayna Johnston
Eli Johnston
Gordon Johnston
Jill Johnston
Kristine Johnston
Robert Johnston
Mary Jokela
Arnold Jolles
Bobette Jones
Brittany Jones
Chris Jones
Edward Jones
Eleanor M. Jones
Frances Jones
Harriet Jones
James Jones
Jessalynn Jones

Campaign A (cont'd)

Jessica Jones
Johnny Jones
June Jones
Kenneth Jones
Kenny Jones
Kim Jones
Mark Jones
Michael Jones
Mr & Mrs B. Jones
Robert Jones
Sharon Jones
Rachel Jordan
Vanessa Joseph
Adeluisa Judal
Brandon Juhl
Ralph Jull
Karn Junkinsmith
Barbara Jurgens
Karen Jurgensen
Tim Kadrmas
Nataly Kagan
Alan Kahn
Tom Kaitchuck
Sergey Kakorin
Ryan Kale
Brad Kalita
Karen Lyons Kalmenson
Erika Kane
Heather Kane
C. Kanemori
Blair Kangley
Karl Kanthak
Karen Kantor
Jennifer Kantver
Eliot Kaplan
Robert B. Kaplan
Stephen Karakashian
Lisa Karas
Gail Karges
Maury Karhus
Muddassir Karim
Aaron Karlgaard
Craig Karls
Fred Karlson
Susan Karr
Verna Kartak
Gail Karuna
Stephen Kaseman
Lisa Kaser
Ed Kashuba
Paul Katen
Jody Katopothis
Marla Katz
Nancy Katz
Meghan Kaul
Lorraine Kay
Steven Kay
Bergith Kayyali
Tim Kearney
Earle Keathley
Michelle Keating
Jeanne Keckler
Alicia Keefe
Dan Keefe
Lexi Keeler
Margaret Keene
Renae Keep
Denise Keeton
Rick Keffer
Erne Kegel
Fred Keip
Teri Keippela
Jeff Keitges
Alison Keith
Lewis Keizer
Amanda Keller-Scott
Bill Kellogg
Susanna Kellogg
Angela Kelly
David Kelly
Dennis Kelly
JoAnne Kelly
Kimberly Kelly
Kristin Kelly
Natalie Kelly
Pamela Kelly
Stephanie Kelly
Tabor Kelly
Josh Kelsch
Dorin Kemmerle
Damian Kemp
Judith Kemp
Dan Kemper
Kathleen Kendrick
Barbara Kendziorski
Catherine Kennedy
Richard Kennedy
Karen Kennell
Melanie Kenoyer
Kirsten Kenyon
Mark Kenzer
Bernard Keough
Jane Kepner
Nicole Kerby
Brian Kerkvliet
Kimberlee Kerley
David Kerlick
Alison Kerns
Allie Kerr
Vicki Kerr
John Kersting
Vicki Kertz
Beth Kerwin
Elizabeth Kerwin
Michal Kessler
Charles Kettle
Christopher Key
Wade Keye
Kimberly Keyes
Catherine Keys
David C. Keysor
Barbara Keyt
Harijot Khalsa
Viriam Khalsa
Zahra Khan
Mark Kidd
Joshua Kielas
Sally Kiepe
Jamie Kifer
Kathy Kifer
Martin Kilbourne
Nancy Kilgore
Gary Killpack
Marilyn Kimmerling
Carol Kimsey
David Kincheloe
Suzanne Kindland
Craig King
Lauri King
Lidian King
N'ecole King
Ryan King
Sarah King
Timothy King
Kay Kinghammer
Joanne Kingsbury
Sharon Kingsford
Eleanor Kinnebrew
Richard Kirchhoff
Debbie Kirkland
Jane Kirkland
Brook Kirklin
Lindea Kirschner
Rick Kirschner
Kathy Kirsh
Mary Ann Kirsling
Margaret Kistler
Maggie Kitson
Kit Kittredge
Ken Klaas
Shelley Klappholz
Max Klare
Chas Klein
Emma Klein
James Klein
Susan Klein
Vanessa Nixon Klein
Joel Kleinbaum
Hans Kleinknecht
Roy Kleiven
Mark Klemmer
Miriam Kley
Miriam Kley
Kitty Klitzke
K. Klooster
Ken Klos
Shannon Kluever
Richard Knablin
Arthur Knapp
Dee Knapp
Karl Knaub
Tim Knight
John Knipe
Sue Knipe
Jason Knopp
Katherine Knowles
Heidi Knutson
Kathleen Knutson
Maureen Knutson
Mike Knutson
Suzy Knutson
Gary Koch
Elizabeth Koepp
Stephen Koepp
Martha Koester
Steve Kofahl
Gary Kohtala
Madeline Kokes
Frank Kolwicz
Amy Kolzow
M. Komisar
Jeff Komisarof
Peter Martin and Kathleen Koprivec
Jennie Kordenat
Greg Kornberg
Lisa Kortangian
G. Kortes
Walter Kortge
Thomas Kostes
Agnes Kovacs
Laurelee Kovacs-Szabo
Ian Kovtunovich
Ted Kowalczuk
Peter Kowalke
Teresa Kowalski
William Kownacki
Joan Krakowiak
Kim Kramer
C. Fuji Kreider
Mark Kreilkkamp
Jennifer Krerowicz
Geri Kromminga
Janis Krug
Chris Krumm
Martha Ksiezopolski
Gene Kuechmann
Susan Kuhn
Linda Kulm
Marjorie Kundiger
Aaron Kunkle
Jane Kurzeja
Melanie Kuss
Helen Kutz
Michele Kyle
Sherri Ladd
Michael Lafferty
JoAnne LaFleur
Alvin Lafon
Jeffrey LaGasse
Daniel Lahey
Julie Laidlaw
Larry Laitner
Amanda Lamb
Ashley Lamb
Barbara Lamb
Lynn Lamb
P. Earlene Lamb
Eric Lambart
Rick Lambert
Kim Lamont
Jo Landefeld
Judy Lander
Madeleine Landis
Corine Landrieu
Ian Landry
Marion E. Lane (Mimi)
Philip Lang
Thomas Lange
Mike Langen
Charles Langford
David Langton
David Lanz
Cheryl Laos
Mike LaPorte
Maitreya Laridon
Chris LaRoche
Jo Larsen
Mary Larsen
Andrew Larson
Judy Larson
Marian Larson
Pat Larson
Eli Lassman
Lynn Latta
Barbara Laudan
Claryce Lauer
Diane Laughter
Nadine LaVonne
Lenora Lawrence
Rhett Lawrence
David & Judith Laws
Charles Lawson
Joan Lawson
Robin Lawton
Thomas Layne
Jo Anne Laz
Nina Le Baron
D.A. Lean
Joline Lear
Julie Leavenworth
Cheri Leavitt
Everell LeBaron
G. LeBlanc
Marci LeBrun
Adrienne Lederer
James Ledford
Audrey Ledgerwood
Lynn Ledgerwood
Barb Lee
Doris Lee
Martin Lee
Ramona Lee
Sau Fong Lee
Tiana Lee
Kathryn Leech
Kimberly Leeper
Kimberly Leeth

Campaign A (cont'd)

John Leffler
Gina Lefranc
Laura Legere
Joyce Leggatt
Elisabeth Lehmans
Lynda Lehrke
Katie Lehto
Lydia Beth Leimbach
Jenny Leis
Gary Leisky
Kevin Leja
Vanessa Leja
Jim LeMaster
Pam Leneve
Brooke Lenzi
Nancy Leon
Rondi Leonard
Scott Leopold
Francisco Leos
Patrick D. Lesher
Alice Levey
Beth Levin
William Levin
William Levin
Tracy Levine
Idil Levitas
Peggy Leviton
Kathlyn Lew
Abigail Lewis
Darelene Lewis
David Lewis
James Lewis
Kimberly S. Lewis
Leah Lewis
Natalie Lewis
Richard Lewis
Susanna Liberty
Jeffrey Librett
Susan Liddell-Jones
Jean Liebert
Mary Liebert
Judith Lienhard
Jasmin Liepa
Ted Light

Van Likes
Rachel Lileet-Foley
Eric Lind
Lianne Lindeke
John Lindman
Linda K. Lindquist
Ilona Lindsay
Katie Lindsay
Barry Linehan
Margaret Linn
Ann Linnell
Roger Lippman
Sirene Lipschutz
Judith K. Litt
Mike Litt
Nancy Little
Lois S. Livingston
Shellie Littau
Colleen Llywelyn
Clyde Alan Locklear
David Lockman
Janet Lockwood
Brenda Loew
Saab Lofton
Corina Logan
Jonathan Logan
Kerry Logan
Michael Logan
Susan Hess Logeais
Marjorie Lohrer
Patti Lomont
Sean London
Gordon Long
Herbert Long
John Long
Sheila Long
Tom Long
John Longenbaugh
Lora Looman
Catha Loomis
Marcia Loraditch
Diane Loran
Lori Lorant
Teresa Loreen

Ruth Lorenz
Frank and Janet Loudin
Dorothy Louis
Peggy Love
Steve Lovelace
Allison Lovell
Mike Lovely
Sara Lovtang
Sammy Low
Patsy Lowe
Rebecca Lowe
Rob Lowe
Stacey Lowe
Emily Lubahn
Melissa Lubofsky
Matt Lucas
Paula Lucas
Philip Lucas
Mary Lucchesi
Louise B. W. Luce
Thom Lufkin
William Luhr
Kate Lukas
Lyn Lukich
Jacob Lundberg
Jamie Lundin
C.W. Lupton
Gene Luttmann
Aarin Lutzenhiser
Mary Lyda
Carmen n'ha Lydia
Robert Lyle
Jeff Lyles
Nancy Lyles
Grace Lynch
Tifni T. Lynch
Dianne Lynn
Gregory Lyon
Marlana Lytehaause
N.J. Mac
Daniel Macca
Deborah Maccabee
Lindsay Macdonald
Jessica MacGilvray

R. MacGinnitie
Yaney MacIver
Wolfgang Mack
W. A. Mackay
Wray Mackay
Heather MacKenzie
Judith Mackenzie
Quinn MacKenzie
Lisa Macki
Richard Mackin
Genevieve MacKinnon
Sally Mackle
Diann MacRae
Karen Madden
Ellen Maddex
Arthur Maddox
Calli Madrone
Annie Madsen
Ellen Madsen
Carolyn Madson
Gary Magdalik
Patti Maggiora
Judy Maguire
Adare Mahan
Mary Lee Mahar
Larry Mahlis
Elizabeth Maier
Liz Malinoff
Fred Mallery
Michelle Mallett
Chuck Malley
Rita Mallon
Nathaniel Malo
Carl Malone
Margaret Malone
Susan Mandel
Hersh Mandelman
Courtney Maness
Sarah Mangum
Nick Maniatis
Barbara Manildi
David and Nancy Mann
Larry Mann
Richard John Mann

Denise Mannino
Eva Mansell
Jennifer Mansson
Nicholas Manusos
James Marceau
Jonathan Marchan
Terry Marchion
Buzz Marcus
Debbie Marcus
Jesse Marcus
Margo Margolis
Tina Margulies
Carol Mariano
Sharon Maribona
Renee Marie-Gumpel
Laura Marinelli
Joe Marino
Andreas Mark
Steven Markham
Shannon Markley
Jana Marks
Kim Marks
Emilie Marlinghaus
Judie Maron-Friend
Frances Marquart
Byron Marsh
Michael Marsh
Janice Marshall
Joshua Marshall
Arianna Martell
Barbara Martin
Celia Martin
Evan Martin
Harry Martin
Joan Martin
Layne Martin
Lindsay Martin
Melodie Martin
Millard Martin
Sandra Martin
Scott Martin
Wendy Martin
Diana Martinez
Dianne Martino

Paul Martinsen
Deborah Martyn
Bill Mason
Evelyn Mason
James Mason
Miriam Mason
Katherine Masotti
Duncan Massey
Jim Massey
Rik Masterson
Mary Mataja
Steve Matera
Sandra Mathews
Todd Mathews
Valarie Matinjussi
Cheryl Matta
Katherine Mattes
Virginia Matthews
Barbara Matthiessen
Sandy Mattison
Sheyla Mattos
Martha Mattus
Donna Maupin
Robin Mauro
Steven Mauvais
Mahrukh Mavalvala
Eric Max
Pamela Maxfield
Nancy May
Mike Mayer
Kathleen Mayo
Geoffrey Mays
Christopher Maziekien
Judith Mc Allister
Marianne Mc Clure
Dawn Mc Dowell
Patrick Mc Intyre
Carol McAdams
Sean Mcallister
MF McAuliffe
Carol Feinberg Mcbrian
Heidi McBride
Rich McBride
Robert McBride

Roberta McBride
Shaun McBride
Melissa McCabe
Roland McCarter
Ai McCarthy
Diane McCarthy
Kenneth Mccarty
Scott McCaughey
Harrison Mccauley-Hill
Evelyn McChesney
Mark McClaughry
Mauria McClay
Sean McClintock
James McClure
L. A. McClure
Nancy McCollum
Steve McComas
Jean McComb
Melinda McComb
Leith McCombs
Kelly McConnell
Velma Mcconnell
Jim McConville
Melissa McCool
Carlyn McCormack
Colleen McCormick
Maureen McCormick
Mike McCormick
Craig McCourt
Louellen McCoy
Ulanah McCoy
Gloria McCracken
Chris McCraw
Dan McCrea
Lani McCullough
Dassi McCurdy
Carol McCutcheon
Catherine McDonald
Nancy McDonald
Cassandra McDougall
Susan McDowell
Andrew Mcelvaney
Caterina McElwain
Hannah McFarland

Campaign A (cont'd)

Barett McGavock
Karen McGeehan
Mary McGilvra
Martin McGinn
Donlon McGovern
Luke McGowan
Wendy McGowan
Corinne McGrady
Doug McGuire
Henry McGuire
Shelley McGuire
Jennifer Mcherson
Brad McKay
Barbara Ann Mckee
Wendy McKee
Lori McKenna
Rick Mckenney
Michael McKenzie
Dennis McKeown
Tina McKim
Kathleen McKinney
Corey McKrill
Charlene McLaughlin
Kent McLaughlin
Cherrie McLean
Cynthia J. McLean
Sean McLean
Justin Mcleod
Charlotte McLucas
Gwen McMahon
John McMullen
Deanna McNallen
Jonathan McNamara
Mark McNown
Susan McRae
Janis McSharry
Pam McWethy
Karin Meacham
Audrey Meade
Erica Meade
Mary Kathleen Meadows
Kathleen Meagher
Sylvia Medeiros
Robert Medley
Helen Meeker
Jonna Mehrens
Kristi Meier
Garrett Meigs
Scott Meihn
Elaine Meis
Drew Meisel
Lora Meisner
Tom Melancon
Ella Melik
Christine Menefee
Ramona Menish
Michael Menke
Gerardo Mercado
Gloria Merriam
Linda Merrick
Lisa Merrick
Nancy Merrick
Rodney Merrill
Regna Merritt
Nancy Merryman
Julie Messerer
Mark Messinger
Gary Methven
Joanne Metroplos
Harold Metzger
Paul Metzger
Laurie Meyer
Marlene Meyer
Nick Meyer
Susan Meyer
Henry Meyerding
Christine Meyers
Gary P. Meyers
Timoithy Meyers
Brenda Michaels
Raelyn L. Michaelson
Shasta Mickali
DG Mickels
Azalea Micketti
Andrew Middlebrooks
Anne Middleton
David R. Miga
Alisha Migliore
Jeff Mihalyo
Allison Miles
Jonathan Miles
Joseph Miles
Kate Miles
Mike Miles
Douglas Milholland
David Miliotis
Susan Milke
Alain Millar
Carole Miller
Carole Miller
Celinda Miller
Doug Miller
Jeffery Miller
Jeramie Miller
Julie Miller
Katharine Miller
Keith Miller
Linda Miller
Max Miller
Patricia Miller
Ronald Miller
Ryan Miller
Sanna Miller
Susan Miller
Timothy Miller
Keith Milligan
Gerry Milliken
Katherine Millman
Matthew Mills
Jim Milstead
Monte Minchow
Ted Mindt
Jim Minick
Lynn Minneman
Barbara Minter
Neil Mintz
Michelle Miranda
Karen Mirande
Chuck Missar
Betsy Mitchell
Erik Mitchell
Lowell Mitchell
Mary Jane Mitchell
Ronnie Mitchell
Norman Mitchell-Babbitt
Valentina Mitroshkova
Keisuke Mizuno
Emily Moddelmog
Alan Moen
Sara Moen
James Moffat
Jara Mohlman
Elizabeth Mohn
Jay Mohr
Robert Mohr
Tamara Mohr
Jeffrey Moidel
Deborah Mokma
Bette Moksnes-Koski
Katherine Molina
Dorothy Moloney
Carol Monahan
Dustin Monda
Ryan Monda
Randal D. Monge
Eric Monroe
John Monroe
Sang Montage
Chariti Montez
Edith Montgomery
Michelle Moodie
Kathryn Moody
Gary Moon
Sarah Moon
Alan Moore
Barbara Moore
Janie Moore
Jolynn Moore
June Moore
Kathleen Moore
Mardell Moore
Matthew Moore
Ralph Moore
Sandra Moore
Thaddeus Moore
Dave Moorehead
Marion Moos
Barbara Mor
Evelyn Morabe
Rikki Moress
Kay Moretti
Ben Morgan
Kelly Morgan
Louise Morgan
Brian Moriarity
Anna Moritz
Stuart Mork
Jennifer Morkunas
Julaine Morley
Larry Morningstar
Hal Moroff
Donald Morris
Linda Morris
Nancy Morris
Teresa Morris
William Morris
Anita Morrison
Diane Morrison
Bruce Morrow
Jo Morton
Andrea Moser
Susan Moser
Tom Moses
Celia Moss
David Moss
Gerald Moss
Susan Mossuto
Julie Motschenbacher
Stephanie Mottola
Reagan Mouritsen
R. Movsky
Greg Mueller
Laura Mueller
Lynda Mueller
Robert Mueller
Teresa Mueller
Tina Mulcahy
James Mulcare
Joel Mulder
Jennifer Mulgrew
Christine Mullaney
Cathryne Mullen
Don Mullinnex
Pennie Mumm
Will Munger
Kathryn Munson
Marlyn Munter
Heather Murawski
Joannie Murayama
Rian Murnen
Kerstin Murphy
Mary Murphy
Meaghen Murphy
Michael Murphy
Michael Murphy
Phyllis Murra
Cristy Murray
Donna Murray
Pam Murray
Tiffany Murray
Deven Murti
Kenneth Myers
Linda Myers
Lindsay Myers
Solaria Myers
Paul Myhre
Michael Nabielski
Shelley Naftel
Kay Nairn
Jenna Nand
Emilie Nangle
Billie Nash
N. Nash
Susan Nash
Diane Nash-McFeron
Elena Naskova
Yogi Nasser
Areli Nathanson
Jim Nave
Peg Nave
Brent Naylor
James Naylor
Elizabeth Neal
Grace Neff
Jill Neill
Mary Nelligan
Tom Nelligan
Erik Noel Nelsen
Amy Nelson
Bette Nelson
Kathie Nelson
Kathleen Nelson
Rusty and Nancy Nelson
Ruth Nelson
Shawn Nelson
Shirley Nelson
Jim Nendel
William Nerin
Ian Nesbit
John Nestor
Erin Netter
Corliss Neuber
Joe Neumann
Thomas Neumayer
Marty Neuschwanger
Richard Nevels
William Neves
Bethany Nevitt
Hazel Newlevant
Charlotte Newman
Constance Newman
Liane Newman
Will Newman
Heather Newton
Jennifer Newton
David Nez
Thomas Ngo
Amanda Nguyen
Dave Nichols
Nikki Nichols
Stephen Nichols
Allan Nicholson
Ronald Nicholson
Sara Nicholson
Nancy Nickelson
Linda Niehaus

Campaign A (cont'd)

Lauriette Nielsen
Kael Nielson
Mary Nieman
John Niendorf
Andreas Niesen
Liesbeth Nieuwenhuijse
Shahrokh Nikfar
John Nikkel
Donna Nikzi
Amanda Niles
Billy Niles
Kim Niles
Dagmar Nilsen
Donovan Nin
Sedrick Nin
Ellen Nippolt
Avantika Nirupama
Andrea Nix
April Nixdorf
John Noe
Joanne Noel
Lee Nolan
Richard Noll
Elaine Nonneman
Jan Nontell
Ted Noon
Phillip Norman
Carol North
Ray North
Rick North
Patty Northman
Erin Nortrup
Susan Norwood
Denis Nosbisch
Ellen Nottingham
Mike Nowicki
Robert Nowlan
Mike Nuess
Tegra Nuess
Charlotte Nuessle
Dana Nunnelly
Roger Nusic
Paula Nuspl
Zach Nylen
Michael Oaks
Richard Oaks
Bonny Oborn
John Obremski
Sandra Obremski
John O'Brien
Pam Obst
Lani O'Callaghan
Ann O'Connell
Octopus Ink Tattoo
Mitch Odom
Colleen ODonnell
Julie O'Donnell
Kathleen O'Donoghue
E. O'Halloran
Ellen Ohara
Frazer O'Hara
Ms. Maggie O'Hara
Shaina Okalani
Donna O'Kelley
Frodo Okulam
Michael Olcsvary
Cyrus Oleary
Maureen E. O'Leary
Eve Olive
Sheelagh Oliveria
Edward Olivos
Rodi (Rosemary) O'Loane
Alice Olsen
Gretchen Olsen
Andrea Olson
Joanne Olson
Brandon Olszewski
Astrida Onat
George O'Neil
Molly O'Neil
Carol ONeill
Eleni O'Neill
Paul Ordway
Linda Orgel
Mike Ortiz
Silas Ortiz
Correen Orton
Douglas Orton
Rainee Osborn
Kim Osborne
Maureen Oscadal
Janice Ososke
Norm Osterman
Susan Osterman
William P. Ostrander, Jr.
Allison Ostrer
Debra O'Sullivan
Tracy Ouellette
Lynne Oulman
Susan Overback
Ruth Owen
Elaine Packard
Ted Padgett
John Page, Jr.
Nicholas Page
Patricia Page
Ian Page-Echols
Brandon Palmer
Carol Palmer
Judy Palmer
Libby Palmer
Jane Palmieri
Janice Palmrose
Della Pangborn
Dennie Pannell
Sarah Panullo
Ildiko Papp
Jeannie Park
Sylvia Park
Susan Parke
Jean Parken
Dave Parker
David and Judith Parker
Dennis J. Parker
Kelley Parker
Michael Parker
Paul Parker
Stan Parker
Michael Parkis
Amy Parks
Gary Parks
Mary Parmenter
Debbie Parnell
Lisa Parra
Linda Parrish
Jill Parrott
Sharon Parshall
Linda Parson
Susan Paschke
Juliana Patrick
Carol Pattee
Sue Patterson
Jitesh Pattni
Daryl Patton
Mary Patton
Sandy Paul
Rhonda Paulson
Robert Paulson
Steve Payeur
Franklin Payne
Michael Payne
Vikki Payne
Rosemary Pazdral
David Peacey
Cynthia Peachey
Clarissa Pearce
Rebecca Pearcy
Alita Pearl
David Pearson
Eleanor Pearson
Eriann Pearson
Jane Pearson
Josh Pedeferri
Ansel Pedrin
Helen Pegg
Joseph Peha
Fred Peitz
Carrie Pellett
Penney Peloquin
Rachel Peltzer
Jana Pender
Alexa Pengelly
Gwenne Penkert
Josie Peper
Kathleen Pequeno
David Percy
Marcel Perez
Michelle Perino
Claudia Perkins
Ethel Perkins
Lela Perkins
Lenny Perkins
Sandra Perkins
Elinor Perlich
Janice and Glenn Perry
Keith Perry
Laura Perry
Pam Perry
Jessica Perry-Kennedy
Cindy Persson
Joerg Peter
Stacia Peter
Penny Peters
Thom Peters
Wendi Petersen
Arlene Peterson
Beau Peterson
Helen Peterson
Kathryn Peterson
Kristy Peterson
Marshall E. Peterson, Sr.
Merry Ann Peterson
Rosa Peterson
Cynthia Petrich
Michele Petsch
Yan Philippe
Allison Phillips
Dave Phillips
Emily Phillips
Talitha Phillips
Tanya Phillips
Ashley Phillis
Raymond Phoenix
Susan Piacentini
Kristin Piacitelli
Matt Piccone
Amy Picker
Kathy Pickering
Rebecca Picton
Jackie Pierce
Trevor Pierce
Andrea Pike
Marie Pike
Robert Pike
Dee and Betty Pinkerton
Malena Pinkham
Lael Pinney
Daryl Pipkin
Ellen B. Pippenger
Temma Pistrang
Stuart Pitman
Thomas Pitre
Marni Pitt
Richard Plancich
Sylvia Platt
Colleen Plog
Stephen Plourde
L. Pluimer
Rebecca Pois
Alicia Polacok
Michael Polenz
Julia Polisher
Sandy Polishuk
Al Polito
Nora Polk
Jason Poll
Jennifer Poll
Gary Pollard
JoAnn Polley
Pamela Pollock
Christopher Pond
Ed Pool
K. Poole
Anne Pope
Mary Wells Pope
Heather Porter
Mark Porter
Casle Portner
Nina Portnow
Ronald Postula
Laura Poueymirou
Steve Pounds
Christopher Powell
Laurel H. Powell
Robyn Powell
Wayne Powell
Carolyn Powers
Elizabeth Powers
Dave Prall
Dale Prappas
Marry Ann Pratt
Susan Pratt
Victoria Pratt
Lida Lee Prchal
Valerie Premore
Alex Prentiss
Kelly Pretlow
Annie Prevost
Frederick M. Price
Stephan Price
Jan Priddy
Ben Pridgeon
Jaymi Priester
Mary Priester
Bruce Pringle
Tamarah Pringle
Johni Prinz
Caroline Prout
Patrick Prout
Amelia Pryor
Robert Puett III
Judith Pulliam
Nancy Pulliam
Jolene Pumpelly
Annelise Pysanky
Apollonia Quale
Madeline Quaresma
Michael L. Quenneville
Niki Quester
Norbert Quiban
Michael Quick
P. Quillian
Sean Quinlan
Francis E. Quinn
Nora Quiros
Michael Raab

Campaign A (cont'd)

Pam Raby
Steve Radcliffe
Jack Radey
Kathy Radford
Andrea Radke
Odessa Rae
Sara Rafter
Martha Ragland
Cecelia Ragsdale-Kellogg
John Rahm
Eden Rain
Astarte' Rainbow
Elizabeth Raintree
JoAnne Raivo
George H. Rallis
Carla Ralston
James Ralston
Julianne Ramaker
Annette Ramsour
Kathleen Randall
Philip Randall
Charles Randolph
Michael Rangeloff
Bud Rankin
Jim Rankin
Malcolm Rankin
Patricia Ranstrom
Tina Rapinoe
Valerie Rapport
Scot Rasmussen
Deanna Ratto
Joyce Rauch
Janet Rauscher
Amy Raven
Karol Rawlings
Alissa Ray
Cindy Ray
Joyce Ray
Pamela Raya-Carlton
Jeanne Raymond
Maryellen Read
Mark Reader
Jennifer Ready
Jo Reasons
Sarah Redd
Rex Redmon
Marilyn Redwine
Jennifer Reed
Joseph Reed
Lisa Reed
Reed Reed
Jesse Reeder
Mike Rees
Sheila Reeves
Melissa Rehder
Alex Reid
Dennis Reid
Kerry Reid
Rebecca Reid
Jill Reifschneider
Deborah Reilly
Erin Reilly
Lise Rein
Robert Reinhart
James Reitz
Paul Remagen
Byron Rendar
Mona Renner
Paul Renner
Catherine Renno
Jan Rettig
Nick Reyman
Charlett Reynolds
David Reynolds
Jane Reynolds
Karen Reynolds
Stephen Reynolds
Henry Rhett
Melissa Rhoades
Angela Rhoads
Becki Rhodes
Susan Rhodes
Hiawatha Rhyans
Cindy Rhys
Ann Rice
Ann Rice
Bette Rice
Stephen Rich
Louis Richard
John Richards
Julia Richards
Richenda Richardson
Dennis Richman
Delora Richmond
Rebecca Rickabaugh
Jeff Ridabock
Carolyn Riddle
Christy Rider
Mary Ridge
Susan Riedel
Ross K. Rieder
Shelley Ries
Tom Rigert
Lesley Rigg
Paula Riggert
Katie Rigsby
Shelby Rihala
Tom Riker
Donna Riley
Emily Riley
Frances Rily
Brandi Rinauro
Dana Rinauro
Michelle Ringgold
Joseph Ripplinger
Laurie Riskin
Ward Risvold
Bill Ritchie
Jane Rittenhouse
Lucas Ritting
John Ritz
Margaret Rivard
Leslie Rivera
Susan G. Rives-Denight
Deanna Rizzo
Greta Rizzuti
Marsha Robbins
Gerson Robboy
Anna Roberts
Brock Roberts
Cal Roberts
Honi Roberts
Janet Roberts
Jason Roberts
John Roberts
Rex Roberts
Sally Roberts
Diana Robertson
Kris Robertson
Rogue Robertson
Yvette Robertson
Ann Robinson
David Robinson
Gail Robinson
Lorri Robinson
Mary Robinson
P. Robinson
Ron Robinson
David Robison
Nancy Roche
Melanie Rodd
James Rodden
Patricia Rodgers
Al Roehl
George and Barbara Rofkar
Karen Rogers
Matt Rogers
Mora Rogers
Shayna Rogers
William Rogers
Angie Rolfs
Janna Rolland
Dave Rollins
Eldon Rollins
Bobbie Romesburg
Margaret Roncone
John Roorbach
Victoria Roos
Melissa Ropke
Dawn Roscoe
Glenn Rose
Margaret Rose
Mark Rose
Nancy Rose
Jill Roseen-Czaplicki
Carol Rose-Inich
Jere Rosemeyer
Juanita Rosene
Barbara Rosenkotter
Steve Rosenman
Elizabeth Rosenzweig
Ian Rosinek
Shari Rosner
Daria Ross
Judy Ross
Patricia Ross
Julie Rossberg
Linda Rossi
Megan Ross-Karow
David Roth
James Roth
Robert Roth
Tom Roth
Florie Rothenberg
Erica Rothman
Margaret Rothschild
David Rousseau
Lou Rowan
Francie Royce
Joe Royce
Lynn Royce
Wonono Rubio
Robert Ruddy
Mytzi Rudolph
Janet Rueger
John Ruhland
Ana Ruiz
Dunja Ruljancich
Mike Rummerfield
Larry Rusch
Dale Russ
Donna Russell
James Russell
Monica Russell
Jay Russo
Diana Rutherford
Kathryn Ryan
Laura Ryan
E. S.
Avram Sacks
Bert Sacks
Brock Sadler
Sophia Sady
Carol Saether
Zandra Saez
Teri Sahm
Heidi Saikaly
Irene Saikevych
T. M. Sailsbury
Susan Salafsky
Sylvia Salget
Alex Salkin
Stephen Saltzman
Katharine Salzmann
Alex Samarin
Irwin and Thelma Sameth
Marjorie Sampson
Murray Sampson
Anna Sandau
Jane Sandau
Cliff Sanderlin
Felicia Sanders
Leslie Sanders
Melissa Sanders
Joanne Sandhu
Stuart Sandler
Patricia Sanitate
Ron and Marya Santi
Helen Sardarov
Russ Sardo
Alixine Sasonoff
Evan Sass
Debra Saude
Steven Sauder
Dan Sauer
Ted Saufley
Jeffrey Saul
Ben Sauls
Dori Saunders
Morgan Savage
Kate Savannah
Nick Saviers
Linda Sawaya
Rebecca Sawyer
Susan Sawyer
Ana Sayavedra
Katie Saylor
Jill Sazanami
Steven Scardina
Ian Keola Scarth
Peter Schutte
Robert Schaaf
Susan Schaar
Susan Schaffner
D. Schafte
Mary Ann Schallert
Barry Scharf
Gwen Schatz
Mariane Schaum
Greg Schechtel
Bob Scheel
Robert and Dolores Scheelen
Mike Schena
Joy Scherr
Ken Schiff
Marbeth Schiff
Donna Schill
Barbara Schiller
Peter Schilling
Warren Schirtzinger
J. Schlacter
Suzanne Schlenker
Bob Schlesinger
Andrew Schlotfeldt
Megan Schmall
Frank Schmeisser
Andrea Schmidt
Arthur Schmidt
Kevin Schmidt
Richard and Sandi Schmidt
Jaylen Schmitt
Debbie Schnaible
Dan Schneider

Campaign A (cont'd)

Keith Schneider
Adam Schofield
Emily Schorr
Jerry Schrader
David Schraer
Susan Schreibe
James Schreiner
Mary L. & Dillard Schroeder
Alex Schroeter
Nancy Schroeter
Marjorie Schubert
Betsy Schultz
Chuck Schultz
Coby Schultz
Robert Schultz
Conti Schulz
Deborah Schumacher
Lauriel Schuman
Randall Schwab
Andrea Schwarz
Jean Schwinberg
Barbie Scott
Beverly Scott
Cecilie Scott
Courtney Scott
Jenna Scott
Patricia Scott
Peggy Scott
Shawna Scott
Terry Scott
Kathy Seabrook
Paul Seabrook
Barbara Searles
Frank Searles
Janet Searles
Will Sears
Mela Seaver
Cathy Seay
Nina Seco
Joyce Seday
John Seeburger
Vicki Sehorn
Suzanne Seiber
Wendy Seignemartin
Elisabetha Sekine
Sonya Selbach
Shannon Selby
Mr. Seldom
Beth Sellars
Martha Sells
Carl Selnes
Wahcato Semon
Steven Serbousek
Mitchell Serebrenik
Terry Setter
Laurence Severtson
Dana Sewall
David and Joan Sexton
Brian Seymour
Margaret Seymour
Fern Shaffer
Paula Shafransky
Mara Shamaya
Peggy Shannon
Howard Shapiro
Peter Shapiro
Donna J-R Sharp
Kathleen Sharp
Fuoad Shashani
Leslie Shattuck
Diane Shaughnessy
Ed Shaul
Carol Shaw
Frank Shaw
Jackie Shaw
Kevin Shaw
Mattie Shaw
Penelope Shaw
Robert Shaw
Susan Shawn
Boone Shawver
James Shea
Jillian Shea
Grace Sheehy
Carrel Sheldon
Allison Shellaway
Martha Shelley
Janet Shelton
LaVerne D. Shemet
Wendy E. Shepard
Jacki Shepardson
David M. Shepherd
Chrystian Shepperd
Rebecca Sherlock
Mike Sherman
Thomas Sherman
John Shields
June Shigeno
Seth Shikora
Rebecca Shim
Evan Shimono
Ric Shimono
Keith Shirley
Pamela Shoberg
William Shockey
Gayla Shoemake
Forest Shomer
Carrie Shomler
Anna Shook
Jamil Shoot
Susan Shouse
Gerald & Patricia Shrader
Dean Shrock
Heidi Shuler
Adam Shumaker
Terence Shumaker
Joey Shyloski
Jim Sibert
Angela Sidlo
Alice Siegal
Sandra Siegner
Anne Siems
Lisa Sieracki
Ana Sierra
Theresa Sihock
Jordan Sill
Jennifer Silva
Susan Silver
Lisa Silverman
Cienna Simmons
Matthew Simonds
Ana Simone
S. Simonet
Drina Simons
Jacalyn Simpson
Lo Simpson
Anna Simsich
Lydia Singer
William Sipple
Rosie Sirek
Sandy Sitzman
Ken Skead
Mary Skelton
Linda Skinner
Todd Skinner
Melah Skoll
George Slawson
Imants Slegelis
Gretchen Sleicher
Vanya Sloan
Amanda Sloane
Jan and Larry Slobin
Ron Slosky
Elizabeth Sloss
Barbara Slyter
Marc Smason
Heather Smeeth
Alaina Smith
Anneliese Smith
Baker Smith
Bonnie Smith
Cameron Smith
Carl Smith
Carol Lee Smith
Darla Smith
Dennis Smith
Diane Smith
Dianna Smith
Don Smith
Greg Smith
Jenny Smith
Jerry Smith
Kathi Smith
LaVonne Smith
M. Ruth Smith
Marla Smith
Martin Smith
Mary Ellen Smith
Morton Smith
Silver Smith
Stephen Smith
Steve Smith
Susan Smith
Susan Smith
Diane Smylie
Caroline Sneed
Jan Sneider-Brown
Constance Snell
Suzanne Snell
Ronda Snider
Sid Snider
Will Snow
Ann Snyder
Kathleen Snyder
Lenn Snyder
Thelma Soderquist
Peter Sodt
Randi Solinsky
Jerry Solomon
Daniel Solomons
Mary Solum
Curt Sommer
Katrina Son
Tyra C. Sorensen
Charli Sorenson
Marni Sorin
Bea Soss
Sharon L. Souders
Sylvia South
Larry Southern
Vivian Sovran
Jessica Sowell
Cathy Spalding
Deborah Spanton
Cal Spates
Gregory Spatz
Diane Speakman
Vana Spear
Shereen Spector
Andrea Speed
Barbara Spencer
Clifford Spencer
Mirta Spencer
Suzanne Spencer
George D. Sperline
David Sperling
Carolyn Sperry
Karin Spicer
Hazel S. Spiegel
Julia Spilker
Sharon Spilman
Lester Splater
Kent Spring
Christopher St. Clair
Susannah St. Clair
Erica St. John
Paloma St. Louis
Debbie St. Marie
Darlene St. Martin
M. A. Stacey
Deborah Stafford
Rick Staggenborg
Christine Stahl
Jerome Stahl
Jessica Stahl
Natalie Stahl
Carrie Stairs
Sonja Staley
Holly Stamper
Pete Stang
Robert Stang
A. Stanger
Douglas Stangler
Jack Stansfield
Mary Stanton-Anderson
Chris Stapelfeldt
Carol Staples
Elizabeth Star
Judith Starbuck
Kiim Stavrum
Linda Stead
Kathe Steck
Anne Steele
Jeff Steenbergen
John Steenson
Greg T. Steers
Sarah Steever
Paul Steinbroner
Patricia Steinburg
Greg A. Steinke
Thomas Stekkinger
Mickey Stellavato
Richard Stellner
Chad Stemm
Daniel Stenge
Casey Stennick
Larkin Stentz
Sally Stepath
Margaret Stephens
Jack Sterett
Mare Stern
Naomi Stern
Kristin Sterner
David Stetler
Jessica Stevens
Julie Stevens
Robert Stevens
J. Stewart
Jan Stewart
Pamela Stewart
Patricia Stewart
Sylvia Stewart
Tracina Stewart
Patrick Stickney
Joan Stiehl
John Stimatz
Craig Stimson
Karen Stingle
Michael Stirling
Heather Stites
Ann Stockdale
Cindy Stoddard
Jeffrey Stoddard
Wade Stoddard
Anna Stone
Judy Stone

Campaign A (cont'd)

Linda Stone
Lou Stone
Carol Storke
Sandra Storwick
Dhyan Story
Brigitte Stout
James Stoy
Keith Stracchino
Rianna Stracke`
Gregory Stragier
Courtney Strand
Lea Ann Strand
Haim Strasbourger
Jessica Strater
Robert Strauss
Claude Strebe
Ken and Julee Streeter
Eycke Strickland
Jeanne Strickland
Marcia Strickland
Eugene Strobeck
Beth Stroh-Stern
Mary-Alice Strom
Craig Strong
Marilyn Strong
Linda Strout
Donna Stuart
Richard Stuart
Rebecca Studen
Linda Sturgeon
Marry Sturgeon
Marion Sturtevant
Caroline Su
Beth Suel
Pauline Sugarman
Kent Sugnet
Caitlin Sullivan
Dewey Sullivan
Heather Sullivan
Meg Sullivan
Terry Sullivan
Tom Sullivan
George Summers
Theresa Sumoge

James Sundberg
Elizabeth Anne Sunrise
H. M. Sustaita
Paula Suter
Julie Sutherland
Sam L. Sutherland
Harold Mark Sutton
Aaron Svela
Linda Swan
Nancy Swann
J.J. Sweeney
Leslie Sweeney
David Sweet
Danda Sweetwater
Jonathan Sweigert
Daniel Swerbilov
Jackie Swift
Shawn Swilley
S.J. Swinyard
Tom Swoffer
Gene Swygard
Claire Sykes
Laura Syperda
Thalia Syracopoulos
K. Tabor
Kira Tabor
Astha Tada
Bill Talbot
Susan Talbot
Diana Talcott
Ayala Talpai
Maryann Tamayo
Ben Tanler
Joan Tanner
Kathy Tapley
Ekizabeth Tapper
Elisabeth Taqieddin
Jon Tardiff
Judy Tarr
Linda Tate
Sean Tatol
Michael Taus
Gordon Taxer
Aileen Taylor

Amary Taylor
Angela Taylor
Carol Taylor
David Taylor
Elizabeth Taylor
F. J. Taylor
Gregory Taylor
Kirk Taylor
Lawrence Taylor
Lisa J. Taylor
Michael Taylor
Mike Taylor
Miranda Taylor
Stan Taylor
John Teagle
Monique Teal
Edwin and Margaret Tegenfeldt
David Tejeda
Laurel Temple
Nick Tennant
Barbara tenWolde
Susan Tercek
Willy Terrall
Joyce Terry
Kevin Test
Ken Tetreault
Sallie Teutsch
Talitha Thalya
K. Tharaldsen
Daniel Tharp
Holly Thayer
Janet Thayer
Lisa Theobald
April Theod
Carol Thiel
Elise Thiel
Patricia Thigpen
Melissa Thirloway
Saundra Thixton
Anne Thoma
Bob Thomas
Dave Thomas
Gerri Thomas

Gina Thomas
Greg Thomas
Jean Thomas
Kat Thomas
Kathryn Thomas
Laura L. Thomas
Sarah Thomas
Andrea Thompson
Ben Thompson
Brooke Thompson
Cary Thompson
Erin Thompson
Lynn Thompson
Marietta Thompson
Martha Thompson
Myah Thompson
Nancy Thompson
Richard & Nancy Thompson
Sandra Thompson
Camila Thorndike
Craig Thorne
Susan Thorsen
Ann Tiedeman
Dale Tiffany
Bonnie Tighe
Charley Tilden
Richard Till
Joel Tilson
Justin Tilson
Rick Tilson
Karen Timberlake
Fred Timmen
Ann Tingley
Trinity Tippin
Justin Tiret
Tracey Tiret
Jennifer Titilah
Patricia M. Titus
Whitney Tjerandsen
A. Todd
Galina Todorova
Todd Tollefson
Paul Tollenaar

Chris Tompkins
Merrily Tompkins
Susan Tone
LaVern Tooley
Wilma Totten
Alyse Toulouse
Diane Tourigny
Kay Tousley
Sandra Towne
Darlene Townsend
James Tracey
Kate Trafton
Stephanie Trasoff
Cyrielle Travaglini
Lynne Treat
Carolyn Trefts
Harold Treinen
Gretchen Treser
Maria Trevizo
Paula Trimble
Victoria Trimble-Lowe
Robert C. Trimmer
David Trione
Kathy Triplett
Clif and Diane Trolin
John Trombold
Phyllis Trowbridge
Anne Trudeau
Silvia Trujillo
Lynn Tullis
Brad Turner
Fredrick Turner
Helga Smith Turner
Patricia Tuton
Valerie Tweedie
Kyle Twohig
Mary Twombly
Joanell Tylor
Eric Tyszka
Tyler Udy
Timothy Ulrey
Kaela Ultican
Richard Umana
Cat Underhill

Judith Uno
Kyle Uno
Annya Uslontseva
Ron Utter
Frank V.
Anna-Maria Vag
Rita Vait
Diana Valdez
Alan Gamble and Debra Valdez
Marcy Valencia
Joseph Valentino
Catlin Valles
Tony and Pam Valley
Rene Van De Sompele
Jane Van Dusen
Karla Van Dyke
Jeff Van Horn
Corinne Van Houten
Natalie Van Leekwijck
Christopher Van Putten
Jan van Raay
Marie Van Schravendijk
Carol Van Strum
Alan Van Zuuk
Anne Vance
JoAnne VanDatta
Roberta Vandehey
Barbara VanDerlaske
Mary VanGorder
Dianne Vann
Michael Vannice
Barbara Vannier
Nonie Vantlin
Jason Varnado
Jessica Vasquez
Monica Vasquez
Jessica Vaughan
Rolf Vaughan
Sandy Vaughn
Kathryn Vaux
Mark Velez
Martin Velez
Jane Vellucci

Marc Vendetti
Sooney Viani
Lesley Vick
John Vieira
Paul & Sharyn Viel
Mary Lou Vignola
Lauri Vigue
Victoria Vining-Gillman
Carol Vinson
David Virden
Walter T. Vitatoe Jr.
Chris Vitron
Kimi Vlach
Diane Vogt
Ray Voice
David Vold
Mike Volk
Bruce von Borstel
Peter von Christierson
Robert von Tobel
Sharon Vonasch
Mary Vorachek
Sarah Voruz
Susan Vosburg
Tia Vouros-Callaha
Frances Vreman
Bruce Wachtel
Therese Wade
Carol Wagner
Florence Wagner
Mark Wahl
Susan Wainer
Jay Wainman
Jason Wakeham
Christopher Waldrip
Liisa Wale
Debbie Walk
Bonnie Walker
Brock Walker
Dana Walker
Dawn Walker
Isaac Walker
Judith Walker
Mary Walker

Campaign A (cont'd)

Megan Walker
Jean Wall
Claudine Wallace
Tiffany Wallace
Warren Waller
Richard Walling
Jeremy Walsh
Ricki Walsh
Steve Walsh
Richard Walter
Lynne Walters
Roxena Walters
Andrea Walterscheid
Jeff Walton
Terry Walton
Angela Wanak
Lise Wang
Deborah Ward
Jennifer Ward
Judy Ward
Shelly Ward
Terrie Ward
Diane Ware
Peter Ware
Patricia Warming
Bonnie Warner
Daniel Warner
Heather Warner
Michael Warner
Charlene Warren
Kay Warren
Valerie Warren
Kathy Wartelle
Liz Washburn
Ted Washburne
Ann Waters
April Waters
Tracy Waters
Colleen Watson
Hillary Watson
Karen Watson
Linda Watson
Mark Watson
Nancy Watson
Kathryn Watt
Marsha Watt
Paul Watt
Carol Watts
David Watts
Lenny Wavra
Dorothy Wayne
James Wayrynen
Jack and Anita Waytz
Carole Weaks
Linda Wearne
Bill Weaver
Britni Weaver
Nora Weaver
David T. Webb
Randall Webb
Beverly Webber
Betty Weber
Joyce Weber
Pamela Weber
Loren Webster
Mark Wedin
John Weeks
Michaela Wehner
Peter Weidner
Elyette Weinstein
Joyce Weir
Daniel Weiskopf
David Weitzer
Joshua Welch
Lori Welch
Susan Welenofsky
Terry Wellman
Cliff Wells
Greeley Wells
Holly Wells
Lisa Wells
Steven Wells
Bob Welsh
Peter Welte
Sharon Welter
Mike Weltman
Leslie Welty
Cristina L. Wenzl
Rachel Werther
Alice West
Barbara West
Marsha West
Tara West
Dayna Westley
Jason Westman
Melanie Weston
David Westphal
Jennifer Westra
Nicole Westre
Willard Westre
Terry Weygandt
Diane S. Whalen
Donna Wheat
Bernadette Wheeler
George Q. Wheeler
Jerry Wheeler
Mark Wheeler
Michael Wherley
Darrel Whipple
William Whitaker
Cheryl Whitcomb
J. White
Jeffrey White
Jody Temple White
John White
Maria White
Nancy White
Nancy White
Shirley White
Valerie White
Karen Whitehead
Allison Whiteley
Ann Louise Whitford
Terry Whitlatch
William Whitlatch
Andrew D. Whitmont
Ted Whitney
Mark Whitson
Scott Whittaker
Karen Wible
Den Mark Wichar
Patricia Wickman
Cathy Wickwire
Shyloh Wideman
R. Widenoja
Donald Widman
Stuart Wilber
Ruth Wilday
Ed Wilder
Carol Wildman
Sharon Wildman
Wayne Wildman
Nadine Wiles
Carolyn Wilkerson
John Wilkins
Irene Willard
Beverly Williams
Charles Williams
Connie Williams
Dave Williams
James B. Williams
Justin Williams
Kendra Williams
Kyenne Williams
Linda Williams
Linda Williams
Marcy Williams
Pamela Williams
R.D. Williams
Robert Williams
Michael Williamson
Erin Willig
Lee Willis
Bryan Willison
Emily Willoughby
Victoria Wills
Kent Willson
Peter Wilsnack
Cjaer Wilson
Doug Wilson
Elida Wilson
Lisa Wilson
Maggie Wilson
Marsha Wilson
Mary Wilson
Richard Wilson
Robert K. Wilson
Steve Wilson
Mindy WilsonFurr
Ginny Wimmers
Paul Winans
Melissa Winfree-Kuhns
Stu Winnie
Elizabeth Winship
Joyce Winslow
Alan Winter
Kathy Winter
Cheryl Winters
Mark Wirth
Jerry Wiseman
Windy Witch
Dale Withey
Katherine Witteman
Gene Wolery
Anita Wolf
Esther B. Wolf
Marcie Wolf
Frank Wolfe
Kathleen Wolfe
Rebecca Wolfe
Laurel Wolff
Glorijana Wolfgang
Halima Wolfgang
Haris Wolfgang
Patricia Wolfram
Erik Woll
Susan Woltz
Barbara Wood
Claire-Anne Wood
Danielle Wood
Gordon Wood
Paula Wood
Ray Wood
Jennifer Woodbridge
Marion Woodfield
Joseph Woodhull
Wyatt Wooding
James Woodruff
Joanne Woodruff
Judy Woodson
Linda Woodward
John Woolley
Robert Workman
Marjorie Worthington
Anson Wright
Catherine Wright
Gary Wright
Barbie Wu
ssss wwww
Laurie Wyatt
James Wygant
Tom Wyliehart
Rachel Wyman
Sara Wyman
James Wynn
Winston Wynne
Junko Yamamoto
Hideki Yamaya
Donna Yancey
David Yao
Patricia Yates
Christopher Yeager
Doris Yepez
Nancy Yialouris
Angela Ying
Mary Lou Yocum
Chris Yoder
Robert Yoder
Amy Yokoyama
June Ginoza Yoon
Linda York
David Young
Lori Young
Mary Young
Nancy Young
Nancy Young
Nancy Young
Robert Young
Sandra Youngquist
Christine Yun
Wendy Yunker
Leonard Zack
Joseph Zadravetz
Angeline Zalben
Noel Zapata
Caroline Zaworski
Aleese Zehm
Alan Zehntbauer
Sue Zerangue
Olga Zharkova
Brooke Zielinski
Sharon Zielinski
Robert Zilbauer
Craig Zimmerman
Megan Zimmerman
Ethan Zink
Andrew Zinner
Daniel Zizza
Susan Zubalik
Marguery Lee Zucker

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: aaron.f.brown@intel.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 6:26:18 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

Radioactive wastes are the real problem with Nuclear power and we should halt all new plant construction unless the issues can be resolved. Shipping it to Hanford is not the solution. *A2-1*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Aaron Brown
37320 NW Hahn Road
Banks, OR 97106

A2-1 Regarding nuclear energy production and the safe storage of waste resulting from it, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: annfrodel@mac.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:00:09 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

The problem with radioactive wastes has always been that there is no good place to put it for the thousands of years that it needs to become harmless to life forms. Rather than adding more to Hanford's already large problem, why not consider ways to create less of this sort of problem by either reusing the residues from nuclear power generation, or investing in alternatives that do not impact the health of the planet and the people who live here. Nowhere needs more radioactive wastes. This includes Hanford. *A3-1*

Sincerely,

Ann Marie Frodel
P.O. Box 342
Poulsbo, WA 98370
annfrodel@mac.com

Sincerely,

Ann Marie Frodel
P.O. Box 342
Poulsbo, WA 98370

A3-1 Regarding the safe disposal of radioactive waste, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD. Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: aue@pdx.edu
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:32:18 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

If the waste is to be untreated and stored, it should be in a place that doesn't require transportation along major freeways, which exposes millions to the toxic dangers. There are vast areas of sparse population in places like Utah, Wyoming, and the Dakotas, and that are without major freeways or ports. These places would be much safer to transport and store waste in. *A4-1*

Sincerely,

Nicole Aue
3946 SW Pomona St
Portland, OR 97219

A4-1 Regarding the transportation of radioactive waste to Hanford and the treatment of this waste, the MLLW and LLW that would be shipped to Hanford from other DOE sites would be treated at the site of generation before being shipped to Hanford. Radioactive waste is transported in DOT-certified containers that meet strenuous technical standards established by NRC. DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: Ayala@FiberFanatics.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:04:17 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

NO MORE NUCLEAR WASTE TO HANFORD!! legislate against the production of more nuclear waste! This is insanity: producing deadly stuff of near-infinite lifespan for which we have no solution! *A5-1*

Sincerely,

Ayala Talpai
95609 Marcola Rd.
Marcola, OR 97454

A5-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: bethdavis@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:01:08 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

Unless and until a safe way to store nuclear waste is discovered or created, nuclear energy must be discarded as a viable source of energy. The half life of the waste is longer than any material we have to store it in. *A6-1*

Those legislators and industry pundits who promote nuclear energy should be required to store its waste in their OWN backyards! Why won't they? Because they know it isn't safe. If they were forced to, maybe we would invest more of our resources into clean energy.

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, and a "down-winder" in childhood, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Davis
12265 Shorewood Lane SW
Burien, WA 98146

A6-1 Regarding nuclear energy production and the safe storage of waste resulting from it, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: bldegl@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 8:01:16 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Then you have the Bonneville Dam. Right now, on the upstream side of the dam, there is a lot of radioactive wast that came from Hanford. If there was a need to dredge the silt away, it would cost a lot and create a radioactive hazard. Until problems like that are solved, there is no way any radioactive waste should be stored at Hanford. *A7-1*

Sincerely,

Jeff Lyles
17300 NE Hooper Wollam Rd.
Yacolt, WA 98675

A7-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: carkins@lanecc.edu
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:45:17 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I am deeply distressed that the U.S. is considering nuclear energy options when we are unable to deal with the waste that exists from multiple forms of nuclear energy. *A8-1*

Sincerely,

Susan Carkin
4081 Alder St
Eugene, OR 97405

A8-1 Regarding nuclear energy production and the safe storage of waste resulting from it, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: carolnbuhl@hotmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 1:20:11 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

PLEASE don't put radioactive trucks on the road! *A9-1*

Sincerely,

Carolyn Buhl
1128 SE 30th Ave
Portland, OR 97214

A9-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: cgjanzen@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:30:19 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

It is very disturbing that the govt. now wants to ship radioactive waste to Hanford - are you kidding me? Hanford is already extremely polluted from the radioactive waste already there. Are you really willing to take the chance that there won't be any accidents getting the waste to the dump? It's extremely frustrating that we can't figure out what to do with this waste, yet we are now moving ahead with new nuclear plants. The people of WA state would appreciate it if you move the waste somewhere else - would you want it in your neighborhood???? *A10-1* *A10-2* *A10-3* *A10-4*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Gayle Janzen
11232 Dayton Ave N
Seattle, WA 98133

A10-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A10-2 DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A10-3 Regarding the safe storage of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

A10-4 Even though it is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*, the comment is noted. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: cnsproductions@charter.net
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 2:28:11 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

the Congress of 1956 promised to establish a permanent waste site and if the federal government can't establish a permanent site all nuclear plants should be forced to store their own wastes. *A11-1*

sincerely

Paul Steinbroner

Sincerely,

Paul Steinbroner
1725 Horse Lake Rd
Wenatchee, WA 98801

A11-1 Regarding the safe storage of waste resulting from the production of nuclear energy, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: cookguyot@charter.net
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 1:28:18 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

It would seem that our representatives in Washington fad never heard of the truth that radioactive materials from our military and commercial sources will be deadly active for a thousand years or more and as such will be a source of concern for anyone or anthing that comes into contact with it over that time span. Thereis no available process or intervention that will convert these substances to a neutral or benign state at the present time. Until such time as this is possible, the manufacture and use of these deadly agents should be stopped immediately.To even suggest moving these deadly toxins over our public highways and through our cities and towns is the heighth of absurdity. They should be encapsulated and buried where they currently are kept and guarded to ensure that they do not fall into unfriendly or careless hands. *A12-1* *A12-2* *A12-3*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Jack Guyot
325 W. Niagara
Astoria, OR 97103

A12-1 Regarding the safe storage of waste resulting from the production of nuclear energy, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

A12-2 Regarding the lack of processes available to convert the Hanford wastes to a neutral or benign state, DOE intends to treat and manage the Hanford wastes as effectively as current technology allows and expects this *TC & WM EIS* to assist DOE decisionmakers in determining solutions for these and other issues at Hanford. Specifically, this EIS analyzes potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

A12-3 Nuclear energy production and disposition of its resulting wastes are not within the scope of this EIS. DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: cr_cruise@msn.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:31:17 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

Hanford is too close to the cloumbia river to be used as a radioactive waste storage site. The extreme damage that could be done to the fisheries alone makes it unacceptable and, as a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). *A13-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Chuck Cruise
105 sw 122nd st
Seattle, WA 98146

A13-1 Regarding the radioactive waste storage site's location relative to the Columbia River, the purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

The results of the ecological resources risk analysis for air and groundwater releases to the Columbia River under the various alternatives for aquatic biota, including salmonids, are presented in Appendix P, Section P.3.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: cvs@casco.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:31:13 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a child I was already subjected to more than a lifetime's worth of radiation. I strongly object to being exposed to more, or to any other children being exposed. As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). *A14-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste should be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Carol Van Strum
7493 E Five Rivers
Tidewater, OR 97390

A14-1 Regarding the potential for exposure to radioactive material related to Hanford operations, in addition to evaluating alternatives for the continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford, this *TC & WM EIS* analyzes potential environmental impacts associated with a specific set of proposed actions and reasonable alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; and decommissioning of FFTF. These latter actions would reduce the potential for long-term impacts of Hanford operations. DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: czaworski@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 11:10:16 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I am an oncology nurse, and I am aware of the increased rates of certain types of cancer in the area around Hanford. It is unethical to add to this environmental risk. We must find other ways to deal with radioactive waste. *A15-1*

Sincerely,

Caroline Zaworski
2928 NW Spurry Pl
Corvallis, OR 97330

A15-1 The potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers of past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this *TC & WM EIS*. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

DOE continues to make improvements in the methods used for managing radioactive waste. Chapter 1 of this EIS states that DOE has committed to disposing of LLW at Hanford in lined trenches, a change from the past disposal practice of using unlined trenches. This EIS compares the effectiveness of alternative methods for the safe retrieval, treatment, and disposal of HLW now stored in SSTs. Storage of waste in the tanks began over 60 years ago; the actions evaluated in this EIS would reduce the long-term environmental risk associated with this waste.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: dar@efn.org
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:24:19 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Finally, stop advocating for the use of nuclear materials for energy production and weapons -- that way there'll be much less radioactive waste. *A16-1*

Sincerely,

David Roth
2994 Quiet Ln
Eugene, OR 97404

A16-1 Even though it is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*, the comment is noted. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: daverwatts@msn.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 7:43:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I strongly oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

This plan poses a threat to our environment,safety, and health, now and for generations to come. *A17-1*

Past behavior and decades of lawsuits over simply getting the Federal Government to live up to its word demonstrates that the Federal Government cannot be trusted to protect the citizens of Washington and Oregon from problems associated with transporting, handling, and storing, nuclear waste in an area which is much more environmentally sensitive and fragile than realized when Hanford was conceived. Don't add to the problem. *A17-2*

Sincerely,

David R. Watts
6247 26th Ave. NE
Seattle, WA 98115

Sincerely,

David Watts
6247 26th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115

A17-1 Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

A17-2 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites. The actual implementation of the selected actions following issuance of DOE's ROD would be subject to following the more detailed evaluations and processes required under RCRA, the state Hazardous Waste Management Act, CERCLA, and the TPA, as applicable, including obtaining appropriate treatment and closure permits from Ecology.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: david@hedges.name
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:51:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

It is insane to even think about adding to Hanford's already insurmountable problems.

Radioactivity has been leaking into the Columbia River for at least 30 years, probably more. It's been 20 years since the oysters of Willapa Bay, on the southern Washington coast, were found to be radioactive. *A18-1*

Dumping more waste at Hanford would be like pouring gasoline on a burning house. I live downriver, and Hanford is my worst nightmare.

Sincerely,

David Hedges
20750 S. Sweetbriar Rd.
West Linn, OR 97068

A18-1 As analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*, 67 of the 149 SSTs at Hanford are known or suspected to have leaked liquid waste to the environment between the 1950s and the present, some of which has reached the groundwater. Estimates of the total leak loss range from less than 2.8 million to as much as 3.97 million liters (750,000 to 1,050,000 gallons). Regarding groundwater contamination from past leaks at Hanford and its potential impact on communities downriver from Hanford, one of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: deaniea47@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:37:11 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways poses a danger to anyone in it's vicinity. Odds are, more than one of those 17,500 truckloads will be involved in a wreck and hazmat spill. Thousands of lives and property would be at risk every day. That is unconscionable! Nuclear waste must stay where it was created until we find a way to safely dispose of it. *A19-1*

The Pacific Northwest is no longer an underpopulated dumping ground. Rather, it is a thriving, vibrant and incomparably beautiful heritage site for our country. People live outdoors here. They fish, hike and camp in the mountains you propose transporting, and likely spilling, this waste through. The thought that anyone would dump poisonous waste here is despicable!

There is already radioactive contamination being found in wells one hundred miles from Hanford. Hanford is NOT a "Safe" disposal site! It needs to be CLEANED UP, not dumped in! *A19-2*

Just because Hanford is out of sight to the other Washington, doesn't diminish it's value to the people who live here. We already have a HazMat site in need of cleanup. Offloading the trash from other sites around the country will give pro-Nuclear interests an argument which supports them continuing to create nuclear waste elsewhere around the country, while we continue to have NO MEANS OF DISPOSING OF IT SAFELY. Out of sight, does NOT make it SAFE! *A19-3*

The solution is NOT to transport ANY nuclear waste, but to keep it right where it is created, so NO ONE can forget about it!

Sincerely,

Geraldine Adams
11016 Colvos Drive NW
Gig Harbor, WA 98332

A19-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A19-2 Regarding further import of waste to Hanford before the site is cleaned up, as well as groundwater contamination at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

A19-3 Regarding transporting nuclear waste to Hanford and the effect of acceptance of offsite waste on the creation of additional waste in other parts of the country, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Regarding the Government's ability to safely dispose of nuclear waste, disposition of certain types of waste is analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*. The purpose of this EIS is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: dharmabum@teleport.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 24, 2010 11:00:13 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 24, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

There is already contaminated water heading towards the upper reaches of the Columbia River, an area, thanks to the Grand Coulee dam, that has turned into a salmon spawning ground. How many species will be poisoned if this flow is increased by adding to the already unstable storage facilities at Hanford? *A20-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Franklin Payne
10775 SW Celeste Ln
Portland, OR 97225

A20-1 The contamination of the Columbia River upstream of Hanford is not attributable to Hanford and is outside the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. DOE is also concerned that the groundwater beneath Hanford may contribute to further contamination of the Columbia River in the proximity of the Hanford Reach, where salmon are currently spawning.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

The estimated radiation doses resulting from air deposition and groundwater discharge under all of the alternatives are less than the 0.1-rad-per-day and 1-rad-per-day benchmarks for aquatic ecological receptors exposed to radioactive COPCs at the Columbia River. Impacts associated with aquatic biota and results of the risk analyses for air and groundwater releases to the Columbia River are evaluated and discussed in Appendix P, Section P.3.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: drunvalo2px@yahoo.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 7:08:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

There are so many alternate clean sources of energy that can be used instead of the outdated and dangerous nuclear fissions reactors. *A21-1*

I currently being a resident of the Pacific Northwest find the idea of transporting these toxins on our highways extremely dangerous.

Regardless of the safety precautions exposure to these elementals is eminent. Not an easy task to transport these toxins safely. It would be Better yet don't use this form of energy any longer. *A21-2*

I've also come to understand that "Vitrification" could be a better way to transmute/transform these toxins into a benign state.

This method would allow us to by-pass dangerous transporting of these toxins over the highways. *A21-3*

Sincerely,

Silas Ortiz
2257 NW Phillips Rd
Gaston, OR 97119

A21-1 The use of nuclear power is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

A21-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A21-3 Please see response to comment A1-4 in the master letter for Campaign A.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: eartha_now@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 10:36:04 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

This is a direct example of safety concerns coming up for new funding of nuclear power plants. there is no safe place or process for which to rid the planet of the waste. *A22-1*

Sincerely,

elise thiel
321 clay st #19
ashland, OR 97520

A22-1 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: emderrington@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 5:51:11 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

The nuclear waste at the Hanford site needs to be remediated, not exacerbated by the addition of more hazardous materials. The Tank Closure Plan should flatly prohibit the addition of any and all offsite waste. Permitting additional waste is not an option that is protective of the environment or the human health. An environmentally responsible tank closure plan will call for the treatment of all current Hanford waste through vitrification, not a cap approach that will leave this waste free to continue to leach through our basalt geomorphic formations into our invaluable groundwater supplies.

Treating nuclear waste with the best available technology may be expensive, but it will create jobs, and it will likely be less costly in the long-term, as it will reduce the government's culpability regarding the toxic disaster that is the Tri-cities area. *A23-1*

Allowing dumping at this site to continue undermines the government's responsibility to ensure the health and wellbeing of its citizens, and may violate "no take" mandate of the Endangered Species Act with regard to the endangered salmon populations in the Columbia River and its tributaries, which are likely to be impacted by continued leeching of toxic wastes into groundwater (as well as considerations of the Safe Drinking Water Act). The health and safety of people and the environment should be a primary consideration when DOI acts to comply with its decision-making mandate to achieve the "highest and best use" of the land in its control (Federal Property Management Regulations 30 CFR 101-47). *A23-2*

Receiving additional waste at this facility will pose a toxic threat to the people of the State of Washington. The shipping routes will endanger the health of the people and environments along every major highway that leads to Hanford, and of every state that proposes to ship its uncontained waste to Washington. We have known since the 1950s that Hanford is not a safe waste receiving facility. The double-shelled tank design may reduce but will not alleviate all risks of waste leakage (our geologically active region is prone to tectonic shifts, and the leak detection technology discussed in the EIS is not failsafe). Long-term, environmentally safe, optimally risk reduced *A23-3* *A23-4*

A23-1 Regarding nuclear waste treatment and associated costs, the *TC & WM EIS* Summary and Chapter 2, Section 2.11, summarize and compare the relative costs of the alternatives. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations.

A23-2 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

This EIS does address potential impacts on endangered species and land use. In addition, in the *Final Hanford Comprehensive Land-Use Plan EIS* (DOE 1999) and ROD, DOE did consider public health and safety and environmental values in establishing the "highest and best use" of the land as part of the Final Comprehensive Land-Use Plan, consistent with "Federal Property Management Regulations" (41 CFR 101-47) (see the *Final Hanford Comprehensive Land-Use Plan EIS*, Chapter 6, page 6–1 and footnote 1).

A23-3 The transportation of radioactive materials and waste, both coming to and leaving Hanford, must comply with DOT and NRC regulations that promote the protection of human health and the environment. This includes requiring the use of certified packaging that minimizes the radiation dose rate outside the transportation package. As indicated in the *TC & WM EIS* Summary, Section S.5.3; Chapter 2, Section 2.8.3.10; and Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12, it is unlikely that transportation of radioactive waste would cause an additional fatality as a result of radiation from either incident-free transportation or postulated transportation accidents. Please see Section 2.1 of this CRD, a volume of this *Final TC & WM EIS*, for details regarding the transport and disposal of offsite waste.

A23-4 The Hanford waste storage and processing facilities are designed and constructed to prevent or limit any release of radioactive material resulting from earthquakes or other severe natural phenomena. For example, the WTP structures and equipment are designed to preclude significant facility damage or radioactive releases to the environment resulting from a strong earthquake with an estimated frequency of once every 2,000 years. Even though the occurrence of a stronger, more-damaging earthquake during the operational life of the WTP is very unlikely, earthquake damage scenarios were analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*. It was assumed that an

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

waste management of existing waste should be the goal of the Tank Closure Plan- adding more waste to the equation does not facilitate this end. Particularly in light of dwindling CERCLA funding, we should not allow more toxic waste to accumulate when Dumping more waste here is not the correct policy solution to the problem of disposing spent nuclear waste- truly a byproduct of our ongoing energy crisis.

Instead, DOI should adopt an aggressive renewable energy policy that aims to phase out grandfathered facilities producing dangerous waste products. These facilities are a threat to national security and to the wellbeing of all Americans, both present and future. Old facilities should be decommissioned and replaced with environmentally sustainable renewable energies such as wind and solar fields. If the costs of treating nuclear waste through best available technology are included in the rates of nuclear energy generation, it quickly becomes clear that nuclear energy is not the answer to our energy crisis. *A23-5*

Decommissioning Hanford must entail closing the facility to all toxic waste- not allowing toxic depositions to continue. To work towards this objective, DOI could mandate the instillation of solar panels and wind turbines on the site in order to improve renewable energy reliance and fund vitrification treatment of existing onsite waste. This option was not considered in the alternatives report, and could significantly offset cleanup costs of existing hazardous waste at the facility. I urge you to consider a cleanup alternative that includes total vitrification, landfill closure, and renewable energy development to achieve the duel objectives of DOI and DOE to protect resources, and promote responsible resource use, thereby serving the public and the preserving our shared environment. Thank you for your commitment to ending the nuclear contamination catastrophe at Hanford. I hope you will use this opportunity to implement our nation's policy of establishing renewable energy for a safe, energy dependent future.

Sincerely,

Erin Derrington
13716 NE 28th St.
Bellevue, WA 98005

earthquake causes major facility damage and the radioactive releases were then estimated. The resulting radiation doses to workers and the public were calculated and used, together with the probability of an earthquake sufficiently strong to cause the assumed degree of facility damage, to estimate the health risks from that scenario that would be associated with each year of facility operation.

The health risks associated with representative scenarios, including earthquakes, are presented in this EIS for use in comparing the human health impacts of EIS alternatives that involve different facilities, processes, waste inventories, and/or duration (number of years) of operations. The analyses of the potential impacts of accidents are presented in Chapter 4. More-detailed descriptions of the scenarios and the methods of analysis are presented in Appendix K.

A23-5 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: emilya57@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 6:32:15 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). I think the only reason that the site in Nevada was removed was because Sen. Reed is from Nevada, and he responded to his constituents. In fact, there is no place that I am aware of that wants to be a repository for nuclear waste. Which is a VERY GOOD REASON to not opt for nuclear power for the future. *A24-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. In fact shipping this type of waste anywhere is very dangerous. Another reason to NOT create any additional nuclear waste.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. Thanks, but we have enough nuclear waste of our own to try to clean up and make safe for our citizens. We DO NOT need or want any additional nuclear waste.

Sincerely,

Emily Willoughby
17000 53rd. Ave. S.
Tukwila, WA 98188

A24-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the disposition of HLW, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: feathy@hotmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 3:33:18 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification. Instead of shipping more waste to Hanford, DOE must focus on cleaning up the existing toxic mess, not adding to it. *A25-1*

Sincerely,

Anita Bryant
2110 NE Park Rd.
Seattle, WA 98105

A25-1 Regarding further import of waste to Hanford and site cleanup timing, in general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: GaryGripp@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 11:37:36 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

The radioactive geenie is out of the bottle, with potential for grerat and lasting harm. It's a deadly mistake to pretend like this is ordinary business as usual. For the sake of my great grandchildren, deal with these atomic mistakes right where they sit. Don't bring them to us here in Oregon. Thank you. *A26-1*

Sincerely,

Gary Gripp
PO Box 38
Vida, OR 97488

A26-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: glm@ashlandhome.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 6:03:06 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Finally, the government's moral obligation to the citizens of this country MUST be to devise a completely safe method for detoxifying the waste that results from the operation of these plants before building any new installations! *A27-1*

Sincerely,

Gwen McMahon
421 N. Mountain Ave
Ashland, OR 97520

A27-1 Regarding the comment "operation of these new plants before building new installations," DOE believes the commentor is referring to commercial nuclear power reactors rather than facilities at Hanford. Even though this comment is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*, the comment is noted.

Regarding the status of ongoing cleanup of facilities at Hanford, please see response to comment A1-1 and A1-3 in the master letter for Campaign A.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: GMKILLPACK@WCN.NET
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 6:18:12 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

NUCLEAR FUEL MUST BE STORED AT THE SITE OF ITS USE. OR IN THE BACK YARD OF THE CEO'S THAT PROFIT FROM IT. *A28-1*

Sincerely,

GARY KILLPACK
1850 SE 23RD
LINCOLN CITY, OR 97367

A28-1 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: hildegan@earthlink.net
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 11:54:13 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

This plan is absolutely wrong and must not be allowed to be acted on. Clean up Hanford and find a real solution to this terribly dangerous mess. We can not continue to ignore the clear dangers from this waste. *A29-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Todd Hildebrandt
P.O. Box 189
Elmira, OR 97437

A29-1 Regarding the shipment of offsite waste to Hanford and site cleanup, in general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates. Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: howeird@oregonfast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:20:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

This is precisely why we should not be looking at a nucleur power option. The disposal of the spent fuel will always be a hazardous problem as well as the accidental spills. *A30-1*

Sincerely,

Howard Shapiro
88453 4TH Ave
Florence, OR 97439

A30-1 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: IANKOVTUNOVICH@HOTMAIL.COM
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:02:45 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I would prefer to have other options explored for the disposal of this waste. Thank you. *A31-1*

Sincerely,

Ian Kovtunovich
5820 N Boston Ave
Portland, OR 97217

A31-1 The alternatives presented in this *TC & WM EIS* were developed under NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to address the essential components of DOE's three sets of proposed actions (tank closure, FFTF decommissioning, and waste management) and to provide an understanding of the differences between the potential environmental impacts of the range of reasonable alternatives. Consistent with CEQ guidance, this EIS analyzes the range of reasonable alternatives that covers the full spectrum of potential combinations. The alternatives considered by DOE in this EIS are "reasonable" in the sense that they are practical or feasible from a technical and economic standpoint and meet the agency's purposes and needs. Potential conflicts with laws and regulations do not necessarily cause an alternative to be unreasonable, but additional mitigation commitments may be required if it is selected for implementation. For a more comprehensive discussion on compliance with regulatory requirements, see Section 2.7 of this CRD.

Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: lmonmyway50@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 7:28:13 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, I demand all current Hanford waste be treated through vitrification, not merely covered up.

It is staggering to believe we continue using nuclear energy, etc, without having anyway of safely getting rid of this hazardly and deadly waste. Unbelievable. *A32-1*

Sincerely,

Teresa Bessett
PO BOX 99
Soap Lake, WA 98851

A32-1 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jacob@chaos2.org
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:34:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Please demonstrate our government's ability to provide clean and safe nuclear power by showing a commitment to properly cleaning up afterward. *A33-1*

Sincerely,

Jacob Lundberg
1519 N Blandena ST
Portland, OR 97217

A33-1 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: janahair@hotmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 12:28:08 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

This cannot be the only option available in how to deal with this toxic waste. It should be dealt with in the safest possible way, and trucking it on busy public highways every day, for many years to come, strikes me as incredibly ill-advised and irresponsible. Please do not allow this to happen! *A34-1*

Sincerely,

Jana Hair
Vashon, WA

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Jana Hair
4729 University View Pl. N.E.
Seattle, WA 98105

A34-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jc@smoklaw.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:44:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to all residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Here's a better plan: ship all nuclear waste to the backyards of every politician in Congress and every employee of the Dept of Energy. Enough!! *A35-1*

Sincerely,

Judith Colbert
4207 SE Woodstock PMB 148
Portland, OR 97206

A35-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jebousek@charter.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:51:13 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I am appalled by the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. The underground plume of radioactive contamination has already reached the river. Meanwhile, with no public discussion of this environmental disaster, windsurfing continues in Hood River and other recreational uses of the Columbia continue without warming. To add more waste to this site is unconscionable. There was a clean up effort in the early 2000s that was abandoned. This effort must be resumed. The idea of adding further waste to this environmental disaster area is an outrage. *A36-1* *A36-2*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. This needs to be done immediately! *A36-3*

Sincerely,

Nyla Jebousek
P.O. Box 642
Newport, OR 97365

A36-1 Regarding public discussion on underground plumes of radioactive contamination reaching the Columbia River, DOE annually publishes compilation and assessment reports of groundwater monitoring data (Hanford Site Groundwater Monitoring Reports) and of multimedia environmental monitoring data (Hanford Environmental Site Reports). The commentor is directed to those documents for an indepth discussion of current conditions at the site. Appendix U of this *TC & WM EIS* includes a discussion of modeling results relative to currently reported conditions for the groundwater system. The *TC & WM EIS* groundwater modeling methodology focuses on concentrations of constituents in groundwater along the nearshore (i.e., Hanford side) of the Columbia River to facilitate comparison with field measurements.

A36-2 Regarding the further import of waste to Hanford before the site is cleaned up, in general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

A36-3 Please see response to comment A1-4 in the master letter for Campaign A.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jepol@verizon.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 4:36:08 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

Hanford has had a problem with radioactive waste leaking into the ground water. I'm STUNNED and APPALLED to learn of this plan to truck more waste to Hanford, knowing the track record of this site! As recently as last week, I saw a news story about how they were planning to pour asphalt on top of the ground, hoping that would somehow help the leakage problem. (I don't see how that could help at all.) *A37-1*

I VEHEMENTLY oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Poll
1827 Virginia Ave
Everett, WA 98201

A37-1 Regarding the possible use of asphalt to prevent groundwater contamination, temporary barriers are currently being placed on some of the tank farms. The goal of these interim corrective actions is to prevent movement of contaminants while the tanks are being retrieved. The asphalt prevents the spread of surface contamination, prevents plant uptake, and has some effect as an infiltration barrier. One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to address the environmental impacts of retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste, as well as activities that would lead from the temporary barriers to final (i.e., permanent) closure of the SST system. This EIS also evaluates the impacts of FFTF decommissioning, including management of waste generated by the decommissioning process. Finally, this *TC & WM EIS* evaluates the potential environmental impacts of ongoing solid-waste management operations at Hanford, as well as the proposed disposal of Hanford LLW and MLLW and a limited volume of offsite LLW and MLLW.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jerrybrees@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 4:36:08 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

There has been a long time systemic lack of federal funding to clean up the existing waste at the site, waste that has reached the ground water and is moving towards the Columbia River. *A38-1*

Given the history of the leakage at Hanford, it is unfathomable to me that our government is considering starting new nuclear reactors!

Sincerely,

Jerry Brees
4221 81st Place NE
Marysville, WA 98270

A38-1 Both DOE and Congress are committed to the cleanup efforts at Hanford, and DOE continues to seek funding for these efforts. Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

DOE received comments on the potential impacts of future remediation activities that are in various stages of planning (which, given the inherent uncertainty, were not included in the cumulative impacts analysis). In response, DOE performed a sensitivity analysis to evaluate the potential impacts if certain remediation activities were conducted at some of the more prominent waste sites on the Central Plateau and along the river corridor. The goal of the sensitivity analysis is to help DOE, EPA, and Ecology prioritize cleanup efforts in the future. This analysis is provided in Appendix U of this EIS and is discussed further in Chapter 7, Section 7.5.

Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jerskine15@msn.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:29:11 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

Having grown up in Sunnyside Washington, just over the hill from Hanford I have often wondered about so many of my friends dying of cancer and wonder if I will be next. We don't seem to understand that this material is for a life time and any error (which we humans are prone to make) means disaster and/or death for those near the "mistake". Growing up in the area I assumed the government had my best interests at heart only to learn later that my "government for the people" was actually not that concerned with my health or the health of the surrounding communities. *A39-1*
Please stop now, do not lift the moratorium! *A39-2*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Jack Erskine
60960 Creekstone Loop
Bend, OR 97702

A39-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past operations at Hanford, Sunnyside is on the Yakima River upstream of its confluence with the Columbia River and, at Hanford, the wind blows predominantly away from Sunnyside. The potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum effective dose equivalent through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

As stated in Appendix K, Section K.1.1.6, it is important to know that the American Cancer Society estimates that, in the United States, a person has about a 40 percent lifetime risk of developing an invasive cancer and that approximately 25 percent of all deaths are a result of cancer. Cancer incidence and death rates in the State of Washington are near the national average. This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes the potential human health impacts related to alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford, as described in Chapter 2. These analyses indicate that the potential human health impacts on the public of incident-free activities are well within established standards for protection of the public.

A39-2 Initially, a legal moratorium restricted the receipt of offsite waste until issuance of this *Final TC & WM EIS*. In a *Federal Register* notice published on

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

December 18, 2009 (74 FR 67189), DOE modified its Preferred Alternative for waste management and extended the moratorium, at least until the WTP is operational. For a more comprehensive discussion regarding the moratorium and the Preferred Alternative, see Chapter 2, Section 2.12, of this *TC & WM EIS*.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jgross@orst.edu
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:04:17 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. The source of life for Native American tribes throughout the ages. ▌| *A40-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Joan Gross
2753 NW Taylor Ave
Corvallis, OR 97330

A40-1 Comment noted.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jhurner@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 9:54:12 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

CLEAN UP ALL RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL. Do not move it around. Leave it where it is and clean it up there to save money in trasportation and put it towards treatment, while not endagering people and ecosystems as it drives around the country. *A41-1* *A41-2*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

j hurner
1409 E Marion St
Seattle, WA 98122

A41-1 Comment noted.

A41-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jillzapski@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:44:17 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

As a resident of Washington state practically my whole life (I'm now 65!), I can't believe that this is even an issue! The concerns about groundwater contamination seeping into the Columbia River; higher than average rates of cancer amongst humans, animals and fish in the whole area; and dealing with the existing radioactive waste at Hanford have not gone away -- they have only gotton worse with time. The long-term cleanup process at Hanford has dragged on for years, with no resolution/ completion in site -- and that's just dealing with what is there now. Also the thought of having truckloads of radioactive waste travelling on our freeways on a constant, regular basis is terrifying. *A42-1* *A42-2* *A42-3*

What happened to Yuca Mtn. for which millions (billions?) of dollars have already been spent in preparation for storage? Also, if states are going to have nuclear reactors, maybe they should also have radioactive waste storage sites.... *A42-4*

Please reconsider your currant plan to concentrate all USA radioactive waste at Hanford. This would be a giant step backward and a disaster for our state.

Sincerely,

Jill Roseen-Czaplicki
18939 NE 20th Ct
Redmond, WA 98052

A42-1 Regarding groundwater contamination seeping into the Columbia River, see Section 2.5 of this CRD, a volume of this *Final TC & WM EIS*, for response details regarding potential contamination of the Columbia River.

A42-2 The rate of cleanup at Hanford is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

A42-3 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A42-4 Regarding the status of the Yucca Mountain program and the idea that states with nuclear reactors also have waste storage sites, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jiminick@gorge.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:10:16 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

No more waste to Hanford until there is another waste site designated. If there is not a waste site designated, then start shutting down nuclear reactors all over the country and invest heavily in alternative energy. Nuclear creates more problems that it solves. *A43-1*

Sincerely,

Jim Minick
5 Wilkins Dr
Lyle, WA 98635

A43-1 Regarding offsite waste being shipped to Hanford, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jjmd@eoni.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 11:38:41 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

I have the good fortune to live in community where DOE did a presentation on the next steps facing Hanford. I came away with a couple of strong opinions:

(1) My mother taught me to clean up my messes. DOE must do the same at Hanford. 99% is not good enough. To my way of thinking 99.9% is closer, but is also not good enough. DOE must strive for 100% containment, followed by 100% cleanup. Time is a-wastin' That plume is moving towards the river and must be stopped. *A44-1*

(2) There are lots of reasons, but the final conclusion must be NO MORE WASTE to Hanford. Moving waste along highways is dangerous -- radiation leaks are anticipated and accidents on the dangerous highways leading to Hanford are predictable. One such accident happened west of La Grande already. And fortunately that truck was not carrying high-level radioactive waste. In addition, Hanford is unable to safely handle the waste already there. Why would we add to that contamination? Especially not in an area bordering a life-blood water system, serving millions of people. *A44-2*

(3) Until such time as our society develops adequate, safe means to deal with waste from nuclear facilities, NO MORE NUCLEAR PLANTS SHOULD BE COMMISSIONED. *A44-3*

I appreciate the work going into this proposal and urgently request Hanford be 100% cleaned up with no additional nuclear materials being added to the toxic soup at the site.

Sincerely,

Janet Cremin
805 N Avenue
La Grande, OR 97850

A44-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. The alternatives presented in this *TC & WM EIS* were developed under NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to address the essential components of DOE's three sets of proposed actions (tank closure, FFTF decommissioning, and waste management) and to provide an understanding of the differences between the potential environmental impacts of the range of reasonable alternatives. Consistent with CEQ guidance, this EIS analyzes the range of reasonable alternatives that covers the full spectrum of potential combinations. The alternatives considered by DOE in this EIS are "reasonable" in the sense that they are practical or feasible from a technical and economic standpoint and meet the agency's purposes and needs. Potential conflicts with laws and regulations do not necessarily cause an alternative to be unreasonable, but additional mitigation commitments may be required if it is selected for implementation. For a more comprehensive discussion on compliance with regulatory requirements, see Section 2.7 of this CRD.

DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford under the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

A44-2 Regarding the transportation of radioactive waste to Hanford, as noted in Appendix H of this *TC & WM EIS*, packaging represents the primary barrier between the radioactive material being transported and the public, workers, and the environment. Transportation packaging for radioactive materials is designed, constructed, and maintained to contain and shield its contents during normal transport conditions. DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A44-3 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jmeao9@q.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:32:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I vehemently oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I am downright angry to learn of this plan. The plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site is thoughtless and ill conceived. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents and travelers. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. The Columbia River stretches along the entire border of Oregon and Washington. It provides irrigation for farmland, feeding the nation and the world. And of course the Columbia empties into the Pacific Ocean. Thus any contamination in the Columbia will end up contaminating the Pacific Ocean. Contamination of the Columbia River contaminates our supply of seafood, most especially salmon. *A45-1*

In addition, downriver from Hanford is the world destination for wind surfing. Bringing more radioactive waste to Hanford puts the tourist industry of Washington and Oregon at risk, which would have a dire impact on the economy. *A45-2*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Judith Green
916 E Laurel St
Bellingham, WA 98225

A45-1 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites. This encompasses analyzing potential impacts on human health and the environment, including the ecosystem.

A45-2 Regarding the potential effect of waste management activities at Hanford on tourism along the Columbia River, this *TC & WM EIS* analyzes potential human health impacts (through the air pathway) of normal operations, presented in Chapter 4, with details in Appendix K, as well as long-term impacts (including through the groundwater and river pathway), presented in Chapter 5, with details in Appendix Q. Impacts are not evaluated for all specific types of river users, such as, for example, a wind surfer. However, analyses in Appendix Q include consideration of impacts on members of downstream populations, assuming that they are exposed by using river water for drinking and irrigating gardens and through fish consumption. These exposure pathways have been shown to be much more significant than casual contact through swimming or other recreational uses. As shown in Appendix Q, the resulting doses to downstream users would be extremely small.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: johnkersting@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 8:59:07 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

Residents of Washington State want nothing to do with more nuclear pollution and any of the associated costs. Hanford and WPPSS was enough! *A46-1*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

John Kersting
2404 Olympia Ave NE
Olympia, WA 98506

A46-1 Even though it is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*, the comment is noted. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jpl@whidbey.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:54:21 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

WE THE PEOPLE of Washington State already voted on this issue. We will not be your nuclear dumping ground. Perhaps hundreds of extra cancer deaths and further degradation of the Columbia River does not mean anything to you bureaucrats. What does matter to you???

We have done more than our share of patriotic duty for the U.S. nuclear weapons industry. It is past time to stop this insanity.

I know it is expedient, and you get lots of money from the nuclear and military industries, but shouldn't you be listening to the voices of the PEOPLE??? Try it, just this once.

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Dr. Jeffrey Paul LaGasse M.D.
PO Box 637
Freeland, WA 98249

A47-1

A47-1 DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jrvduno@charter.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 5:54:19 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

The basalt rock under Hanford is porus, it is not solid material. It is not a safe depository for nuclear waste. It only concentrates the harm in one leaky deposit after hauling it over highways throughout the country. This choice is worse that Yuca mountain. *A48-1* *A48-2* *A48-3*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Judith Uno
62385 Old Sawmill Rd
Coos Bay, OR 97420

A48-1 The analysis of long-term impacts on groundwater beneath all of the potential waste disposal sites was explicitly predicated on the presence of porosity in the suprabasalt sediments and the basalt itself, and on the partial or complete presence of water in the porous media. This is described in Appendices L and N of this *Final TC & WM EIS*.

A48-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A48-3 The current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: juliamp@hotmail.com
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 4:14:19 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 19, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I live right off I-5 in Portland, OR. Please, please don't allow that nuclear waste to go by house, day after day, year after year! Let's clean it up, not just dump it someplace else. Thanks so much for listening. *A49-1*

Sincerely,

Bruce Brown
5346 NE 16TH Ave
Portland, OR 97211

A49-1 This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve, treat, and dispose of Hanford tank waste; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate environmental cleanup activities at Hanford and other DOE sites. Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jw277402@ohio.edu
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 2:57:14 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. At a minimum we need above ground monitored retrievable storage of nuclear waste at existing nuclear power facilities as they are transitioned for nuclear power stations to solar and wind powered nuclear waste storage centers. *A50-1*

Sincerely,

James Wynn
2250 Patterson Street #23
Eugene, OR 97405

A50-1 Regarding the possibility of monitored, retrievable storage of nuclear waste at existing nuclear power facilities, the storage of existing nuclear power (commercial) facilities is not within the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jwdavis@hevanet.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 8:03:16 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Cancer incidence downwind from Hanford is very high. I have a friend who grew up there. She died from brain cancer in 1995, as did many of her contemporaries who suffered other forms of cancer. *A51-1*

Sincerely,

Judy Davis
17617 Arbor Lane
Lake Oswego, OR 97035

A51-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: j_maron@msn.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 7:30:08 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

This is what is so scary about getting involved with the production of additional nuclear power plants... we do not have ANY REALISTIC PLAN TO REMOVE THE WASTE "SAFELY"!!! HOW DARE OUR ELECTED OFFICIALS PLAY WITH OUR LIVES AND WELL-BEING OF OUR FAMILIES. IT IS LUDICROUS!!!

The Columbia River has already shown radition levels as far down stream as Portland and who knows how much of this has made its way into the ocean by now. We need to wake up and stop heading in the wrong and dangerous direction and begin producing alternative sources for our energy NOW!!!

Sincerely,

Judie Maron-Friend
123 Abcde
Portland, OR 97220

A52-1

A52-1 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: kandr@gorge.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:39:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As residents of the Pacific Northwest, we oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

We vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like us. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. We live along the Columbia River.

According to Dr. Helen Caldecott, the Columbia River is the most radioactive river in the nation. The transportation of this radioactive waste will further endanger the Columbia River Gorge as well as towns and cities along the transportation paths of the trucks carrying nuclear waste to Hanford. *A53-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

We are also disturbed about the cost of human life. By the USDOE's own statistic: as many as 816 deaths would result from waste transportation. We believe this figure to be understated. At any rate, the cost of human life to implement this program is unacceptable. Imagine the death count if an accident or terrorist attack were to occur. *A53-2*

Cumulative impacts are not yet disclosed. The USDOE doesn't know the impact. What will be the impact to the groundwater, the tribes, the salmon, our communities? There are too many unanswered questions for this program to proceed. *A53-3*

We demand that the USDOE clean up the nuclear waste it already has at Hanford before bringing more to the site.

In closing, we demand an end to the delays to cleanup Hanford. Cleanup that was to occur by 2007 is now postponed to 2019. The USDOE must commit to prompt cleanup, not new waste streams created at the site OR imported to Hanford from other sites. *A53-4*

Sincerely,

Kelly Hochendoner
367 NE Spring St White
Salmon, WA 98672

A53-1 Regarding the potential negative impacts on Hanford groundwater that the offsite waste poses without mitigation, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A53-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A53-3 An extensive discussion of cumulative impacts is provided in Chapter 6 and Appendices R through U of this *TC & WM EIS*.

A53-4 Regarding the further importation of waste to Hanford and delays in site cleanup, the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA, identifies cleanup actions and schedules. According to the TPA, DOE was years behind schedule for pumping radioactive waste out of the storage tanks and for startup of the vitrification plant (the WTP). In late 2008, the State of Washington sued DOE to enforce deadlines for Hanford's cleanup. In October 2010, the parties reached a settlement, resulting in a Consent Decree (*State of Washington v. Chu*, Civil No. 2:08-cv-05085-FVS, October 25, 2010). The Consent Decree milestones for WTP construction and startup were revised to "hot start of WTP" by December 31, 2019, and to achieve "initial plant operations" of the WTP no later than December 31, 2022.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: kcdcweld@wwest.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 4:49:24 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

It is a known fact that radio active waste at Hanford has already seeped into the ground water and that degradation of the fish is present. Years ago a local newspaper wrote not to eat but two stugeon out of the Columbia a year because of radio active contaniments and it was stressed for pregnant women especially. *A54-1*

The federal government hasn't lived up to cleaning up this site as promised and now they want to add more waste. This is unconscionable as the thought of building more nuclear facilities, when we cannot even deal with the waste we have already made. *A54-2*

Sincerely,

Karen Caspers-Curl
P.O. Box 1
Naselle, WA 98638

A54-1 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites. This analysis encompasses potential impacts on human health and the environment, including animals and plants. The impacts and results of the risk analysis for air and groundwater releases to the Columbia River under the various alternatives are discussed and evaluated in Appendix P, Section P.3.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

A54-2 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: kiliastrom@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 6:24:19 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). Are you aware of the history of expensive (to say the least) malfunctions at Hanford? Are you aware of the danger this would put residents of our state in? Please dont make Hanford and Washington state suffer any more nuclear caused destruction to our people, animals and environment. *A55-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Mary-Alice Strom
7115 77th Ave NE
Marysville, WA 98270

A55-1 As noted in Chapter 1 of this *TC & WM EIS*, it has been determined that cleanup and remediation actions are needed to permanently reduce the risk to human health and the environment from past operations at Hanford. DOE is committed to carrying out those actions in a way that complies with applicable Federal, state, and local laws and regulations. This EIS was prepared to evaluate and compare the potential human and environmental impacts of alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford, as described in Chapter 2. Chapters 4 and 5 present potential short- and long-term impacts, respectively.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: kitkatmcla@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:14:19 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. The Columbia is already cynically known by us locals as "the most radioactive river in the NW, if not the world." How does it make any kind of logical scientific or environmental sense to store radioactive waste so near a major river? What's already here is enough of a problem--it should NOT be added to in such a simplistic and thoughtless way! Do not make a bad problem worse by adding to it! This proposal should make its originator blush in shame, and if carried out, would be no less than criminal. *A56-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Peterson
3146 SE 54th Ave
Portland, OR 97206

A56-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: kitty@futurewise.org
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 1:08:10 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a lifelong resident of Spokane, WA, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). In fact, none of the alternatives that have been considered are acceptable. High level nuclear waste---whether reprocessed or not, does not belong in shallow landfills on the Columbia River. The best option is to stop creating this waste. Until that is done the waste needs to be somewhere deep and geologically stable and far away from groundwater that people and nature rely on. *A57-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Thank you for your attention to this critical issue that will affect the health of the Pacific Northweste for generations.

Sincerely,

Kitty Klitzke
25 W Main, Suite 244
Spokane, WA 99201

A57-1 Regarding shallow disposal of HLW and the creation of additional HLW, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: ksvm@mac.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:02:16 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

I live in Oregon near Hanford. Finally, 30 years ago this plant was closed. Now, you are discussing opening it again after all we have been through. *A58-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

karen mirande
325 NE 4th St. dufur,
OR 97021

A58-1 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate environmental cleanup activities at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: kwarren98532@yahoo.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 24, 2010 9:16:16 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Hanford is still a disgrace. I attended Whitman College & at the time Hanford was releasing radioactive waste into the air. I didn't learn about it until 20 years later. I had a friend who was a geologist for Hanford & a local farmer. A child of his was born dead. He said its hands were perfectly formed & its body looked like chopped liver. This broke his heart & he worked for the rest of his life for nuclear abolition. Will this insanity never stop? *A59-1*

Sincerely,

Kay Warren
POB 1124
Centralia, WA 98531

A59-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: k_shirley@charter.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 10:42:12 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

They need to get the clean-up figured out 1st - which isn't likely to happen since they have been working on it for years without any progress. The waste needs to go where it is save - AWAY FROM THE COLUMBIA RIVER!!!!!!! *A60-1*

Sincerely,

keith shirley
2691 Eaton Dr
Medford, OR 97504

A60-1 Regarding the rate of cleanup at Hanford, in general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include (nor will the potential NEPA ROD) groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze the potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms by landfill closure, selective clean closure, or clean closure. Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: leslie.green@charter.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:34:19 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me.

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site.

In fact I oppose the creation of any more nuclear waste at all. ▌| *A61-1*

Sincerely,

Leslie Green
1490 NE Lake Drive
Lincoln City, OR 97367

A61-1 Even though it is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*, the comment is noted. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: loweb3@nventure.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:33:18 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

As a former "downwinder" who suffered thyroid cancer at an early age, I'm probably more aware of the dangers of radioactive waste than most other and painfully aware of poorly the waste at Hanford has already affected the health of those who live in the area. *A62-1*

DOE needs to solve the problems there now before compounding them with more problems! *A62-2*

Sincerely,

Loren Webster
5037 North Mildred St
Tacoma,, WA 98407

A62-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

A62-2 This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: lsouthern@bmi.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:01:17 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Yucca Mountain was developed for this very purpose...Let's use it and not waste more taxpayers dollars. *A63-1*

Sincerely,

Larry Southern
1412 S 7th
Sunnyside, WA 98944

A63-1 The current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: maryburnley@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 5:22:13 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 19, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. Already, there is a disturbingly high incidence of cancer along the I-5 corridor, and, by the DOE's own analysis, that will only increase. What are you thinking?!? *A64-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Mary Burnley
88708 Gentry
Eugene, OR 97402

A64-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: mission419@earthlink.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:59:13 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. I think it is outrageous to slip such a plan through with so little public debate. I just now heard about the Friday deadline for speaking out. *A65-1*

Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Munson
419 N 61st
Seattle, WA 98103

A65-1 As a NEPA document, this *TC & WM EIS* was prepared in an open manner, with opportunities for public input provided at both the scoping meetings and public hearings on the draft EIS. Two sets of public scoping meetings for this *TC & WM EIS* were held, in February 2003 and March 2006. The proposed alternatives and assumptions to be analyzed in this EIS were communicated to the public during these public scoping periods, and public comments from this process were considered during development of the *Draft TC & WM EIS*. Notice of the comment period and hearings was given in the *Federal Register*, mailings to interested parties, and local newspapers. Public input is important to DOE and DOE appreciates the public's participation in these hearings. In response to the public's request for additional time to review the draft EIS, DOE extended the public comment period by 45 days, for a total comment period of 185 days. All comments made during the public comment period, whether given orally at hearings or sent via mail or email, were considered equally by DOE. All comments received on the *Draft TC & WM EIS* and their approved responses are included in this CRD, a volume of this final EIS. DOE has posted this *Final TC & WM EIS*, including this CRD, on the Hanford website (http://www.hanford.gov) and on the DOE NEPA website (http://energy.gov/nepa), and a Notice of Availability will be published in the *Federal Register*.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: musicetc@clearwire.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:05:18 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

Obama supports building more nuclear reactors! More toxic waste for the planet! More $ for a few jerks! *A66-1*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Marc Smason
3409 18th S.
Seattle, WA 98144

A66-1 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: myhreclimber@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 7:25:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

In the near future salmon that came up the Col. river would not be edible !!! *A67-1*

Sincerely,

Paul Myhre
11114 Merry Canyon
Leavenworth, WA 98826

A67-1 Regarding the potential impacts of Hanford activities on Columbia River fish species, this *TC & WM EIS* analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with specific proposed actions and reasonable alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford. These analyses include impacts on fish and wildlife and their habitat, as well as environmental justice and socioeconomic considerations, consistent with current CEQ and DOE NEPA guidance. Short-term impacts are presented in Chapter 4; long-term impacts, including those associated with a scenario specific to an American Indian hunter-gatherer, are presented in Chapter 5.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: nana9grans@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 3:58:19 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

We have a active earthquake near enough to cause a mess with the nuclear plant among other things. We have a large enough mess to clean up as it is! *A68-1* *A68-2*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

DA Lean
6255 NE 184th st
Kenmore, WA 98028

A68-1 Regarding the possibility of foreseeable seismic events at Hanford and the potential for impacts on waste treatment and disposal facilities, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.5.1.1, of this *TC & WM EIS* discusses and depicts the locations of geologic faults relative to Hanford and the faults' potential for producing earthquakes at the site. DOE Order 420.1B and its implementing standards require that nuclear and nonnuclear facilities be designed, constructed, and operated to safeguard the facility, public, workers, and environment from natural phenomena hazards, including earthquakes. The impacts of seismic events with respect to Hanford facilities, worker health and safety, and risk to the general public are assessed in Appendix K and presented in Chapter 4 of this EIS.

A68-2 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze the potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: nroche@opusnet.com
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 1:03:08 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

Those of us who live downstream on the Columbia River feel very strongly that the further pollution of the area will eventually cause such terrible pollution that the whole area will become uninhabitable. That would be a really shortsighted disaster. People simply cannot cohabit with nuclear waste without eventually all becoming very sick.

The burying of the waste cannot continue forever without eventually rendering the entire Columbia Basin a total loss to our nation.

Then there's the issue to shipping the waste along the nation's highway's and taking the chance of polluting other areas on the path here. Why don't you guys give up on nuclear power totally before anymore harm is done to the nation. *A69-1*

And by the way, the Exxon Valdese (sp?) people have never paid the fines levied against them for polluting miles of Alaska. Let's not keep moving pollution around to the rest of the country. Let's contain it where it is or even better, just cease polluting altogether. *A69-2*

Sincerely,

Nancy Roche
1411 NE 16th Ave #209
Portland, Oregon 97232

Sincerely,

Nancy Roche
1411 NE 16th Ave #209
Portland, Oregon 97232

A69-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

A69-2 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Regarding the transport of waste across the Nation, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: onyerpockets@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:24:06 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. It is because of these waste problems (its life and its disposal) that I am not a proponent of nuclear fission. Let's develop FUSION- far more bang for the buck and few, if any, waste and disposal issues. *A70-1*

Sincerely,

Jill Johnston
POB 221
Vader, WA 98593

A70-1 Nuclear fusion is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate environmental cleanup activities at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: marc@2910.org
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:27:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Of course, the best plan of all is to put all that money being spent on Nuclear energy and put it into clean, safe, comparitively cheap solar, geothermal, wave, wind and other developing forms of renewable energy. We don't need nuclear. *A71-1*

Sincerely,

Marc Vendetti
4742 42nd Ave. SW #383
SEATTLE, WA 98116

A71-1 Even though the use of renewable energy instead of nuclear energy in the United States is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*, the comment is noted. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: shipahoy@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:13:18 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

No more radioactive waste should be added to Hanford which is already a problem. This doesn't make sense at all! *A72-1*

The site needs to be cleaned up not made worse.

Dorothy Davis

Sincerely,

Dorothy Davis
202 Morey
Bellingham, WA 98225

A72-1 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate environmental cleanup activities at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: hrblessing@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 2:26:03 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 19, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

It's time to fulfill the promises that have been made to people living anywhere near Hanford, so that cancer and genetic abnormalities no longer affect their families and their animals. That is NOT a healthy area! *A73-1*

Sincerely,

Hannah-Riley Blessing
Blessing 3017 NE Emerson St.
Portland, OR 97211

A73-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: dianar@peak.org
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 9:17:16 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Please let me know how this proceeds. *A74-1*

Sincerely,

Diana Robertson
P.O. Box 592
Waldport, OR 97394

A74-1 All comments received on the *Draft TC & WM EIS* and their approved responses are included in this CRD, a volume of this final EIS. DOE has posted this *Final TC & WM EIS*, including this CRD, on the Hanford website (http://www.hanford.gov) and on the DOE NEPA website (http://energy.gov/nepa), and a Notice of Availability will be published in the *Federal Register*. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jmcleod84@hotmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 12:45:13 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).
I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.
Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I enjoy swimming in the Columbia River on occasion, i don't want to have to tell my friends and family that we can no longer do so without risk of serious radiation exposure due to your incompetence in keeping our rivers and this planet as a whole clean. In truth i would like to see the end of any form of nuclear power. For now you must find a different and safer way to dispose of, or treat the radioactive wastes. *A75-1*

Considering that i travel around the Vancouver area regularly i don't want to be at risk of any type of deadly cancer just from traveling. I live off of highway 14 and use I-5 and I-205 regularly and knowing that these shipments will use those routs is completely unacceptable. It would behoove you to change your stance on how to deal with radioactive waste rather than just dump it in the ground where it will contaminate a river used by thousands if not tens of thousands of people regularly, myself included. Keep in this in mind when making your decision... Do you want to be known as the reason why so many will be born in the future in the pacific north west with a vast amount of deformities, as well as being born with a multitude of different cancers. All because you decided to turn the pacific north west into a toxic waste dump. Rest assured that if in fact you do decide to make this decision that the educated and informed people will not stand for it, and your incompetence will be dually noted. *A75-2* *A75-3* *A75-4*

Sincerely,

Justin McLeod
3900 ne Cardiel dr
Washougal, WA 98671

A75-1 The use of nuclear power is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

A75-2 This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes transportation routes from specific origination/destination sites to/from Hanford, as shown in Appendix H, Figure H–4, Waste Management Alternatives – Analyzed Truck and Rail Routes. The analyzed routes include routes that pass through the northeastern part of the state of Oregon (i.e., Interstate 84). DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A75-3 Regarding the potential effects of waste management activities at Hanford on the Columbia River, as noted in Chapter 1, Section 1.3, the purpose and need of this *TC & WM EIS* include long-term actions to permanently reduce the risk to human health and the environment posed by waste in the SSTs and DSTs and to facilitate the cleanup of Hanford. This EIS analyzes potential human health impacts (through the air pathway) of normal operations, presented in Chapter 4, with details in Appendix K ("Short-Term Human Health Risk Analysis"), as well as long-term impacts (including through the groundwater and river pathway), presented in Chapter 5, with details in Appendix Q ("Long-Term Human Health Dose and Risk Analysis"). Analyses in Appendix Q include consideration of impacts on members of downstream populations, assuming that they are exposed by using river water for drinking and irrigating gardens and through fish consumption. As shown in this appendix, the estimated doses to downstream users are extremely small.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

A75-4 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: pennie@penniemumm.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:45:17 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a "down wind" resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). Guess why! Who wants to glow in the dark and have damaged children? I'm just saying N O THANKS! *A76-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. Something is being covered up here, and it's not radioactive waste but another sort.... *A76-2*

Sincerely,

Reverend Pennie Mumm CD MS
"PO Box 483, permanent mailing address"
College Place, WA 99324

A76-1 Regarding the potential health impacts of being a downwinder, potential radiological impacts on the public of proposed activities at Hanford are presented in Chapter 4, Section 4.1, for Tank Closure alternatives; Section 4.2 for FFTF Decommissioning alternatives; and Section 4.3 for Waste Management alternatives. The potential impacts of combinations of alternatives are presented in Chapter 4, Section 4.4, which shows that the potential short-term radiological impacts on an MEI residing near Hanford would be less than 2 millirem in the year of maximum impact and about 12 millirem over the life of the project.

DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A76-2 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites. DOE's intention is to provide full disclosure of the data and analysis included in this EIS to stakeholders.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: phunrichs@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 9:37:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Nuclear Power may become a viable option at some point, but as long as we continue to pretend it's within our power to safely store hazardous substances for ten thousand years real solutions won't be found. Don't make us part of the absurdity – more than we already are. I've lived downwind of this poison for 35 years, we've got enough waste, thanks. *A77-1*

Sincerely,

Peter Hunrichs
w. 1401 13th Ave.
Spokane,, WA 99204

A77-1 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: pse@aaahawk.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 6:23:04 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

I grew up in Yakima, near Hanford. Many parents and relatives of childhood mates worked at Hanford. I've travelled all over the world for business, and have had choices to live many places, but always preferred home in the majestic natural beauty of Washington State. I cannot say strongly enough: I vehemently oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

The gravely serious pending groundwater contamination of the Columbia River is a travesty, from which all of us, and particularly the source originator U S Federal Government, should be expending heroic measures, at all cost, to avert. It is more important than bailout money for Goldman Sachs, more just than the wars in Iraq. After YEARS of unsuccessful, inadequate and woefully incomplete foot-dragging efforts by the FEDS to CLEAN UP HANFORD, any plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site is really complete lunacy. Add to that the plan requirements to ship this waste along Northwest freeways ("let's really make things easy for domestic/international terrorists") - it's worse than dangerous, it's the height of irresponsibility. *A78-1*

CLEAN UP the CURRENT HANFORD WASTE properly, including vitirification. If the FEDS can accomplish this, with every help from us people in Washington State, THEN and only then can this plan legitimately be put on the table for discussion. *A78-2*

Sincerely,

Pamela Erickson
4107 Hillcrest Ave SW
Seattle, WA 98116

A78-1 Regarding groundwater contamination at Hanford and further import of waste to Hanford, please see Sections 2.3 and 2.11 of this CRD, a volume of this *Final TC & WM EIS*, for a comprehensive response related to remediation cleanup of the site and mitigation of potential impacts.

Regarding the transportation of waste along Northwest freeways, based on the transportation analysis summarized in this *TC & WM EIS*, Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12, Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Transportation, the additional LCFs expected from radiation exposures to the general population from truck transport would be less than 1 under all alternatives. Rail transport would lead to lower doses to the general population, due to the smaller number of transports and lower exposures to the people in the vicinity of stations where the reclassification and inspections would take place. Also, no additional LCFs are expected due to an accident involving a rail or truck shipment (DOE 1997). DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A78-2 DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford under the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: pvonc@olypen.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:54:21 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

There is no safe storage at Hanford. Do not allow nuclear waste to be stored at Hanford. *A79-1*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Peter von Christierson
1229 - 29th St.
Port Townsend, WA 98368

A79-1 Comment noted.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: ray.clayton@pnl.gov
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:28:06 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

You guys are sensationalists! I work at the Hanford site and it is one of the safest work environments I have seen. I came out of the farming industry where there were multiple injuries, repeated chemical exposures and deaths. I know statistics, so don't feed me the lines about the fatal cancers and regular births of weird farm animals. Send me the reports!!! *A80-1*

Don't worry about the Columbia River. I work on the Hanford Reach all the time and you have to be so fast to find the contamination, that it is almost impossible to capture it. The river is so large and so fast that everything just disappears. If you want to do something constructive, get the Administration to reopen the Yucca Mountain facility in Nevada. *A80-2*

Sincerely,

ray clayton
503 S. Beech
Toppenish, WA 98948

A80-1 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites. As part of this EIS, the impacts on workers and the environment, including the Columbia River, are analyzed.

A80-2 Regarding the commentor's support for the Yucca Mountain facility, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: rerickson@pobox.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:19:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

I think the best approach is clear: use Yucca Mountain as a *short term* repository, until the next, better one can be developed and opened. Storing more waste at Hanford is almost as bad an idea as the permanent repository at Yucca Mountain was. (We don't have the technology yet for permanent, non-retrievable storage!) *A81-1*

Sincerely,

Roddy Erickson
3902 V Ave
Anacortes, WA 98221

A81-1 Regarding the commentor's support for the Yucca Mountain facility, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: rlee@victoriancrochet.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 11:08:17 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

Again we get to watch corporate america destroy our environment. We MUST shut down nuclear plants so we don't have to try to find ways to dispose of something that CAN NOT be disposed. No more nuclear waste. *A82-1*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Ramona Lee
P.O. Box 1072
Port Hadlock, WA 98339

A82-1 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: rmn@icehouse.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:35:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Nuclear weapons are strategically foolish and nuclear electricity is economically unwise and environmentally stupid. This junk should be in no one's backyard. STOP producing it! *A83-1*

Sincerely,

Mike Nuess
2025 E 10th Ave
Spokane, WA 99202

A83-1 Even though it is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*, the comment is noted. The management of waste resulting from environmental cleanup activities is analyzed in this EIS. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: robertav@centurytel.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:50:13 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Ship your radioactive, chemical and biological waste to the capital, they are the ones who want to build more nuclear power plants. We have had enough of dumping those hazardous materials in the Columbia River, then wondering why there are no fish! To fix that problem, they kill the seals!! *A84-1*

Sincerely,

Roberta Vandehey
20481 Winlock Lane
Fossil, OR 97830

A84-1 Even though it is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*, the comment is noted. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: robin.ford@globalcache.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:31:19 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

I was born and raised in Eastern Washington. I have had to have thyroid surgery, and most of my extended family from that area has had serious thyroid problems. I believe it is a direct result from being exposed to the plutonium waste of Hanford. As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). *A85-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Robin Ford
11894 Upper applegate Rd.
Jacksonville, OR 97530

A85-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: ronamayo@msn.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 5:03:10 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Also, if you have no place to dump this waist, why is the US going to build more reactors? Bad idea! *A86-1*

Ron Mayo

Sincerely,

Kathleen Mayo
228 NW 41st Street
Seattle, WA 98107

A86-1 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: ronpm800@msn.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:43:05 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

I'm old enough to know families of downwinders that had babie with health problems linked to Hanford. I am incensced at the idea to choose this site that was supposed to be cleaned up as a dump. Not haaving done cleanup is a broken promis to begin with and storing it at Hanford has many problems for the nation.

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I feel stupid saying this but the Pacific Northwest has some extreme weather. We have blizzards, black ice, freezing rain and fog and it is unpredictable enough I doubt the truck would stop. The whole idea of shipping waste from anywhere is insane. It is a danger where it is and it is a danger expnentionally if it is shipped. *A87-1*

I don't trust government officials not to outsource it to god knows who and make it even less safe and regurlated. The Columbia River is a source of life for this area and it feeds a huge area. The last thing we need is polluted ground water and the last time this was proposed the studies showed no gurarentees that it wouldn't leak into the water. Water is to be the next oil so why would we contanimnate this. Did I mention the seismic ativity in the area? *A87-2* *A87-3*

Are the trucks going to have danger designations? Either answer is bad. Yes means they can be targeted by terrorists, crazies or just for ransom. No, means that if there is an accident it will be too late to take precasutions as again it will be more secret government. *A87-1 cont'd*

The country cannot afford a spill. It can't afford the press, cost in lives, land and cleanup.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

maggi dunn
1930 e cataldo
spokane, WA 99202

A87-1 DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A87-2 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

A87-3 The geologic setting, including the seismic activity associated with Hanford, is discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.5, of this *TC & WM EIS*.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: Ross@molalla.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:42:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

My sister as well as every person she knows in her little town downriver from Hanford has had cancer even though death certificates do not list that as cause of death. Why so many? *A88-1*

I was exposed as a child from Hanford releases that were never made public. Has that caused some of my health problems?

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Patricia Ross
31728 S Shady Dell Rd
Molalla, OR 97038

A88-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: rudyberg@rio.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:38:16 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

Ten years ago, I heard an engineer who was involved in the Hanford cleanup effort describe it in frightening terms: it was clear that a vast, toxic groundwater plume was moving toward the Columbia River. Among the remedies under consideration was to immobilize the plume by freezing it, pumping huge amounts of chilled refrigerant through underground tubes to create a subterranean iceberg -- essentially forever. The engineer said that an immediate "crash program" on the scale of the Manhattan Project would be needed to avoid a catastrophe. *A89-1*

Instead of that program, we've had a decade of fumbling. And now the DOE proposes to sharpen this crisis by adding to the poisonous burden.

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Rudy Berg
195 E 32nd Ave
Eugene, OR 97405

A89-1 For a comprehensive response regarding existing onsite waste and further import of waste to Hanford, please see Sections 2.1, 2.3, and 2.5 of this CRD, a volume of this *Final TC & WM EIS.*

The impacts of the offsite waste in terms of radiological risk are presented in the Summary, Section S.5.5.3, and Chapter 2, Section 2.10, Key Environmental Findings. These sections discuss the radiological risk differences between including and not including offsite waste disposal at IDF-East.

The *TC & WM EIS* analysis shows that receipt of offsite waste streams that contain specific amounts of certain isotopes, specifically, iodine-129 and technetium-99, could cause an adverse impact on the environment. Therefore, one means of mitigating this impact would be for DOE to limit disposal of offsite waste streams at Hanford. Other mitigation measures, such as recycling secondary-waste streams into the primary-waste-stream feeds within the WTP to increase iodine-129 capture in ILAW and bulk vitrification glass, are discussed in Chapter 7, Section 7.5, of this final EIS.

Ecology's foreword to the draft EIS included its views and positions concerning DOE's analysis in the document and has been updated in this final EIS.

This *TC & WM EIS* discusses in situ soil remediation (freezing of soil and contaminants) at Hanford in Appendix E, Section E.1.3.5.2. This technology was reviewed but not evaluated in this EIS for the reasons described in that section.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: salafsky@lamar.colostate.edu
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:25:13 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I strongly oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to lift the moratorium and add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Even without traffic accidents, shipping this radioactive waste along Northwest freeways is known to be a danger to residents like me that live near the transit routes. Additionally, groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River poses further risks to many more residents of the Pacific Northwest. *A90-1*

There is already too much nuclear waste at Hanford that needs to be dealt with in a safe and effective manner. We need to engage in a long-term cleanup process by treating the current Hanford waste through vitrification, not by covering it up. Radioactive waste from other Department of Energy sites needs to be dealt with locally, instead of shipping the waste to the Pacific Northwest and increasing the risks of spreading the contamination. *A90-1 cont'd*

Sincerely,

Susan Salafsky
1516 Crestmore Pl
Corvallis, OR 97330

A90-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: sbtgamble@msn.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:41:08 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

Hanford has yet to safely contain the waste it currently has, and it certainly does not need more waste to add to its problems. I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

This is the best proof ever that all things nuclear never have been and never will be "green". Please consider this when thinking of building MORE nuclear power plants. Put the waste in your backyard and see how you feel about it. Let there be no doubt NUKES= CANCER & DEATH! *A91-1*

Sincerely,

Sara Gamble
15538 SE 168th St.
Renton, WA 98058

A91-1 The use of nuclear power is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: scottaj3h@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:27:17 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

Hanford is not the solution. We in the Pacific Northwest should not pay the price for the lack of a realistic and safe long-term plan for nuclear waste. As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). *A92-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Scott Johnsen
5510 248th Place SE
Issaquah, WA 98029

A92-1 Regarding the safe long-term storage of nuclear waste, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: seth@shikora.org
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:34:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Maybe we should finish cleaning up the mess we've already made of the place before dumping new waste there. If the billions spent on the Nevada site isn't good enough to store waste, how is it that a sight we've spent billions to clean up is? *A93-1*

Sincerely,

Seth Shikora
2232 SE 42nd Ave.
Portland, OR 97215

A93-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Regarding the safe long-term storage of nuclear waste, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: shelley@dahlgren.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:36:18 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

It has been proven that Hanford is a lousy place to store nuclear waste because the ground is full of holes that allows water to move up, down and sideways. The underlying ground was laid down from lava flows that left lave tubes that are well know in many places. SDD *A94-1*

Sincerely,

Mr. Shelley "Dahlgren, PhD"
4449 242nd Ave. S. E.
Issaquah, WA 98029

A94-1 Regarding the heterogeneity of the subsurface materials at Hanford, this *TC & WM EIS* analyzed a number of known and potential source locations for wastes containing radionuclides to support decisions regarding tank waste retrieval, treatment, and disposal and tank closure. The source locations analyzed include the SST farms (for residual tank waste, retrieval losses, and ancillary equipment) and several shallow land burial sources (trenches 31 and 34, the RPPDF, and an IDF). All of these sources are located near the surface of the vadose zone in suprabasalt sediments. The heterogeneity of the suprabasalt sediments was included in the analysis to the extent that (1) there was a documented, traceable description of the subsurface materials (e.g., a record made during well drilling) and (2) the physical scale of the heterogeneity was consistent with the discretization of the STOMP and MODFLOW models. This encoding process, the uncertainties in the supporting data, and the sensitivity of the models to those uncertainties are described in Appendices L and N.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: smcrae@earthlink.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 11:27:18 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Anyone who still thinks that nuclear power is a viable option ought to have their head examined. *A95-1*

Sincerely,

Susan McRae
1231 Miller Ave NE
Olympia, WA 98506

A95-1 Even though it is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*, the comment is noted. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: STEPHEN@PEAK.ORG
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:42:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

We have been trying to get this mess cleaned up for decades now, and adding more waste just seems crazy! Stop this madness, and let's think about what we are going to do with all the new waste we will have if we return to nuclear power! What happened to green alternative energy and the creation of new green jobs??? *A96-1*

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Cutler
PO Box 131
Yachats, OR 97498

A96-1 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Regarding the further import of waste to Hanford before the site is cleaned up, in general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: stephenjohnson@pol.net
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 3:55:17 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 19, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents and travelers. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

The priority should be to clean up current Hanford waste through vitrification, and establishing safe storage with multiple levels of safety redundancy before new waste is sent to Hanford. *A97-1*

Sincerely,

Stephen Johnson
3454 NE Hassalo St
Portland, OR 97232

A97-1 As described in the *TC & WM EIS* Summary, Section S.3.1, and Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2.2, this EIS evaluates vitrification of the tank waste for a number of the Tank Closure alternatives. However, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include remediation of either nontank waste (e.g., burial grounds, cribs and trenches [ditches]) or groundwater as part of the proposed actions evaluated. Thus, while vitrification of these nontank wastes could be chosen by DOE, this is not a decision that is within the scope of this NEPA process.

DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones, and is governed by the requirements of CERCLA. CERCLA and the implementing EPA regulations require that the substantive requirements of all applicable or relevant and appropriate Federal and state laws and regulations be met for each cleanup action taking place at Hanford. CERCLA also requires consideration of detailed decision criteria for each cleanup alternative as part of determining cleanup levels for each operable unit or waste management area. NEPA's purpose is different; its focus is to ensure agencies take a "hard look" at the potential environmental impacts associated with a proposed action and the reasonable alternatives to that proposed action. Agencies must conduct a comparative analysis of the alternatives and present the results; consider the cumulative impacts of the alternatives when added to other ongoing actions; and identify potential mitigations that could be used to offset the impacts identified by the NEPA analysis. The goal is to consider the best-available information at the time of the agency's decisionmaking process. However, NEPA does not require that an agency ultimately choose the most environmentally preferred alternative based on a "ranking" process.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: steve12698@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:56:08 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Thousands have died already from radioactive waste cancers. No more in Washington. *A98-1*

Sincerely,

Steve Lovelace
PO Box 245
Wilkeson, WA 98396

A98-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: susannas@efn.org
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:50:15 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site.

Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like myself, my friends and family.

And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

The consequences of an accident would be a disaster and there are truck accidents on the highways every month. *A99-1*

This waste does not belong in any ones back yard and does not belong shipped along major highways in major population areas.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Susanna Liberty
po box 324
Eugene, OR 97440

A99-1 The transportation of radioactive materials and waste, both coming to and leaving Hanford, must comply with DOT and NRC regulations that promote the protection of human health and the environment. This includes requiring the use of certified packaging that minimizes the radiation dose rate outside the transportation package and the likelihood of the packaging being breached in an accident. DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: teddy@gorge.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:10:16 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

The Eastern Washington terrain may look like "desert" to you, but it's a wildlife refuge! In addition,the nuclear waste stored there already is seeping underground into the Columbia River--which is increasingly absorbing more population from the urban areas to the west. The Hanford area (only one hundred miles from my home) has given enough to our nuclear madness. *A100-1* *A100-2*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

In the meantime, all current Hanford waste hasn't been treated adequately. It stillmust be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely, Theodora Cole, 402 Brashear Way, Goldendale, WA 98620

Sincerely,

Theodora Cole
402 Brashear Way
Goldendale, WA 98620

A100-1 DOE recognizes the ecological importance of Hanford to eastern Washington. As noted in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.1.1.1, of this *TC & WM EIS*, on June 9, 2000, approximately 78,900 hectares (195,000 acres) of the site was designated as the Hanford Reach National Monument. This proclamation recognized the unique character and biological diversity of the area, as well as its geologic, paleontological, historic, and archaeological significance. USFWS manages the monument under existing agreements with DOE. DOE manages land within the monument that is not subject to existing agreements; however, DOE consults with the Secretary of the Interior when developing any management plans affecting these lands. DOE fully recognizes the importance of rare habitat and species on those portions of the site not managed by USFWS and follows the requirements set forth in the *Hanford Site Biological Resources Management Plan* (DOE 2001).

A100-2 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: threepines@jeffnet.org
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 10:59:15 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. We must get responsible for the waste we've created, and not produce more at least until such a time as we can safely convert it to something harmless. *A101-1*

Sincerely,

Hal Anthony
3995 Russell Road
Grants Pass, OR 97526

A101-1 DOE has taken responsibility for the cleanup of waste at Hanford. In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: toddjacobs7@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 1:52:17 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

I'm aagainst nuclear power becuase of the significant risks of the waste - transport, long-term storage, and protection against terrorists. *A102-1*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Todd Jacobs
3535 NE 165th Street
Lake Forest Park, WA 98155

A102-1 Even though it is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*, the comment is noted. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: velvetcat1@peoplepc.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:06:29 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up

Keep this poison waste in your own back yard. Better yet ship it to Teaxas, they are such big abusers of everything pretaining to earth and mankind, animals, the air we breathe and the water we drink. No one wants this poison so why are the congress and senate pushing for more nuclear plants? NOT IN OUR BACK YARD!!! *A103-1*

Sincerely,

Katherine Holland
8710 N. Colton ST
Spokane, WA 99218

A103-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

The use of nuclear power in the United States is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate environmental cleanup activities at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: vulpis@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 5:58:10 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. There is too much waste at Hanford as it is. Leaking underground tanks and decomposing above ground storage is threatening the Columbia river, which threatens all commuties down river, including Portland Oregon and Vancouver Washington. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. *A104-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Abra Gwartney
4104 s.e. Ash st.
Portland, OR 97214

A104-1 As analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*, 67 of the 149 SSTs at Hanford are known or suspected to have leaked liquid waste to the environment between the 1950s and the present, some of which has reached the groundwater. Estimates of the total leak loss range from less than 2.8 million to as much as 3.97 million liters (750,000 to 1,050,000 gallons). Regarding groundwater contamination from past at Hanford and the contamination's potential impact on communities downriver from Hanford. One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: xero390@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 9:46:17 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. All current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

**********I would like to add that I live in Southeast Portland, and work in Southwest, passing near and occasionally driving the highways proposed to transport the nuclear waste. Those highways are in dire need of repair for potholes and re-painting the lines on the road. I also call into question the skill of the drivers on the roads in my area. I make use of the Sandy River during the summer for swimming, and I have been told that it's tributaries already leach nuclear waste into the river. I am upset about that amount of exposure I get as it is. I do not want any more nuclear waste getting into the water I drink from and recreate around. I do not want toxic waste of any kind being transported through my neighborhood(s). Please find somewhere else to put the toxic waste. *A105-1* *A105-2*

Sincerely,

Kristen Busold
3203 SE Clinton St
Portland, OR 97202

A105-1 DOE Manual 460.2-1A, *Radioactive Material Transportation Practices Manual for Use with DOE O 460.2A*, specifies that drivers be trained in compliance with DOT regulations as set forth in "Transportation" (49 CFR). DOE and its contractors would also comply with applicable state and local regulations pertaining to driver requirements and training. Drivers are technically qualified and experienced and have completed training in hazardous and radioactive materials transportation. Like all drivers, the truck drivers must take into consideration road maintenance activities in determining their route and timing; however, an evaluation of potential road conditions is not within the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*.

A105-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: xmas_carole@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 11:01:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. Scientists have found mutated insects in the area of Hanford and who knows what the lasting effects of Hanford waste has on the people, animals, and plants nearby? *A106-1*

Do not ship waste here! Make no more waste; get rid of nuclear power. *A106-2*

Sincerely,

Carole Henry
6109 Seabeck Holly Road NW
Seabeck, WA 98380

A106-1 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites. This analysis encompasses potential impacts on human health and the environment, including animals and plants.

A106-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: lizharmony@msn.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 11:39:46 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Let's also permanently close down all nuclear reactors before we have any more major disasters. *A107-1*

Sincerely,

Liz Washburn
2919 Racine St
Bellingham, WA 98226

A107-1 Even though it is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*, the comment is noted. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate environmental cleanup activities at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: syracopoulos@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:54:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

Along with opposing shipping nuclear waste to Hanford I strongly oppose the building of new nuclear power plants anywhere. All this country needs is more waste that we are unable to safely dispose of. Change that $46 billion loan from nuclear power to wind, solar etc energy sources that are distributed all across the country. *A108-1*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Thalia Syracopoulos
1607 bigelow N
Seattle, WA 98109

A108-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

The use of renewable energy sources in the United States is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jamesbarbour@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:35:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

When will this country learn that Nuclear Power is something we should have never messed with. President Obama is easily misled on this topic. *A109-1*

Jim & Jeannie Barbour

Sincerely,

Jeanniemaria Barbour
13217 97th Ave NE E104
Kirkland, WA 98034

A109-1 Even though it is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS,* the comment is noted. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on– and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: lizajanegray@hotmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 5:12:12 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a fine resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me and fellow travelers. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. Regional farmers are already regularly reporting three-legged chicks and two-headed calves. Regularly!

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

We cannot afford to shuffle around radioactive waste as if it were just so much refuse. It seems obvious that it needs to be delt with swiftly and decisively, vitrified and carefully stored with as little travel with the public as practical. *A110-1*

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lizajane Gray
3220 NE 85th Ave
Portland, OR 97220

A110-1 Radioactive waste is transported in DOT-certified containers that meet strenuous technical standards established by NRC.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: rnlburrows@earthlink.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 4:03:17 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

We really need to solve these waste deposit problems BEFORE embarking on creating more nuclear waste energy !! *A111-1*

Sincerely,

Richard Burrows
19512 56th St. E.
Bonney Lake, WA 98391

A111-1 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: twilightmoongoddess@ymail.com
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 10:26:13 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 19, 2010

Dumping more nuclear waste at Hanford is a BAD idea!! Besides the fact nuclear energy is BAD(renewable sources like solar, wind, geothermal, wave is the way to go). The Hanford reservation has already seen decades of abuse and pollution from the nuclear plant there! Sending more trucks on public highways carring nuclear waste would be putting many people in danger! So many accidents happen on highways as it is. Radioactive waste is not something to mess with. Farmers around the Hanford reach already have chickens born with 3 legs, and cows with two heads. Mother Nature sure didn't do that! Please do not allow MORE dumping at the Hanford reservation. Thank you. *A112-1* *A112-2*

Sincerely,

Heather Baron
5568 Se Flavel Dr
portland, OR 97206

A112-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Even though the generation of energy in the United States is beyond the scope of this EIS, the comment is noted. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve, treat, and dispose of Hanford tank waste; decommission FFTF; and expand waste disposal capacity at Hanford to provide for disposal of on- and offsite DOE waste.

A112-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: kipa@kipanderson.net
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 1:53:12 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. Even the government run Bonneville Power Adminstration recognizes the vast extent of current contamination covering well over 100 square miles into groundwater and ultimately the Columbia River. *A113-1*

Sincerely,

Kip Anderson
1854 Kent Ln
Eugene, OR 97404

A113-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: wymansc@shattered-realms.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:30:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

What the hey....??? Why are you planning to send MORE radioactive waste to Hanford when it is already one of the costliest "superfund" clean-up areas in this country? *A114-1*

~You want to make the cleanup more expensive and dangerous?

~You want MORE folks to come down with thyroid cancer, as they have been doing for decades in the area within a 50-75 mile radius of Hanford? Will the government pay for their medical expenses this time, or decline to do so, as in the past? *A114-2*

~You think this will give you support for the nuclear power industry's bid to supply clean (hahaha--if it's so clean, why not leave the nuclear waste right where it was generated--instead of shipping it here???)energy to the country? *A114-3*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Sara Wyman
802 Boyer Avenue
Walla Walla, WA 99362

A114-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

A114-2 DOE does not wish to see, or contribute to, any increases in cancer incidence in the region and is working toward reducing/eliminating site-associated risks. The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. The alternatives presented in this *TC & WM EIS* were developed under NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to address the essential components of DOE's three sets of proposed actions (tank closure, FFTF decommissioning, and waste management) and to provide an understanding of the differences between the potential environmental impacts of the range of reasonable alternatives. Consistent with CEQ guidance, this EIS analyzes the range of reasonable alternatives that covers the full spectrum of potential combinations. The alternatives considered by DOE in this EIS are "reasonable" in the sense that they are practical or feasible from a technical and economic standpoint and meet the agency's purposes and needs. Potential conflicts with laws and regulations do not necessarily cause an alternative to be unreasonable, but additional mitigation commitments may be required if it is selected for implementation. For a more comprehensive discussion on compliance with regulatory requirements, see Section 2.7 of this CRD.

DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford under the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

A114-3 Even though it is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*, the comment is noted. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: dragonsnail@mac.com
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 11:10:14 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

And, perhaps, we really need to rethink nuclear power if we haven't figured out what to do with the trash it generates. *A115-1*

Sincerely,

Marie Barham
713 SW 3RD Pl
Renton, WA 98057

A115-1 The production of nuclear energy is outside the scope of this EIS. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: rauchjoyce@msn.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 4:41:09 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of wshington state I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. My cousin suffers severe health problems from living in that contaminated area for many years. Your EPA director is a disservice to those she should be protecting,including animals that are threatened as well as humans. *A116-1*

Sincerely,

joyce rauch
1402 22nd st NE #450
Auburn,, WA 98002

A116-1 Although not involved in the development of the *Draft TC & WM EIS*, EPA became a cooperating agency (40 CFR 1501.6) during the preparation of this final EIS.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: blacksquare@comcast.net
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 10:18:19 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

Safety first! As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). *A117-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Stu Winnie
6431 South Clement
Tacoma, WA 98409

A117-1 Safety would be a top priority for DOE in implementing any of the alternatives evaluated in this EIS. DOE has high expectations of its operating contractors to perform work in a manner that is protective of workers and the public. The safety of the public in the long term under the various alternatives is evaluated in Chapter 5 of this EIS.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: gaylashoemake@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 10:18:19 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 19, 2010

As a long time opponent of nuclear power (because of the problem of waste disposal)of course I oppose your plan, as described in the EIS called the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

Shipping waste on NW highways and freeways is a hazzard to residents like me (at least 800 more WA individuals will have terminal cancer because your shipment has passed their locations). *A118-1* Plus the contamination of our Columbia River groundwater will cause untold cancers and other related diseases and deaths. *A118-2*

As you well know, the waste currently at Hanford is already a problem-pollution, seepage, corrosion, etc. The entire site is a Radioactive location; additions of this magnitude will only multiply the problem.

You must NOT allow this to happen. Hanforad must figure out what to do with the toxic materials they already have. Don't make their job impossible by adding more nuclear waster which may push them toward the "tipping point." *A118-3*

Sincerely,

Gayla Shoemake
PO Box 324
Edmonds, WA 98020

A118-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A118-2 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

A118-3 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: renewable_energy@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:54:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

stop transporting radioactive waste around our country! its just a huge accident waiting to happen--and once it does, someone is going to be held responsible. will it be YOU?? *A119-1*

Sincerely,

scottd durkee
6215 sw 244th st
Vashon, WA 98070

A119-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: dtrione@seanet.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:00:17 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the plan to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, WA.

There are easier ways to boil water to run turbines. We don't need to poison the next 1,000 generations. We can generate all the power we need with a variety of solar and wind projects.

We must stop generating this waste that is no one wants and that is extremely expensive to deal with, subject to hazardous occupational exposures, routine releases, accident and terrorism risks, proliferation risks.

Those who still believe in the nuclear fantasy should pay for that fantasy. The rest of us will get about the business of building a sustainable energy future.

Sincerely,

David Trione
Pres. Sound Power Inc.
www.soundpower.us

Sincerely,
David Trione
2819 280th Ave NE
Redmond, WA 98053

A120-1

A120-1 Even though it is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*, the comment is noted. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: marion.woodfield@publicis-usa.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:28:13 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

It's pretty incredidible, to me, that this is even a consideration. It's costing more billions to get the sight cleaned up and the 'solution' is to add more? I fail to see the logic and wisdome in this potential decision. *A121-1*

Sincerely,

Marion Woodfield
1525 NW 195th St., #18
Shoreline, WA 98177

A121-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Regarding the cost of Hanford cleanup, this *TC & WM EIS* analyzes potential impacts associated with DOE's proposed actions and alternatives to safely retrieve, treat, and dispose of Hanford tank waste; decommission FFTF; and upgrade/expand waste disposal capacity at Hanford to provide for disposal of on- and offsite DOE waste. Site cleanup actions and their costs are not within the scope of this EIS. Chapter 2, Section 2.11, of this EIS, however, summarizes and compares the relative estimated costs of the proposed alternatives.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jo.pep@seasurf.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:24:06 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

WHAT ON EARTH IS GOING ON HERE ? ? ?

I live in the Pacific Northwest and I oppose the proposal to allow more nuclear waste to be shipped from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, WA. *A122-1*

The government is supposed to be CLEANING UP HANFORD, not adding to the problem. Also, taking the wasste out of one repository and shipping it on the highways is rediculous, endangering motorists and folks who live along the route. *A122-2*

Please stop this madness!

Sincerely,

Josie Peper
5334 Alder
Astoria, OR 97103

A122-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

A122-2 DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: dferm@bainbridge.net
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 12:30:07 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of Washington State, and therefore very well aware of the poor track record of safety and cleanup at Hanford, I strongly oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

They still haven't finished cleaning up the current mess at Hanford. *A123-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Mary Ferm
5062 New Sweden Rd
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

A123-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jorgie92@earthlink.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 10:59:15 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

I have worked with first, second, and third generation Hanford victims.

Please wake up, what you are doing to people, children, grandchildren, plant and animals our earth. *A124-1*

Time to honor and value the truth of the essence of life.

Geraldine Helwing
Everett, WA

Sincerely,

Geraldine Helwing
609 Wood Pl
Everett, WA 98203

A124-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes the potential human health impacts related to alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford, as described in Chapter 2. The analyses encompass consideration of potential impacts of transporting radioactive waste to Hanford, including via routes through Oregon. These analyses indicate that the potential human health impacts on the public of incident-free activities, whether transportation or operations at Hanford, are well within established standards for protection of the public.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: alanna.beebe@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 11:52:04 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Before using or building any more nuclear power plants please think of issues such as the Hanford site. We must protect the vulnerable people living in these areas. *A125-1*

Sincerely,

Alanna Beebe
281 NW Market St
Seattle, WA 98107

A125-1 Nuclear power plants are not the subject of any of the alternatives evaluated in this EIS. This *TC & WM EIS* evaluates the potential impacts of alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: kulufarm@rockisland.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:43:06 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I have been fighting this kind of idiotic plan for thirty years. Why would we start shipping more waste to this site when the waste already there is leaking into the ground water. This certainly makes no sense whatsoever. *A126-1*

Stop the trucks! *A126-2*

Sincerely,

Anne Pope
P.O. Box 156 Friday
Harbor, WA 98250

A126-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

As analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*, 67 of the 149 SSTs at Hanford are known or suspected to have leaked liquid waste to the environment between the 1950s and the present, some of which has reached the groundwater. Estimates of the total leak loss range from less than 2.8 million to as much as 3.97 million liters (750,000 to 1,050,000 gallons). DOE recognizes that groundwater contamination from past leaks is a concern at Hanford and its potential impact on communities downriver from Hanford. One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks.

A126-2 Comment noted.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: leonard_49@msn.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:56:13 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

Yucca Mountain was going to be an excellent repository. The thought seemed to be that in 20,000 years, humans will be so stupid that they wouldn't be able to detect radioactivity. Let's give our after-bearers some credit and figure that they are smart enough to stay away. *A127-1*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Leonard Butters
2006 E 64th Ave
Spokane, WA 99223

A127-1 Regarding the use of Yucca Mountain as a repository, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: Brian@Kudu.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:53:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

I oppose shipping nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

Stockpiling the waste without finding a REAL solution is not a real plan. Living in the Pacific Northwest, I fear the transportation of the waste through my freeways and rail lines. Storing the waste is just going to pollute the groundwater more in our area. *A128-1*

We need to treat the waste through vitrification, not just store it for the next generation.

Sincerely,

Brian Seymour
27482 Crow Road
Eugene, OR 97402

A128-1 The current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: safetywork4u@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 11:17:18 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

No one wants this waste and no new waste should be produced. Nuclear waste generation is an albatross around the necks of future generations. All nuclear power generation should stop today. It is not green. It is as black as death can get. *A129-1*

Sincerely,

Dennis Smith
5723 Schornbush Rd.
Deming, WA 98244

A129-1 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: kilobyte@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 2:33:19 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest and the United States, I feel all communities should do their part to combat the growing problem of long-term nuclear waste storage. I agree with the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other DoE sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). *A130-1*

Please do what you can to minimize groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River and clean existing and incoming waste through vitrification. *A130-2* *A130-3*

Sincerely,

Barett McGavock
2620 E MADISON ST
Seattle, WA 98112

A130-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A130-2 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Chapter 7, Sections 7.1 and 7.5, of this *TC & WM EIS* discuss mitigation measures that could be used to avoid or reduce potential impacts on all resource areas. Many of the mitigation measures discussed would apply across all alternatives because of the similar nature of some of the activities analyzed in this EIS (e.g., construction of facilities). However, the resource subsections of Section 7.1 do acknowledge specific alternatives where only certain mitigation measures would apply or where additional mitigation consideration may be warranted.

A130-3 The alternatives presented in this *TC & WM EIS* were developed under NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to address the essential components of DOE's three sets of proposed actions (tank closure, FFTF decommissioning, and waste management) and to provide an understanding of the differences between the potential environmental impacts of the range of reasonable alternatives. Consistent with CEQ guidance, this EIS analyzes the range of reasonable alternatives that covers the full spectrum of potential combinations. The alternatives considered by DOE in this EIS are "reasonable" in the sense that they are practical or feasible from a technical and economic standpoint and meet the agency's purposes and needs. Potential conflicts with laws and regulations do not necessarily cause an alternative to be unreasonable, but additional mitigation commitments may be required if it is selected for implementation. For a more comprehensive discussion on compliance with regulatory requirements, see Section 2.7 of this CRD. Options for tank waste treatment span a variety of technologies, including vitrification. DOE decisions based on the data presented in this EIS will be documented in a ROD or a series of RODs no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: Nancy_L_311@msn.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 5:29:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Other countries have figured out how to detoxify nuclear waste---why haven't we? There was a program on the news about this. Why doesn't someone call and find out about this before transporting nuclear waste. What is wrong with this picture people? Is our government that inept or is it that they just don't care? *A131-1*

Sincerely,

Nancy Leon
459 N 8th ST
Cottage Grove, OR 97424

A131-1 Waste treatment is analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*. This EIS addresses proposed actions to retrieve, treat, and dispose of Hanford tank waste; decommission FFTF; and expand waste disposal capacity at Hanford to provide for disposal of on- and offsite DOE waste. The disposal of other wastes, including waste associated with commercial nuclear power generation, is beyond the scope of this EIS. Radioactive waste is transported in DOT-certified containers that meet strenuous technical standards established by NRC.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: trolldance@efn.org
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 9:17:10 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As residents of the Pacific Northwest, we unequivocally oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

We vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. This plan is turning a blind eye to the inherent dangers of the plan. Even barring any accident, shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like us. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

We also feel strongly that it is time to truly clean up the waste and toxins that are already polluting the Hanford site and its surrounds. It is imperative that all current Hanford waste be treated through vitrification, rather than just being covered up. *A132-1*

Sincerely,

Clif and Diane Trolin
82085 Hanna Rd.
Dexter, OR 97431

A132-1 One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms by landfill closure, selective clean closure, or clean closure. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks, including remediation of the contamination in the vadose zone.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: bettychan1@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 7:12:06 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). Since Yucca Flats wants it, give it to them instead. *A133-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Betty Chan
P O Box 65106
Shoreline, WA 98155

A133-1 Regarding the use of Yucca Mountain, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jazzkoo@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 4:53:08 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site because shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is extremely dangerous to residents like me. The current proposal would put about 17,500 truckloads of radioactive waste on our freeways. That's more than 2 trucks per day for more than 20 years.

The DOE's own analysis in 2009 shows that even without traffic accidents or a terrorist attack, trucking highly radioactive waste would lead to as many as 816 fatal cancers in the public along the transit routes. These are preventable deaths! *A134-1*

The proposed plan will result in groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

It would be best for all current Hanford waste to be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Debra Chang
2500 H Street
Bellingham, WA 98225

A134-1 On average, up to 2 trucks per day for 20 years would be involved in transporting about 14,200 truck shipments to Hanford, as presented in this *Final TC & WM EIS*, Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12. The transportation of radioactive materials and waste, both coming to and leaving Hanford, must comply with DOT and NRC regulations that promote the protection of human health and the environment. This includes requiring the use of certified packaging that minimizes the radiation dose rate outside the transportation package.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: cgwildman@wildblue.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 5:05:25 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

We are already down winders from Hanford and have a very high rate of cancer in this county. *A135-1*

Sincerely,

Carol Wildman
543 Bell Plain Rd
Pomeroy, WA 66347

A135-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: marthaas43@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 8:34:13 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 19, 2010

As a Portland resident , I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

The Native Americans fish the Columbia, and they and we eat the salmon they catch. My neighbors catch sturgeon from the Columbia. Don't poison our river! *A136-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Martha Shelley
9026 N Syracuse St
Portland, OR 97203

A136-1 Regarding the potential impacts of Hanford activities on Columbia River fish species, this *TC & WM EIS* provides analysis of potential environmental impacts associated with a specific set of proposed actions and reasonable alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford. These analyses include impacts on ecological species (including fish) and habitat, as well as environmental justice and socioeconomic considerations, consistent with current CEQ and DOE NEPA guidance. Short-term impacts are presented in Chapter 4; long-term impacts, including those associated with a scenario specific to an American Indian hunter-gatherer, are presented in Chapter 5.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: gosslings@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:22:06 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

What?!?! I didn't realize our problems at Hanford were solved and you want to add more?!? Why in the world would we consider more nuclear plants if we can't even deal with the waste we have? *A137-1*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Shari Gos
12618 NE 5th Ave
Vancouver, WA 98685

A137-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: maworth@skynetbb.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:34:21 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

It is insane to consider this action on more than one front.

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. DOE has managed to delay, delay and delay this essential step for far too long, endangering all life within the Columbia River watershed. The DOE must take this ife-affirming action NOW. *A138-1*

Sincerely,

Marjorie Worthington
1947 Clovercrest Street
Enumclaw, WA 98022

A138-1 As discussed in the *TC & WM EIS* Summary, Chapter 1, and Chapter 2, this EIS analyzes additional waste treatment capability that includes expanding the vitrification process capability currently being constructed in the WTP or supplementing the WTP's capability with supplemental treatment technologies. Thus, decisions to be made by DOE regarding whether to treat all waste in the WTP, as is or expanded, or to supplement its capacity by adding new treatment capability depend on demonstrating the feasibility of supplemental treatment technologies.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: pprenner@charter.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:45:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

My brother-in-law grew up in Umatilla, Oregon. He died a painful, cancer-ridden death like most of the kids he grew up with. *A139-1*

Hanford, and the Columbia River, have enough waste to be "cleaned up" (good luck on that) and don't need more. *A139-2*

Keep your "waste" where you made it and work on a real clean-up solution!

Sincerely,

Paul Renner
P.O. Box 1202
Gold Beach, OR 97444

A139-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

A139-2 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: pwf1616@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 6:11:11 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I strongly oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

Shipping this waste across our state puts me and my fellow citizens in danger every day. I fear for all of us if there is any problem in shipment, and I am also very concerned about groundwater contamination of the Columbia River. These plans for transport must be stopped! *A140-1*

In addition, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. The focus at Hanford must be on cleaning up the hazardous waste on site, not on bringing more in!

Again, I urge you to oppose shipment of any more nuclear waste to the Hanford site. This is not a "preferable alternative" for us in the Northwest, or for anyone along the routes where the waste would be shipped. *A140-1 cont'd*

Sincerely,

Phyllis Friedman
925 11TH Ave E Apt I
Seattle, WA 98102

A140-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: skye@ucdavis-alumni.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:27:19 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River which supports critical species including ESA listed Pacfic Salmon. *A141-1*

DOE must change course and engage in a long-term cleanup process by using vitrification, the safest way to treat the most radioactive nuclear waste, not covering it up. Instead of shipping more waste to Hanford, please focus attention on cleaning up the existing toxic mess. *A141-2*

Sincerely,

Barbara Rosenkotter
201 Crest Drive
Deer Harbor, WA 98243

A141-1 DOE has considered the potential impacts of construction and normal operations on threatened and endangered species, although the potential impacts of accidents were not evaluated for this group of species. However, as noted in Appendix H, Section H.7.3, the maximum reasonably foreseeable offsite transportation accident under the Waste Management alternatives with the highest consequences is an accident involving rail shipment of RH-LLW, with a likelihood of occurrence of 2.5×10^{-7} per shipment in a rural area. It should be noted that a truck accident would have an even lower probability of occurrence. Beyond the very low probability of such an accident occurring, waste would be cleaned up within a short period of time, thus reducing or eliminating the likelihood of it reaching the groundwater and eventually the Columbia River. Therefore, the likelihood of impacts on the river and its biota would be none to negligible.

A141-2 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: ljaffee@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 6:13:13 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

I am a resident of the Pacific Northwest, very near the Columbia River, downstream from the Hanford Nuclear Reservation. I oppose the "preferred alternative" that would ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, per Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I demand that Department of Energy NOT adopt the "preferred alternative." I demand that the Department of Energy continue, indefinitely, the existing preclusion of shipping radioactive waste to the Hanford Site. I demand that Department of Energy NOT increase, by ANY means or from ANY source, the quantity of radioactive waste stored at the Hanford Site. *A142-1* *A142-2*

The waste's Northwest freeways shipment would endanger Columbia River area residents like me. Groundwater and Columbia River contamination would harm the health of everyone living anywhere near the Columbia River region, especially (but not only) those who eat food the region produces and fish that run up and down the Columbia. Contaminated Columbia River salmon would harm not only the Northwest's population but also anyone who eats that salmon anywhere, even thousands of miles away from the Columbia. *A142-3*

Even now, the Hanford Site's radioactivity endangers the health of local people and all who eat the food the region produces and the fish that swim the Columbia. So, I demand that all CURRENT Hanford radioactive waste be treated by vitrification.

Right now and forever, our government ought terminate all purchase, production, and stocking of atomic weapons and terminate also all operation of atomic-energy-derived electric-power plants. But, in the meantime, at least the government ought not store radioactive waste anywhere except in the most outlying, least-populated, most barren wastelands of our nation and only after treating the waste by vitrification. *A142-4*

Sincerely,

Leonard Jaffee
11710 SE Fuller Rd
Clackamas, OR 97222

A142-1 The commentor is referred to Chapter 2, Section 2.12, for a discussion of DOE's Preferred Alternatives for tank closure, FFTF decommissioning, and waste management. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

A142-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A142-3 Regarding the potential impacts of Hanford activities on groundwater and the Columbia River, this *TC & WM EIS* analyzes potential environmental impacts associated with DOE's proposed actions and reasonable alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford. The analyses include potential human health impacts (through the air pathway) of normal operations, presented in Chapter 4, with details in Appendices J and K ("Environmental Justice" and "Short-Term Human Health Risk Analysis," respectively), as well as long-term impacts (including through the groundwater and river pathway), presented in Chapter 5, with details in Appendix Q ("Long-Term Human Health Dose and Risk Analysis").

A142-4 Nuclear energy and weapons production are beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: sharksneedfins@earthlink.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:44:22 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

The fact that no one seems to want this waste in their own back yard, and given the extensive life of this waste and our inability to deal with it sends a message loud and clear: this stuff is unsafe and we should stop producing it! *A143-1*

Sincerely,

Ulanah McCoy
1720 Mount Baker Rd.
Eastsound, WA 98245

A143-1 The production of nuclear waste is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: adriennelederer@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:33:18 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). On TV I heard a report that foreign countries are shipping their waste to the US. *A144-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Adrienne Lederer
4244 Wintergreen Cir #270
Bellingham, WA 98226

A144-1 Foreign shipment of waste to the United States is beyond the scope of this EIS. The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: alex@imcclains.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 5:33:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Taxpayers have already spent billions dealing with the mess that is already there. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. *A145-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Alex Prentiss
15685 SW 116th Ave
King City, OR 97224

A145-1 Comment noted.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: techcluster@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:41:13 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose shipments of nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford.

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

We have been dealing with a site in nearby Port Angeles for many years. It is NOT nuclear waste, but it is a site full of toxic pollutants. It is close to home...too close, and Hanford is in my state and has been a contaminated site for far too many years. *A146-1*

Thomas Pitre
PO Box 2124
Sequim, WA 98382

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Thomas Pitre
PO Box 2124
Sequim, WA 98382

A146-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: shanachie@hughes.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:25:19 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

Having lived nearly two decades in Washington State, I met far too many "Hanford victims." Now, more than a decade since I left Seattle, the government has done nothing to improve the situation. It is criminal that they are considering making it worse. *A147-1*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Jack Duggan
P.O. Box 524
Jacksonville, OR 97530

A147-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: rosemary@easystreet.net
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 4:34:09 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to us residents. Would you want this waste on your freeways ? That doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

We do not want our tax dollars spent on poisoning us. We have wiser ways of using our monies. You are responsible for coming up with better solutions. *A148-1*

Sincerely,

Rosemary Forester
16580 Maple Circle
Lake Oswego, OR 97034

A148-1 Regarding the allocation of tax funds and the responsibility of DOE to solve Hanford issues, the purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to assist DOE decisionmakers in determining solutions for issues at Hanford. Specifically, this EIS analyzes potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: friedman@gorge.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 4:31:08 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Hood River Valley living near the Columbia River and I-84 in the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like myself, my neighbors with their little 3-year-old daughter, my farm neighbors who help everyone in need, the single mother and her 8-year-old up the road. Further, we and the wildlife and livestock surrounding us would be endangered by groundwater contamination of the Columbia River nearby.

We don't need further risk from our area being treated as a dumping ground; I don't notice anyone suggesting a nuclear dump at, say, Great Falls or next to Silver Spring. Not meaning to sound NIMBY here, but first you put it also in your own back yard, okay? And in the same regard, it is urgent, too, that all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. *A149-1*

Sincerely,

Paula Friedman
5830 Billings Road
Mount Hood Parkdale, OR 97041

A149-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: kklos@merrymanbarnesarchitects.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:31:19 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

The danger of nuclear power exhibited by the impossible problem of how to safely dispose it ought to be enough to halt the proliferation of nuclear generators for our electricity. The sun, wind, and tides are the only free and safe form of energy there is, and it is for free. *A150-1*

Sincerely,

Ken Klos
1231 NW Hoyt Street / Suite 403
Portland, OR 97209

A150-1 The use of renewable energy sources in the United States is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: sjr91@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 1:07:03 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

The current problems with nuclear waste storage will only be exacerbated by a national energy policy that creates even more nuclear waste. Clearly nuclear technology is not a viable path forward, where the problem of radioactive waste storage has not been satisfactorily solved. We do not want the high risk of radioactive leakage into our water, land and air.

Last year the journal Science published a research article reporting that ALL of China's energy needs through 2050 could be met by wind power alone! Clearly we are not doing all that we can to reach a national energy policy that is compatible with an atmosphere that can support life. *A151-1*

Hanford already has enough nuclear material onsite--our Evergreen state does not need any more. Please put a stop to adding to Hanford's radioactive burden.

Sincerely,

Steve Rosenman
8260 Avalon Drive
Mercer Island, WA 98040

A151-1 The use of renewable energy sources in the United States is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: Vabene55@verizon.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:39:19 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

It is inconceivable that serious consideration is being given to alrady contaminated Haniford as a nuclear dump site. We should be looking for a place with low rainfall, very deep water table if any, away from agriculture and a population center, and away from waterways. One does not have to be a rocket scientist to see that Haniford does not qualifiy. *A152-1*

Sincerely,

george castellani
5803 rosario way
anacortes,, WA 98221

A152-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* did not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: errosenzweig@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:44:21 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

We need to come up with ways of treating our radioactive waste, rather than shipping it around the country! Why are we shipping radiation out of Hanford and then shipping different radiation back? Please don't give us more radiation! *A153-1*

Elizabeth Rosenzweig
7100 132nd Pl Se Unit 2-208
Newcastle WA 98059

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Rosenzweig
7100 132nd Pl SE Unit 2-208
Newcastle, WA 98059

A153-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: davidhstetler@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 9:08:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. In nearly 70 years, the waste at Hanford has accumulated, and has STILL not been cleaned up.

I also oppose the creation of additional nuclear facilities proposed by the Obama administration, in direct conflict with the creation of newer, greener energy sources. *A154-1*

Sincerely,

David Stetler
203 Dorn Ave, Apt. C"
Everett, WA 98208

A154-1 Even though it is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE notes the commentor's support for increasing the use of renewable energy sources in the United States and opposition to nuclear energy production. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: bgschatz1990@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 10:38:12 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 19, 2010

Hauling nuclear waste by TRUCK is very dangerous.....just got home from Portland a short time ago.....and ALL that traffic !!!!

My husband was a truck driver for over 30 years, so understands the many problems of hauling hazardous materials.

We need to protect our environment.

see letter below....

gwen schatz
the dalles, oregon

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

gwen schatz
P.O. Box 1091
The Dalles,, OR 97058

A155-1

A155-1 The transportation of radioactive materials and wastes, both coming to and leaving Hanford, must comply with DOT and NRC regulations that promote the protection of human health and the environment. This includes requiring the use of certified packaging that minimizes the radiation dose rate outside the transportation package. As indicated in the *TC & WM EIS* Summary, Section S.5.3; Chapter 2, Section 2.8.3.10; and Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12, it is unlikely that transportation of radioactive waste would cause an additional fatality as a result of radiation from either incident-free transportation or postulated transportation accidents.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: rodney.merrill@charter.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:45:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" of shipping the nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in(DOE/EIS--0391).

Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a proven danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River and farmland.

My "preferred alternative" is to start digging a big hole out back of 1000 Independence Ave., SW. *A156-1*

Sincerely,

Rodney Merrill
35798 Dow Lane
Astoria, OR 97103

A156-1 Even though alternative disposal sites are outside the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*, the comment is noted.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: andrewj123@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:15:13 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

And I will Add that it is a lunatics Grand Folly to create more nuclear power plants when it is well know that there is never going to be a SAFE WAY to dispose of the WASTE!! *A157-1*

Sincerely,

andrew mcelvaney
6409 n. market st
spokane, WA 99217

A157-1 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: genlee2@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:54:05 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I just heard that a friend who has NEVER SMOKED has been diagnosed with lung cancer. Hanford has polluted our air for years. Don't let them add to pollution of ANY KIND *A158-1*

Sincerely,

Doris Lee
13124 East 23rd Ave.
Spokane Valley, WA 99216

A158-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

Proposed activities to remove and treat the waste from the SSTs and to close the tanks would result in airborne radioactive releases. DOE would ensure that radiation doses from those emissions are reduced to ALARA levels through the use of air treatment technologies on facility air discharges. The potential impacts of those radioactive air emissions are evaluated in Chapter 4, Section 4.1.4, of this EIS. The maximum impact projected to occur under any of the alternatives is less than 2 millirem in a year, well below the EPA standard of 10 millirem per year (40 CFR 61, Subpart H).

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: lcostello@pol.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:38:08 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of Spokane WA, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I appreciate the recent DOE Hearing here in Spokane, and am disappointed more hearings haven't been scheduled here since the ones in about 2004 (?). *A159-1* Unfortunately, DOE apparently did not follow-through on promised hearings here. Also, DOE did not act upon our overwhelming refusal for new waste to Hanford before Hanford is cleaned of the existing, leaking waste. *A159-2* A proposal to clean 90% is laughable...even 99% is less than adequate. And to talk about bringing more... please!!!

Sincerely,

Lauri Costello
4313 E Congress
Spokane, WA 99223

A159-1 Two sets of public scoping meetings for this *TC & WM EIS* were held in Richland and Seattle, Washington, as well as in Portland and Hood River, Oregon, in February 2003 and March 2006. DOE was aware that Spokane citizens were interested in providing comments on the *Draft TC & WM EIS*, so a hearing was planned for this location. In total, eight public hearings were held around the region. DOE will evaluate the level of attendance and input received from the public in all the hearing locations for purposes of planning any future public meetings on Hanford activities.

A159-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: sylviaericson@earthlink.net
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 9:38:19 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 19, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I strongly oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Highway accidents during shipping are inevitable, given the amount of hazardous waste that is proposed to be transported on our highways. Further contamination of the Columbia River is also part of the picture if this legislation is enacted. *A160-1*

Current radioactive waste at Hanford needs to be treated by means of vitrification.

There is plenty of work to be done here without adding further toxic waste to the site. *A160-2*

Sincerely,

Sylvia Ericson
23405 Lakeview Drive, unit H306
Seattle, WA 98043

A160-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A160-2 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: camzier@charter.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 4:59:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Keep that stuff away from me!!! Hanford has caused so much cancer in the Spokane/Coeur d Alene area as I used to live there...I do not want you coming down Hwy 5 I am in Southern Oregon...stop polluting the population with this dangerous waste!!!!!!!! *A161-1* *A161-2*

Sincerely,

Kathleen Frazier
3835 Arrowhead Drive
Medford, OR 97504

A161-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

A161-2 The truck and rail routes analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS* are shown in Appendix H, Figures H–2 through H–4. These routes do not include Interstate 5.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jfriesem@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 1:34:12 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

It is time that we, as a country, look at what we are doing with radioactivity -- not just today and the impacts of illness, genetic mutation and environmental catastrophies but also for the generations that follow. How can we answer their questions as to why we allowed this kind of toxic destruction? We must stop the craziness now! *A162-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Judy Friesem
353 Wallace Way NE #25
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

A162-1 Comment noted.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: susan@tohonor.org
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:50:15 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents, and could prove a target for those wishing to visit harm in the United States. Let's not make it so easy for them. *A163-1*

Also I remain concerned about groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Susan Hobbs
29451 Le Clerc Rd. N.
Ione, WA 99139

A163-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: Pjdewald@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:58:19 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Moving radioactive waste is not viable. ‖ *A164-1*

Sincerely,

Paul dewald
2562 thorndyke ave w
seattle, WA 98199

A164-1 Radioactive waste is transported in DOT-certified containers that meet strenuous technical standards established by NRC.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: system001@q.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:30:17 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I have a much better idea for this waste. place it across our entire southern border, and what is leftover can be dumped in Mexico. This would let illegal immigrants know how serious we are about keeping them out of the united states. *A165-1*

Sincerely,

Gene Gossett
1030 NE 102nd Avenue No. 12
Portland, OR 97220

A165-1 Comment noted.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: ginahixx@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:51:30 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

Hanford is already a mess and a hazard to everyone who lives anywhere near it or downstream from it. They are having trouble dealing with the waste that was generated there. Hanford is in no position to take on additional waste. *A166-1*

Each site should deal with its own waste until a national depository located away from people and watersheds is made available. *A166-2*

Sincerely,

gina hicks
1136 13th Ave Apt C
Seattle, WA 98122

A166-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

A166-2 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: star085@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 1:43:14 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 19, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the moving of this dangerous substance to Hanford. In fact, I really do not understand why it ought to be moved. *A167-1*

Sincerely,

Star Holmberg
937 D Street
Springfield, OR 97477

A167-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: fasnacht@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 6:50:20 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River, AND ULTIMATELY THE PACIFIC OCEAN!

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

AND..IF RADIOACTIVE WASTE CANNOT BE SAFELY "DISPOSED OF" (in less than 2500 years) AT THE SITE WHERE IT IS CREATED, THEN STOP CREATING IT! BUT UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES SHOULD YOU "SHIP" IT CROSS COUNTRY. PLEASE CALL IF YOU WANT ME TO CONTINUE THIS DIATRIBE! SHARON FASNACHT 4006 113TH AVE. S.W. OLYMPIA, WA 98512 *A168-1* *A168-2*

xxx) xxx xxxx

Sincerely,

Sharon Fasnacht
4006 113th Avenue S.W.
Olympia, WA 98512

A168-1 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

A168-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: papadootz@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:52:05 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

The Southern Willamette valley is bad enough with pollen and smog... find another way to dispose of your poison. *A169-1*

Sincerely,

Geoffrey Mays
439 Polk
Eugene, OR 97402

A169-1 Comment noted.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: fkreider@campblackdog.org
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 9:19:11 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010 I was not available to comment at the public hearing in La Grande, Oregon, hence this letter. I am living abroad currently. I was a former appointed member of the Oregon Hanford Advisory Committee and Hanford Health Advisory Board. It is sad for me to hear about the plans to bring more waste to Hanford when we have been discussing these issues for over twenty years!

The interstate corridors are not safe for these materials, particularly in winter; hazmat teams are stretched; and the best solution is STILL "on-site dry cask storage!" Then, when vitrification is proven cost-effective, we can talk about on-site vit plants--possibly. But for now, Stop playing the nuclear waste shell game; stop thinking about putting communities at risk; and keep focused on real clean-up! *A170-1* *A170-2* *A170-3*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

C. Fuji Kreider
60366 Marvin Rd
La Grande, OR 97850

A170-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A170-2 Dry cask storage applies to storage of SNF at reactor sites. The offsite waste that would be shipped for disposal at Hanford is solid LLW and MLLW from across the DOE complex that would require no further treatment at Hanford. Although it could be stored at Hanford in a "dry storage system," this *TC & WM EIS* addresses disposal.

A170-3 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

The impacts of the offsite waste in terms of radiological risk are presented in the Summary, Section S.5.5.3, and Chapter 2, Section 2.10, Key Environmental Findings. These sections discuss the radiological risk differences between including and not including offsite waste disposal at IDF-East.

The *TC & WM EIS* analysis shows that receipt of offsite waste streams that contain specific amounts of certain isotopes, specifically, iodine-129 and technetium-99, could cause an adverse impact on the environment. Therefore, one means of mitigating this impact would be for DOE to limit disposal of offsite waste streams at Hanford. Other mitigation measures, such as recycling secondary-waste streams into the primary-waste-stream feeds within the WTP to increase iodine-129 capture in ILAW and bulk vitrification glass, are discussed in Chapter 7, Section 7.5, of this final EIS.

Vitrification of waste along with other supplemental treatment technologies are analyzed in the *Final TC & WM EIS*. Ecology's foreword to the draft EIS included its views and positions concerning DOE's analysis in the document and has been updated in this final EIS. Ecology's foreword includes their views on supplemental treatment and vitrification.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jalh2@frontiernet.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 4:04:15 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

HANFORD IS ALREADY CONTAMINATING GROUND WATERS & THE COLUMBIA. DO NOT ADD TO THIS BURDEN OF TOXIC WASTE. NO MORE NUCLEAR POWER - ALTERNATIVES EXIST! THINK OF THE FUTURE!!! As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, we oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). *A171-1*

We vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Lester and Judy Hoyle
765 Mesa Verde Dr.
Cave Junction, OR 97523

A171-1 This EIS addresses the environmental impacts of retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste and final closure of the SST system. It also evaluates the impacts of FFTF decommissioning, including management of waste generated by the decommissioning process. Finally, this *TC & WM EIS* evaluates the potential environmental impacts of ongoing solid-waste management operations at Hanford, as well as the proposed disposal of Hanford LLW and MLLW and a limited volume of offsite LLW and MLLW. The use of nuclear power and alternative energy sources in the United States are beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: leo1@oregonfast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:24:17 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

As a geology student in the 60's we were told that the trajectory between the Hanford Plant and the Pacific Ocean has the highest rate of lukemias on the world at that time. Let us not make that any worse. *A172-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Christianna Ellingson
05967 View Court
Florence, OR 97439

A172-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: mollyweasley4@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 12:01:09 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

Think about it: would you want your grandchildren growing up near this stuff? Neither would we. This stuff should be put in a rocket and shot at the sun. *A173-1*

Sincerely,

Aimee Conner
114 NE 65th Ave
Portland, OR 97213

A173-1 This EIS addresses the environmental impacts of retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste and final closure of the SST system. It also evaluates the impacts of FFTF decommissioning, including management of waste generated by the decommissioning process. Finally, this *TC & WM EIS* evaluates the potential environmental impacts of ongoing solid-waste management operations at Hanford, as well as the proposed disposal of Hanford LLW and MLLW and a limited volume of offsite LLW and MLLW.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: lee@thelocomotive.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 4:34:21 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

Writing on behalf of the three voting, tax-paying residents of this household--Eitan Zucker, Danya Zucker, and me: The plan to resume dumping at Hanford is really outrageous. How can citizens ever get behind a move to supposedly-clean nuclear energy with pre-existing contamination, and its results, not yet resolved. *A174-1*

As residents of the Pacific Northwest, we vehemently oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents and groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River is even less responsible, because the negative fallout is inevitable.

All current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up; and --can you hear us?--NO MORE!.

Sincerely,

Marguery Lee Zucker
1966 Orchard St.
Eugene, OR 97403

A174-1 The use of nuclear power in the United States is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. This EIS addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: dorisaunders@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 1:34:29 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I have my children, grandchildren, and great grand children whose health is at stake here. Please do not add to the Hanford problem which already exists to the point where leakage into our beautiful Columbia River is very dangerous. I have been writing to Senator Wyden for years off and on to get Hanford cleaned up. Let's do that before considering putting us in the beautiful scenic Northwest in more danger. *A175-1* *A175-2*

Sincerely, Dori Saunders
10005 SE Bell Av., #305
Portland, Oregon 97222-2235
email: dorisaunders@comcast.net
Phone: XXX XXX XXXX

Sincerely,
Dori Saunders
10005 SE Bell Av., #305
Portland, OR 97222

A175-1 Regarding the potential human health impacts of Hanford activities, this *TC & WM EIS* analyzes potential environmental impacts associated with DOE's proposed actions and reasonable alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford. The analyses include potential human health impacts (through the air pathway) of normal operations, presented in Chapter 4, with details in Appendices J and K ("Environmental Justice" and "Short-Term Human Health Risk Analysis," respectively), as well as long-term impacts (including through the groundwater and river pathway), presented in Chapter 5, with details in Appendix Q ("Long-Term Human Health Dose and Risk Analysis").

A175-2 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: seco@orthodoxpress.org
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:52:15 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. There is already too much untreated waste at Hanford, and until the vitrification plant is up and running, and the present amount of waste taken care of, no additional waste should be sent there. *A176-1*

It's time for other arrangements to be made for radioactive waste - generated throughout the US, especially since President Obama wants to consider nuclear energy as part of the future energy mix. At least one more new disposal site it needed urgently (get going on Yucca Mountain please!). Washington State should not bear the whole load. *A176-2*

Sincerely,

Nina Seco
524 NE 112th St., #7
Seattle, WA 98125

A176-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A176-2 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: donaflora@wavecable.com
Sent: Saturday, March 20, 2010 11:04:07 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 20, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

furthermore, we should consider the question of waste disposal before we build more nuclear plants. Conservation and renewable, education and better laws first. *A177-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Beth Hailey
18211 Raleigh Ln
LaConner, WA 98257

A177-1 Conservation and use of renewable energy sources in the United States are beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: b52gunr@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 6:14:16 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

The Federal Government has been dragging its feet for decades in cleaning up the Hanford site. Why should we allow them to continue to dump additional waste until they cleanup their toxic site from decades past? *A178-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Don Ely
7109 46th Ave E
Tacoma, WA 98443

A178-1 One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms by landfill closure, selective clean closure, or clean closure. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks, including remediation of the contamination in the vadose zone.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: beckerz@hotmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 5:50:05 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). Hanford is already poisoning the entire lower Columbia River basin. The government has failed to complete most of the mitigation it has proposed in the past. Why should we believe they will now. *A179-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Dan Becker
611 14th
Prairie City, OR 97869

A179-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Chapter 7, Sections 7.1 and 7.5, of this *TC & WM EIS* discuss mitigation measures that could be used to avoid or reduce potential impacts on all resource areas. Many of the mitigation measures discussed would apply across all alternatives because of the similar nature of some of the activities analyzed in this EIS (e.g., construction of facilities). However, the resource subsections of Section 7.1 do acknowledge specific alternatives where only certain mitigation measures would apply or where additional mitigation consideration may be warranted.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: dvdkeysor@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 8:05:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 19, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I quite agree! RaDIOACTIVE WASTE MUST BE BURIED AT ITS SOUCE; NOT TRANSPORTED! *A180-1*

Sincerely,

David C Keysor
1501 17th Ave #912
Seattle, WA 98122

A180-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: lhofstrand@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:26:11 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

PLEASE Do not ship any more radioactive waste to Hanford. We Washingtonians have tried for years to protect our people, our Columbia River and the farms around Hanford from the disastrous effects of past policies. IF vitrification is really possible and cost effective, make those DOE sites building and/or operating nuclear facilities responsible for the waste products. DO NOT truck it over our hiways and add to the danger. Continue the moratorium. *A181-1*

Sincerely,

Lorene Hofstrand
3450 pinehurst ct
Bellingham, WA 98226

A181-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: Mike.nancyq@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 5:50:11 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). Why do they have to ship to Hanford why not just keep it on site? *A182-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Michael L. Quenneville
14529 Westside Hwy. SW
Vashon, WA 98070

A182-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: mehn@uoregon.edu
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:27:11 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

Adding more waste to the Hanford site is bad for the entire Pacific Northwest region. Not only is it potentially dangerous to current residents, as waste travels along our freeways, but given the proven risk of Columbia watershed contamination, it's a danger to the natural world and to our descendents. *A183-1*

I am strongly opposed to lifting the shipping moratorium, and to any attempt to lower treatment standards for waste already at the site. *A183-2*

Sincerely,

Melissa Ehn
2233 SE Tibbetts
Portland, OR 97202

A183-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

A183-2 Regarding the moratorium on offsite waste shipments to Hanford and the treatment of the waste stored at Hanford, the purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: natalie.stahl@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:30:17 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account the potnetial for groundwater contamination to pollute the nearby Columbia River and affect all those living downstream. *A184-1*

All current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification before there is any discussion of lifting hte moratorium on shipping NEW waste there. *A184-2*

Sincerely,

Natalie Stahl
4002 Corliss Ave N
Seattle, WA 98103

A184-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

A184-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: psodt@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:34:21 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. *A185-1*

This needs to be done promptly. If care like this is taken, a permanent site for radioactive waste can be found. To ignore the problem only makes everyone more anxious. *A185-2*

Sincerely,

Peter Sodt
324 Alta Via Drive
Camano Island, WA 98282

A185-1 Please see response to comment A1-4 in the master letter for Campaign A.

A185-2 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jansearles@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 8:47:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

Washington State citizens have suffered enough for the energy plans of others. We want to clean up Hanford and shut it down!!!! *A186-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Janet Searles
271 Fries Lane
Newport, WA 99156

A186-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates. The focus of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms by landfill closure, selective clean closure, or clean closure. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks, including remediation of the contamination in the vadose zone.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: donna@pacinfo.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:36:08 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

Please stop sending more radioactive waste to Oregon!!! There are already signs of genetic aberrations in that area around Hanford. This Hanford sight should be cleaned up!!!! We are tired of being poisoned against our will. We do not want this radioactive waste material traveling along our highways either -- an accident could be devastating. As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). *A187-1* *A187-2*

I reiterate: I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me AND our future inhabitants. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. It is outrageous!

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Please stop this madness!

Sincerely,

Donna Murray
P O Box 22324
Eugene, OR 97402

Sincerely,

Donna Murray
87140 Territorial Rd.
Veneta, OR 97487

A187-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes the potential human health impacts related to alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford, as described in Chapter 2. The analyses encompass consideration of potential impacts of transporting radioactive waste to Hanford, including via routes through Oregon. These analyses indicate that the potential human health impacts on the public of incident-free activities, whether transportation or operations at Hanford, are well within established standards for protection of the public.

A187-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: kathleen.randall@overlakehospital.org
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:16:12 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Downstreamers and physicians in this state know the dangers of what you propose to do. We have seen the increased incidences of cancer and other deformities and early deaths from leaching contamination. Enough is enough. *A188-1*

I propose we store the nuclear waste under the Pentagon or the Congressional office of maybe the White house. It make just as much sense and is just as reasonable as uggestion as what you propose to expose Washington residents to this danger. *A188-2*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Randall
4315 7th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98105

A188-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

A188-2 Alternative disposal sites are outside the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. The current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: andpride@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 10:08:12 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

I was born and raised in the Pacific NW. I believe that until regions of this country come to terms with their own waste, we will continue to recklessly ignore the potential problems by sending it off to somewhere else.

Please don't send dangerous waste products to Hanford, which already has problems safely containing its own waste.

Sincerely,

Jan Priddy
P.O. Box 1442
Cannon Beach, OR 97110

A189-1

A189-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: judyross@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 3:44:05 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. What are the likely outcomes of our eating crops that have been watered with water from the Columbia River or fish that have grown in that river if we allow pollution with nuclear waste? *A190-1*

I believe all nuclear waste should be treated and rendered as harmless as it is within our power to do, right within the locale where the waste products are generated. To force one region of the country (my home region)to "handle" all the nuclear waste in this country is unconscionable, especially when you consider that several large cities are sited in the immediate vicinity of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation. *A190-2*

I wonder if the rest of the nation realizes we are due for a major subduction type of earthquake on the Pacific coast along Washington and Oregon sometime in the near future! Recent earthquakes in Haiti and Chili should tell us the kind of disruption to land and buildings AND NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE BUNKERS that that could bring! *A190-3*

Further, all nuclear waste from past nuclear projects should be cleared up before any further waste is generated unless and until we can formulate a safe plan that provides for some sort of "neutralize-as-we-go" plan for nuclear waste. *A190-4*

Also, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Please do not send further poison to Hanford--especially before the cleanup of radioactive material already stored there has been completed! *A190-5*

Sincerely,

Judy Ross
2701 Umatilla St. S.W.
Albany, OR 97321

A190-1 This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes the potential human health impacts under the described alternatives during operations and over the long term. The long-term human health impacts are described in Chapter 5 and discussed in more detail in Appendix Q, "Long-Term Human Health Dose and Risk Analysis." This analysis accounts for the potential impacts of migration of radioactive and chemical contaminants to the river.

A190-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Depending on the outcome of this *Final TC & WM EIS* and its ROD, DOE will evaluate whether additional NEPA reviews or updates to previous decisions are appropriate, as needed.

A190-3 The analysis in this *Final TC & WM EIS* includes accidents triggered by seismic events and discusses potential impacts on site workers and the general public (see Appendix K, Section K.3). Potential long-term impacts likely would be less than analyzed, as no credit was taken in the groundwater analysis for long-term structural stability of the repository or of any of the waste-form containers.

A190-4 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

A190-5 One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms by landfill closure, selective clean closure, or clean closure. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks, including remediation of the contamination in the vadose zone.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: pfellows@cypressmail.net
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 2:19:25 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

I have lived in Washington State for 60 years and grew up near Hanford. We citizens have worked over the years to get DOE to clean up the mess which is left as a legacy of the nuclear catastrophe of the making of bombs and the lie of nuclear energy as a safe and inexpensive power source.

As a resident of Washington State, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

DOE has obfuscated and avoided clean up for years and now has the audacity to want to dump more nuclear filth where it can leak into the ground water and poison our great river and recreation area? I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. *A191-1*

DOE needs to do the work that was agreed to years ago and finish the clean up - ALL the clean up, including all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. All leaking tanks must be cleaned and barriers installed to prevent further contamination. Then Hanford needs to be closed forever. *A191-2*

Hanford is proof that nuclear energy is far too expensive and dangerous to be considered a viable energy source.

Sincerely,

Paul Fellows
4220 Dayton Ave N
Seattle, WA 98103

A191-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

A191-2 As analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*, 67 of the 149 SSTs at Hanford are known or suspected to have leaked liquid waste to the environment between the 1950s and the present, some of which has reached the groundwater. Estimates of the total leak loss range from less than 2.8 million to as much as 3.97 million liters (750,000 to 1,050,000 gallons). DOE recognizes that groundwater contamination from past leaks is a concern at Hanford. One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms by landfill closure, selective clean closure, or clean closure. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks, including remediation of the contamination in the vadose zone.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: autismtymz2@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 5:20:13 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

Greetings. As a life-long resident of Washington State, I respectfully request that the Department of Energy continue the moratorium on shipping radioactive waste to the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from other DOE sites. *A192-1*

Thank you for your time, and thoughtful consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Lesley Vick
"1018 S. Henderson St., Apt. A"
Seattle, WA 98108

A192-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: janellis16@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 4:48:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). I have lived in Washington most of my life amd while billions have been spent and government subcontractors live it up in lavish houses little has been done to control the waste. THIS WOULD ONLY MAKE IT WORSE!!!! The private nuke power industry wants the taxpayers stuck with it's mess. There is no magic potion to get rid of nuclear waste!!! Until there is a proven, workable one no more power plants should be built and we don't want their filth here. *A193-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Jan Ellis
1218 115th st ct nw
Gig Harbor, WA 98332

A193-1 Nuclear energy production is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: 4mjmeyer@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 8:52:15 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

This is one of the largest receiving areas already. Do not add to its quantity. It is completely unfair to the people of the area. *A194-1*

Also, has anyone studied the possible wide-spread ground water effects for the salmon? What about tourism? *A194-2* *A194-3*

Sincerely,

Marlene Meyer
2408 131st Place NE
Bellevue, WA 98005

A194-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A194-2 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

The results of the risk analysis for air and groundwater releases to the Columbia River under the various alternatives for aquatic biota, including salmonids, are presented in Appendix P, Section P.3. The estimated radiation doses resulting from air deposition and groundwater discharge under all of the alternatives are less than the 0.1-rad-per-day and 1-rad-per-day benchmarks for ecological receptors exposed to radioactive COPCs at the Columbia River. All Hazard Indices associated with these alternatives are below 1.0. Only estimated exposures of aquatic biota to chromium in nearshore surface water under all Tank Closure alternatives and Waste Management Alternatives 2 and 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroups 1-C, 1-D, 1-E, and 1-F, exceed the Hazard Quotient criterion of 1.0 at the Columbia River. Based on the conservative nature of the exposure assumptions and on the estimated Hazard Indices and Hazard Quotients for the representative receptors, no adverse effects of chemical or radioactive COPCs in air or groundwater releases to the Columbia River are expected to result under the various alternatives evaluated.

A194-3 Implementing the alternatives analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS* could potentially have positive impacts on tourism within the ROI. The analysis of the potential secondary (indirect) economic and social impacts of all tank closure activities incorporates all industries, including tourism, and is discussed in Chapter 4 of this EIS.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jeanschwinberg@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 6:46:21 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 19, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. Yes, the vitrification program has been delayed for years and years. That is a major problem needing resolution. Given all the pollution still at Hanford, that requires immediate action as well. *A195-1*

Sincerely,

Jean Schwinberg
4538 18th Avenue NE, 8-D
Seattle, WA 98105

A195-1 Regarding the delays in the vitrification project at Hanford, DOE is working diligently to bring the WTP online to treat the tank waste at the site. Chapter 1, Section 1.2.3, provides a brief history and background on DOE's efforts to reduce costs and speed up Hanford cleanup efforts. As discussed in the *TC & WM EIS* Summary, Chapter 1, and Chapter 2, this EIS analyzes additional waste treatment capability that includes expanding the vitrification process capability currently being constructed in the WTP or supplementing the WTP's capability with supplemental treatment technologies. Thus, decisions to be made by DOE regarding whether to treat all waste in the WTP, as is or expanded, or to supplement its capacity by adding new treatment capability depend on demonstrating the feasibility of supplemental treatment technologies.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: topcat15@msn.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:14:19 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. The Federal Government still hasn't kept it's promise to finish cleaning up Hanford. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me and just adds to the unfinished cleanup. The groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River from Hanford waste must end immediately! *A196-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Theodore Cooper
13422 78th PL NE
Kirkland, WA 98034

A196-1 Regarding the status of Hanford cleanup, in general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* did not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: sandiyoungquist@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:13:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As an American citizen and living in the Pacific Northwest I strongly oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

Hanford is less safe than Yucca Mountain that was recently removed from the approved list. I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping nuclear waste along freeways is dangerous to residents and to the crops that feed all Americans. Groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River poses an equally dangerous situation that has not been addressed. Before shipping waste, we must first ensure no harm be done to people, land, water, and animals in the area. *A197-1* *A197-2* *A197-3*

Furthermore, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. We have just begun to take care of that issue without making it larger. This proposal just moves the problem of nuclear waste storage from the areas where it is currently stored to another area and endangers all along the routes where it would travel. It is not a good idea. It is a dangerous idea. It is an idea not well thought out. *A197-4*

Please table it and come up with a comprehensive, safe plan.

Sincerely,

Sandra Youngquist
7041 SW Hammond Ter
Beaverton, OR 97007

A197-1 The current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

A197-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A197-3 Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

A197-4 DOE has a national strategy for disposing of radioactive waste that requires transportation between DOE sites. This strategy was analyzed in the *WM PEIS* (DOE 1997). DOE explained in the *WM PEIS* that additional analyses would be prepared to implement DOE's programmatic decisions. This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with a number of proposed actions, including disposal of LLW and MLLW potentially shipped to Hanford from offsite DOE locations. Depending on the outcome of this *Final TC & WM EIS* and its ROD, DOE will evaluate whether additional NEPA reviews or updates to previous decisions are appropriate, as needed. As shown in the Summary, Section S.5.3; Chapter 2, Section 2.8.3.10; and Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12, of this *TC & WM EIS*, it is unlikely that the estimated total public radiation exposures from transporting radioactive waste to Hanford for disposal would result in any additional LCFs.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: l_fabrick@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 4:34:19 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents, and would dumping the waste at Hanford would continue to contaminate groundwater of the nearby Columbia River.

Instead, please create JOBS by starting a long-term cleanup process of the toxic waste at Hanford and other sites, by using vitrification, the safest way to treat the most radioactive nuclear waste. *A198-1* *A198-2*

Sincerely,

Laurine Fabrick
1819 Broadway Ave. E., Unit B
Seattle, WA 98102

A198-1 The potential impacts of all activities analyzed in this EIS on employment rates, including the increases and decreases in full-time equivalent positions, are presented in Chapter 4.

A198-2 Comment noted.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: Mhiam86377@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, March 20, 2010 3:15:18 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 20, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford.

Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents. Exposure of this waste, can result with an increase in Cancer and Health Concerns to the pubic in this area. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. *A199-1*

Sincerely,

Jennifer Hiam
10124 48th Ave E
Tacoma, WA 98446

A199-1 As shown in the Summary, Section S.5.3; Chapter 2, Section 2.8.3.10; and Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12, of this *TC & WM EIS*, it is unlikely that the estimated total public radiation exposures from transporting radioactive waste to Hanford for disposal would result in any additional LCFs. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: hankusb@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:41:05 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

As a resident of Portland, Orgon, which gets a portion of its drinking water from the Columbia River, radioactive contamination of the Columbia is of vital importance to me! I believe that the only soluion that protects citizens and wildlife is that all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. *A200-1*

Sincerely,

Henry Bennett
4014 SE Grant Court
Portland, OR 97214

A200-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: bleeweaver@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:50:13 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Enough is enough. If you're going to persist in creating radioactive waste, come up with a sustainable plan to handle that waste safely. Perhaps you would like to store it in the District of Columbia's Rock Creek Park? *A201-1*

Sincerely,

Bill Weaver
432 NE 73rd Street
Seattle, WA 98115

A201-1 Even though the creation of radioactive waste and alternative storage sites are not within the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*, the comment is noted regarding the continual production of radioactive waste and appropriate storage sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: pam.mcwethy@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 7:05:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I most strongly oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

Whoever supports this idea must be not only daft but short sighted and ignorant. Do you not know that already the nuclear waste at Hanford has escaped "impenetrable", man made barriers and a panic effort is underway to prevent this terrible killer from reaching the Columbia river. Read the news papers.

Any one who supports the idea of transporting to and storing nuclear waste anywhere within a water shed as vital to the life of people and fish as the Columbia... or as densely populated as the Puget Sound could well have the destruction the river, sound, and even the Pacific on their souls forever. That is not a gamble I advise for any reason. *A202-1*

Face it guys, Nuclear power is like heroin. It is a substance of great power that promises great rewards (so called "nonpolluting electricity", etc.) but, like the drug, it's power is devastatingly addicting and leaves death in its wake. It should only be used on rare occasions of greatest need and the waste should be stored like a family treasure deep inside the solid rock of the most stable, oldest mountain, not in one of the newest regions of our continent. *A202-2*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Pam McWethy
2415 Cleveland Street
Port Townsend, WA 98368

A202-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

A202-2 The current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: kgear1@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 5:19:12 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Not to mention Hanford is leaking as it is. *A203-1*

Sincerely,

Kathleen Geary
119 Speers Ln
Elkton, OR 97436

A203-1 As analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*, 67 of the 149 SSTs at Hanford are known or suspected to have leaked liquid waste to the environment between the 1950s and the present, some of which has reached the groundwater. Estimates of the total leak loss range from less than 2.8 million to as much as 3.97 million liters (750,000 to 1,050,000 gallons). DOE recognizes that groundwater contamination from past leaks is a concern at Hanford and its potential impact on communities downriver from Hanford. One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: eltomategordo@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 11:37:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

There still are people on the east side of the State of Washington who are dying from downwind exposure to eternally toxic radioactive emissions. What this proposal would do is virtually guarantee that the lower Columbia River, all surrounding groundwater tables and much of the Pacific Ocean will become poisoned for all human time. *A204-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. Vitrification does NOT change toxicity; it merely changes how it can be stored! *A204-2*

Please get a clue...

Robert A. Ethington
13216 N Stevens St
Spokane, WA 99208-7205

Sincerely,

Robert A Ethington
13216 N Stevens St
Spokane, WA 99208

A204-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

The actions proposed in this *TC & WM EIS* support the cleanup of Hanford. As noted in Chapter 1, Section 1.3, the purpose and need include long-term actions to permanently reduce the risk to human health and the environment posed by waste in the SSTs and DSTs and to facilitate the cleanup of Hanford. DOE intends to pursue the selected alternatives as expeditiously as technology and funding allow following issuance of a ROD on the actions proposed in this EIS.

A204-2 Please see response to comment A1-4 in the master letter for Campaign A.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: truelaura@earthlink.net
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 12:00:19 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As someone who regularly visits relatives in the Pacific Northwest, I am shocked at the "preferred alternative"of shipping nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents and to everyone who travels the freeways, I-5 (which I travel every year), I-205, I-84 and I-90 (which I have sometimes traveled.) I know that often there is no alternative to taking those routes because of mountain ranges on either side,etc. The public should not beexposed to highly radioactive waste being transported something like every day for more than 20 years (given the DOE's proposal to send about 17,500 truckloads to Hanford.) It makes me sad (and sick) to think of the beautiful Columbia River sustaining groundwater contamination from Hanord's wastes. *A205-1*

Instead of dumping more radioactive waste there, we should treat all current Hanford radioactive waste through vitrification. Covering it up (in more ways than one) is not a solution.

Sincerely,

Laura Mueller
8014 South Lawler
Burbank, IL 60459

A205-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: marfrates@mycomspan.com
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 2:05:24 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

As a resident of the state of Oregon I appalled that highways we frequently travel would be used as the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, WA, as proposed in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I understand that the DOE has itself conducted studies that show that, even without traffic accidents or terrorist attacks, trucking highly radioactive waste could cause upwards of 800 fatal cancers among the public along the transit routes. Is this truly my government's "preferred alternative"? *A206-1*

I furthermore think it insane to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site which already poses serious environmental hazards to the surrounding region. Contaminated groundwater seeps into the nearby Columbia River threatening communities downstream.

Rather than adding more to a potential disaster waiting to happen, the government should make every effort to clean up current toxic wastes at Hanford. *A206-2*

Sincerely,

Francis E. Quinn
425 Bandon Ave SW
Bandon, OR 97411

A206-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A206-2 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: itsaboutstars@cs.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:54:05 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

Also, speaking as a "down winder"-- a huge group of people who were damaged by their radioactive iodine fallout of the 40's and 50's--I think Hanford has created quite enough harm already. *A207-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

David and Nancy Mann
85 Sycamore St. Port
Hadlock, WA 98339

A207-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: thevenuemonmouth@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 1:40:12 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I consider it incredibly stupid to even consider dumping so close to one of Americans greatest rivers - as well as another insult to the Native Americans on the Umatilla Reservation - do they still not count? Can't we move forward instead of declining. *A208-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Ruth Everitt
167 Main St W
Monmouth, OR 97361

A208-1 The perspectives and values of both the American Indian community and the citizens in this region are among the factors driving the current ORP mission to clean up the chemical and radioactive wastes left behind from the previous Hanford mission of defense-related nuclear research, development, and weapons production activities. DOE recognizes that the tribes feel a strong connection and association with their surrounding environment. For example, DOE appreciates receiving the Umatilla Tribe's narrative, which provides its perspectives. DOE included this narrative in this *Final TC & WM EIS* as a new appendix (Appendix W), with references to this appendix added in the main volume of this EIS. Also, this EIS includes a number of analyses of the potential impacts of the various alternatives on the local American Indian population over the short term (see Appendix J) and long term (see Appendix Q).

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: lcater@peoplepc.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:09:15 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of Spokane, WA, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. *A209-1*

This idea was proposed twenty years ago. It was a bad idea then and it is still a bad idea.

Sincerely,

Lindy Cater
628 W. 22nd
Spokane, WA 99203

Sincerely,

Lindy Cater
628 W 22nd
Spokane, WA 99203

A209-1 As discussed in the *TC & WM EIS* Summary, Chapter 1, and Chapter 2, this EIS analyzes additional waste treatment capability that includes expanding the vitrification process capability currently being constructed in the WTP or supplementing the WTP's capability with supplemental treatment technologies. Thus, decisions to be made by DOE regarding whether to treat all waste in the WTP, as is or expanded, or to supplement its capacity by adding new treatment capability depend on demonstrating the feasibility of supplemental treatment technologies.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: anderlik@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:12:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

Even the thought of using nuclear reactors for a source of "CLEAN" energy is insane. The expense and eternal danger of the Hanford "clean-up" is proof that we cannot afford to produce MORE waste. *A210-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site.

Sincerely,

Barbara Anderlik
23602 E. First Ave.
Liberty Lake, WA 99019

A210-1 The use of nuclear power and its resulting waste in the United States are beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. This EIS addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Site cleanup actions and their costs are not within the scope of this EIS. Chapter 2, Section 2.11, of this EIS, however, summarizes and compares the relative estimated costs of the proposed alternatives.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: dodluk@msn.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 12:04:04 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

Let me tell you a story about a friend of mine, Joan, who was a young wife and mother, married to a worker on the Hanford Nucear Reservation. The family lived near Hanford for 15 years. Joan become unexplicably sick a couple of years after moving there. For many years no doctor could explain the unusual health problems that eventually destroyed her immune system and left her vulnerable to many lung, bowel, and heart problems. She was diagnosed with cancer for the first time in her early 30's. radiation and chemotherapy drove it into remission. Four times over a period of thirty years she was diagnosed with different types of cancer. It was not until her early fifties that the doctors at Swedish hospital finally made the connection between her many immune system problems, her heart, lung and bowel issues with repeated bouts of differing types of cancer with the heavy exposure to radiation at Hanford that she had experienced over her residency in the vicinity of the nucear reserve for a 15 year period. She suffered poor and declining health because of the exposure to the radioactivity in her early adulthood. The last 30 years of of her life were spent in and out of hospitals and doctor offices combatting one illness after another. No one should have to experience the effects of exposure now that it is understood what such exposure does to the human body.

It is unconscionable that the Department of Energy would even consider adding to the already huge amount of radioactive waste at Hanford by lifting the moratorium on shipping waste to Hanford at this time (or any other.) *A211-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. Additionally, I believe all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Do not aloow any more citizens to be subjected to a life of pain and suffering like that of my friend Joan.

A211-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

It is unconscionable that the Department of Energy would even consider adding to the already huge amount of radioactive waste at Hanford by lifting the moratorium on shipping waste to Hanford.

Sincerely,

Linda Dodson
615 Boren Ave
Seattle, 98104

Sincerely,

Linda Dodson
615 Boren Ave Apt 5
Seattle, WA 98104

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: stormbird@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 8:09:17 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

I vehemently oppose shipping nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in DOE/EIS--0391.

Shipping this waste - up to two trucks a day, every day, day in and day out - along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents, and this doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the Columbia River. *A212-1*

Mark me down as opposed, certainly until the Hanford site is cleaned up.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Christopher Bryant
11314 179th Court NE
Redmond, WA 98052

A212-1 DOE agrees with the commentor's statement that, on average, up to 2 trucks per day for 20 years would be involved in transporting about 14,200 truck shipments to Hanford, as presented in this *Final TC & WM EIS*, Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12. Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: bethrtc@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 7:21:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

This agricultural corner of the state has evolved to become a promising vinticulture region. I am not much of a wine drinker, but can appreciate what this does for our state's economy, for the preservation of land for sustainable agricultural practices, and for tourism. What might appear to be desert or wasteland at first glance has proved to produce prize winning reds (wines, that is) and an occasional chart-topping white wine. This is, therefore, high-$$$-yield agricultural land, not a dumping zone. Please be thoughtful stewards of our land and those who wish to live healthy lives on or near it (or down-wind/downriver from it). *A213-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Beth Cullison
4910 54th Ave S
Seattle, WA 98118

A213-1 DOE appreciates the commentor's desire for DOE to be a thoughtful steward of the land and, in fact, is undertaking the cleanup of Hanford to further that end. Although not specifically analyzed, there is no reason to believe that the viticulture industry would be impacted by activities under any of the *TC & WM EIS* alternatives.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: tohron@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:41:16 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. Furthermore, as a Physics student at Washington State University, I do not appreciate the additional risk this poses toward workers at the LIGO project - people working at the cutting edge of physics should not be put at risk for the sake of a power source that loses money in the long term when there are numerous alternatives that keep getting better. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. *A214-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Nuclear fission as a power source has many things going against it - and one of the foremost is that managing the waste costs more the the power the plants produce. Thus, we should focus on dealing with the mess we have, not making it bigger. *A214-2*

Sincerely,

Aaron Kunkle
240 Orton Hall
Pullman, WA 99163

A214-1 The potential radiological impacts on a person at the Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory (LIGO) are evaluated annually in the Hanford Site environmental reports (Poston, Duncan, and Dirkes 2011). As indicated in this *TC & WM EIS*, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.1.1, the annual dose in 2010 to a hypothetical individual at LIGO was 0.0054 millirem; the EPA standard for exposure to radiation emissions such as those from Hanford is 10 millirem per year (40 CFR 61, Subpart H). Appendix K shows the calculated doses under each of the Tank Closure alternatives to an onsite member of the public at LIGO, the Columbia Generating Station, or US Ecology. In all cases, the doses this hypothetical receptor (at US Ecology) would receive over the life of the project (not in a year) would be less than 15 millirem. This can be contrasted with the EPA limit of 10 millirem for a single year.

A214-2 Nuclear energy production and the cost of managing the resulting waste are beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: kmgjovik@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:38:12 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

Is the Pacific Northwest dispensable? Not only do we have Hanford, which you are attempting to expand, we have Bangor with 8 Trident submarines, each equipped equipped with 24 Trident II D-5 missiles. *A215-1*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the use - and existence - of these weapons AND the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Kat Gjovik
8459 Katy Lane NE
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

A215-1 Nuclear weapons production and use are beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*, as is the expansion of Hanford. This EIS addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: barbashman@exchangenet.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:31:16 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. Cancer rates are high along the Columbia as well as down wind from Hanford. *A216-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Barbara Ashman
1830 NW 17th Street
Corvallis, OR 97330

A216-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: theresih@uoregon.edu
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 7:07:09 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Adding more deadly waste to an area that is already leaking is both immoral and shameful. Instead states that want nuclear plants and have waste from other industries should have to store it within the state of origin and not expect another area to bear the danger of exposure to radioactive substances. That the proposal is to truck anywhere, or send by rail with all the accidents recently is unbelievable. Prohibiting the shipping of radioactive waste 30 years ago was a smart decision, and should be continued. Nothing has changed to make it safe to do so now. *A217-1*

Sincerely,

Theresa Sihock
3265 Oriole St
Springfield, OR 97477

A217-1 As analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*, 67 of the 149 SSTs at Hanford are known or suspected to have leaked liquid waste to the environment between the 1950s and the present, some of which has reached the groundwater. Estimates of the total leak loss range from less than 2.8 million to as much as 3.97 million liters (750,000 to 1,050,000 gallons). DOE recognizes that groundwater contamination from past leaks is a concern at Hanford. One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks.

Disposal of waste produced from nuclear energy plants and other industries is not within the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. However, shipment of waste between DOE sites is analyzed in this EIS. DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: russell.monica@deq.state.or.us
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 11:56:36 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

I oppose shipping any nuclear waste anywhere. Nuclear energy is not the answer to any of our energy problems and this waste you are trying to deal with is a prime example of why. Supposedly the "new generation" nuclear plants will use this old waste as fuel...without producing any other waste? it's practically a miracle....It's time we focused on renewables and energy efficiency and shut down the plants that are currently operating. *A218-1*

Sincerely,

Monica Russell
3635 SW Custer St
Portland,, OR 97219

A218-1 The use of renewable energy sources in the United States is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: glynnth@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:32:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

(My personal note - On top of all that, this country needs to STOP PRODUCING RADIOACTIVE WASTE, which we don't yet have a safe method of disposing of! And why should the residents of Washington State, be responsible for, or have to suffer the consequences, for waste produced by other states?? Let each state be responsible for IT'S OWN WASTE PRODUCTS! If they don't want to deal with the problems of disposing of their own waste, they should not produce it, in the first place!) *A219-1*

Sincerely,

Gerri Thomas
1221 11th St
Bremerton, WA 98337

A219-1 Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: tnpranstrom@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 8:34:06 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

No No No none of it. We are still trying to clean up the existing toxic mess and save the Columbia from nuclear run off.

Who would stop some terrorists from hijacking these loads to do god knows what damage with?

Not in my state, I suggest North Carolina.

Sincerely,

P Ranstrom
PO Box 2181
Vashon, WA 98070

A220-1

A220-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: coruscate@gorge.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 4:16:45 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

It seems shortsighted to me that Hanford, already one of the nation's most polluted sites, should even be considered as a toxic dump. *A221-1*

The Columbia River, called the River of the West, is a fundamental resource for all in the Pacific Northwest, including the ancestral Amer-Indian nations. Salmon run dangered here. Tribal groups rely heavily on salmon as they have for centuries. This mighty river and the lands that it serves must be healed of its sickness. *A221-2*

The National forests which abound in this area, will see the mutating effects of a nuclear waste presence. Many mutations have already been observed. Wildlife, domestic, and farming, not to mention our children's health, are already manifesting the results of this horror. Please. Lets try to view our country wholistically. I quote: "Your end of the canoe is sinking." *A221-3*

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Leslie Davee
box 194
Odell, OR 97044

A221-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A221-2 This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with specific proposed actions and reasonable alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford. These analyses include impacts on fish and wildlife and their habitat, as well as environmental justice and socioeconomic considerations, consistent with current CEQ and DOE NEPA guidance. Short-term impacts are presented in Chapter 4; long-term impacts, including those associated with a scenario specific to an American Indian hunter-gatherer, are presented in Chapter 5.

A221-3 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites. This analysis encompasses potential impacts on human health and the environment, including animals and plants.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: nibi_kabuchi@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 10:18:08 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I've been to the Tri-Cities area enough times to know that while it might seem the perfect place for this, believe me, they're screwed up enough without your help. *A222-1*

Sincerely,

Norbert Quiban
3660 - 41st Ave. West
Seattle, WA 98199

A222-1 Comment noted.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: realtorchick@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 9:16:08 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I have been careful of everything that goes into the bodies of my children from the moment I found out I was pregnant. That was a dozen years ago, and I am still just as protective. Seven years ago I found out that my children had high lead, tin, mercury, and cadmium levels, and I was at a loss to explain how that happened. After a traumatic and expensive series of chelation, they have somewhat lower levels. The thought of more highly toxic contaminants (radioactive waste) polluting the environments of children makes me angry. Please do the right thing and think about how many generations it takes for radioactive waste to disintegrate. Thank you, Megan Zimmerman *A223-1*

Sincerely,

Megan Zimmerman
3326 SE 28th Place
Portland, OR 97202

A223-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: alanmoen@nwi.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:28:11 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

I live in Washington State, less than 150 miles from the Hanford Nuclear Reservation. I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

This is a very bad idea. Hanford is cleaning up its nuclear waste now, at great expense. Why add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site? Shipping it here is dangerous, and the potential pollution of the Columbia River — the lifeblood waterway of this entire region — is a risk we should not take. Citizens in this state voted recently to deny the shipping of more nuclear waste here, and that vote should be respected. *A224-1* *A224-2*

Also, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Alan Moen
6701 Entiat River Road
Entiat, WA 98822

A224-1 The cost of Hanford cleanup is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes potential impacts associated with DOE's proposed actions and alternatives to safely retrieve, treat, and dispose of Hanford tank waste; decommission FFTF; and upgrade/expand waste disposal capacity at Hanford to provide for disposal of on- and offsite DOE waste. Chapter 2, Section 2.11, of this EIS summarizes and compares the relative estimated costs of the proposed alternatives. Further, please see response to comment A1-1 in the master letter for Campaign A.

A224-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: dsquared69@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 8:52:16 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I am not against nuclear energy and understand there are SAFE ways to 'store'the waste for eternity deep in the earth in special containers *A225-1*

Sincerely,

David Davies
316 Chuckanut Pt Rd.
Bellingham, WA 98229

A225-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the disposition of HLW, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: kendrawb@bithead.net
Sent: Monday, March 22, 2010 2:45:18 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 22, 2010

My Mother in Law is a down winder who lives in Richland. She worked at the Hanford cleanup sites for years before retiring for her health. I've heard real horror stories about what is really buried out there, and how much there is to do to stabilize this site. Adding more waste before this is complete seems foolish and dangerous to me.

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. This is a reality, not just scare tactic. I've seen the paperwork.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. The waste is way too close to the Columbia River which is the people of the NW's major source of water, energy, and fish. Let each State figure out their own waste problems, or put more National thought into a safe alternative site. *A226-1*

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,

Kendra Williams
3736 SW Webster St.
Seattle, WA 98126

A226-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: ritaheinz@hotmail.com
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 1:11:18 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

I live in Southern Oregon less than 1 mile from I5. I've already had cancer twice. NO MORE!!! As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). *A227-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Rita Heinz
210 Suncrest Rd #3
Talent, OR 97540

A227-1 Transportation activities analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS* would not occur on Interstate 5. As shown in the Summary, Section S.5.3; Chapter 2, Section 2.8.3.10; and Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12, of this *TC & WM EIS*, it is unlikely that the estimated total public radiation exposures from transporting radioactive waste to Hanford for disposal would result in any additional LCFs.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: cpeach1@msn.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 7:55:18 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

Handford Wste Managers estimate that the old waste is due to mix into the Columbia river in the next decade... that is ugly stuff.. Lets reinstitue the Carter energy policy that Ronnie Ray gun killed and no one since has dared to get us back on this masterful plan for energy independence. HOw powerful are the energy companies anyway.... that is not a question by the way... They are your master we know... *A228-1* *A228-2*

' represent the people please..... and the Planet///..

Charles Gorder

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

charles Gorder
16080 s w hillsboro hwy
Hillsboro, OR 97123

A228-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

A228-2 National energy policy and the role of energy companies in implementing this policy are beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: maryly8@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 11:36:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

I lived eleven years in Moses Lake, WA, just north of Hanford. Five years ago, I was diagnosed with multiple myloma, an incurable blood cancer. Coincidence? Not likely! As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). *A229-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Mary Young
5709 189th Ave E Lake
Tapps, WA 98391

A229-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: ninahc@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:30:08 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. All waste of this type should be put through an on site vitrification process so that the danger is minimized. *A230-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. It is well known that waste has traveled underground into the Columbia river. Sending more wast to Hanford would only exacerbate problems already present at that site. *A230-1 cont'd*

Sincerely,

Craig King
369 Brady Loop Rd E
Montesano, WA 98563

A230-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jckburdick@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:43:21 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

The existing contamination at Hanford is a visible reminder that nuclear waste is a problem which must be faced immediately. To even consider adding to this hazardous waste is venal and stupid. The companies which have generated this massive amount of waste need to pay for handling it - and trucking it to Hanford is NOT a solution. *A231-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. The Columbia River is already contaminated. *A231-2*

Sincerely,

Karolyn Burdick
25293 Highway 112
Clallam Bay, WA 98326

A231-1 This EIS addresses the environmental impacts of retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste and final closure of the SST system. It also evaluates the impacts of FFTF decommissioning, including management of waste generated by the decommissioning process. Finally, this *TC & WM EIS* evaluates the potential environmental impacts of ongoing solid-waste management operations at Hanford, as well as the proposed disposal of Hanford LLW and MLLW and a limited volume of offsite LLW and MLLW. The generation and management of nuclear waste by private companies are not within the scope of this EIS.

A231-2 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: michael.higgins@evolone.org
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 1:13:12 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I can't add much more to this but to say, the same old issues still keep cropping up. The stuff is dangerous, deadly and can't yet -- if ever -- be dealt with in an economically-feasible manner.

Moving it will never happen as the public simply won't allow it. And these regulatory and investment manoeuvers are just a shell game to fleece the public now and sacrifice them later. Hmm. Kinda like sheep to mutton. Baaah!

Sincerely,

Michael Higgins
125 NW 22nd PL
Portland, OR 97210

A232-1

A232-1 Regarding the safe and economical management of waste at Hanford, the purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze proposed actions to address these waste management concerns. Specifically, this EIS analyzes potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: enonneman@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 6:15:10 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 19, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I feel it is utterly irresponsible of this administration to include significant expansion of nuclear power to meet U.S. energy needs, when we are still unable to safely treat and store the nuclear waste that currently exists. *A233-1*

Sincerely,

Elaine Nonneman
226 21st Ave. E
Seattle, WA 98112

A233-1 Nuclear energy production is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: peggye@eoni.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:58:15 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I object to our area of the country becoming the dump site for the rest of the country. We must CLEAN up this site not put more death there. *A234-1*

As a nation we must find better technology to safeguard ourselves from these residues. *A234-2*

Sincerely,

P. Earlene Lamb
403 Allium ST
La Grande, OR 97850

A234-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

A234-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

The impacts of the offsite waste in terms of radiological risk are presented in the Summary, Section S.5.5.3, and Chapter 2, Section 2.10, Key Environmental Findings. These sections discuss the radiological risk differences between including and not including offsite waste disposal at IDF-East.

Chapter 7, Section 7.5, of this *Final TC & WM EIS* provides a summary discussion on sensitivity analyses and potential mitigation measures for reducing radiological risk associated with onsite sources of contaminants. Some of the mitigation strategies discussed involve potential contaminants to specific areas of research and development associated with tank waste retrieval, treatment, and disposal, as well as improving technologies designed to limit or control the transport of contaminants in the subsurface.

The *TC & WM EIS* analysis shows that receipt of offsite waste streams that contain specific amounts of certain isotopes, specifically, iodine-129 and technetium-99, could cause an adverse impact on the environment. Therefore, one means of mitigating this impact would be for DOE to limit disposal of offsite waste streams at Hanford. Other mitigation measures, such as recycling secondary-waste streams into the primary-waste-stream feeds within the WTP to increase iodine-129 capture in ILAW and bulk vitrification glass, are discussed in Chapter 7, Section 7.5, of this final EIS.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: 3quarks@ashlandhome.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 7:04:24 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford. This move clearly tells us that the gov't doesn't have clue as to what to do long term with waste even as it plans to develop new nukes here. The French, who get most of their power from nukes, still don't know what to do with all the waste!! don morris , Ashland , Oregon . *A235-1*

Sincerely,

donald Morris
1644 Ross Lane
Ashland, OR 97520

A235-1 Nuclear energy production is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: cstreamwood@yahoo.com
Sent: Sunday, March 21, 2010 2:41:18 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 21, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I don't want to get cancer again! Take care of your own trash. In your own state. You made it you treat it. We are called the GREEN state FOR A REASON *A236-1*

Sincerely,

Carol Bankord
6330 201 Ave SW unit B
Rochester, WA 98579

A236-1 Appendices K and Q of this *TC & WM EIS* specifically address the analyses of potential human health risk of the *TC & WM EIS* proposed actions.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: revy@shaw.ca
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 6:57:17 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). You may not remember this but I am old enough to remember that Hanford's nickname, for many years, was WOOPS. It was a mistake in the seventies, it would be a HUGE mistake in this new milenium. We need alternative power, we do not need nuclear waste. So let's try other methods. Wind, water, solar cells, what have you. NOT NUCLEAR. *A237-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. Washington state is a pearl of natural beauty. But soon, if not protected, it will be no better than that poor over-burdened state, California. Don't, please don't, allow this to happen to Washington state. Leave our state out of this round of bad decisions where nuclear power is concerned. Yours, Diane Butler *A237-2*

Sincerely,

Diane Butler
Keyport Keyport,
WA 98393

A237-1 The use of renewable energy sources in the United States and nuclear energy production are beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

A237-2 This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve, treat, and dispose of Hanford tank waste; decommission FFTF; and expand waste disposal capacity at Hanford to provide for disposal of on- and offsite DOE waste. The disposal of other wastes, including waste associated with commercial nuclear power generation, is beyond the scope of this EIS.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: rachef@u.washington.edu
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 9:37:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I oppose this plan in the strongest of terms. It may help our pocketbooks in the short run, but this plan is dangerous to citizens of the Northwest and the groundwater we rely on.

We must focus our efforts on treating all radioactive waste through vitrification and preventing additional radioactive waste from being created. This waste is the price paid by future generations, non-human animals, and once-healthy ecosystems for the convenience of present people. It is not a price I would wish on anyone. *A238-1*

Sincerely,

Rachel Fredericks
1305 NE 43rd St Apt 503
Seattle, WA 98105

A238-1 For a summary and comparison of the relative estimated costs of the proposed *TC & WM EIS* alternatives, see Chapter 2, Section 2.11, of this EIS.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: larry@pedersonbros.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:23:15 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. If you can't get it toghether better than this I would suggest that you find a new occupation. It's time to think about the world you will be leaving to your family in the future. *A239-1*

Sincerely,

Larry Mann
7696 Silver Lake Rd.
Maple Falls, WA 98266

A239-1 Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*. In all cases, DOE's commitment to the protection of public health and safety will be taken into consideration.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: teh.spike@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 12:17:08 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I find it disgustingly appalling that some mentally disabled paper pushers in Washington would have such a bad acid trip that they would consider polluting our beautiful state any more then it is already. But alas not everyone in our government can think beyond "Herp de derp we have a problem, how can I solve it in the most hazardous stupid way possible?" Thank you for your time. Either quit your job and don't follow through, or be fired after going on trial for crimes against humanity. *A240-1*

Sincerely,

Ethan Zink
1112 S 44th ave
Yakima, WA 98908

A240-1 This EIS addresses the environmental impacts of retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste and final closure of the SST system. It also evaluates the impacts of FFTF decommissioning, including management of waste generated by the decommissioning process. Finally, this *TC & WM EIS* evaluates the potential environmental impacts of ongoing solid-waste management operations at Hanford, as well as the proposed disposal of Hanford LLW and MLLW and a limited volume of offsite LLW and MLLW.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: gary.parks@edx.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 7:47:33 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

Department of Energy -

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I strongly oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I strongly oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site and the transportation of that waste through public areas. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to the families that live anywhere along the transportation routes - even in the unlikely event that it can be done with few or no accidents or releases. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River, and the long-term danger that poses to the resources, people, and wildlife all along its course to the Pacific Ocean. *A241-1*

The energy companies and the governmental agencies that sponsored them must truly clean up this deadly waste, and not just disguise / hide it away. A real and truly safe clean-up is part of the real cost of this "cheap" energy source, and must be taken into account now and for future energy decisions as well. *A241-2*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Thanks for your attention and responsible actions.

Gary Parks
655 W. 27th Ave.
Eugene, OR 97405

Sincerely,

Gary Parks
655 W. 27th Ave.
Eugene, OR 97405

A241-1 As shown in the Summary, Section S.5.3; Chapter 2, Section 2.8.3.10; and Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12, of this *TC & WM EIS*, it is unlikely that the estimated total public radiation exposures from transporting radioactive waste to Hanford for disposal would result in any additional LCFs.

A241-2 Nuclear energy production is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: earth_kpr@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 6:47:05 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 19, 2010 As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

I am fiercely protective of our water ways and live near the Columbia. Without healthy water, we all die.... who will it be? Would you be supporting these proposals if your family lived near one of the proposed routes or on the Columbia? *A242-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Joni Chambers
786 Frost Rd
Winlock, WA 98596

A242-1 This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve, treat, and dispose of Hanford tank waste; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate environmental cleanup activities at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: serbo6@msn.com
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 11:38:29 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

The DOE's proposal would put about 17,500 truckloads of radioactive waste on Pacific Northwest freeways: I-5, I-205, I-84, and I-90. That's more than two trucks per day, every day, for more than 20 years.

The DOE's own analysis in 2008 showed that even without traffic accidents or a terrorist attack, trucking highly radioactive waste would lead to as many as 816 fatal cancers in the public along the transit routes. *A243-1*

And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

When it comes to Hanford, the DOE must change course. They must engage in a long-term cleanup process by using vitrification, the safest way to treat the most radioactive nuclear waste. Instead of shipping more waste to Hanford, they must focus their attention on cleaning up the existing toxic mess. *A243-2*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Steven Serbousek
6885 Holland Road NW
Bremerton, WA 9831

A243-1 On average, up to 2 trucks per day for 20 years would be involved in transporting about 14,200 truck shipments to Hanford, as presented in this *Final TC & WM EIS*, Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12. This number of shipments, reduced from the number analyzed in the *Draft TC & WM EIS*, is a result of a potential mitigation measure to address the public's input and concerns about offsite waste disposal at Hanford; specifically, an offsite waste stream containing a significant inventory of iodine-129 (i.e., RH-LLW resins from INL) was eliminated from the analysis. This mitigation measure has been incorporated into the Waste Management alternatives. In addition, a sensitivity analysis that shows the potential impacts on groundwater of limiting offsite waste streams containing iodine-129 and technetium-99 is included in Appendix M, Section M.5, of this EIS. Other mitigation measures, such as recycling secondary-waste streams into the primary-waste-stream feeds within the WTP to increase iodine-129 capture in ILAW and bulk vitrification, are discussed in Chapter 7, Section 7.5, of this final EIS.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A243-2 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: blsherlock@workspacesolution.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:22:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). The Hanford area is already over saturated by the dumped nuclear waste. The ground poluted water should be reason enough to stop. There is farming and ranching that is being adversly effected. Please stop. Hanford has had enough. There must be other sites where ground water, farming and ranching would not be effected. This is not another 'not in my beckyard' situation. Hanford has done more than it's part and you need to find another site. Thank you. *A244-1* *A244-2* *A244-1 cont'd*

Rebecca Sherlock
350 Alpine Street
Seaside, or. 97138

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Sherlock
350 Alpine Street
Seaside, OR 97138

A244-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A244-2 DOE acknowledges the role of the agricultural community as one of several driving forces of the economy in the Hanford area since the early 1970s. This *TC & WM EIS* evaluates the health impacts of normal operations, including consideration of radiation exposure through ingestion of contaminated products from animals raised locally and fruits and vegetables grown in a family garden (see Chapter 4). The impacts of activities such as new facility construction and closure under the various alternatives on surface water, the vadose zone, and groundwater, which could affect stormwater runoff, surface water, or groundwater hydrology or quality, are also presented in Chapter 4.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: nwbirders@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 11:54:48 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

In the early 1970's I remember seeing a picture in the newspaper of glass-lined 55 gal. drums being bulldozed into a large hole in the ground at Hanford. We have enough nuclear waste here in WA we don't need more. *A245-1* *A245-2*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Beverly Webber
1701 Utah Court
Milton, WA 98354

A245-1 Note that current Hanford staff are not familiar with the use of glass-lined drums. However, current waste disposal practices have evolved since the time period of the photo mentioned. As discussed in Chapter 1, Section 1.4, of this *TC & WM EIS*, since 2004, DOE has buried all LLW in lined trenches and waste packages are now placed in disposal trenches in an orderly manner. The exception to the use of lined trenches is the disposal of the Navy's reactor containment vessels, in which contamination is contained within heavy steel walls. DOE ensures that disposal activities are protective of the environment and meet regulatory requirements. See Appendix E, Section E.3.3, for a description of the evolution of waste disposal practices.

A245-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: gaiatrek@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 8:21:11 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

My family is already without health care and now you want to truck radioactive waste though my neighborhood? I know that you know better; that treating the root problem rather than disposing of more waste is the only way to go. As a PNW resident, I am horrified that my government wants to make Hanford America's radioactive wasteland. Farm animals already suffer horrific mutations; Please stop this craziness before we have start counting human deaths as a result of government disresponsibility! I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

A246-1

A246-2

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Laura Fraser
905 N Lake Samish Dr
Bellingham, WA 98229

A246-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A246-2 Birth defects in livestock have been associated with a variety of different environmental and genetic factors, including viruses, nutrient deficiencies, toxic plants, and inbreeding. Although rumors periodically circulate, there is no evidence to indicate that unusual numbers or types of mutations occur in farm animals near Hanford, according to the Washington State Department of Agriculture (Kohrs 2010). This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with specific proposed actions and reasonable alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford. The analyses include potential human health impacts (through the air pathway) of normal operations, presented in Chapter 4, with details in Appendix K ("Short-Term Human Health Risk Analysis"), as well as long-term impacts (including through the groundwater and river pathway), presented in Chapter 5, with details in Appendix Q ("Long-Term Human Health Dose and Risk Analysis"). These data will be considered by DOE in making decisions on the alternatives to implement.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: treatlm@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:35:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

All current Hanford waste must be treated through the process of vitrification, and not just covered up. Hanford cannot keep up with its current nuclear waste, let alone adding new contamination.

The Department of Energy needs to find a location which is more isolated for its nuclear waste processing, not in the middle of a populated farming community. *A247-1*

Sincerely,

Lynne Treat
674 NE Franklin Ave
Chehalis, WA 98532

A247-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: maryvorachek@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 7:25:06 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

End the dumping of nuclear waste in other people's back yard. Areas that want to go nuclear should be responsible for their own deadly waste. *A248-1*

Sincerely,
Mary Vorachek
680 16th St. N.E.
Salem, OR 97301

A248-1 Nuclear energy production is not within the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: mahala77@live.com
Sent: Saturday, March 20, 2010 1:32:18 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 20, 2010

I voted for Obama. I cried tears of joy when he was elected. I cannot believe; I am stunned, that he is approving more nuclear power. Stop the insanity now. No nuclear waste to Hanford. No nuclear anything, ever again, period. Never again! And I will not vote for anyone who is not 100% against all nuclear. The waste alone should be enough to make any rational person NOT want to have anything to do with it. Shame on you. No nuclear waste through the beautiful northwest. Put what is left in the middle of the desert, far away from anyone. Shame on you! Shame on you! Even in the desert it is not safe! Shame on you! *A249-1*

Sincerely,

Robin Mauro
547 w 12th #4
Eugene, OR 97401

A249-1 Nuclear energy production is not within the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: liserein@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 2:12:19 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

I do not support dangerous and bankrupting excessive costs of nuclear energy, and anything related to the toxic, forever half life plutonium and radioactive waste. As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). *A250-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Lise Rein
1237 E. 25th Ave
Eugene, OR 97403

A250-1 Nuclear energy production is not within the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jrwygant@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:09:15 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Hanford is a problem because of years of government mismanagement and cover-up. Although efforts are now being made to remedy serious problems, plans to turn Hanford into a dump site only exacerbate existing conditions. *A251-1*

Sincerely,

James Wygant
7505 SE Reed College Pl.
Portland, OR 97202

A251-1 Regarding the management of Hanford, as well as the effects on the site of additional offsite waste disposal there, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: instantconstantabundance@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:35:20 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

I STRONGLY MEAN THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT AGAINST THE USE OF HANFORD FOR RADIOACTIVE WASTE STORAGE. FURTHERMORE, I INSIST THAT THE WASTE, THERE, THAT HAS NOT BEEN CLEANED UP TO DATE BE NEUTRALIZED WITH VITRIFICATION. *A252-1*

WHEN I USED TO VISIT MY FRIEND IN THE HANFORD AREA, SHE WAS SICK ALL THE TIME AND QUITE LITERALLY, HER SKIN WOULD BE COVERED WITH LITTLE CRYSTALS THAT SPARKLED AND GLOWED! NUCLEAR WASTE IS NASTY BUSINESS WHICH HAS NO PLACE IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST! *A252-2*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Saskia Harris
10640 Exeter Ave. N.E.
Seattle, WA 98125

A252-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Also, please see response to comment A1-4 in the master letter for Campaign A.

A252-2 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: hamboni@q.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:35:20 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 19, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Tests show that has already occurred.

We demand that all current Hanford waste be treated through vitrification as previously promised. How can we trust you anymore? You are endangering our population and our planet.

This is the USA-the land of the free and the brave and you choose to trifle with our health, our progeny, our environment, our water resources? This is preposterous-unthinkable -it is nothing less than criminal behavior!

We ask reversal to your previous pledge to clean up Hanford. No more delays. *A253-1*

No more waste added-no trucks on I-5, 405 spewing cancer to our residents. *A253-2*

Tax to preserve your original commitment but don't kill us. *A253-3*

16210 SE 134th, Renton, WA. 98059

Sincerely,

MaryEllen, Donald, Randall, Todd, Todd Jr Hamblin
16210 SE 134 St.
Renton, WA 98059

A253-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites. DOE is implementing, however, an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

A253-2 Transportation activities analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS* would not occur on Interstate 5 or Interstate 405. As shown in the Summary, Section S.5.3; Chapter 2, Section 2.8.3.10; and Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12, of this *TC & WM EIS*, it is unlikely that the estimated total public radiation exposures from transporting radioactive waste to Hanford for disposal would result in any additional LCFs.

A253-3 This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes potential impacts associated with DOE's proposed actions and alternatives to safely retrieve, treat, and dispose of Hanford tank waste; decommission FFTF; and upgrade/expand waste disposal capacity at Hanford to provide for disposal of on- and offsite DOE waste. Site cleanup actions and their costs are not within the scope of this EIS. However, Chapter 2, Section 2.11, of this EIS summarizes and compares the relative estimated costs of the actions proposed under each of the alternatives.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: rosegarden54@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 1:34:16 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. Contamination is already a problem at the Hanford site, so how can you justify sending more of this extremely dangerous waste there?

There are many other places this waste could be sent...many other government owned areas that are NOT being used - perhaps at the White House, or in the wealthy areas of upstate New York? L.A.? Atlanta? I'm sure it would be quite easy to find alternative storage sites for something with a 20,000 to 50,000 year half life. Perhaps we do need nuclear energy, but I believe the waste problem should be spread out evenly among ALL 50 STATES! Or, to be more fair, it should be stored in the state that created it. Why only Washington? Are we less valuable as American citizens? Or is it just that we're about as far as you can get in the continental U.S. from the 'other' Washington, where these decisions are made? *A254-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Carol Rose-Inich
1002 26th St NW
Puyallup, WA 98371

A254-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Nuclear energy production is not within the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: robertr9@epud.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 12:39:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I write to oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I understand the proposal would put about 17,500 truckloads of radioactive waste on Pacific Northwest freeways: I-5, I-205, I-84, and I-90. That's more than two trucks per day, every day, for more than 20 years. *A255-1*

I further understand the DOE's own analysis in 2008 showed that even without traffic accidents or a terrorist attack, trucking highly radioactive waste would lead to as many as 816 fatal cancers in the public along the transit routes.

And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

The DOE must change course with respect to Hanford. The Department must engage in a long-term cleanup process by using vitrification, the safest way to treat the most radioactive nuclear waste. Instead of shipping more waste to Hanford, you must focus your attention on cleaning up the existing toxic mess. *A255-2*

I would appreciate being kept informed of your decisions on this matter. *A255-3*

Sincerely,

Robert Roth
2510 Kincaid Street
Eugene, OR 97405

A255-1 On average, up to 2 trucks per day for 20 years would be involved in transporting about 14,200 truck shipments to Hanford, as presented in this *Final TC & WM EIS*, Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12. This number of shipments, reduced from the number analyzed in the *Draft TC & WM EIS*, is a result of a potential mitigation measure to address the public's input and concerns about offsite waste disposal at Hanford; specifically, an offsite waste stream containing a significant inventory of iodine-129 (i.e., RH-LLW resins from INL) was eliminated from the analysis. This mitigation measure has been incorporated into the Waste Management alternatives. In addition, a sensitivity analysis that shows the potential impacts on groundwater of limiting offsite waste streams containing iodine-129 and technetium-99 is included in Appendix M, Section M.5, of this EIS. Other mitigation measures, such as recycling secondary-waste streams into the primary-waste-stream feeds within the WTP to increase iodine-129 capture in ILAW and bulk vitrification, are discussed in Chapter 7, Section 7.5, of this final EIS.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A255-2 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

A255-3 Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: valerietweedienz@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 7:45:18 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 19, 2010

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

I feel like I am losing my democracy! That we are going back to the days of the Industrial Revolution, when human beings are just cogs in the wheel of industries making huge profits. I beg of you. Do not lift the moratorium on shipping radioactive waste to Hanford from other DOE sites. Cut off the Pacific Northwest from all the benefits of nuclear energy if you want. I welcome that decision. But don't drag nuclear pollution to our area as is outlined in the Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). *A256-1*

I have lived in Germany, New Zealand and Australia in addition to the U.S. What strikes me most is the unwillingness on the part of most Americans to be inconvenienced the smallest amount. We don't want to be a little too warm or put on a sweater in the winter months. Surely, we can make do with the energy sources we already have without resorting to nuclear energy. This should be a last resort.

In truth, you know that most Americans don't even know where our energy comes from and would be horrified to find out that nuclear waste is deposited in their backyards. Scientists hired by the industry to say it is safe, are not giving us the true story. *A256-2*

You know, as intelligent people, that it is better to be safe than sorry.

Please do not lift the moratorium.

1528 North Fife St,
Tacoma, WA

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Valerie Tweedie
1528 North Fife St.
Tacoma, WA 98406

A256-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Nuclear energy production is not within the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

A256-2 Nuclear energy and radioactive waste from commercial nuclear energy production are not within the scope of this EIS. This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with specific proposed actions and reasonable alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management, including disposal, of LLW and MLLW at Hanford. The analyses include potential human health impacts (through the air pathway) of normal operations, presented in Chapter 4, with details in Appendix K ("Short-Term Human Health Risk Analysis"), as well as long-term impacts (including through the groundwater and river pathway), presented in Chapter 5, with details in Appendix Q ("Long-Term Human Health Dose and Risk Analysis").

One of the purposes of providing a draft of this *TC & WM EIS* for public review is to solicit comments on the technical analyses. The scientists and other technical staff evaluate the comments received and, where appropriate, update the analyses in this final EIS based on the input.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: deva1008@yahoo.com
Sent: Saturday, March 20, 2010 11:58:15 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 20, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I can hardly believe this. Endangering the people who have moved to the Northwest to HAVE clean water, air, environment. I travel I-5 & I -90 frequently. And then - the Columbia River, a national treasure being FURTHER desecrated? Is it the DOE's intention to give ALL residents of Portland, OR some form of cancer? *A257-1*

Our government seems to get more despicable all the time. STOP it. I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Vitrification,please.

Sincerely,

donna houghton
7833 Vireo Ct
Olympia, WA 98513

A257-1 This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with specific proposed actions and reasonable alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford. The analyses include potential impacts on fish and wildlife and their habitat; human health impacts (through the air pathway) of normal operations, presented in Chapter 4, with details in Appendix K ("Short-Term Human Health Risk Analysis"); and long-term impacts (including through the groundwater and river pathway), presented in Chapter 5, with details in Appendix Q ("Long-Term Human Health Dose and Risk Analysis") and Appendix P ("Ecological Resources and Risk Analysis"). This EIS also analyzes potential impacts of transport of radioactive materials. Note that the planned transportation activities analyzed in this EIS would not occur on Interstate 5. The transportation routes of specific origination/destination sites to and from Hanford are shown in Appendix H, Figures H–2 through H–4. The actual routes used could vary due to changes in route characteristics and highway construction, but the risk results are expected to remain essentially the same.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: Vegiman@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 9:18:16 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I live right off of I-5 and in a two year span there were three rollovers of trucks right where I live at the Terwilleger Curves. It is unacceptable to risk the lives of so many people in the NW with this radioactive waste. It should remain where it is currently stored or produced. *A258-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

David Langton
2529 NW Westover Road
Portland, OR 97210

A258-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: palmarsurface@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 10:25:36 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

I am a resident of the Pacific Northwest.

I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, which is outlined in DOE/EIS--0391.

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site.

The DOE's proposal would put about 17,500 truckloads of radioactive waste on Pacific Northwest freeways: I-5, I-205, I-84, and I-90: more than 2 trucks/day, every day, for more than 20 years. *A259-1*

Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me and to the environment as a whole.

Current waste from Hanford is already contaminating groundwater in the nearby Columbia River.

All current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not by underground - and leaking - storage.

Sincerely,

MF McAuliffe
338 NE Roth
Portland, OR 97211

A259-1 On average, up to 2 trucks per day for 20 years would be involved in transporting about 14,200 truck shipments to Hanford, as presented in this *Final TC & WM EIS*, Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12. This number of shipments, reduced from the number analyzed in the *Draft TC & WM EIS*, is a result of a potential mitigation measure to address the public's input and concerns about offsite waste disposal at Hanford; specifically, an offsite waste stream containing a significant inventory of iodine-129 (i.e., RH-LLW resins from INL) was eliminated from the analysis. This mitigation measure has been incorporated into the Waste Management alternatives. In addition, a sensitivity analysis that shows the potential impacts on groundwater of limiting offsite waste streams containing iodine-129 and technetium-99 is included in Appendix M, Section M.5, of this EIS. Other mitigation measures, such as recycling secondary-waste streams into the primary-waste-stream feeds within the WTP to increase iodine-129 capture in ILAW and bulk vitrification, are discussed in Chapter 7, Section 7.5, of this final EIS. As shown in the Summary, Section S.5.3; Chapter 2, Section 2.8.3.10; and Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12, of this *TC & WM EIS*, it is unlikely that the estimated total public radiation exposures from transporting radioactive waste to Hanford for disposal would result in any additional LCFs.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: dmcferon@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 7:00:20 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). My sister-in-law died of leukemia after living near the Hanford plant where her father worked. *A260-1*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Diane Nash-McFeron
2923 NE 199th Street Shoreline,
WA 98155

A260-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: bridgesevan@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 1:06:13 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I have lived in the Pacific Northwest for all of my life and have family members living in the Tri-Cities area near Hanford who would be directly at risk of nuclear contamination. *A261-1*

I cannot accept this as an option and neither should the Department of Energy. *A261-2*

Sincerely,

Evan Bridges
2110 New St. Apt. 203
Bellingham, WA 98225

A261-1 As noted in Chapter 1, Section 1.3, of this EIS, the purpose and need include long-term actions to permanently reduce the risk to human health and the environment posed by waste in the SSTs and DSTs and to facilitate the cleanup of Hanford. This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with specific proposed actions and reasonable alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford. The analyses include potential impacts on fish and wildlife and their habitat; human health impacts (through the air pathway) of normal operations, presented in Chapter 4, with details in Appendix K ("Short-Term Human Health Risk Analysis"); and long-term impacts (including through the groundwater and river pathway), presented in Chapter 5, with details in Appendix Q ("Long-Term Human Health Dose and Risk Analysis") and Appendix P ("Ecological Resources and Risk Analysis"). The potential impacts of combinations of alternatives presented in Chapter 4, Section 4.4, show the potential short-term radiological impacts on a hypothetical MEI residing near Hanford would be 10 millirem or less in the year of maximum impact and up to 49 millirem over the life of the project. For comparison, the EPA radiation dose standard for airborne emissions from DOE facilities is 10 millirem per year (40 CFR 61, Subpart H). In those cases where projections indicate that doses would be at or approaching 10 millirem per year, DOE would take action to ensure that emissions are controlled so that the total site impact remains below the regulatory limit.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A261-2 Comment noted.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: wmiciii@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 10:30:11 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Prove that the waste already on site has been adequately cleaned up, and then there can be talk of using that facility as a new waste repository. But until your sincerity and honesty in this matter are no longer in question, do not even think to use this facility to further your disregard. *A262-1*

Sincerely,

Will Cool
6533 SE 89th Ave
Portland, OR 97266

A262-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: mikerumm@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 2:09:10 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

I live in Washington state and I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

The Columbia River Gorge is a priceless treasure that is my favorite place to hike.

The DOE has done a very poor job of cleaning up Hanford so far. Not only are they way behind schedule they're apparently not even addressing the radioactive ground water plume already seeping toward the Columbia River. *A263-1* How can one expect even more nuclear waste to do anything but exacerbate the present problems, not to mention the hazards inherent in shipping that waste into and through Washington state. *A263-2*

I, therefore, completely OPPOSE shipping or storing more nuclear waste at the Hanford site. Also all the current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, which at this time seems to be the best 'solution' to the problem.

Sincerely,

Mike Rummerfield
214 August Rd
Onalaska WA 98570

Sincerely,
Mike Rummerfield
214 August Rd
Onalaska, WA 98570

A263-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

A263-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: andefinley@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:54:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

When it comes to Hanford, the DOE must change course. They must engage in a long-term cleanup process by using vitrification, the safest way to treat the most radioactive nuclear waste. Instead of shipping more waste to Hanford, they must focus their attention on cleaning up the existing toxic mess. *A264-1*

Thank you for considering my urgent request!

Sincerely,

Andrea Finley
100 Vera Lane
Lopez Island, WA 98261

A264-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: sebastian@coastaccess.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 11:05:15 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

We want no more nuclear waste shipped to the Hanford site. We, the taxpayers, have spent millions on cleaning up the current site and want no more waste. *A265-1*

Sincerely,

Richard Anderson
467 Breakers Ct. SW
Ocean Shores, WA 98569

A265-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Even though it is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*, the comment is noted about the cost of Hanford cleanup. This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes potential impacts associated with DOE's proposed actions and alternatives to safely retrieve, treat, and dispose of Hanford tank waste; decommission FFTF; and upgrade/expand waste disposal capacity at Hanford to provide for disposal of on- and offsite DOE waste. Chapter 2, Section 2.11, of this EIS summarizes and compares the relative estimated costs of the proposed alternatives.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: lucchesemarigold@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:29:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Please refer to the safer and healthier way of handling the nuclear wastes for all of us. *A266-1*

Sincerely,

Mary Lucchesi
7736 Delridge Way SW
Seattle, WA 98106

A266-1 Through this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE evaluates the potential environmental and human health impacts of a range of alternatives for managing the radioactive waste in the SSTs, decommissioning FFTF, and disposing of LLW and MLLW. As described in Chapter 2, the alternatives for managing the tank waste include the use of different technologies for treating the waste prior to disposal. This EIS analyzes the potential human health impacts, both short term (Chapter 4) and long term (Chapter 5), of implementing these alternatives. Once alternatives are selected, DOE will ensure that policies and procedures are in place to handle the radioactive waste in a way that protects workers, the public, and the environment.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: meristem@clear.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 11:27:18 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I strongly oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is an unacceptable danger to residents like me. Groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River has already lead to negative health impacts on our communities. Adding more waste to our ecosystem is unacceptable. *A267-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste and waste from other facilities must be treated through vitrification, at it's current location, not covered up.

Sincerely,

chad Stemm
4505 NW Washington St.
Vancouver, WA 98663

A267-1 The potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes the potential human health impacts related to alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford, as described in Chapter 2. This EIS analyzes the potential human health impacts, both short term (Chapter 4) and long term (Chapter 5), of implementing these alternatives. Once alternatives are selected, DOE will ensure that policies and procedures are in place to handle the radioactive waste in a way that protects workers, the public, and the environment.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: kateyn@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:15:19 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

When you live in Washington, you hear stories and personally know people who have been terribly effected by the Hanford nuclear waste. My friend grew up in the Tri-Cities area and has a daughter without female sex organs. Another friend from Sunnyside died of ovarian cancer. Today there are farmers with chickens being born with two heads.

Please, please stop sticking your head in the sand. We need to vitrify the waste we have to stop the leaching into the Columbia River. We need to stop making new nuclear waste. We don't know how to handle this longterm terribly toxic material. As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). *A268-1* *A268-2*

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Y. Nelson
2315 N 55th Street,
Seattle, 98103

Sincerely,

kathleen Nelson
2315 N 55th St
Seattle, WA 98103

A268-1 As analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*, 67 of the 149 SSTs at Hanford are known or suspected to have leaked liquid waste to the environment between the 1950s and the present, some of which has reached the groundwater. Estimates of the total leak loss range from less than 2.8 million to as much as 3.97 million liters (750,000 to 1,050,000 gallons). DOE recognizes that groundwater contamination from past leaks is a concern at Hanford and its potential impact on communities downriver from Hanford. One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks.

A268-2 This EIS addresses the environmental impacts of retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste and final closure of the SST system. It also evaluates the impacts of FFTF decommissioning, including management of waste generated by the decommissioning process. Finally, this *TC & WM EIS* evaluates the potential environmental impacts of ongoing solid-waste management operations at Hanford, as well as the proposed disposal of Hanford LLW and MLLW and a limited volume of offsite LLW and MLLW.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: kp@kathleenpequeno.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 2:15:15 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

I live in Portland, and I strongly oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford. (As outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington, DOE/EIS--0391).

We don't need to move more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me and my family.

Your own research indicates that this project could lead to the eventual death of hundreds of people from cancer along the transportation route. You cannot play Russian Roulette with our families. *A269-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up. The long-term health of the region, including the health of the Columbia River, has to come first as you make plans for Hanford. *A269-2*

Sincerely,

Kathleen Pequeno
3515 NE Mallory
Portland, OR 97212

A269-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

A269-2 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites. This analysis includes potential impacts on human health and the environment, including animals and plants.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: msimonds2@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:02:09 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I strongly feel that Hanford is one of the Least appropriate sites for such activities, not only because of the routes that such materials would have to take, and the vast numbers of people and extremely sensitive ecosystems that it would travers, but also because the site its self is located on the Columbia river on of the most important natural and economic resources for the entire region. From Salmon habitat, to water to irrigate crops that feed the nation and the world, and transport goods to market, we can not risk destroying such a vital ecological and economic lifeline for generations of not only Washington's but for that entire nation as the river and the land surrounding it. *A270-1*

Not only that but all one has to do is to take a look at history and at the contamination that has been left on the site it self to know that the Hanford site and washingtion state have served more then their fair share when it comes to nuclear waste housing, as hanford is home to some of the first high level nuclear was associated with the production of plutonium for nuclear weapons production. It was responsible for the worlds first plutonium nuclear weapon and was a front line site producing and disposing of high level radioactive waste, in the cold war nuclear arms race providing the nuclear material to help build this country's arsenal. But now the land, and the ground water are left scared and contaminated from that past activity, they have

A270-1 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites. This analysis includes potential impacts on human health and the environment, including animals and plants.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

yet to be properly clean and restored, and until such time that they have been. Not until the time that there is no longer any threat posed to the environment, the river, the wild life the live on or near the reservation will it be even remotely appropriate to think about adding any more material is appropriate. I once again say this as a resident of the northwest, and of washington state, the home to the Hanford Nuclear Reservation. *A270-2*

Sincerely,

Matthew Simonds
887 ST Andrews Way
Bellingham, WA 98229

A270-2 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: kaelnielson@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:32:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

The Pacific Northwest is one of the most beautiful regions in America. As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. There have been higher-than-normal rates of cancer, thyroid disease and other health problems reported by residents of southeastern Washington State. We must not increase the incidence of said diseases by allowing additional radioactive wastes to be transported to Hanford. *A271-1*

Additionally, I strongly believe that all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Kael Nielson

Sincerely,

Kael Nielson
PO Box 841
Mukilteo, WA 98275

A271-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes the potential human health impacts related to alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford, as described in Chapter 2. These analyses indicate that the potential human health impacts on the public of incident-free activities, whether transportation or operations at Hanford, are well within established standards for protection of the public.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: stairscarrie@yahoo.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:52:15 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391). I live downstream from Hanford and have grave concerns for all Oregonians should Oregon become a radioactive waste dumpyard. *A272-1*

Please do not lift the moratorium.

Sincerely,

Carrie Jo Stairs
5716 NE 35th Ave.
Portland, OR 97211

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Carrie Stairs
5716 NE 35th Ave.
Portland, OR 97211

A272-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jbchalls6@msn.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 5:34:15 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

(New comment) I already have lost one friend and another is dying now from cancer after working at Hanford. NO MORE! There are deserts where that waste can be treated and buried safely. It is morally wrong to expose many in this highly populated area. *A273-1*

Sincerely,

Bea Challstrom
32608 - 2nds Place South
Federal Way, WA 98003

A273-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: krigsby@willamette.edu
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 7:58:09 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

To whom it may concern,

My name is Katie Rigsby. I am a 20 year old college student in Oregon, and have lived my entire life in the Pacific Northwest (Idaho for 18 years and Oregon for the rest of the time).

Hanford is one of the most polluted sites in the United States, with the impacts of that pollution spreading beyond just the scope of the site. Consider the ecological harm that would occur across the Columbia River. Think of the endangered salmon populations that so many Pacific Northwesters identify with and want to protect. Think of all of the people that could be harmed if an accident did occur. Consider those animals that have been genetically mutated because of exposure to radioactive material. *A274-1* *A274-2* *A274-3*

One of my family members is a down-winder. She has unexplainable tumors all over her body and is in constant pain because of her exposure to radioactive material.

I don't want Hanford to be an available site for nuclear waste disposal. I don't care how clean of energy people say this is, it is not safe for any party. *A274-4*

Please, do not do any further contamination of this area. It is a special place.

Sincerely,

Katie Rigsby

Sincerely,

Katie Rigsby
900 State St. #F321
Salem, OR 97301

A274-1 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites. This analysis includes potential impacts on human health and the environment, including animals and plants.

A274-2 To compare the potential health and safety impacts of the different *TC & WM EIS* alternatives, this EIS identifies and analyzes a range of reasonably foreseeable accidents associated with each alternative. The consequences and risks associated with facility accidents are presented in Chapter 4. The scenario descriptions, methodology, and details of the accident analyses are presented in Appendix K, Section K.3.

A274-3 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites. This analysis encompasses potential impacts on human (Appendix Q) and ecological (Appendix P) health, including adverse effects on animals and plants. Exposure pathways and receptors were selected to represent scenarios that may occur in or near the Columbia River, as shown in Appendix P. The estimated radiation and chemical doses to ecological receptors under all of the alternatives were less than the 0.1-rad-per-day benchmark, and the Hazard Indices associated with these alternatives were all below 1.0 for terrestrial and aquatic (including riparian) receptors. Exposures exceeding the Hazard Quotient criterion of 1.0 for chemical doses at one or more locations for the terrestrial and aquatic receptors are discussed in Appendix P. Impacts under the alternatives on representative receptors for both terrestrial and aquatic resources, while possible, would not be likely, based on the conservative nature of the exposure assumptions and on the estimated Hazard Indices and Hazard Quotients.

A274-4 Please see response to comment A1-4 in the master letter for Campaign A.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: whalelight@centurytel.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 8:21:11 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

Dear Sirs and Madams, Please seek an alternate site for this waste. It should be as far away from current and likely future life settlements. It should be held at places that are the most geologically stable,;away from water supplies , food production,safe from vandalsm,etc. *A275-1*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Respectfully,

Deborah Martyn

Sincerely,

Deborah Martyn
16 Opal Commons
Eastsound, WA 98245

A275-1 Waste management activities addressed in this *TC & WM EIS* would take place within the 200 Areas, which are within the Industrial-Exclusive Zone as identified in the *Final Hanford Comprehensive Land-Use Plan EIS* (DOE 1999). This area has been determined to be suitable for waste management and industrial uses and is not accessible to the public (see Chapter 3, Section 3.2.1.1). Further, the 200 Areas are located over 12 kilometers (7.5 miles) from the nearest site boundary, which provides a buffer for the public.

DOE Order 420.1B and its implementing standards require that nuclear and nonnuclear facilities be designed, constructed, and operated to safeguard the facility, public, workers, and environment from natural phenomena hazards, including earthquakes. Consequently, impacts of earthquakes on waste management and disposal facilities, tank farms, and the WTP are evaluated. Information can be found in Chapter 4. More-detailed information can be found in Appendix K.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: amyraven28@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 10:20:10 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

Please stop the transfer of nuclear waste from one place to another. Dispose of this garbage, yea how smart is that to go on the freeways, the DOE's proposal states that over a 20 year time span! I will be dead by then and so will alot of other animals. *A276-1*

Sincerely,

amy raven
330 Prospect ST. #17
Leavenworth, WA 98826

A276-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: normski@hevanet.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 11:27:18 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I believe, even a child in kindegarten could understand how just plain bad it is to transport nuclear wasted in truckloads and dumping it nearby a river. Come on grow up and let's use our brains, a little! *A277-1*

Sincerely,

Norman Mitchell-Babbitt
5255 NE 32nd Ave
Portland, OR 97211

A277-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: jolene1113@yahoo.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 12:44:28 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

During my teenage years I lived in Sunnyside, Washington downriver and downwind of Hanford. I later developed thyroid problems and uterine cancer, and wonder if there may be some connection. *A278-1*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Sherri Hammond
PO Box 177
Hammond, OR 97121

A278-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past operations at Hanford, Sunnyside is on the Yakima River upstream of its confluence with the Columbia River and, at Hanford, the wind blows predominantly away from Sunnyside. The potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: janegf1@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 12:45:13 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

Please add my name to the list of people opposed to shipping more nuclear wast to Hanford. I am totally opposed to the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

Shipping waste around the country presents a number of hazards I'm sure you are well aware of. The Hanford site is unstable and already over-polluted. It needs to be cleaned up--the last thing it needs is MORE waste. *A279-1*

Please find a better solution. Perhaps vitrification at the source rather than shipping unstable waste all around the country.

It is so easy to turn this in to a "not in my back yard" issue, but Hanford is not a good candidate for waste because of the permeable rock beneath and groundwater contamination. *A279-2* It never has been a good place to put waste, and just because it already is a mess doesn't mean you should just add to it. *A279-3*

Find a better solution.

Sincerely,

Jane Reynolds
Mercer Island, WA 98040

Sincerely,

Jane Reynolds
8105 SE 48th St
Mercer Island, WA 98040

A279-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

A279-2 DOE recognizes the potential negative impacts on Hanford groundwater that the offsite waste poses and proposes that the receipt and disposal of offsite waste be delayed, at least until the WTP is operational, except for certain limited exemptions. These exemptions were specified in DOE's January 6, 2006, Settlement Agreement with the State of Washington (as amended on June 5, 2008) regarding *State of Washington v. Bodman* (Civil No. 2:03-cv-05018-AAM), signed by DOE, Ecology, the Washington State Attorney General's Office, and DOJ.

DOE has carefully considered the characteristics of Hanford's geology in developing the computer model codes used in assessing the fate and transport of contaminants through the vadose zone and groundwater at Hanford. Groundwater model components are described in Appendices L, M, N, and O of this EIS. In general, the dense basalts of the Columbia River Basalt Group, which generally underlie Hanford, are relatively impermeable as compared to the coarser sediments (e.g., gravel and sand) composing the overlying Hanford and Ringold geologic formations. Hydraulic conductivities (which represent the permeability of a geologic unit or its capacity to transmit water) of the various Hanford geologic units are presented in Appendix N.

DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford under the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

A279-3 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: mlneuschwanger@hotmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 12:51:14 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010 As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. The Hanford site is designated a super cleanup site, so how are we suppose to clean it up if they keep bringing in the waste. *A280-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Marty Neuschwanger
2667 Vincent Way
Bremerton, WA 98312

A280-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: credo@sarmonster.net
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 1:41:14 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

PLEASE not that close to one of the world's largest rivers, river or source of fresh water! I know its gotta go somewhere, and space isn't an option, but PLEASE consider where it will have the least impact. *A281-1*

Sincerely,

Sarah Steever
14616 Ley Rd
Gold Bar, WA 98251

A281-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: lizajune@verizon.net
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 3:00:12 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

My parents and older sister lived 30 miles downwind from Hanford in 1952 for a year, when my mother was pregnant with me. Now, my sister and her children, my mother, my son and I all have thyroid problems, the only ones among a very large extended family of over 60 people. We are probably the lucky ones of the downwinders.

Shipping radioactive waste cross country is not a good solution even if it is your only current option. The variables are too many for a mishap of any proportion, and any proportion can only create disaster.

We had followed the implications of shipping radioactive waste to the Yucca Mountain site. Imperiling everyone along any of these routes is criminal, as I know you realize it is only a matter of time until the first incident occurs. Having one's health and lives ruined does not make people "statistically insignificant." Safeguarding the health of the American people should be your primary concern, not your last. *A282-1*

Put your thinking caps back on, shipping radioactive waste back to Hanford is a terrible idea. The cleanup at Hanford is not yet complete and the water table will be futher indangered. This is not a plan, this is a default position that is unacceptable.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Betsy Diedrick
Arlington, Washington

Sincerely,
Betsy Diedrick
19316 Burn Road
Arlington, WA 98223

A282-1 Regarding the potential consequences of transporting radioactive waste and DOE's priorities in protecting the public's health and safety, DOE is committed to conducting its operations in a manner that best protects the public's health and safety through compliance with Federal, state, and local laws and regulations and implementation of DOE orders and directives. One of the purposes of performing these NEPA analyses is to take into consideration possible impacts on the public. The impact of transportation accidents is expressed in terms of probabilistic risk, which is the probability of an accident occurring multiplied by the consequences of that accident and summed over all reasonably conceivable accident conditions. These risks were calculated for each proposed alternative in this *TC & WM EIS* using common assumptions and statistical data so that the risk associated with an alternative can be compared with those of other alternatives. This comparison is not meant to be a value judgment of the worth of people, but rather a tool for making decisions on which alternatives would best accomplish DOE's goals while also taking into consideration possible impacts on the public.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: erikmitchell@clear.net
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 3:46:17 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

We need to start reprocessing waste on site like the french!! *A283-1*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Erik Mitchell
1212 NE 58th
Ptld, OR 97213

A283-1 Even though it is beyond the scope of this EIS, the comment is noted. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: tjpringle1@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 7:32:13 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Please consider the wishes of the residents of the NW as a determining factor in this decision. If nuclear power is to be a viable alternative as an energy source, the disposal of waste has to be addressed in an equable manner. Until then, I will oppose the future use of nuclear power with every ounce of my being. *A284-1*

Sincerely,

Tamarah Pringle
4305 SW ALFRED ST
PORTLAND, OR 97219

A284-1 Nuclear energy production is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: gordon@mind.net
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 10:34:08 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

The Columbia is a national resource that must not be polluted and contaminating salmon that feed so many people. Rethink this! *A285-1*

Sincerely,

don Gordon
583 Prim St.
Ashland, OR 97520

A285-1 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: sandauj@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 12:41:17 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 17, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Please keep all living creatures in Oregon safe from radioactive waste. We cherish our clean environment and don't want to see additional hazards brought in to damage air, water, or soil. Please work to find an alternative to disposing this waste that will keep all living things everywhere safe and healthy. *A286-1*

Sincerely,

Jane Sandau
2750 Holiday Lane
Newberg, OR 97132

A286-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: nealmccarter@wavecable.com
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 2:20:28 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

My wife is a "Down Winder," having lived in that area when the government chose to release radioactive material into the atmosphere to see what would happen to the populace.

Hasn't the government done enough to this area and the people living there? Dumping radioactive material in this already beleaguered is not a just or wise decision. *A287-1*

Sincerely,

R. N. McCarter
42 McCarter Place
Sequim, WA 98382

Sincerely,

Roland McCarter
42 McCarter Place
Sequim, WA 98382

A287-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: sallyjeane65@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 3:25:27 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Additionally, why are we cosidering more nuclear power plants when there is no good way to dispose of the waste we already have? *A288-1*

Sally J. Crum

Sincerely,

sally crum
25534 hall rd
junction city, OR 97448

A288-1 Nuclear energy production is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: haan_box@hotmail.com
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 1:02:53 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

We have had many friends and relatives in Eastern Oregon come down with cancer and we don't need more toxins in this area. Please don't put our future at risk. *A289-1*

Sincerely,

Corey Haan
6719 NE Roselawn St.
Portland, OR 97218

Sincerely,

Corey Haan
6719 NE Roselawn St.
Portland, OR 97218

A289-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes the potential human health impacts related to alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford, as described in Chapter 2. The analyses encompass consideration of potential impacts of transporting radioactive waste to Hanford, including via routes through Oregon. These analyses indicate that the potential human health impacts on the public of incident-free activities, whether transportation or operations at Hanford, are well within established standards for protection of the public.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: ewdsoto@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 2:05:36 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.we in white city also have some contamination of the ground water,we have enough health problems in this state,DO NOT ADD TO THEM *A290-1*

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Ernest Drown
2622 Falcon st #77
White City, OR 97503

A290-1 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: gayleeona@comcast.net
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 2:20:37 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

This is a horrible threat to all people in our region of the country! *A291-1*

Please stop this plan immediately!

Sincerely,

Gaylee Goodrich
1030 NW 31st St.
Corvallis, OR 97330

A291-1 As noted in Chapter 1, Section 1.3, of this *TC & WM EIS*, the purpose and need include long-term actions to permanently reduce the risk to human health and the environment posed by waste in the SSTs and DSTs and to facilitate the cleanup of Hanford. This EIS analyzes the potential human health impacts related to alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford, as described in Chapter 2. The analyses include potential human health impacts (through the air pathway) of normal operations, presented in Chapter 4, with details in Appendix K ("Short-Term Human Health Risk Analysis"), as well as long-term impacts (including through the groundwater and river pathway), presented in Chapter 5, with details in Appendix Q ("Long-Term Human Health Dose and Risk Analysis") and Appendix P ("Ecological Resources and Risk Analysis").

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: dcrichmond@att.net
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 8:19:06 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

DON'T DESTROY OUR BEAUTIFUL PACIFIC NORTHWEST. There is another way! *A292-1*
Please don't take the lazy way. Our lives, our childrens lives, our grandchildrens and our great grandchildrens lives depend on you doing the responsible thing. DO NOT LIFT THE MORATORIUM and continue the vitrification process. *A292-2*

Thank you

Delora Richmond
12219-66thSt NE
Lake Stevens,WA 98258

Sincerely,

Delora Richmond
12219-66thSt NE
Lake Stevens, WA 98258

A292-1 This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve, treat, and dispose of Hanford tank waste; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate environmental cleanup activities at Hanford and other DOE sites. DOE is currently implementing groundwater remediation activities as a component of an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

A292-2 Comment noted.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: demian@buddybuddy.com
Sent: Sunday, March 21, 2010 12:01:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 21, 2010

Hi:

I live in the Pacific Northwest and do not want nuclear waste to be shipped to Hanford (as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391)).

Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me.

There already is groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River. This would add even more dangerous radiation.

This groundwater grows the food we eat. *A293-1*

Also, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Thank you.

Sincerely, .

Demian
PO Box 9685
Seattle, WA 98109

A293-1 This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with specific proposed actions and reasonable alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford. The analyses include potential human health impacts (through the air pathway) of normal operations, presented in Chapter 4, with details in Appendix K, as well as long-term impacts (including through the groundwater and river pathway), presented in Chapter 5, with details in Appendix Q. A number of scenarios that involve use of groundwater at different locations on Hanford are analyzed in Appendix Q, including a drinking-water well user, a resident farmer who uses groundwater, an American Indian resident farmer with a broader range of groundwater usage, and an American Indian hunter-gatherer, who is potentially affected by using both groundwater and surface water. Additionally, because the groundwater under the site flows to the Columbia River, there is also a scenario of a resident farmer who uses river water.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: ingersoll2009@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 11:01 AM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Also we are down winders and all of us have died young in our family (50's) and/or all have been ill most of our lives. And I am positive Hanford project is a huge contributor. *A294-1*

Ann Ingersoll

A294-1 Regarding potential health impacts of past Hanford operations, the potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers of past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this *TC & WM EIS*. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: aaquigon@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 2:45:20 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 18, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Please heed my words, we must not end lives like this, no matter what you think, people WILL DIE, and you and every one involved WILL be sued as a result, keep that in mind when making your decision, people are more important then the easier or cheaper solution. *A295-1*

Sincerely,

Aaron Svela
14516 east burnside street
Portland, OR 97233

A295-1 The analyses include potential human health impacts (through the air pathway) of normal operations, presented in Chapter 4, with details in Appendix K ("Short-Term Human Health Risk Analysis"), as well as long-term impacts (including through the groundwater and river pathway), presented in Chapter 5, with details in Appendix Q ("Long-Term Human Health Dose and Risk Analysis"). The results of this EIS will be one of the factors considered by DOE in selecting an alternative for implementation. Other factors may include technical feasibility, schedule, and cost.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: OstranderJr@PeoplePC.Com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 3:51:14 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

When it comes to Hanford, the DOE must change course. Instead of shipping more waste to Hanford, they must focus their attention on cleaning up the existing toxic mess. *A296-1*

Thank you for considering these viewpoints.

Sincerely,

William P. "Ostrander, Jr."
1117 37th Street
Bellingham, WA 98229

A296-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: katherine@olympus.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 1:24:07 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

We need to do the slower and more difficult work, now, to clean up our messes. *A297-1*

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

Sincerely,

Katherine Macomber Millman
1033 29th Street
Port Townsend, WA 98368

A297-1 This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate environmental cleanup activities at Hanford and other DOE sites. DOE has already begun retrieving waste from the tanks located in the C Area tank farm, in accord with a TPA milestone to close this tank farm in 2019.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: llaitner@rocketmail.com
Sent: Thursday, April 01, 2010 9:40:16 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

April 01, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

PS: Nuclear power is not the answer to our energy problems. Nuclear power is still burdened with all the problems that we had three decades ago. Nothing has changed! *A298-1*

Sincerely,

Larry Laitner
801 Pinecrest
Ashland, OR 97520

A298-1 Nuclear energy production is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Campaign A (cont'd)

Individuals submitting "Campaign A" with additional comments

From: lecf@localnet.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 5:50:11 PM
To: tc&wmeis@saic.com
Subject: Comment on DOE/EIS—0391

March 16, 2010

As a resident of the Pacific Northwest, I oppose the "preferred alternative" to ship nuclear waste from other Department of Energy sites to Hanford, as outlined in the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS--0391).

I vehemently oppose the plan to add more radioactive waste to the Hanford site. Shipping this waste along Northwest freeways is a danger to residents like me. And that doesn't even take into account groundwater contamination of the nearby Columbia River.

Additionally, all current Hanford waste must be treated through vitrification, not covered up.

I do not want Hanford [or the Pacific Northwest in general] to become the nations radioactive waste dump. *A299-1*

Sincerely,

Mr. & Mrs Lloyd Etters

Sincerely,

Lloyd Etters
49280 hwy 101
Bandon, OR 97411

A299-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Campaign B

Photo Comments: draft Tank Closure & Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement

30 April 2010

The 55 photos enclosed are respectfully submitted as comments on the draft Tank Closure & Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site. Students at Gonzaga and Seattle University are standing together to oppose the alternative that prefers to import off-site waste to Hanford and make Hanford a national radioactive waste dump.

We are the next generation, who will inherit Hanford's problems, and we do not want the current contamination exacerbated by irresponsibly dumping more radioactive and toxic waste. So, we stand and say together, "I don't want Hanford to become a national radioactive waste dump" and "I support Clean-Up First!" ***B-1***

B-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Campaign B (cont'd)

Individuals submitting this campaign:

PUBLIC HEARING OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT COMMENT-RESPONSE GUIDE

As described in the DOE Notice of Availability of the *Draft TC & WM EIS* (74 FR 56194) and subsequent DOE public notices (75 FR 1048 and 75 FR 3902), public hearings were held to encourage public comments on the draft EIS and to provide members of the public with information about the NEPA process and the proposed actions.

The table below lists the location, date, estimated number of attendees, number of oral commentors for each hearing, and the comment document identifier range. The attendance estimates are based on the number of people who signed in, as well as a rough "head count" of the audience.

Public Hearing Official Transcript Comment-Response Guide

Location	Date	Estimated Number of Attendees	Number of Oral Commentors	Comment Document # Range
Richland, Washington	1/26/2010	65	11	98–108
Boise, Idaho	2/2/2010	6	1	109
Hood River, Oregon	2/9/2010	50	22	383–402
Portland, Oregon	2/10/2010	300	49	274–318
La Grande, Oregon	2/22/2010	85	18	403–420
Spokane, Washington	2/23/2010	65	22	421–442
Eugene, Oregon	3/1/2010	75	30	359–382
Seattle, Washington	3/8/2010	250	42	319–358

Following the various presentations, attendees were given an opportunity to provide oral and written comments. Each oral comment, recorded by the court reporter as part of the hearing transcript, was treated as a comment document. Each written comment collected during the hearing was likewise treated as a comment document.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

DATE: JANUARY 26, 2010
6:00 p.m.

RED LION HOTEL
802 George Washington Way
Richland, Washington 99352

James Parham, Facilitator
PANEL MEMBERS:
Ms. Mary Beth Burandt, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection

Ms. Suzanne Dahl, Washington State Department of Ecology, Hanford Project Office

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

QUESTION POSED	PAGE	LINE
Mr. Conant	3	6

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION	PAGE	LINE
Marlene Oliver	4	14
Gary Troyer	7	17
Brett Vandenheuvel	9	12
Gary Woodcock	12	20
Gerry Pollet	16	11
Carl Holder	19	17
Joe Conant	22	11
Tom Carpenter	23	19
Claude Oliver	26	13
Liz Mattson	30	1
Jen Gregor	31	1

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

(7:45 p.m.)

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Restate the question one more time so we can get that question answered, sir.

MR. CONANT: Hanford workers --

FACILITATOR PARHAM: I'm sorry, the microphone.

MR. CONANT: Hanford workers that got the cohort, why did they only go up to 1972 and not to the present?

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Okay, you got that? We'll get that answered.

(Further questions taken; not reported.)

FACILITATOR PARHAM: This is the comment period. Let's go ahead with the comment period. As I said, we have a series of people who would like to comment, but we originally advertised as three minutes but because we have a manageable number, we'll go five minutes. I am going to use a stop watch, just to keep me on, and I'll let you know with one minute left of the comment period.

We're taking people in the order that you signed up. We need to have you come to the microphone,

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Patti, and make sure absolutely positive that we capture your comments. We do not miss. It's not a requirement you give your name and affiliation, by the way. That's your option, and if you want to, please do.

If you have written comments ancillary to your oral comments, we would love to have those. We're trying to get this right. If we don't hear something, like the question, over there, we'll ask to repeat it. Sorry, but I want to make sure this gets done and there's no stone left unturned here.

So the first person that we would like to have called to the microphone is Marlene Oliver.

Marlene.

MS. OLIVER: Thank you. I have a number of hats on tonight. I'm a member of the Washington State Farm Bureau. I represent ten million cancer patients in the United States of America. I'm a consumer advocate for research and related activities to the National Cancer Institute. I work on the Centers for Disease Control Project in an effort to control cancer state by state. I'm a member of the local American Nuclear Society, Eastern Washington Section Board.

I'm a member of a number of medical organizations, domestically and around the world, and I'm here representing the American people.

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

5

So from what I have seen in the statements made, and I haven't read the document yet, but from what I have seen around the room, I think the Department of Energy and the people who are writing this EIS should follow the law. There is a federal law on the books called the Federal Data Quality Act that mandates that decisions, such as those being considered tonight and in this process, be based on sound science.

There are any number of scientists in this room, in this community and around the world who will tell you that the decision to do anything except to restart FFTF -- and you have letters from around the world on file from organizations, such as the International Atomic Energy Agency; the French government -- by the way, the French get 80 percent of their electricity from nuclear, they're moving to 90 percent; the Secretary of Energy Chu has said he's opting for the nuclear option to decrease our reliance on foreign supplies of fossil fuels.

So I ask you to follow Secretary Chu's directive. We need this reactor, and some other people will address this to get there.

Now I'm going to address the medical issue, medicine. I'm involved with medical isotopes. Medical isotopes can be used for a variety of things. The best isotopes for therapy must be made in a fast-neutron

98-1 **98-1** DOE issued a ROD (66 FR 7877; January 26, 2001) for the *NI PEIS* (DOE 2000a) wherein DOE announced its decision that FFTF would be permanently deactivated. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this *TC & WM EIS*, Section 1.4.2, Decisions Not to Be Made, DOE is not considering restarting FFTF. The scope of this *TC & WM EIS* is to address the final decommissioning of FFTF. Although the costs of the various alternatives presented in this EIS have been analyzed (see Chapter 2, Section 2.11), the analysis does not include restarting FFTF because that decision has been made and is not a part of this *TC & WM EIS*.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

6

1 reactor. We have no other fast-neutron reactor that can
2 make isotopes in the quantity and the quality to treat
3 patients in America. I'll give you some examples.
4 Oh, by the way, I have not seen, in this EIS
5 so far from what has been discussed, a cost-benefit
6 analysis. We are all taxpayers. You're talking about our
7 tax dollars being ruined by the destruction of FFTF, to
8 replace it as a test reactor, to look at some of these new
9 technologies which we need, to recycle nuclear waste,
10 which would make Harry Reed the head of the senate very
11 happy because that basically takes off the table Yucca
12 Mountain, which we have wasted billions of dollars on FFTF
13 to get rid of much of this nuclear waste.
14 But back to isotopes, the cost analysis done
15 for Medicare and Medicaid for the very least, every doctor
16 I've talked to has came up with the same figure. We could
17 save, easily, 50 percent of our Medicare and Medicaid bill
18 with the judicious use of medical isotopes. We cannot
19 produce moly-99 to diagnose patients. Now the reactors in
20 the world are closed. They're old.
21 We can target and kill 100 percent of cancer
22 cells. We can do it now. We need the isotopes at FFTF to
23 do this. We can target and eliminate arthritis for 80
24 percent of Americans.
25 Medicare spends three times as much on

98-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

7

arthritis as it does on cancer. But what really has the doctors scared is infectious disease. We can target and kill, if we had the isotopes that the FFTF can make, 100 percent of bacterium, 100 percent of fungus, and 100 percent of cell's anti-viruses. That's the truth. So listen to us, scientists, listen to the secretary, your boss, listen to the American people.

We only want Option 4. We want options, alternatives 1, 2, and 3 removed and we want the only option to be FFTF restart. We want it in there and we want it now because the life you save may be your own or your child's. Thanks.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.

Gary Troyer is up next, and then Brett Vandenheuvel, I believe. I may have mangled your last name. Gary and Brett.

MR. TROYER: Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to come here. I know that this has been a stellar effort required to produce a document that we can take a look at and see what the future looks like for Hanford and for our society.

I do have some concerns. Some of it was voiced by Marlene, just ahead of me, that one of the options is not there that I really think should be considered, is restart, availability for the American

98-1 cont'd

99-1

99-1 DOE issued a ROD (66 FR 7877; January 26, 2001) for the *NI PEIS* (DOE 2000a) wherein DOE announced its decision that FFTF would be permanently deactivated. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this *TC & WM EIS*, Section 1.4.2, Decisions Not to Be Made, DOE is not considering restarting FFTF. The scope of this *TC & WM EIS* is to address the final decommissioning of FFTF.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

8

1 public to see the utilization of what they paid for.
2 I'm finding is that I've retired from Hanford
3 and gone into private consulting and fast-reactor
4 research, that we are going overseas to get this work done
5 because we don't have it here in our own country. That,
6 to me, is a travesty. It flies in the face of every
7 working man, woman, and child in our country and needs to
8 be seriously reconsidered.
9 We've come forward a number of years now since
10 your decisions to fold this into this EIS, but there still
11 is the opportunity to look at the other alternatives, that
12 being potentially preservation for restart. There's a
13 number of private companies that have offered plans that
14 were denied only for political reasons. They had an
15 economic basis. Medical isotopes was the main masthead
16 for that operation.
17 We're now entering into this idea of what do
18 we do with our spent used fuel. Yucca Mountain is
19 definitely shut down because there's no money to bring it
20 into activation. That means we've got to do something
21 else. We have those solutions. It was called GINA, the
22 Fast Fuel Cycle initiative, etc. We need to go forward
23 with that, and the key cornerstone, when you look at
24 Dr. Chu's description of what is needed to do the testing
25 for materials and fuels and targets, the specs come out to

99-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

9

be very similar to the FFTF.

So to me, any logical, rational look at this bringing jobs back on shore, getting down the road in our energy crisis, requires that option being in this EIS, preservation for the potential to restart. Dr. Chu has said, regarding nuclear energy, we need to preserve our resources, "to provide options for future policymakers."

Now on the other hand, what does that say about our current policymakers? Thank you.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Brett, and then following Brett will be Gerald Woodcock.

MR. VANDERHEUVEL: Thank you. I'm Brett Vandenheuvel. I'm the director of Columbia River Keeper. I'm not going to talk about FFTF right now.

Columbia River Keeper began working on Hanford issues in 1989 when we first got started under the name of Columbia River United. Our mission is to protect and restore water facility throughout the whole Columbia Basin, and this is a pretty exciting time when, looking at this draft EIS, when major decisions are going to be made.

I want to talk about a couple of things, tank closure and off-site waste. By exciting, I mean there's major decisions being made, not that we're necessarily excited about this EIS. The Department of Energy proposes not to clean up about a million gallons of waste that has

99-1 cont'd

100-1

100-1 As analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*, 67 of the 149 SSTs at Hanford are known or are suspected to have leaked liquid waste to the environment between the 1950s and the present, some of which has reached the groundwater. Estimates of the total leak loss range from less than 2.8 million to as much as 3.97 million liters (750,000 to 1,050,000 gallons). DOE recognizes that groundwater contamination from past leaks is a concern at Hanford and its potential impact on communities downriver from Hanford. One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms by landfill closure, selective clean closure, or clean closure. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding the cleanup of the past leaks, including remediation of the contamination in the vadose zone.

The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

10

already leaked below the tanks. This is simply not acceptable, so we're encouraging the Department of Energy to complete the job, to not just look at the tanks themselves but to actually clean up the tanks that have leaked, clean up the material, the radioactive material that has leaked from the tanks.

It's not okay to ignore the ground water in the soils and to focus only on the tanks. We encourage the Department of Energy to meet the greater than 99 percent waste retrieval goals. The question for the waste retrieval is, and there's some interesting charts in the EIS summary, if you haven't seen them. The question is, how much radioactive waste will we allow to reach the river? How much radioactive waste will we allow to contaminate the soils and contaminate the ground water?

100-1 cont'd

And the chart I'm talking about asks the question, how many people will be allowed to get cancer? And there's different lines, based on different levels of waste retrieval. There's a line that shows basically one in a hundred, you know, for no action. Obviously, everyone agrees that's completely unacceptable. There's a line for one in a thousand, one in ten thousand. At what level do we think it's acceptable?

I certainly don't think many people would agree here that one in a thousand is acceptable or even

100-2

factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

100-2 This *TC & WM EIS* is an assessment of the potential impacts of a variety of alternatives. Based upon this EIS and other appropriate factors, DOE will select an approach to cleanup of the site that reflects DOE's commitment to the protection of public health and safety.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

11

one in ten thousand. If we can do it more, if we can clean it up to 99.9 percent and not risk one in ten thousand people, then we certainly should do that. Sure, it's going to be expensive. It will continue to produce jobs in the economy and it will benefit our economy, not only now, but into the future when we're not dealing with some of these medical problems and, you know, people getting cancer from the ground water.

100-2 cont'd

So off-site waste is the next topic. It's simply not acceptable to make Hanford the nation's offsite nuclear repository, to ship waste from Hanford, to Hanford from Tennessee, from New York, from New Mexico. The voters of Washington have already spoken on this issue by banning the importation of radioactive waste. Hanford is a bad location. It's on the banks of the Columbia River, the life blood of the Pacific Northwest.

100-3

There are, you know, we work with people all up and down the river, all the way down to the estuary who are affected by these decisions.

I just wanted to make a brief comment to the Oregon Department of Energy and to Ecology, to thank both the agencies for their work on this, in reviewing this, but also to encourage you to continue to represent the people of Washington and Oregon -- I know I saw a couple or at least one Oregon Department of Energy employee --

100-3 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

1 continue to represent those interests of the people who
2 care deeply about these issues.
3 And for Ecology, you have a lot of power in
4 this issue, and so does Oregon. Ecology has the power of
5 their own SEPA process, the State Environmental Policy
6 Act, and if DOE does not address your issues, if they do
7 not address the issues you've taken stances on already,
8 don't go quietly. You have a lot of authority, you have
9 substantive authority under SEPA and you have the
10 supplemental, ability to do supplemental SEPA analysis,
11 supplemental EIS, which you're required by law to address
12 every single issue that Ecology does not think is
13 adequately addressed by Department of Energy.
14 So you've already brought up some of those
15 issues, and I encourage you to not, you know, just be
16 frustrated by DOE's actions but to actually take things
17 into your own hands. Thank you.
18 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Gerald, and then
19 after Gerald is Gerry Pollet.
20 MR. WOODCOCK: I'll make this easy on you.
21 I'll hand you a copy of this when I'm done.
22 Good evening. My name is Gerald Woodcock. I
23 worked at Hanford 30 years, beginning in June of 1974.
24 During that time, I held a wide variety of both
25 professional and managerial positions in both Westinghouse

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

13

1 Hanford Company and its successors, Lockheed Martin
2 Company and Fluor Hanford.
3 I'm a member of the American Nuclear Society
4 and chairman of the Public Information Committee, and it's
5 in that capacity I speak to you this evening. I'm also a
6 part-time consultant and I also teach people to fly
7 airplanes.
8 I managed the group that accounted for FFTF
9 during its final stages of construction. I was here when
10 the FFTF went critical for the first time and I was here
11 when it was shut down while it was still actively running
12 experiments for both the U.S. and foreign countries.
13 I'm aware that DOE aggregated a contract with
14 Japan when it shut the reactor down. I have followed and
15 participated in the ensuing invade of FFTF's future. All
16 of the evidence that I have seen points to a purely
17 political decision to shut down the reactor. There is no
18 rational basis in science, engineering, or economics for
19 the decision to abandon this incredible machine in which
20 the American taxpayer has invested over $1.2 billion
21 dollars and, remember, I'm the guy that did the accounting
22 for it.
23 Further, the replacement cost of a similar
24 machine to be built today would be about two-and-a-half
25 times that amount or well over $3 billion dollars. DOE's

101-1

101-1 DOE issued a ROD (66 FR 7877; January 26, 2001) for the *NI PEIS* (DOE 2000a) wherein DOE announced its decision that FFTF would be permanently deactivated. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this *TC & WM EIS*, Section 1.4.2, Decisions Not to Be Made, DOE is not considering restarting FFTF. The scope of this *TC & WM EIS* is to address the final decommissioning of FFTF. Although the costs of the various alternatives presented in this EIS have been analyzed (see Chapter 2, Section 2.11), the analysis does not include restarting FFTF because that decision has been made and is not a part of this *TC & WM EIS*.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

14

statement that there is no economic use of FFTF is demonstrably incorrect. It was incorrect when the original shutdown decision was made. It's still incorrect today. Further, even if that were not the case, the Federal Government subsidizes many activities for the common good of the population. Wind power comes to mind, as does the recent Cash for Clunkers scheme.

So to say that FFTF has not paid for itself was and is patently disingenuous. Much more to the point, nuclear power, in particular, and nuclear technology, in general, is in fact surging very strongly into prominence once again. This is occurring around the world, as well as in the United States. In evidence, I would recall to your minds the headline in Sunday's Tri-City Herald, "Nuclear Renaissance." The article discusses at length the reasons for a strong resurgence of interest in the nuclear power.

This was followed just yesterday by another headline, "Feds Drowning in Demand for Nuclear Power Licenses." This article discusses the fact that the NRC has had to add substantial staff and office space to handle the flood of Construction and Operation Licenses, COL applications. By the end of this year, it is expected that there will be about 31 license applications for new reactors.

All of this activity is expected to cause a

101-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

15

1 huge upswing in demand for test facilities. Indeed,
2 Secretary of Energy David Chu, in just the last 30 days,
3 has issued a statement pointing out a requirement for a
4 test facility in which, by sheer coincidence, must have
5 just about the exact specifications that the FFTF is
6 capable of.
7 This country is currently in financial crisis
8 mode. Its national debt is several multiples of what it
9 has been historically, and no end in sight. Why then
10 should we taxpayers stand idly by while an extremely
11 valuable piece of capital property is wasted when it could
12 be restarted at a very reasonable cost and produce huge
13 benefits to not only the United States but the entire
14 world?
15 I mention just three areas where FFTF is quite
16 capable of making contributions: fuels and materials
17 research, transmutation of used nuclear fuel, and medical
18 isotopes, and that's just the tip of the iceberg. There
19 is no other machine on the planet with capabilities that
20 even approach those of the FFTF. The FFTF must be
21 preserved as much as possible, with the goal to restarting
22 within the very near future. To do anything else is to
23 fly in the face of the requirements Dr. Chu laid down in
24 the recent letter to the Office of Management and Budget,
25 and equally to the point, squander a huge resource which

101-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

16

is already paid for and which yet has great potential for the future benefit of mankind.

The first alternative for FFTF under Section S.4.2 on page S-52 of the Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement Summary needs to be put back on the table and seriously examined for the benefits that would accrue from a restart of the FFTF.

101-1 cont'd

Thank you, very much.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.

Gerry Pollet, followed by Carl Holder.

MR. POLLET: Thank you. Gerry Pollet for Heart of America Northwest. The draft EIS and tonight's hearing is the beginning of a dialogue process, we hope, and we are sure it will be. In that dialogue, the public should be asking, are there alternatives that you prefer, as opposed to what is presented? Are there alternatives that are missing that are reasonable alternatives? This is the time to have that conversation. Do you agree with the Energy Department's preferred alternatives, given the projected impacts of each of them? What are the cumulative impacts from the whole range of actions presented? Is key information missing?

Now for many people, it's hard to assess these questions. The Hanford Advisory Board, as Susan said, is going to be having a workshop on February 16th and 17th

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

17

that the public is invited to and a meeting on March 4th at the Kennewick Red Lion on March 4th. I think that's where it is, someone else can correct me if I'm wrong, and it's very important for people to get good information. We're disappointed with some of how things are presented in the summary, whereas, there is really fabulous information presented, if you read 6,000 pages of this document.

One of the areas I would like to praise is the use of plume maps showing cancer risk levels from ground water and the concentrations in ground water through different alternatives over time. It's essential that people look at these maps and use them. For instance, if you look at the map for carbon tetrachloride, a poison and carcinogen, we see that today, as many people knew in the central plateau, you have levels of carbon tetrachloride 50 times the drinking water standard.

Unfortunately, under the modelling in the EIS, what we see is projected out into the future a hundred years from now that we're at 50 times the drinking water standard for carbon tetrachloride at the river's edge, where it is reasonably foreseeable, indeed more than just reasonably foreseeable, that there will be significant exposures.

In a thousand years, under the projection of

102-1

102-1 Regarding both the high groundwater contaminant concentrations predicted in this *TC & WM EIS* and their implied impacts, two aspects have bearing on this issue. First, there is some conservatism in the predicted concentrations presented in the draft EIS. While refinements in the approach used in this *Final TC & WM EIS* lessen predicted concentrations, modeled exceedances of standards still are predicted. This is why the second aspect—the regulatory context—is important. Potential conflicts with regulatory standards do not necessarily cause any given alternative to be unreasonable, but additional mitigation commitments may be required to implement the alternative (if selected). This EIS addresses those laws and requirements that would apply to the proposed actions, depending on the alternative. Issues concerning the ability to meet legal standards or requirements are also discussed, along with the potential mitigation measures that may be needed and that are feasible for DOE to implement. In particular, additional mitigation measures could be required in future permits issued by the State of Washington or addressed under the scope of the TPA as part of future remedial actions that are subject to CERCLA. In the ROD, DOE will identify and discuss the factors considered in reaching its decisions, such as economic, technical, and national policy considerations, along with mitigation and monitoring measures that DOE will implement. In all cases, DOE will select activities designed to protect public health and safety.

102-2 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. DOE's preferred retrieval option (i.e., to retrieve at least 99 percent of the tank waste) is consistent with the TPA goal of residual waste not exceeding 10.2 cubic meters (360 cubic feet) for 100-series tanks or 0.85 cubic meters (30 cubic feet) for the smaller 200-series tanks, corresponding to 99 percent retrieval. DOE has already begun the process of retrieving waste from the tanks, such as tanks located in Waste Management Area C. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed retrieval actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

18

1 just the residues in the soil today, without adding
2 anymore waste, in a thousand years, the EIS projects that
3 the plutonium level in river shore will reach 300 times
4 the drinking water standard. The drinking water standard
5 is set so that one adult in every ten thousand who uses it
6 will get a fatal cancer. That's 300 in 10,000, 30 in a
7 1,000, 3 in a 100 from one contaminant. This is
8 unacceptable.

102-1 cont'd

9 Part of our core problem here is the DOE's
10 preferred alternatives to cap and leave, instead of
11 retrieve and treat. It is essential that the alternatives
12 of fully retrieving wastes are presented, along with the
13 benefits, and that the Department of Energy adopt
14 alternatives that retrieve to the maximum extent
15 practicable, which is what Washington State law requires.

102-2

16 There are some key alternatives missing from
17 this Environmental Impact Statement. Both of the waste
18 management alternatives presented include adding off-site
19 waste to the incredible harmful ground water and cancer
20 risks from the existing wastes. It makes no sense and it
21 violates NEPA not to have an alternative of not adding
22 offsite waste.

102-3

23 More importantly, perhaps because offsite
24 waste adding to the harm is just utterly ridiculous, is
25 the question of whether or not we should have an

102-4

102-3 DOE recognizes the potential negative impacts on Hanford groundwater that the offsite waste poses. The proposed actions evaluated in this *TC & WM EIS* are intended to support a decision about the onsite location of disposal facilities for Hanford's waste and other DOE sites' LLW and MLLW. Waste Management Alternative 1 (No Action) analyzes the potential impacts of maintaining the "status quo" at Hanford in terms of waste management activities and assumes, subject to narrowly defined exceptions, that no offsite LLW, MLLW, or TRU waste would be received. Waste Management Alternatives 2 and 3 are action alternatives and therefore do assume receipt of offsite LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites, but no offsite TRU waste would be received at Hanford. The *TC & WM EIS* analysis shows that receipt of offsite waste streams that contain specific amounts of certain isotopes, specifically iodine-129 and technetium-99, could cause an adverse impact on the environment. One means of mitigating the impacts of the offsite waste inventory would be for DOE to limit disposal of offsite waste streams at Hanford.

In a *Federal Register* notice published on December 18, 2009 (74 FR 67189), DOE modified its Preferred Alternative for waste management and extended the duration of the moratorium until the WTP is operational. DOE also included GTCC waste as part of that moratorium. DOE has not changed its Preferred Alternative in this final EIS concerning this extended moratorium. DOE's inclusion of the moratorium in its ROD following issuance of this final EIS would result in its enforceability.

The impacts of the offsite waste in terms of radiological risk are presented in the Summary, Section S.5.5.3, and Chapter 2, Section 2.10, Key Environmental Findings. These sections discuss the radiological risk differences between including and not including offsite waste disposal at IDF-East.

The *TC & WM EIS* analysis shows that receipt of offsite waste streams that contain specific amounts of certain isotopes, specifically, iodine-129 and technetium-99, could cause an adverse impact on the environment. Therefore, one means of mitigating this impact would be for DOE to limit disposal of offsite waste streams at Hanford. Other mitigation measures, such as recycling secondary-waste streams into the primary-waste-stream feeds within the WTP to increase iodine-129 capture in ILAW and bulk vitrification glass, are discussed in Chapter 7, Section 7.5, of this final EIS.

102-4 Chapter 7, Section 7.1, discusses potential mitigation measures that could be used to avoid or reduce adverse environmental impacts associated

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

19

alternative that says, if the landfill permits are not going to allow wastes to exceed ground water protection standards, where will the waste go? This EIS needs to have a set of alternatives that examine waste streams that need to be removed from the Hanford site pre-1970 transuranic wastes. Chemical wastes mixed with radioactive wastes that are now proposed to go into landfills or to remain under caps need to be exhumed and removed from the Hanford site and the landfills, as Susan noted earlier on behalf of Ecology, needs to have permits that say, we will not violate the standards.

That is missing from the EIS. There is no discussion of that mitigation required under state law. Thank you very much.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.

Carl Holder, followed by Joe Conant.

MR. HOLDER: Good evening. Benton County sued the Department of Energy in 2002 to stop liquid sodium drain and to stop the rush to destroy the FFTF. Benton County argued that the decommissioning was not allowed, and DOE argued that only deactivation was ongoing.

Benton County lost the case, but in Judge Shea's order, we won the knowledge that any action at FFTF must be accomplished under the rules of the National

102-4 cont'd

103-1

with implementation of the alternatives. As discussed in Chapter 5 of this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE acknowledges that benchmark standards could be exceeded in groundwater at the Core Zone Boundary and/or at the Columbia River nearshore at various dates. In response to comments received on the *Draft TC & WM EIS* concerning potential long-term impacts on groundwater resources, additional sensitivity analyses were performed and are included in this EIS. The additional analyses evaluate the potential impacts if certain remediation activities were conducted at some of the more prominent waste sites on the Central Plateau and along the river corridor, including existing burial sites where pre-1970 TRU waste was disposed of. Furthermore, a sensitivity analysis has been included that evaluates the effect of restricting the receipt of offsite waste containing target COPCs. The discussion found in Chapter 7, Section 7.5, was added to summarize these results.

DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

103-1 As discussed in Chapter 1 of this *TC & WM EIS*, Section 1.4.2, Decisions Not to Be Made, DOE is not considering restarting FFTF. The scope of this EIS is to address the final decommissioning of FFTF.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

20

1 Environmental Policy Act, as NEPA allows for public
2 comment, the analysis of good alternatives and
3 consideration of new information.
4 The previous NEPA document is the programmatic
5 Environmental Impact Statement that was completed in
6 January of 2001. Very significant events and new
7 information should be evaluated by DOE, most
8 significantly, the medical isotope supply is in crisis due
9 to aging international reactor infrastructure, domestic
10 production of the isotope Pu-238 did not start and
11 production planning has failed.
12 And there was a record of decision that
13 confirmed the need to reestablish production capability,
14 and the DOE-IG said that continuing delays in
15 reestablishing a domestic Pu-238 production capability
16 could severely impact the Department's ability to meet its
17 core national security mission, as well as those of DoD,
18 NASA, and other government users. And the U.S. purchase
19 of Russian Pu-238 will end and cannot be used for national
20 security.
21 The civilian reactor research and development
22 is constrained due to the lack of testing and
23 certification facilities and programs, and current
24 research and development projects and intellectual
25 property are moving off-shore to China, South Korea,

103-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

21

India, Russia, Ukraine, France, Canada, etc., and nothing for the United States.

RL's VIT plant needs 40 megawatt electric, which could be supplied by the FFTF with a power block attachment and, most significantly, on December 22nd, DOE's Secretary Steven Chu wrote "The closed fuel cycle cannot be implemented without a fast neutron spectrum ...," that "... research is needed now to provide options for future policymakers," "The administration has pledged that a Blue Ribbon panel will consider all alternatives to Yucca Mountain ...," "... other nations are pursuing the technology ...," and "If the United States does not have a broad fast reactor research program, we will have no opportunity to influence design of these foreign reactors from a vital national security perspective such as proliferation resistance."

103-1 cont'd

The FFTF is now in cold standby with sodium system piping under argon cover gas, also known as Stage II Surveillance and Maintenance. I assume that's correct. The April 2007 study accomplished by Columbia Basin Consulting Group for the Department of Energy's Global Nuclear Energy Partnership concluded that FFTF is a fully licensed nuclear reactor with a 20-year full power life. Even though the liquid sodium coolant has been drained, the FFTF could be restarted and the GNEP EIS was

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

22

1 cancelled. *103-1 cont'd*
2 In conclusion, with the minor yearly cost of
3 surveillance and maintenance, I believe it is incumbent
4 upon EM to preserve the reactor, and of the listed
5 alternatives, the No Action alternative is the alternative *103-2*
6 that should be chosen, so as Secretary Chu's words, to
7 provide options for future policymakers. Thank you.
8 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Joe Conant, followed
9 by Ron Hale.
10 Joe?
11 MR. CONANT: Hello. I worked out there at
12 Hanford for 25 years and looking at some of the friends
13 and cohorts I've worked with, you're going to have a high
14 dose of people with cancer. And it would be great to have *104-1*
15 FFTF running or WPPSS restarted or something to work.
16 You're going to need the power to run the vitrification
17 plant, but first you're going to have to look at the
18 workers who worked out there, the ones that did like
19 characterization of the tank farms, and have them do an
20 epidural test to find out how many people you worked with
21 had cancer with these chemicals and stuff.
22 Right now, Advance Med isn't, they just take *104-2*
23 each individual person, and they spent millions of dollars
24 characterizing this waste but they didn't look at my
25 co-workers that got sick and had cancer. And when you

103-2 Comment noted.

104-1 DOE is not considering the use of FFTF to provide electric power to the vitrification facilities supporting tank closure. DOE issued a ROD (66 FR 7877; January 26, 2001) for the *NI PEIS* (DOE 2000a) wherein DOE announced its decision that FFTF would be permanently deactivated. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this *TC & WM EIS*, Section 1.4.2, Decisions Not to Be Made, DOE is not considering restarting FFTF. Decisions regarding any potential new missions for the Washington Public Power Supply System nuclear power plant are similarly beyond the scope of this EIS. The scope of this *TC & WM EIS* is to address the final decommissioning of FFTF.

104-2 Regarding the performance of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) dose reconstruction study for Hanford, comments on the dose reconstruction study are not within the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. However, the answer to why site employees who worked at Hanford prior to June 30, 1972, were included as part of a special exposure cohort that would receive compensation and medical benefits if they were diagnosed with cancer is as follows: NIOSH concluded that, from late 1943 through mid-1972, they could not find adequate monitoring information to determine exposure to three radioactive materials—purified polonium, thorium, and neptunium—used in special programs during those years. NIOSH's research led them to conclude that, after June 30, 1972, they have monitoring data, source-term information, and/or methods necessary to support dose reconstructions for Hanford claims.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

23

1 have cancer, I ask the question, why did they have the
2 cohort only go to '72, because most of the people I know
3 got cancer, I worked with them in the '80s and '90s.
4 I have a friend here that got only 31 percent
5 for his cancer reading and lost a kidney due to cancer,
6 but he was denied on his claim. I've got a lot of people
7 that I know that's that way.
8 Now we do need the isotopes and it would be a
9 win/win situation if everybody worked together and admit
10 that people are getting sick out here, which I think some
11 of these cohorts have, admit to the downwinders what
12 happened to them and, plus, if nuclear is the source that
13 we have to go to, see what we can do to use it to help
14 people. That's about all I can say. Thank you.
15 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you, sir.
16 Ron Hale followed by Tom Carpenter.
17 Ron Hale?
18 Tom Carpenter?
19 MR. CARPENTER: Hello, I'm Tom Carpenter
20 with Hanford Challenge. And I also want to thank the
21 state of Washington and the state of Oregon for their
22 comments and especially the state of Oregon's Alternative
23 No. 7 that was presented in a letter earlier this month
24 about tank farm closure. I think that had some real
25 possibilities.

104-2 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

24

I wanted to focus a little bit on some of the principles that we're looking at that we think underlie or should underlie Hanford clean-up and that we're advocating.

And that includes that anything that's done out here for clean-up or in remediation be done so with the long-term protectiveness of the river in mind, of human health, including, as we just heard, of workers and, of course, of the environment, with the idea that down the road other people will be utilizing this site for other purposes in several hundred years or several thousand years and maybe not remember that there ever was a Hanford site here, and yet underlying that site could be a pretty serious contamination source. *105-1*

Any clean-up ought to be compliant with legal requirements, including the limits for ground water contamination for drinking water, for use in the future, and it appears to us that there is not an alternative that reaches that goal as was mentioned by previous speakers.

And we think that there ought to be alternatives that do so. We think that, as a principle, waste ought to be well characterized, that is low to the ground, especially underneath the tanks. I think there's very poor characterization data so far and, therefore, not really a basis to make a good decision about which tanks *105-2*

105-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

105-2 For the residual waste remaining within the 200 Area tank farms, closure would require detailed examinations of the tanks and residual waste to support the preparation of site-specific radiological performance assessments and closure plans. These documents would provide the information and analysis necessary for DOE and regulators to make decisions on what levels of residual tank waste are acceptable in terms of short- and long-term risks. For additional response information, please see response to comment 105-1.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

25

to remove, how much waste you need to go for.

A previous speaker talked about going through BETA zone waste that's leaked out of the tank, tank waste a million gallons or so that's leaked below the tanks, how much is in there and where is it, and obviously those decisions need to be made and we support as much, getting as much of that as possible for future protection. *105-2 cont'd*

And that we need to retrieve and put into glass all the high level waste that's at the Hanford site right now and send that to a repository in the ground when we've got one. *105-3*

We also have as a principle to not rely on any institutional controls for the future that we use as barriers and glass, where possible. And I would like to just point out as a data point here, as many people here know, the profile of this site geologically changes pretty significantly over time, and we're talking long timeframes for some of these. 12,000 years ago, this area was under several hundred feet of water because of glacial flooding, and apparently, that's happened many times geologically and we need to keep that in mind, that when we put material and leave it in the ground, that it's likely to wash out and that could be a very poor result for a lot of people down the road. *105-4*

Finally, there's going to be a lot of money *105-5*

105-3 Regarding the commentor's concern about the disposition of HLW, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

105-4 This *TC & WM EIS* assumes several different types of end-state management, as described in Chapter 2, the Glossary, and the Summary. These include administrative controls, institutional controls, and postclosure care, as appropriate. Each of these end-state management options would take place at the completion of an action and is assumed to occur for 100 years following the end of the action (e.g., active institutional controls would be maintained for 100 years following final placement of waste in a storage facility). The 10,000-year time period described in this *TC & WM EIS* represents the period of analysis used for the long-term impact analyses for groundwater, human health, and ecological risk; it does not represent the assumed period of institutional controls. For clarity, the definition of "10,000-year period of analysis" is included in this final EIS in Chapter 2, the Glossary, and the Summary, as appropriate.

Regarding the possibility of foreseeable natural events at Hanford and the potential for related impacts on waste treatment and disposal facilities, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.5.1.1, of this *TC & WM EIS* depicts and discusses the locations of geologic faults relative to Hanford and their potential for producing earthquakes, as well as the locations of floodplains on the site. DOE Order 420.1B and its implementing standards require that nuclear and nonnuclear facilities be designed, constructed, and operated to safeguard the facility, public, workers, and environment from natural phenomena hazards, including earthquakes and floods. Appendix V of this EIS also provides an analysis that depicts potential impacts at Hanford that could result from climatic changes, which may increase infiltration rates and the rise of the groundwater table.

105-5 Even though it is beyond the scope of this EIS, the comment is noted.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

26

spent on Hanford cleanup. It's going to cost more to clean up more. And I would like to point out that the Brookings Institution did a study a few years back that put the manufactured nuclear weapons at about $5.5 trillion dollars to the taxpayer, so we may have to spend some more money to get this waste in a stable form to protect the future, and we ought to spend that money. Thank you. *105-5 cont'd*

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.

Next up, Claude Oliver followed by Liz Madison.

Mr. Oliver.

MR. OLIVER: Thank you. In November, in 2002, the United States Department of Energy ignored responsibility under the NEPA Policy Act with all of the political help and guidance it needed to do up the largest, small business award contract in the history of U.S. Department of Energy to expedite destruction of the Fast Flux Test Facility. *106-1*

So what about NEPA compliance, the law governed the process. Nuclear scientists and the people of Benton County, Washington State watched as no federal elected officials came to their aid as Fluor Hanford contractors proceeded with advancing the Fast Flux Tear Down Project. So in desperation, Benton County took the

106-1 DOE issued a ROD (66 FR 7877; January 26, 2001) for the *NI PEIS* (DOE 2000a) wherein DOE announced its decision that FFTF would be permanently deactivated. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this *TC & WM EIS*, Section 1.4.2, Decisions Not to Be Made, DOE is not considering restarting FFTF. The scope of this *TC & WM EIS* is to address the final decommissioning of FFTF.

The current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

27

1 United States Department of Energy to Federal Court in
2 November of 2002 with Federal Judge Edward F. Shea
3 presiding. Washington State U.S. DOE FFTF decommissioning
4 process, under CERCLA pretense, was a clear violation of
5 NEPA policy law designed to leave nuclear scientists, the
6 public, and the energy and research development needs of
7 the United States out of consideration by U.S. DOE and
8 other federal elected officials.
9 Federal Judge Edward F. Shea, on February
10 28th, 2003 ruled that prior to committing any resources to
11 any one of the options for decommissioning, the DOE must
12 prepare an EIS NEPA 40 CFR 1502.2. This ensures the
13 opportunity for public comment.
14 Thank you, Judge Shea, and members of the DOE
15 that are now providing an opportunity for public comment
16 on these areas years later. Even with Judge Shea's
17 ruling, the people of Benton County were ignored as U.S.
18 DOE and its elected federal officials issued CERCLA
19 Contract B 2949102 for FFTF Tear Down, which was issued in
20 early 2005.
21 On August 31, 2005, I asked federal regulators
22 governing the county office and U.S. DOE Inspector General
23 to review what contract issue authority U.S. DOE had
24 issued the FFTF Tear Down procurement contract valued at
25 $260 million dollars. Result, U.S. DOE lacked authority

106-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

28

1 and the contract was withdrawn.
2 Should the Obama administration continue the
3 rush to destroy the Washington State Fast Flux Test
4 Facility and abandon Yucca Mountain without required NEPA
5 compliance, the United States will lose the nuclear
6 capability of the FFTF, a multi-million dollar complex,
7 which offers -- which would preclude the very need for
8 Yucca Mountain's 10,000 year storage. The national
9 impacts for President Obama's political decision are in
10 the billions, with glass vitrification from Hanford
11 Douglas to go to Nevada being orphans.
12 Recently President Obama made this comment in
13 New Orleans. There is no reason why technologically we
14 can't employ nuclear energy in a safe and effective way.
15 Japan does it and France does, and it doesn't have
16 greenhouse gas emissions, so it would be stupid for us not
17 to do that in a much more effective way.
18 FACILITATOR PARHAM: One minute.
19 MR. OLIVER: One minute?
20 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Yes.
21 MR. OLIVER: Thank you. So, in closing, I
22 have some questions. And the text will be provided it, so
23 if I don't get through them in all of this minute I will
24 give them to you.
25 Do you know what Barack Obama means with his

106-1 cont'd

106-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

29

1 comment that it would be stupid for us not to do
2 employment of nuclear power in the U.S.? I think we
3 should know this. We've got a new president. He's saying
4 he wants to do something with this. This is the test
5 machine that would be vital for advancing that, if the
6 president is in fact serious with that comment.
7 Also I think it's important that U.S. DOE
8 advise why it did not accept Federal Judge Shea's ruling
9 and instead issued a contract which was in violation of
10 his ruling. And also that U.S. DOE, in complying with
11 NEPA process impact issue, should look at Yucca Mountain
12 with consideration for FFTF as a nuclear fuels materials
13 waste recycling demonstration that could offer major
14 scientific mitigation, plus time and cost savings for
15 which DOE has legal obligation to address for Washington
16 State, for host communities and commercial utilities of
17 the United States.
18 Options to restart of the Fast Flux Test
19 Facility must immediately be explored in the context of
20 major policy decisions being faced by U.S. DOE, President
21 Obama, Washington State, Washington Congressional
22 Delegation, Nevada, Commercial Utilities and host U.S. DOE
23 communities. Thank you very much.
24 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.
25 Liz Mattson.

106-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

30

MS. MATTSON: My name is Liz Mattson and I'm with Hanford Challenge. I agree with the comments made by Brett and Jerry and Tom. And the reason that this EIS is important is because it is about the future of the Pacific Northwest and I care about the future of the Pacific Northwest. This is our home. I want an aggressive Hanford cleanup that is legally compliant and protective of human health and the environment to the maximum extent possible.

I prefer clean closure to landfill closure. The tank closure preference for 99 percent of waste removal sounds good, but the remaining one percent of the waste contains a disproportionate amount of the radioactivity and poses a threat that is not acceptable. Additionally, I do not want Hanford to import offsite waste. *107-1*

I also care about the health and safety of Hanford workers and I want a cleanup that considers their safety and honors the hard and hazardous work they do at a compensation system that works. Thank you. *107-2*

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. That ends our list for now. Anyone who did not sign up who would like to provide comments now? Anyone who would like to comment after what they've heard at this point?

No. Is there anyone, yes.

107-1 The decision to leave 0.1 percent, 1 percent, or more of the waste in the SSTs is one of the decisions supported by this *TC & WM EIS* (see Section S.1.3.1 of the *TC & WM EIS* Summary and Chapter 1, Section 1.4.1). With regard to the disproportionate amount of radioactivity in the residues at the bottom of the tanks, DOE currently does not have a technical basis for making more-specific assumptions about the expected compositions of the waste "heels" that would remain in the tanks after retrieval. Retrieval has been completed on only a small number of SSTs and not much is known about the behavior of, or ability to remove, small volumes of residual waste. Thus, the uncertainties are high. However, the tank closure process, which includes detailed examinations of the tanks and residual waste, requires preparation of a performance assessment and a closure plan. These required documents will provide the information and analysis necessary for DOE and the regulators to make specific decisions on what levels of residual tank waste are acceptable in terms of short- and long-term risks.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

107-2 Regarding protection of the health and safety of Hanford workers, DOE administers programs that implement human health and safety requirements that comply with applicable laws and regulations. The applicable laws and regulations are outlined in Chapter 8, Section 8.1. Workers are compensated based on prevailing industry rates, taking into consideration potential job hazards.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

Public Hearing January 26, 2010

31

MS. GREGOR: Hi, I'm Jen Gregor with Hanford Challenge. I just want to say, you know, being for Hanford site is the greatest extent possible, please don't leave a mess for future generations. I love the Pacific Northwest and I don't want my children and grandchildren to have to deal with this when we can do it now.

The goal is for healthy and safe life and for people cleaning up the site. Let's put the resources and the money that we need to spend into this to do the best job possible. The technology and processes and expertise that we develop will help us in the future here and other places as well. Let's do, you know, let's remove the contaminated soil, do what we need to do. Thank you.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else who would like to provide comment at this time that hasn't? Anyone who would like to provide comment that hasn't at this time? If not, anyone who has provided comments previously who would like to provide additional comments?

If not, we would like to thank you for your patience and politeness, and thanks to DOE and Department of Ecology for their presentations. And we have several meetings coming up and plenty of information about those to provide to go on-line and look that up for additional

108-1

108-1 Both DOE and Congress are committed to the cleanup efforts at Hanford, and DOE continues to seek funding for these efforts even though this is beyond the scope of this EIS.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

1 comments so you can do that. Thank you very much.
2 (9:15 p.m.)
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Richland, Washington, Public Hearing (January 26, 2010)

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
)
County of Benton)

I, Patricia E. Bute, do hereby certify that at the time and place heretofore mentioned in the caption of the above-entitled matter, I was a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public for Washington; that at said time and place I reported in stenotype all testimony adduced and proceedings had in the foregoing matter; that thereafter my notes were reduced to typewriting and that the foregoing transcript consisting of 32 typewritten pages is a true and correct transcript of all such testimony adduced and proceedings had and of the whole thereof.

I further certify that I am herewith securely sealing the said original deposition transcript and promptly delivering the same to

Witness my hand at Kennewick, Washington, on this 27 day of April, 2010.

/s/ Patricia E. Bute

Patricia E. Bute
CSR No. 2919
Certified Shorthand Reporter
Notary Public for Washington
My commission expires: 2-29-12

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Boise, Idaho, Public Hearing (February 2, 2010)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

DATE: FEBRUARY 2, 2010

6:00 p.m.

OWYHEE PLAZA HOTEL
1109 MAIN STREET
BOISE, IDAHO 83702

James Parham, Facilitator

PANEL MEMBERS:
Ms. Mary Beth Burandt, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection

Mr. Jeff Lyon, Washington State Department of Ecology, Hanford Project Office

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Boise, Idaho, Public Hearing (February 2, 2010)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION

ANDREA SHIPLEY: Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Department of Energy's plans for cleanup of the Hanford Reservation analyzed in the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement.

My name is Andrea Shipley. I am the executive director of the Snake River Alliance. The Snake River Alliance serves as Idaho's nuclear watchdog and Idaho's advocate for renewable nuclear-free energy. We raise community awareness about the dangers of nuclear waste, weapons, and power while working to identify and promote sustainable alternatives.

We do our work through advocacy, collaboration, education, and grassroots organizing. I make the following comments on behalf of the Alliance's dues-paying members.

Before I address the plans to decommission the Fast Flux Test Facility, let me

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Boise, Idaho, Public Hearing (February 2, 2010)

Public Hearing February 2, 2010

3

first voice the Alliance's support for the justifiable concerns of the people of Washington and Oregon about the long-term health, safety, and environmental threats posed by Hanford.

Radioactive and hazardous pollution there have made it the most contaminated place in the western hemisphere. At the same time, it sits on the banks of the Columbia River, one of the most valuable water resources on the planet. This is a perilous combination.

That peril could only be made worse by the importation to Hanford of more nuclear waste from other DOE sites. The DOE must abandon that misbegotten plan, particularly in light of the draft EIS summary's acknowledgement that "there is substantial uncertainty associated with the sources, volumes, and potential long-term performance of radiological and chemical offsite waste inventories forecast for disposal at Hanford."

It is certain that abandoning the plan will mean something like 3 million cubic feet of radioactive and hazardous materials stay off the Northwest's major transportation corridors, such as I-81, which runs right through Boise.

109-1

109-1 This EIS addresses the environmental impacts of retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste and final closure of the SST system. It also evaluates the impacts of FFTF decommissioning, including management of waste generated by the decommissioning process. Finally, this *TC & WM EIS* evaluates the potential environmental impacts of ongoing solid waste management operations at Hanford, as well as the proposed disposal of Hanford LLW and MLLW and a limited volume of offsite LLW and MLLW. The *Draft TC & WM EIS* analyzed the transportation of remote-handled LLW (RH-LLW) from INL to Hanford for disposal. Based on the public's input and concerns about offsite waste disposal at Hanford, DOE has included in this *Final TC & WM EIS* an example of a potential mitigation measure that could be taken by DOE. Specifically, an offsite waste stream containing a significant inventory of iodine-129 (i.e., RH-LLW resins from INL) was eliminated from the analysis. This mitigation measure has been incorporated into the Waste Management alternatives.

In addition, a sensitivity analysis is included that shows the impacts of limiting offsite waste streams containing iodine-129 and technetium-99. The results of this sensitivity analysis illustrate the difference this would make in potential groundwater impacts and are included in Appendix M. Other mitigation measures, such as recycling secondary-waste streams into the primary-waste-stream feeds within the WTP to increase iodine-129 capture in ILAW and bulk vitrification, are discussed in Chapter 7, Section 7.5, of this EIS. As shown in the Summary, Section S.5.3; Chapter 2, Section 2.8.3.10; and Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12, of this *TC & WM EIS*, it is unlikely that the estimated total public radiation exposures from transporting radioactive waste to Hanford for disposal would result in any additional LCFs. While there is some uncertainty regarding the waste volumes and other information, the analyses were performed with appropriately conservative assumptions that addressed this uncertainty, as stated in Appendix D, Section D.3.6. In addition, these assumptions were consistently applied across all of the alternatives so that a meaningful comparison could be made.

Comments from the Boise, Idaho, Public Hearing (February 2, 2010)

Public Hearing February 2, 2010

4

We understand that cleanup of Hanford's high-level wastes tanks faces immense, intractable obstacles. Those obstacles have not been lowered by years of mismanagement. Nonetheless, the Alliance is convinced that lowering the goal posts cannot be substituted for lowering the obstacles.

The DOE must remove 99.9% of the waste or to the limits of technical capability from the tanks, pipes, and ancillary equipment. After all, the waste that can be removed has been removed. The DOE must evaluate the contaminated soil around the tanks and, if appropriate, remove it. *109-2*

According to the National Academy of Sciences, plutonium was buried at Hanford and at the Idaho National Laboratory under the assumption that it would remain essentially immobile for tens of thousands of years.

That assumption was proven wrong in a couple of decades. INL has been successfully exhuming plutonium-contaminated waste for a number of years, and the Snake River Alliance is puzzled by the DOE's decision to abandon, so close to groundwater, the plutonium at Hanford.

We read with interest a newspaper account of the Richland, Washington, hearing on *109-3*

109-2 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. This closure includes the tank system, along with the vadose zone as impacted by the tank farms (i.e., past leaks). Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*. As discussed in the Summary, Section S.1.3.2, and Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2, of this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE will not make decisions on groundwater remediation, including the remediation of groundwater contamination resulting from non-tank-farm areas of the 200 Areas, because that is being addressed under the CERCLA (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) process. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford under the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

109-3 Comment noted.

Comments from the Boise, Idaho, Public Hearing (February 2, 2010)

Public Hearing February 2, 2010

5

the tank waste draft EIS. Half the commenters called for saving the Fast Flux Test Facility. That led an Alliance member to compare the FFTF's fan base to a nuclear National Rifle Association.

We urge the DOE to go ahead. Tear that reactor away from their cold, stiff fingers.

109-3 cont'd

It is our understanding that the Washington State standard for nuclear reactor decommissioning requires removal and site restoration. That was the course taken for the Trojan reactor in Oregon.

As part of FFTF decommissioning, alternatives in this draft EIS call for shipping radioactively contaminated bulk sodium or remote handled equipment to INL for treatment and then shipping it back to Hanford or shipping remote-handled special components to INL and then shipping them back after treatment.

109-4

The Alliance has objected to these proposals in the past, and with the support of our allied organizations in Washington, we do so again today. The risks of shipping radioactive sodium or remote-handled equipment are simply unacceptable and the benefits of treatment in Idaho are relatively modest.

109-4 In Washington State, in conformance with Nuclear Energy and Radiation Act (RCW 70.98), the Washington State Department of Health is responsible for administering regulatory, licensing, and radiation control requirements to protect public health and safety. These licensing provisions, as well as those of "Radioactive Material – Licensing Applicability" (WAC 246-232), expressly do not apply to activities conducted within Hanford's boundaries. The Department of Health's general radiation protection provisions ("Radiation Protection – General Provisions" [WAC 246-220]) contain exemptions for DOE or NRC contractors or subcontractors engaged in activities at U.S. Government–owned or –controlled sites, including transportation of sources of radiation to or from such sites and use or operation of nuclear reactors and devices ("Exemptions" [WAC 246-220-050]). Under NEPA, agencies identify the laws, regulations, and requirements that may apply to the proposed action and alternatives. Chapter 8 of this *TC & WM EIS* provides both a listing and short description of the laws, regulations, and requirements that may apply to the proposed actions, including decommissioning of FFTF.

Regarding the commentor's remarks about shipping bulk sodium and the RH-SCs to Idaho for treatment, DOE concludes that the commentor supports the Hanford treatment option.

Regarding the shipping of the large RH-SCs to Idaho, DOE acknowledges that there is currently no NRC-licensed transportation cask with the capacity to handle these components. For analysis purposes, this *TC & WM EIS* assumes that a specially designed Type B cask or other shielded container would exist at the time of the transports. Specifics regarding these transport containers are included in Appendix H of this final EIS.

Comments from the Boise, Idaho, Public Hearing (February 2, 2010)

Public Hearing February 2, 2010

6

There are no licensed shippings casks that could be used for the large special components envisaged for shipment. The FFTF waste should be stored and treated as safely as possible at Hanford. Thank you.

109-4 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Boise, Idaho, Public Hearing (February 2, 2010)

1 R E P O R T E R' S C E R T I F I C A T E
2
3
4
5 I, Roxanne K. Patchell, Court Reporter,
6 a Notary Public, do hereby certify:
7 That I am the reporter who took the
8 proceedings had in the above-entitled action in
9 machine shorthand and thereafter the same was
10 reduced into typewriting under my direct
11 supervision; and
12 That the foregoing transcript contains a
13 full, true, and accurate record of the proceedings
14 had in the above and foregoing cause, which was
15 heard at Boise, Idaho.
16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
17 my hand April 29, 2010.
18
19
20
21 /s/ Roxanne K. Patchell
Roxanne K. Patchell, RPR, CSR No. 733
22
23
24
25

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

February 9, 2010
6:00 p.m.

Columbia Gorge Hotel
4000 Westcliff Drive
Hood River, Oregon

Mr. James Parham, Facilitator

PANEL MEMBERS:
Ms. Mary Beth Burandt, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection
Mr. Jeff Lyon, Washington State Department of Ecology, Hanford Project Office

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION

	Page	Line
Gerry Pollet	4	9
Jurgen Hess	9	3
Brett VandenHeuvel	10	14
Steve Curley	15	12
Robin Klein	18	18
Mike Clement	20	1
Karen Harding	22	20
Hugh B. McMahan	24	20
Daniel Lichtenwald	26	18
Lisa Van Dyk	30	23
Keith Harding	32	19
Lauren Goldberg	35	16
Aera Atkins	38	20
Bonnie New, M.D.	40	11
Aaron Morehouse	44	5
Rollean	46	9
Theresa North	49	21
Catherine Fitzgerald	50	22
Dan Solitz	53	19

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

3

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION (Cont'd.)

	Page	Line
Doug Charters	55	15
Daniel Lichtenwald	57	12
Jurgen Hess	58	12

* * *

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

4

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION

MR. PARHAM: Gerry Pollet from the Heart of America Northwest. We'd like for you to come to the microphone. And our court reporter here is starting to take the verbatim comments now. Thank you.

COMMENTS BY GERRY POLLET:

I've got some slides, so I'm going to use them. No disrespect, I'm going to face this way.

I went for a walk today along the Gorge on a trail with 200-year-old trees. And I was thinking about the fact that those trees were saplings when Lewis and Clark came by. And then tonight, you're talking about a legacy where, 200 years from now, after the Energy Department says it has cleaned up Hanford, walking along the Columbia River will be dangerous for our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren because of the levels of contamination under their proposed decisions.

And make no mistake, when the Energy Department says it has a preferred alternative, that means their proposed decision. And what you've heard tonight, unfortunately, was misleading

383-1

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

383-1 Although the draft and this final EIS discuss the Preferred Alternatives, no decisions have been made regarding any of the proposed actions analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

5

in implying that that proposed decision is not to issue a formal decision, that is to use Hanford as a national radioactive waste dump. And indeed, if you listened carefully tonight, what you heard is that the Energy Department says they made that decision in 2000. And that is why they are illegally failing to include in this impact statement consideration of any alternative of which they do not dump more waste at Hanford. *383-1 cont'd*

Let's look at this -- Go to the next slide. We're here tonight because we're concerned about the Columbia River and the health of future generations; the river that flows past Hanford, past nine nuclear reactors, and flows past for 50 miles.

Today, contamination is entering the river at 1500 times the drinking water standard. What the Energy Department doesn't explain to you clearly, even in the EIS, is that the drinking water standard is set for each contaminant at the level of which one adult drinking that water out of every 10,000 will die of cancer. You all can do the math. 1500 out of 10,000 per radioactive strontium 90 entering the river in seeps today. *383-2*

Let's jump ahead. Forty miles of unlined *383-3*

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

383-2 DOE must comply with certain legal requirements to undertake specific activities that are part of the proposed actions and alternatives; these requirements are identified throughout this EIS. For example, Chapter 1, Section 1.2.1, discusses Hanford regulatory compliance requirements; Section 1.2.7 discusses the WAC regulations DOE must meet for the proposed closure of the SSTs. Section 1.9, which describes the alternatives evaluated in this EIS, refers to the RCRA, WAC, and DOE order requirements that must be met for DOE to implement Tank Closure alternatives. The very nature of "environmental impact analysis" requires DOE to analyze and describe in the EIS how proposed processes and technologies would operate; what results they are expected to achieve; what end products or byproducts might result; and how these measure up against the legal requirements that apply. Statutory, regulatory, Executive order, and DOE requirements are discussed in the context of each chapter and are listed in the references at the end of each chapter. Chapter 8 identifies and discusses the laws and legal requirements that are potentially applicable to the proposed actions and alternatives, as well as the permits and approvals DOE must obtain from Federal, state, and local agencies. In Sections 8.1.7 and 8.3, DOE identifies the consultations and coordination that DOE has undertaken with American Indian tribes and would need to continue for the purpose of implementing the proposed actions and alternatives. In addition, Chapter 7, Sections 7.1 and 7.5, discuss potential mitigation measures that may be needed and are feasible for DOE to implement to offset the potential impacts that might result from implementing an alternative.

While DOE's Preferred Alternatives for tank closure, FFTF decommissioning, and waste management in this *TC & WM EIS* may not necessarily represent the most environmentally preferred alternatives, the ROD issued by DOE will identify any additional mitigation and monitoring commitments adopted by DOE and specify other factors considered by DOE in reaching its decision, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. In announcing its decision in the ROD based on the EIS analyses, DOE will be obligated to carry out the decision consistent with the requirements identified in this EIS. These requirements will be interpreted and applied by Federal, state, and local regulatory agencies through their independent authorities. These agencies may also impose additional mitigation measures through future permitting processes or remedial actions under the scope of the TPA, which include additional opportunities for public comment.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

6

burial grounds. This EIS fails to address the cumulative impacts truly from not digging up the waste in these burial grounds, that they were dumping waste into unlined ditches until 2004.

383-3 cont'd

Next slide. The voters of Washington state and the people of Oregon have spoken clearly. We passed Initiative 297 saying, "Clean up before you dump more." This EIS shows that it is unconscionable, A, to dump more; B, to even leave the waste that is already at Hanford.

383-4

Next slide. You've seen some of these maps before. This one is carbon tetrachloride in the groundwater today. Next slide. In 120 years, the dark red area near where the river shore is now -- will then be at 50 times the drinking water standard.

Next slide. Plutonium in 1,000 years. Plutonium in 1,000 years will be 300 times the drinking water standard under DOE's proposed decisions to leave tank waste in the ground, not clean up the billions of gallons of liquid discharges from the tanks or the million gallons that have leaked from the tanks, not to clean up those soiled ditches, and to add more waste.

383-5

Next slide. Let's just skip over these maps, because you've seen some from Ken. This one shows

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

383-3 Cleanup of Hanford is a major goal of implementing the Preferred Alternatives presented in this *TC & WM EIS*. The commentor is referred to Chapter 2, Section 2.12, for a discussion of the Preferred Alternatives for tank closure, FFTF decommissioning, and waste management. While implementation of the Preferred Alternatives would go a long way toward achieving cleanup of the site, not all actions related to cleanup are addressed in this *TC & WM EIS*. As stated in Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2, of this EIS, the groundwater contamination in the non-tank-farm areas within the 200 Areas (including the burial grounds, cribs, and trenches [ditches]) is being addressed under CERCLA, which will also satisfy substantive RCRA and Washington State Hazardous Waste Management Act corrective action requirements. Contamination in the vadose zone resulting from tank farm past leaks would be addressed in the SST closure process. The cumulative impacts analysis for this *TC & WM EIS* (see Appendix U and Chapter 6) includes the vadose zone of the 200 Areas in addition to the other areas of Hanford.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

383-4 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

383-5 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include (nor will the potential NEPA ROD) groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. As described in the Summary and Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2, Decisions Not to Be Made, there are six sets of cribs and trenches (ditches) that are contiguous to the SSTs and would fall under the barriers placed over the SSTs during closure. They are CERCLA past-practice units and were evaluated in this EIS as part of a connected action because they would be influenced by barrier placement. Similarly, closure of these CERCLA past-practice units is

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

7

that from the tank residues and the leaks and billions of gallons of deliberate discharges out of the tanks, over the next several thousand years, uranium 238 will be a hundred times the drinking water standard. And that's because of the waste from the tanks that they just only -- that they leave a percent behind and pour cement in. The waste will mobilize and move again. And if they just put a cap over the billions of gallons of different waste discharge sites, the waste will be mobilized and move, leave the cap, and go out through the groundwater.

383-5 cont'd

Next slide. The Energy Department is not telling the truth about how the waste trucks will come to Hanford. 17,000 trucks of waste. The Energy Department says it's basing this analysis on the same analysis it did in 2004, which its own internal document said it was, quote, "technically indefensible." That analysis clearly showed that the waste streams included numerous sites from California sending waste to Hanford.

383-6

Also, the highly radioactive Greater-Than-Class-C shipments would come up I-5 and I-84 to Hanford. Those Greater-Than-Class-C shipments should be in this Environmental Impact Statement.

383-7

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

not part of the proposed actions analyzed in this EIS. These six sets of cribs and trenches (ditches) are noted in Chapter 2 and described in detail in Appendix D.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks.

383-6 The methodology, assumptions, calculations, and results for the transportation analysis in this *TC & WM EIS* are provided in Appendix H. Transportation routes analyzed for this EIS are shown Appendix H. Transportation of radioactive waste from DOE facilities located in California was not analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*; therefore, these shipments would not occur without additional NEPA analyses. While there is some uncertainty regarding the data used for the analysis, appropriately conservative assumptions were used to calculate possible impacts, as stated in Appendix D of this *TC & WM EIS*. This *TC & WM EIS* contains analysis of the transportation impacts that would be associated with transporting radioactive waste to and from Hanford that is independent from the analysis performed for the 2004 documents. This *TC & WM EIS* also contains an updated analysis of the transportation routes from specific origination sites to specific destinations that would most likely be used, as shown Appendix H. The analyzed routes include routes that pass through the northeastern part of Oregon (Interstate 84). It is possible that, due to changes in route characteristics and highway construction, specific routes between Hanford and other sites could change in the future; however, this change is not expected to alter the comparative risk results presented for the alternatives.

383-7 Regarding the commentor's concern about the inclusion of GTCC LLW in this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE has included information from the *Draft GTCC EIS* in the *Final TC & WM EIS* cumulative impacts analysis. For a more comprehensive discussion on GTCC LLW, see Sections 2.1 and 2.12 of this CRD.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

8

Make no mistake about it. NEPA, the environmental law under which this EIS is conducted, says all federal actions and proposals have to be disclosed to you in one impact statement showing their impacts all together, the cumulative impacts. That means the impacts of the trucks that will go by a hundred yards from here. And make no mistake that they are dangerous.

383-7 cont'd

This is the last slide. The Energy Department's own estimate was that 816 fatal cancers would occur if Hanford was used for its GNEP program, receiving radioactive wastes and spent fuel. The GTCC wastes are as hot as this. This is without an accident; this is just what happens from sitting in traffic or being exposed as it goes past your home, your community center, your school.

383-8

We have to say "No." Please join me in saying: Empty the waste out of the tanks all the way. Remove the tanks, clean up the leaks from the tanks and the discharges. And that it is unconscionable, unconscionable to add more waste to Hanford. Say "No."

383-9

Thank you very much.

MR. PARHAM: Next up is Jurgen Hess, and Brett

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

383-8 Appendix H shows calculated impacts on MEIs, such as someone stuck in traffic next to a shipment or residing along a route; these risks are very small. Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

383-9 Please see response to comment 383-8 for information on the transport and disposal of offsite waste.

The clean closure alternatives considered for the SST system are represented by Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, Base and Option Cases. For both Base Cases, the assumption is that the SST system would be cleaned to levels that would allow for unrestricted use, which is represented by the removal of the tanks, ancillary equipment, and soils beneath the tanks (contaminated as a result of past leaks) down to the groundwater table. The two Option Cases represent this type of clean closure along with removal of soils beneath the tank farms (contaminated as a result of infiltration from the contiguous cribs and trenches [ditches]). The analysis shows that removal of the contaminants from the vadose zone would not capture those contaminants that may have already reached the water table due to past practices (past leaks and contiguous cribs and trenches [ditches]).

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

9

will be after that.

COMMENTS BY JURGEN HESS:

I'm Jurgen Hess from Hood River. I'm here tonight, very, very frustrated. More on that later.

Some specifics first: Please clean up all contaminated water, all of the 53 million gallons of radioactive waste. And not 99 percent, but 99.99999999 percent. Don't bury any of the tanks; they will eventually leak. Include cleaning up all of the unlined soil trenches, all of the leaked radioactive waste. Completely dismantle the Fast Flux Test Facility. *384-1*

On the off-site waste: None, nada, none; especially until all or 100 percent of the existing waste is cleaned up. There are just too many risks and dangers to our Gorge communities, with cancer risks, terrorism threats, spills. Even after the waste treatment plant is up, even then there shouldn't be any. *384-2*

Now this gets to my frustration: Does it really matter what we say? We have been saying this for countless years. Local citizens have been unanimous about no off-site waste. The State of

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

384-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all of the SST system, which would effectively remove 100 percent of the waste. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

With respect to the trenches, as described in Chapter 1, there are six sets of cribs and trenches (ditches) that are contiguous to the SSTs and would fall under the barriers placed over tanks during closure. The cribs and trenches (ditches) are evaluated in this EIS as part of a connected action because they would be influenced by barrier placement. However, closure of these CERCLA past-practice units is not part of the proposed actions for this EIS.

The commentor's preference for dismantling FFTF completely (essentially FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3) is noted. However, although nearly all elements of FFTF and the two adjacent support facilities would be removed under this alternative, the lower portion of the RCB concrete shell would remain. This would be backfilled with either soil or grout to minimize void space. The area would be regraded and revegetated, with no need for a barrier.

384-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Oregon has said that; now it appears tonight that the State of Washington has said that. Our senator, Senator Wyden, has said no off-site waste. Is anybody listening or do you even care what our comments are? I'm just so frustrated.

In closing, I want to say regarding off-site waste: Our future generations will say the same thing, no off-site waste. And we'll be telling you that for the next 5,000 years.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Next will be Brett, after Brett will be Steve Curley.

COMMENTS BY BRETT VANDENHEUVEL:

I'm Brett VandenHeuvel with Columbia Riverkeeper.

First, a little bit of a victory. I know I see a lot of people in this room who were testifying at the mercury disposal hearing about a year ago. And you probably heard that about a month ago, they decided not to make Hanford the national repository for mercury. And so that's good to keep one extremely toxic chemical off of the banks of the Columbia River.

And I share Gerry's frustration about not

384-2 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

11

listening. But I think in fact, people are listening. And I think a lot of your testimony for the mercury kept it out of here and actually shipped it to Texas, where it belongs.

A couple of quick issues. I mean, just simply our motto is to clean up first, no new waste, and protect our salmon. Very simple. There's lots of charts in the EIS. If you've had a chance to dig through it at all, 6,000 pages of fascinating charts, one of which I'm just going to briefly mention regarding the tank closure. Tanks should be cleaned up to 99.9 percent clean, or as clean as technology allows it.

I think Ken showed the slide, but we have a little flier we put together. And on the back of it, if you don't feel like digging through the 6,000 pages of EIS, is the chart showing the cancer risks with the different cleanups. So at 99.9 percent, the cancer risk, even then, is going to be about one in a thousand -- I mean, sorry, one in 10,000 people. If we drop that down to only cleaning up to 90 percent, it goes down to one in a thousand people. So a dramatic increase in cancer risk by not cleaning up to the full amount.

I mean, it shouldn't even be a discussion

385-1

385-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

385-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

12

we're having tonight when we're talking about orders of magnitude of more cancer if we don't do a full cleanup. So please, we encourage the most thorough cleanup possible on the tanks. Your own data show that there's a dramatic increase of cancer risk if you do not clean up to 99.9 percent.

385-1 cont'd

That's not to mention the spilled waste, the waste that has been dumped or spilled or leaked out of these tanks. Over a million gallons already has been spilled. And this EIS, this proposal by the Department of Energy, does not address that. It does not propose to clean that up. That's not part of the preferred alternative.

So we ask that you clean up not only the waste that is in the tanks, but also the waste that has already leaked. It doesn't make sense to do an incomplete job, to clean up only part of it. You know, Hanford just got $2 billion in stimulus money. And as a taxpayer, I strongly encourage that money be spent for cleaning up all of the waste. And we don't think that money should be spent on, a second point, bringing in new waste. Absolutely unacceptable to import more waste to Hanford.

385-2

The concept of cleanup first is widely

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

385-2 As analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*, 67 of the 149 SSTs at Hanford are known or suspected to have leaked liquid waste to the environment between the 1950s and the present, some of which has reached the groundwater. Estimates of the total leak loss range from less than 2.8 million to as much as 3.97 million liters (750,000 to 1,050,000 gallons). DOE recognizes that groundwater contamination from past leaks is a concern at Hanford and its potential impact on communities downriver from Hanford. One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze the potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the SSTs, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms via either landfill closure, selective clean closure, or clean closure. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks, including remediation of the contamination in the vadose zone.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

13

accepted by the public. You know, it was passed by an overwhelming vote in Washington, trying to prohibit this. The people do not want more waste coming to Hanford. Hanford sits -- I made a joke about Texas, like the waste should go there. That's not true. We shouldn't ship the waste anywhere.

But Hanford sits on the banks of the Columbia River, the lifeblood of the Pacific Northwest, vital to our economy, vital to the health and welfare of many of the communities that sit along its banks, to Native Americans who consume a lot of fish, to all of us in this room who use that river to recreate, who eat the fish from that river every day. It's completely inappropriate to ship more waste to Hanford.

I want to talk briefly about the State of Oregon and the State of Washington. For Oregon, you know, Ken Niles has been an amazing advocate for cleanup of Hanford, has done a tremendous job over the years and is continuing to do so. But I think it's time we need to step it up. I mean, I think Ken does an excellent analysis, raises good alternatives, but I think it's time for our leadership in Oregon to step it up.

385-2 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

14

Ken makes a good point: There's not a lot of regulatory authority in Oregon, so we need to step up the political pressure. It's time that we demand Governor Kulongoski to make trips to -- to Washington, D.C., to stand up for the people, to meet with Secretary Chu, and say that this proposal today is unacceptable.

The State of Washington does have regulatory authority, which is even more exciting. Under the State Environmental Policy Act in Washington, Washington holds some stronger cards here. Not saying it's, you know, holding a trump card. But we certainly encourage Washington to utilize their authority under SEPA; and for all the Washington citizens in the room, to encourage your governor and agency to do so.

So Washington should consider the preferred alternative of cleaning up the 99.9 percent of the tank waste and consider to clean up the one million gallons of spilled waste. Do the analysis that DOE failed to conduct. Because DOE did not conduct this analysis, the State of Washington must do so. And you have the legal authority to do so.

And lastly, the -- Washington should also conduct the analysis of, surprise, what the people

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

385-3

385-3 Ecology has been a cooperating agency since 2003, and one of Ecology's primary responsibilities as identified in the MOU is to help ensure that the contents and analyses in this *TC & WM EIS* are sufficient to satisfy SEPA requirements.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

15

want of not importing more waste. All the Department of Energy did was said, "Where should we put this waste?" It wasn't an analysis of whether we should bring in the waste or not, but where to put it. Washington, in their SEPA analysis, should conduct the alternative of not importing off-site waste to Hanford.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Steve Curley. And after Steve will be Robin Klein.

COMMENTS BY STEVE CURLEY:

I'm Steve Curley. I live here in the Gorge. I would like to thank you for having this meeting here in Hood River.

And it just blows my mind that we've been around for I don't know how many years -- some say millions of years and some say 6,000 years -- and since the mid '40s, we've been dumping this toxic goo in Hanford up there, that has a half-life of 200,000 years. And we're just screwing it up for future generations, for hundreds and hundreds and thousands of years, for this short-term whatever it is that we're doing here. It's just ridiculous.

Why don't we keep the waste where it comes

385-3 cont'd

386-1

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

386-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comment noted regarding dismantling FFTF and 99.9 percent retrieval of tank waste.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

16

1 from? So if it comes from Seabrook, New Hampshire,
2 if it comes from Limerick, Pennsylvania, why don't
3 you keep it back there? Or keep it back in
4 Tennessee. Why are you shipping it across the
5 country here, to my backyard? I don't appreciate
6 it.
7 And I'll tell you what. I've been coming to
8 these meetings for 20 years. National Geographic
9 Magazine had an article right around 1990, and I
10 remember they said it was going to take 20 years to
11 clean up Hanford at the cost of X billion dollars.
12 I forget, it might have been 12 billion, it might
13 have been 50 billion. I don't know. But here it
14 is, 20 years later. I'm 51 years old now. I was
15 30 when I started coming to these things. This is
16 ridiculous.
17 I believe that the voters of Washington state
18 also passed a law requiring the Department of
19 Energy to clean up the largest Superfund site in
20 the western hemisphere; that would be Hanford. I
21 believe they passed a law, and I believe that
22 should be upheld.
23 This clean coal and clean nuclear baloney I
24 heard from President Obama in the State of the
25 Union Address is just nonsense. We all know

386-1 cont'd

386-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

that -- If there's a way to safely dispose of nuclear waste, you can sign me up; I'll buy that stuff. But you know what, there is no safe way.

I used to protest back at Limerick, Pennsylvania, back in the late '70s, when the thing in Harrisburg went off, when Three Mile Island went off. I'm an hour from there. I know all about this stuff.

Who is the contractor there now? I'm asking you.

MR. PARHAM: Dussens (phonetic spelling) is the contractor.

MR. CURLEY: Dussens. It was GE; it was Bechtel. I mean, it seems they just shuffle the paper around for five years and shuffle the paper around, and stick billions of dollars in their back pocket and just move on. And it's 20 years later. Wow, Mr. Curley is 51 now. Where did the time go? While these guys are getting totally rich.

It's time to clean the mess you've made and stop making any more and stop bringing any more here. Hanford should not be used as a radioactive waste dump. I urge you to dismantle the FFTF reactor. This waste is and always has been heading towards the Columbia, leaching towards the

386-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

18

Columbia. It's totally ridiculous that you'd even think of bringing more waste to Hanford.

The Department of Energy graphs showing the plumes of radioactive waste heading towards the river. I mean, is that correct?

MR. PARHAM: M-hm.

MR. CURLEY: Is that what I saw up there earlier? Yeah, it is. There's no logical reason to accept off-site waste to Hanford. I say clean up all 3 million gallons of buried nuclear waste to a 99.9 retrieval, and drop the proposal to ship radioactive waste to Hanford, across the nation to Hanford.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Robin Klein. And after Robin will be Mike Clement.

COMMENTS BY ROBIN KLEIN:

My name is Robin Klein. And this EIS, like perhaps so many in the past, seems like -- this one particularly seems like an analysis designed to prepare -- for the DOE to do what it was intending to do in the first place. It seems a sneaky way to do it.

It's not considering the opinions of the

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

386-1 cont'd

387-1

387-1 DOE appreciates the public's participation in the hearings. All comments and opinions provided during the public comment period were considered equally by DOE and are included in this CRD, a volume of this final EIS. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

19

public, which are well understood. We're asked whether we should clean up the tanks 99 percent or 99.9 percent. You already know the public wants it completely cleaned up. The FFTF decommission or entomb decommission, these are easy answers.

But we're not asked whether or not you should bring in off-site waste. That seems a manipulative device in this EIS. It's just included in the analysis in case you want to do it later on. But you have a resounding answer on that. You have the initiative. You have a great answer on this subject.

I'm frustrated with being spoon-fed alternatives. And we're just part of the framework that enables the DOE to do what it wants, not what the public wants. What if we went with the no action alternative? Would that be the only way we could stop off-site waste from coming to the site? We're not making much progress in the cleanup, anyway. We certainly don't need to add to it; that's going in the wrong direction.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Mike Clement. After Mike, Karen Harding.

387-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

20

COMMENTS BY MIKE CLEMENT:

Thank you for coming. My name is Mike Clement. I live in Hood River. And I would like to voice my opinion for myself, my family, my children, my grandchildren, and for all future generations.

This is quite a lot of liability you people have taken on. I realize the problem is not your fault. It's unfortunate that this is here, but it is here. And the people who first started working with these materials are mostly dead, at a very early age, because they had no clue about what they were dealing with and how dangerous these things were, and how intransient they are as far as getting rid of.

There is no way technically now to get rid of the material, unless you're going to put it in a spaceship and send it off someplace. You can talk about cleaning it up. It's all a shell game, move it from Point A to Point B. You change what it looks like. It's still toxic; it's still radioactive waste.

So the first thing to do is quit making any more. If you've already soiled yourself, why would you stand there and do that again and again? I

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

388-1 **388-1** Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

21

1 mean, the United States -- in my opinion, the
2 world -- needs to quit using radioactivity for
3 anything until the number one problem is solved,
4 which is: How do we really get rid of waste? And
5 there is no answer to that right now.
6 So as far as the tanks are concerned, of
7 course they need to be cleaned up to the point that
8 modern technology will allow. And that's got to be
9 to 99.99 percent. If you think it can be done that
10 much, do it. And don't be covering them up in a
11 landfill. That's just an "out of sight, out of
12 mind" solution.
13 Secondly, the Fast Flux. You know, at times
14 it seems like we're getting on the right track of
15 closing these things down, and then they come back
16 to haunt us again. Of course, it should be
17 dismantled and removed and cleaned up to 99.9
18 percent or whatever the capabilities are today.
19 The idea of bringing waste here from other
20 parts of the country. I mean, it seems to me,
21 being the dirtiest place in the nation, that we've
22 done our share, so to speak. And that's an
23 absolutely absurd idea. Get rid of that idea by
24 quit making nuclear waste.
25 The vitrification, well, I sort of addressed

388-1 cont'd

388-2

388-1 cont'd

388-3

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

388-2 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all of the SST system, which would effectively remove 100 percent of the waste. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

The commentor's preference for dismantling FFTF entirely (essentially FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3) is noted. However, although nearly all elements of FFTF and the two adjacent support facilities would be removed under this alternative, the lower portion of the RCB concrete shell would remain. This would be backfilled with either soil or grout to minimize void space. The area would be regraded and revegetated, with no need for a barrier.

388-3 Vitrification of radioactive waste into glass is an attractive option because it atomistically bonds the species in a solid glassy matrix. Because radioactive constituents are bonded within the glass structure, the waste forms produced are very durable and environmentally stable over long time periods, yet they remain toxic. EPA has declared vitrification the best-demonstrated available technology for HLW.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

388-3 cont'd

that about it's not gone; it's just in a different form.

And, Mr. Lyon, I would just like to say to you that I have advocated in the past that Washington state, being in the seat of power, sue -- sue these people at every transgression. And I have sat at meetings where they have reported to you that "We will stop the process." That's great.

You go to court at that point, and you get a -- an injunction on that work stoppage, and you get them back to work. And you use the powers that you have, as a state, through the court system, through the vote of the people, et cetera, to make these people conform to what they know in their heart of hearts is the right thing to do.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Karen Harding. And after Karen will be Hugh McMahan.

COMMENTS BY KAREN HARDING:

My name is Karen Harding. I live in Mt. Hood. I work with children. And I guess what I wanted to express first off this evening is that I often feel like a child when I'm coming up here, my emotional response to all this poison in the air and the

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

23

water.

And there are times when I am directing a toddler and I will say, "Well, it's time to pick up. You know, are you going to pick up the truck or the doll?" And they -- they have to trust me that, you know, they're going to get lunch, and they are going to pick up the truck and the doll. Because I am moving that way. I don't offer them to sit down and watch their friends do all the work.

And there's sort of an analysis here of, you know, I feel like there was some decision made -- whether it was in 2000 or whenever -- that we're going to truck in all the waste from the rest of the country. And who made that decision? Was it a president? Was it somebody, you know, under the Bush administration decided, well, we're going to do this as cheaply as possible?

Who is that shrouded, mysterious person or persons that decides, "Okay, that decision is made. You're just going to have to trust us and we're going to ship it all around the country."

Unacceptable. Unacceptable that there would be an EIS that totally disregards what they've been hearing over and over and over: Don't ship in more

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

389-1

389-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comment noted regarding 99.9 percent retrieval of tank waste, clean closure, and FFTF removal.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

24

waste; clean up the waste 99.9 percent; take out the tanks; don't bury the FFTF plant; don't bury the trenches.

We want drinking water for the thousands and thousands of people who are going to be living in this area in those next hundreds of years. And because we aren't going to be around, well, we'll just, you know, do it on the cheap. Unacceptable. We are talking about humanity here, not government bureaucracy and decision making.

So I, like the folks this evening, that have said push the governors, push the states. I would highly recommend that we look very carefully at the analysis that Oregon is suggesting, their preferred proposal.

I think that is it. Thanks.

MR. PARHAM: Okay. Hugh McMahan, and after that will be Daniel Lichtenwald.

COMMENTS BY HUGH McMAHAN:

My name is Hugh McMahan. And I'm a physician, a retired diagnostic radiologist. So I've had some exposure to radioactivity and health, no pun intended.

I support wholeheartedly the recommendations

389-1 cont'd

390-1

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

390-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. The clean closure alternatives considered for the SST system are represented by the Base and Option Cases of Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B. For both Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, Base Cases, the assumption is that the SST system would be cleaned to levels that would allow for unrestricted use, which is represented by removal of the tanks, ancillary equipment, and soils beneath the tanks (contaminated as a result of past leaks) down to the groundwater table. The two Option Cases represent this type of clean closure along with removal of soils beneath the tank farms (contaminated as a result of infiltration from the contiguous cribs and trenches [ditches]). Removal of FFTF is analyzed under FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3 in this *TC & WM EIS*.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

25

you've heard here tonight. Clean it up 99.9999 percent. As far as the cleanup of the single-wall tanks, clean closure, and remove the tanks and investigate and remediate the soil contamination from the tank leaks. Decommission the Fast Flux Test Facility, the way Trojan was taken care of. And absolutely no more waste.

And I would also make a comment here regarding the contamination, radioactivity into the Columbia River. And I don't know if Ken is aware of this, but the Umatilla Basin, which is in North Central and Eastern Oregon, has a huge agricultural area. And their groundwater, they've been pumping that for years. And the table is dropping.

And there is a program that they're working on called the Umatilla Aquifer Storage and Recovery Program -- or Project, which calls for pumping water in the winter out of the Columbia River, into the aquifer. Can you imagine what that's going to do when those radioactivity levels go up? And if the radioactivity level goes up beyond the Oregon DOE qualifications or standards, then they cannot do that. And that's going to plunge that whole area into an economic chaos.

And just some other comments: The people in

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

390-1 cont'd

390-2

390-2 Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

DOE recognizes that groundwater contamination from past leaks is a concern at Hanford and its potential impact on communities downriver from Hanford. In general, the findings of this *TC & WM EIS* suggest that groundwater contamination at the Columbia River nearshore could be of concern and could require mitigation measures at the site. However, in DOE's view, neither the EIS groundwater model results nor the past and current field monitoring data are consistent with the outcome suggested by the commentor—widespread contamination of the Columbia River in excess of Oregon State standards (or any other applicable surface- or drinking-water-quality standards).

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

26

this room, as you've heard, have been coming here for 20 years and more. I've only been coming for four or five. But the whole thing is like spinning our wheels. We just can't have this drawing out forever. I mean, we Americans put a man on the moon in about ten years. There's no reason we can't clean up Hanford in that period of time.

The bureaucratic process should not be strung out forever. Some things need to be deliberated, but the Hanford cleanup is not one of them. As you've heard here tonight, everybody knows what needs to be done. So just do it. Do what is right. Clean it up and all of it.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Daniel. And after Daniel, Lisa Van Dyk will follow.

COMMENTS BY DANIEL LICHTENWALD:

My name is Daniel Lichtenwald. I live in Goldendale, Washington. Let's see.

This sort of has a -- you know, has a history of these kind of near-term decisions that really are kind of based on bureaucratic and institutional expedience. People get their tickets punched and come onto the job; they get promoted; they go away.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

390-3 **390-3** In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. However, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

27

Presidents get elected; they get replaced. On and on and on and on.

And so this all looks like, you know, there are these sort of decisions that are made that are sort of for the moment, based on pretty much what people would like to have done. And I'm with someone else who was up here saying, you know, these are crafted decisions that are run through a process, and we're part of the process to say that someone can sign off and say that there was a public hearing, and it moves on.

What needs to be done really is to look at the real goals, not just goals for the next 20 years, somebody's career while someone is in office, but the real goal, which should be that that area can be occupied safely by humans and animals forever. That's the goal. And that should be kept in mind. And all the other stuff, you know, is you do the best you can.

And in that regard, I think that the Department of Energy has a conflict of interest. And this has been brought up before. I claim that it's impossible for the Department of Energy to deal with Hanford. And I'm just talking about Hanford. See, this is what happens, is the whole

391-1

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

391-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

A Summary was prepared by DOE to provide a brief overview of the technical information contained in the *Draft TC & WM EIS*. To assist the public in navigating through the technical information in this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE also issued a Reader's Guide. This guide serves as an introduction to the contents of this EIS, highlights the key features of the reasonable alternatives, and helps readers review the technical analyses presented. Recognizing that many people may not read beyond the EIS Summary, the information presented in both the Summary and the Reader's Guide attempts to strike a balance between providing information to those readers interested in the more technical details regarding DOE's proposed actions and alternatives and those seeking a simpler overview.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

28

rest of the Department of Energy, their whole bailiwick gets involved in this, gets sucked into it.

This has got to do with Washington state, the Columbia River, the Northwest. And the Department of Energy has a conflict of interest. I question even the -- the data that's been presented in these tomes that get bigger and bigger, more and more detailed. We come here tonight. We're supposed to look at these slides? You can't even read them. No, this is -- this is smoke and mirrors. This is just a way of throwing a lot of stuff at people, you know, impressing them with tables and charts. They're impressed.

The cleanup should be viewed as 100 percent. That's what you start with; that's your goal. It may not get done in anybody's lifetime that's in this room. Certainly not. But that has to be the goal. And you have to be able and willing to set up programs that go beyond your lifetime, beyond your government career. They have to go way beyond that.

And I'm a little disappointed that the State of Washington has sort of -- Well, anyway, they're doing the best they can, I guess. But this is just

391-1 cont'd

391-2

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

391-2 Ecology has been a cooperating agency since 2003, and one of Ecology's primary responsibilities as identified in the MOU is to help ensure that the contents and analyses in this *TC & WM EIS* are sufficient to satisfy SEPA requirements.

In addition, Chapter 7, Sections 7.1 and 7.5, discuss potential mitigation measures that may be needed and are feasible for DOE to implement to offset the potential impacts that might result from implementing an alternative. While DOE's Preferred Alternatives for tank closure, FFTF decommissioning, and waste management in this *TC & WM EIS* may not necessarily represent the most environmentally preferred alternatives, the ROD issued by DOE will identify any additional mitigation and monitoring commitments adopted by DOE and specify other factors considered by DOE in reaching its decision, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. In announcing its decision in the ROD based on the EIS analyses, DOE will be obligated to carry out the decision consistent with the requirements identified in this EIS. These requirements will be interpreted and applied by Federal, state, and local regulatory agencies through their independent authorities. These agencies may also impose additional mitigation measures through future permitting processes or remedial actions under the scope of the TPA, which include additional opportunities for public comment.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

not doing the job. These are unique situations. They call it a landfill. I mean, we've got a landfill in Klickitat County. And it's received certain kinds of waste, certain things that can't go into it, certain things that can; and it's designed for that purpose.

So now you say that you're going to cover these tanks that have been partially emptied, not completely, and they're going to be a landfill. It's a landfill solution. No, when you're talking about stuff that has -- I mean, this isn't household waste.

This is stuff that has -- You know, tens of thousands of years, it's almost beyond comprehension the things that it's going to have impact, you know, little by little by little. So you're not going to be here. That's a problem for someone else. Just kick the can off the road, say, "Well, we're going to do what we can in this budget cycle."

Also, somebody back here mentioned that when they first went in there, they didn't know what they were doing. Well, I think they did know what they were doing. I think they did know what they were doing. All they were saying was, "We'll let

391-2 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

30

the future take care of that." And that's exactly what you're doing now. You're setting up another set of circumstances where you're going to let the future take care of it.

No, you have to look beyond that, and you have to look to a total solution. And you may never achieve it, but you pass the best you can on to what comes later. But that -- that area has to be -- it won't be occupied by humans and animals safely. The drinking water, people have to be able to drink the water. That all has to come.

Anyway, that's -- this FFTF, we're trying to drive a stake through its heart, and it keeps coming back to life all the time. No, that should be dismantled, neutralized, ground up in little tiny pieces, whatever it takes. And the ground under it and around it, people can live on it. That's what needs to be done.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Lisa Van Dyk, followed by Keith Harding.

COMMENTS BY LISA VAN DYK:

I'm Lisa Van Dyk, with Heart of America Northwest. I wanted to take the first part of my

391-2 cont'd

391-3

391-3 DOE issued a ROD (66 FR 7877; January 26, 2001) for the *NI PEIS* (DOE 2000a) wherein DOE announced its decision that FFTF would be permanently deactivated. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this *TC & WM EIS*, Section 1.4.2, Decisions Not to Be Made, DOE is not considering restarting FFTF. The scope of this *TC & WM EIS* is to address the final decommissioning of FFTF.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

31

time to not ask my question, but turn it into a comment now since I didn't get the chance to get that in.

But this is a follow-up to Brett's question about off-site waste. And I just wanted to clarify that this fall, I read the consent decree. And I'm not a lawyer. But there was no language in the actual consent decree barring off-site waste. It was in the cover letter, pre-letter. I don't know what it's called. But it was not in the actual consent decree.

From what I understand, that does not mean that DOE is legally obliged to not bring waste to Hanford; it is more a promise of the order. So that's what I wanted to clarify.

Anyway, I will keep my comments short, because I agree with what everyone has said before me tonight. And it's clear that we're all concerned about the future of the Pacific Northwest. We all want a clean and healthy environment for future generations. And it is also clear that the preferred alternatives in the document that we're talking about simply don't cut it.

There absolutely must be an alternative under which no new waste is shipped to Hanford. The

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

392-1

392-2

392-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

392-2 The impacts of the offsite waste in terms of radiological risk are presented in the *TC & WM EIS* Summary, Section S.5.5, and Chapter 2, Section 2.10, Key Environmental Findings. These sections discuss the radiological risk differences between including and not including offsite waste disposal in IDF-East. As seen in the figure, the radiological risks increase by an approximate factor of seven. In addition, this *Final TC & WM EIS* includes an example of a mitigation measure that could be taken by DOE. This action would eliminate a specific offsite waste stream from the groundwater analysis to illustrate the difference in groundwater impacts. Regarding the 99.999 percent cleanup of the tank waste, the impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in this *TC & WM EIS*. For both Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, Base Cases, the assumption is that the SST system would be cleaned to levels that would allow for unrestricted use, which is represented by the removal of the tanks, ancillary equipment, and soils beneath the tanks (contaminated as a result of past leaks) down to the groundwater table. The two Option Cases represent this type of clean closure along with removal of soils beneath the tank farms (contaminated as a result of infiltration from the contiguous cribs and trenches [ditches]). The analysis shows that the removal of the contaminants from the vadose zone does not capture the contaminants that may have already reached the groundwater table due to past practices (i.e., past leaks and contiguous cribs and trenches [ditches]).

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Chapter 2, Section 2.6.4, of this *Final TC & WM EIS* has been revised to include a discussion of the Oregon Department of Energy's proposal and how DOE has addressed the range of reasonable alternatives for tank waste storage,

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

1 public has told you this repeatedly. And with this
2 document, as Ken Niles pointed out, we now have
3 your own modeling that shows us how horrible it
4 will be when we do bring it. So please, do not
5 bring any off-site waste to Hanford.
6 And just a little bit on the impacts of not
7 cleaning up the tank leaks are also horrifying, and
8 are entirely unprotective of the groundwater in the
9 Columbia River. So as everyone has said before me,
10 99.999 percent must be cleaned up of the tank
11 waste. And do not forget the tanks leaks and the
12 burial grounds, cribs and trenches. I would also
13 encourage you to do an analysis of the Oregon
14 preferred alternative.
15 Thank you.
16 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Keith Harding, and
17 then following Keith will be Lauren Goldberg.
18
19 COMMENTS BY KEITH HARDING:
20 Hi, I'm Keith Harding. I live in the Upper
21 Hood River Valley, about ten miles from the edge of
22 the Columbia River.
23 Hanford is one curse from our fathers laid
24 upon us, and now we are following suit and laying
25 even more curses on generations to come. Things

392-2 cont'd

retrieval, and treatment and remediation of the existing tank farms in its original alternatives. DOE has carefully considered the Oregon proposal and, as explained in Section 2.6.4, has determined that it is not reasonable.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

33

like the depleted uranium used in modern warfare, PCBs, dioxins, it's circulating all through the global ecosystems. Tens of thousands of chemicals, pesticides, herbicides. We're making this planet more and more perilous all the time for all life.

How wide is humanity's threshold of tolerance for all this garbage? We need to get serious about this. There's several things that come to mind. We need to, as other people have said, completely dismantle the FFTF. We've talked about that for years now. All the way down. *393-1*

Drop all consideration of moving hazardous waste, toxic waste from anywhere else in the country. Now, there's some things that shouldn't be in anyone's backyard. But there is an upside to having it in your own backyard. You might focus on it more and clean it up. *393-2*

Everything I've been hearing here for years tells me that someone far away is looking at making the Pacific Northwest a sacrifice area, literally. That's us. What is the significance of the Pacific Northwest in weather patterns, climate for the entire United States? Not to mention, the Pacific Northwest has a history of being a very rich and bountiful place. That's fast disappearing because

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

393-1 The commentor's preference for totally dismantling FFTF (essentially FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3) is noted. However, although nearly all elements of FFTF and the two adjacent support facilities would be removed under this alternative, the lower portion of the RCB concrete shell would remain. This would be backfilled with either soil or grout to minimize void space. The area would be regraded and revegetated, with no need for a barrier. DOE's preference is for FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2, under which some below-grade structures would remain; however, these would be grouted in place to immobilize the hazardous constituents. The filled area would then be covered with a modified RCRA Subtitle C barrier to further isolate the entombed structures and prevent infiltration of water. These actions (grouting and barrier placement) would prevent the migration of any contaminants to the environment.

393-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

34

of what we're doing here: dams, pollution, et cetera.

There's a lot to be said for decentralization versus centralization. When something is centralized, it's easy to put it out of mind. When it's decentralized, like where it is, people are more apt to work on it, clean it up. In a smaller amount, it may be easier to handle than in a humongous amount in one faraway place.

And like other people said, the real goal needs to be not 99.9999, but 100 percent. That needs to be the goal, to do it down to the very end, to clean those tanks up and then to process those tanks as best we can. You know, in this "United States of Amnesia," things can quickly go out of sight. And it needs to be held in sight for a long time to come.

According to Heart of America's presentation that Gerry gave us upstairs and his presentation here, even the Department of Energy's own scientific findings have some pretty horrendous casualties that even the DOE has found. That should tell you something. What is it really saying, that we'll just go along with these casualty levels? That's real human beings for a

393-3

393-4

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

393-3 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in this *TC & WM EIS*. For both Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, Base Cases, the assumption is that the SST system would be cleaned to levels that would allow for unrestricted use, which is represented by the removal of the tanks, ancillary equipment, and soils beneath the tanks (contaminated as a result of past leaks) down to the groundwater table. The two Option Cases represent this type of clean closure along with removal of soils beneath the tank farms (contaminated as a result of infiltration from the contiguous cribs and trenches [ditches]). The analysis shows that removal of the contaminants from the vadose zone would not capture those contaminants that may have already reached the groundwater table due to past practices (i.e., past leaks and contiguous cribs and trenches [ditches]).

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

393-4 The alternatives presented in the draft EIS constitute a set of approaches with varying degrees of effectiveness. The purpose of the analyses is to facilitate traceable and reasonable comparisons of the impacts of the alternatives within the context of a NEPA ROD. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses the potential laws and requirements that would apply to the proposed actions, depending on the alternative. Issues concerning the ability to meet legal standards or requirements are also discussed, along with the potential mitigation measures that may be needed and that are feasible for DOE to implement. Additional mitigation measures could be required in future permits issued by the State of Washington, or could be addressed under the scope of the TPA as part of future remedial actions that are subject to CERCLA. In the ROD for this EIS, DOE will identify and discuss the factors considered in reaching its decisions, such as economic, technical, and national policy considerations, along with mitigation and monitoring measures that DOE will implement.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

35

393-4 cont'd

long, long time.

Another thing that comes to mind is vitrification seems to be the state-of-the-art method for processing some of the waste at Hanford. And if a second vitrification plant is needed, that should get into the pipeline for action also.

393-5

And the spilled waste at Hanford should be added into this EIS, also. And I understand that it is not there at the present time. But waste that has been spilled on site and is migrating, that should be added in also.

393-3 cont'd

Thanks a lot.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Lauren Goldberg. And after Lauren will be Aera Atkins.

COMMENTS BY LAUREN GOLDBERG:

Hi, everyone. My name is Lauren. I'm a staff attorney with Columbia Riverkeeper.

I just want to thank everyone so much for coming out tonight. I've seen your testimony at other hearings. And it's very critical that we have this mass of people coming out tonight, in Portland, and also submitting comments.

And I just want to make two just general comments to all of you based on what you're hearing

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

393-5 As discussed in the Summary, Section S.1.3.1, of this *TC & WM EIS* and Chapter 1, Section 1.4.1, this EIS analyzes additional waste treatment capability, including expanding the vitrification process capability currently being constructed in the WTP (i.e., constructing a second vitrification plant or supplementing the WTP's capability with supplemental treatment technologies). Thus, decisions to be made by DOE regarding whether to treat all waste in the WTP, as is or expanded, or to supplement its capacity by adding new treatment capability depend on demonstrating the feasibility of supplemental treatment technologies.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

36

tonight in terms of the years of frustration and already being listened to. The first is that your comments are critical. Ultimately, this will all become part of a huge administrative record; ultimately, a record that a court could even review.

And your comments tonight and written comments will create what is really critical to demonstrate that the Department of Energy, our federal government, has not done their job under the National Environmental Policy Act in looking at a reasonable range of alternatives and looking at cumulative impacts of this project.

So please, continue to stay engaged in this process, as frustrating as it might seem at moments. We have had our victories, you know, just within the last two months. And we need to continue bringing that through the process.

And the second point is, outside of the Environmental Impact Statement, please do what you can to talk to your neighbors about this hearing tonight, to send a letter to the editor. As Gerry pointed out during the talk earlier, we need to make sure this moves out of the sight of just a small, public hearing to the general public.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

394-1

394-1 The alternatives presented in this *TC & WM EIS* were developed under NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to address the essential components of DOE's three sets of proposed actions (tank closure, FFTF decommissioning, and waste management) and to provide an understanding of the differences between the potential environmental impacts of the range of reasonable alternatives. Consistent with CEQ guidance, this EIS analyzes the range of reasonable alternatives that covers the full spectrum of potential combinations. The alternatives considered by DOE in this EIS are "reasonable" in the sense that they are practical or feasible from a technical and economic standpoint and meet the agency's purposes and needs. Potential conflicts with laws and regulations do not necessarily cause an alternative to be unreasonable, but additional mitigation commitments may be required if it is selected for implementation. For a more comprehensive discussion on compliance with regulatory requirements, see Section 2.7 of this CRD.

The alternatives for the regional disposal of LLW and MLLW were analyzed in a previous EIS. DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

37

The words that, you know, Ken Niles shared tonight, this is critical. This is our Oregon Department of Energy saying that this isn't enough; this isn't going to bring us to the point of cleanup that will protect our state. So please share that with people outside of the public process.

And then my last two points go more specifically to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. And that is that there's one really critical federal statute that you hear about a lot on the Columbia River, which is the Endangered Species Act. And it's noticeably missing in this Draft Environmental Impact Statement. That is, we see very little mention of how the Department of Energy's decision will impact endangered and threatened salmon and steelhead and other species on the Columbia River.

And that's a really critical flaw. Because by not discussing those impacts, the Department is electing not to consult with the expert science agencies on how its decisions will impact those species. So that's a really important comment to make to the DOE in your comments as well this evening.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

394-2

394-2 Communications have occurred with DOE and with USFWS, NMFS, and the state concerning listed species that are potentially present on Hanford (see Appendix C). Potential impacts on special status species at Hanford are addressed in Chapter 4, Section 4.1 and there is no impact (that is, "no effect") on any federally or state-listed threatened or endangered species. If circumstances change DOE will evaluate the need and undertake additional informal consultation with the appropriate agencies to ensure protection of listed species.

Potential long-term impacts on salmonids of actions taken under the various alternatives presented in this *TC & WM EIS* are addressed in Appendix P. The analysis indicates that chromium is the only COPC that could have a potential toxic effect on salmonids (i.e., the Hazard Quotient was above 1 under all Tank Closure alternatives, including No Action, and some Waste Management alternatives). However, it should be noted that there is virtually no difference between the Tank Closure action alternatives and the No Action Alternative, indicating that a source(s) other than the tank farms is contributing significantly to the results. Further, when Hazard Quotients for chromium under Alternative Combinations 2 and 3 are compared to values that include Alternative Combinations 2 and 3 plus nontank sources (i.e., cumulative impacts), it can be seen that the Hazard Quotient of the latter is approximately 10 times that of the former (see Chapter 6, Section 6.4.3), again indicating that a source(s) other than the tank farms is contributing the majority of chromium at the Columbia River. Analysis has shown that the majority of chromium comes from the 100-K Mile-Long Trench, 216-C-1 Hot Semi Work Crib, 216-S-8 Trench, and certain ponds in the 200-West Area and 300 Area.

Considering that actions proposed in this *TC & WM EIS* are not the major contributors to a Hazard Quotient that is greater than 1 for chromium at the Columbia River, they cannot lead to a finding of "may affect" relative to threatened or endangered species, or critical habitat, associated with the river. Thus, further consultation with NMFS is not indicated.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

38

And the last point is the National Environmental Policy Act. Over the last several decades, courts have repeatedly said that the heart of this whole exercise in preparing an Environmental Impact Statement is the agency's analysis of the alternatives.

And, you know, what's clear this evening, in comments from the State of Oregon and from many members of the public, is that there's a major, reasonable alternative that's missing here, which is not importing waste to Hanford. And so let's all join in reminding the agency that at the heart of this analysis, the public deserves and the agency is required by law to provide reasonable alternatives.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Aera Atkins, and after Aera will be Bonnie New.

COMMENTS BY AERA ATKINS:

My name is Aera. Good evening, everybody. And thank you for your presentations.

A bit of a caveat with that though, because just feedback for our technical expert here: Not very understandable to me. And I feel like it's

394-1 cont'd

395-1

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

395-1 DOE published a Summary along with the draft EIS to provide a brief overview of the material contained within. DOE also issued a Reader's Guide to assist the public in navigating through the complex information presented in the *Draft TC & WM EIS*. This guide serves as an introduction and guide to the contents of this EIS, highlights the key features of the reasonable alternatives, and helps readers review the technical analyses presented. Recognizing that many people may not read beyond the EIS Summary, the information presented in both the Summary and the Reader's Guide attempts to strike a balance between those readers interested in the more technical details regarding DOE's proposed actions and alternatives and readers seeking a simpler overview. DOE also held a 1-hour open house prior to each public hearing on the draft EIS to allow the public to meet informally with members of the *TC & WM EIS* team, ask questions, and learn more about the EIS. Informative factsheets also were provided at these open houses.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

39

all a little -- that there's a big disconnect going on, and that the technical information that we've been given is very hard to receive. But I hear that in court, the technical information has been called indefensible. So it leaves me feeling like -- very uncertain that anything I'm hearing is the bottom line of truth.

395-1 cont'd

Having said that, I would just like to record my request, my desire that everything at Hanford that can be cleaned up is cleaned up, including the trenches, the contaminated water, the tanks taken out, the Fast Flux Test Facility completely dismantled, all the spilled waste taken care of. I don't know if I'm supposed to say 99.9999 percent or 100 percent, but I'm sure you get my drift.

395-2

And please, the State of Washington, please conduct the analysis that's being proposed by the Oregon DOE. No outside waste, please. No more outside waste coming into Oregon and to Hanford. Clean closure, I think that's another thing I'm supposed to say, that will speak your language, hopefully. Yes.

395-3

Please, let's -- I mean, it seems to me that Hanford as a place for nuclear waste is completely inappropriate. Shouldn't we be looking for

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

395-2 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. This closure includes the tank system, along with the vadose zone as impacted by the tank farms (i.e., past leaks). Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

However, as discussed in the Summary, Section S.1.3.2, and Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2, of this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE will not make decisions on groundwater remediation, including the remediation of groundwater contamination resulting from non-tank-farm areas in the 200 Areas, because that is being addressed under the CERCLA (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) process. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford under the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates. Appendix S includes DOE's inventory estimates for the burial grounds and Appendix U provides supporting information on the long-term cumulative impact analyses that includes the burial ground inventories.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

395-3 Chapter 2 of this *TC & WM EIS* discusses the range of reasonable alternatives for tank waste storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal, as well as remediation of the existing tank farms. Chapter 2 has been revised to include a discussion of the Oregon Department of Energy's proposal in Section 2.6.4.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

40

somewhere that's away from a major river, where it's somewhere that's very sparsely populated or, preferably, not populated at all? I mean, these seem like common-sense alternatives to be pursuing. And I would like to urge everybody to move in that direction.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Bonnie New, and after Bonnie will be Aaron Morehouse.

COMMENTS BY BONNIE NEW:

Thank you. Good evening. My name is Bonnie New. I'm a physician from Hood River and a public health specialist.

This is a health issue. There are lots of other ramifications: political, economic, technical, and so on. But it's generally a health issue, health of the biological community. My little niche in the biological community happens to be human health, so I'll sort of stick with that one.

From the public health point of view, it would be best to have a very complete cleanup of equipment, like the single-shelled tanks, whether leaking or not. Those that aren't leaking, thank

395-3 cont'd

396-1

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

396-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. This closure includes the tank system, along with the vadose zone as impacted by the tank farms (i.e., past leaks). Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

However, as discussed in the Summary, Section S.1.3.2, and Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2, of this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE will not make decisions on groundwater remediation, including the remediation of groundwater contamination resulting from non-tank-farm areas in the 200 Areas, because that is being addressed under the CERCLA (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) process. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford under the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

41

1 God for that. But they have the potential to leak
2 in the same ways that the ones before them have
3 leaked. The tanks should -- need to be completely
4 emptied, same reasoning. The tanks need to be
5 removed.
6 In regards to treatment of the nuclear waste,
7 both the low-activity waste and the high-level
8 nuclear waste: The most solid and health-
9 protective approach is vitrification of both of
10 those waste streams. The so-called alternative
11 methods have not shown the effectiveness or
12 efficiency that vitrification has. And the
13 proposals for vitrifying just portions of it really
14 are incomplete.
15 I can't imagine how you would decide what
16 to -- I mean, I understand there are some technical
17 criteria for deciding what to vitrify or not. But
18 from a public health point of view, health is not
19 going to be protected unless it's all rendered in a
20 non-mobile state, which is the point with
21 vitrification. This applies to nuclear waste
22 that's in tanks, in the unlined trenches, in
23 contaminated soils and water; in fact, in any
24 mobile or potentially mobile form.
25 The Department of Ecology has made a very

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

396-1 cont'd

396-2 Vitrification of radioactive waste into glass is an attractive option because it atomistically bonds the species in a solid glassy matrix. Because the radioactive constituents are bonded within the glass structure, the waste forms produced are very durable and environmentally stable over long time periods, yet they remain toxic. EPA has declared vitrification the best-demonstrated available technology for HLW. As described in the *TC & WM EIS* Summary, Section S.1.3, and Chapter 1, Section 1.3, this EIS evaluates vitrification of the tank waste for a number of the Tank Closure alternatives. However, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include remediation of nontank waste (e.g., burial grounds, cribs and trenches [ditches]) or groundwater as part of the proposed actions evaluated. Thus, while vitrification of this waste could be chosen by DOE, this decision was not made in this EIS.

396-2

DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones, and is governed by the requirements of CERCLA. CERCLA and the implementing EPA regulations require that the substantive requirements of all applicable or relevant and appropriate Federal and state laws and regulations be met for each cleanup action taking place at Hanford. CERCLA also requires consideration of detailed decision criteria for each cleanup alternative as part of determining cleanup levels for each operable unit or waste management area.

NEPA's purpose is different; its focus is to ensure agencies take a "hard look" at the potential environmental impacts associated with a proposed action and the reasonable alternatives to that proposed action. Agencies must conduct a comparative analysis of the alternatives and present the results; consider the cumulative impacts of the alternatives when added to other ongoing actions; and identify potential mitigation measures that could be used to offset the impacts identified by the NEPA analysis. The goal is to consider the best-available information at the time of the agency's decisionmaking process. However, NEPA does not require that an agency ultimately choose the most environmentally preferred alternative based on a "ranking" process.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

42

1 sensible, brief statement of the goal, which is to
2 do what is as much as is technically possible. Not
3 economically feasible, not any of those sort of
4 slippery legal terms that mean not doing too much.
5 It needs to be done to the extent that's
6 technically possible and at least 99 percent.
7 I would suggest also that it might be useful
8 in -- in the DOE's communications to specify -- to
9 explain to the public exactly what vitrification
10 and other methods of treatment accomplish. And I
11 think this might have been the substance of our
12 first question tonight. That is, it's not clear,
13 from some of the materials produced by DOE, exactly
14 what vitrification offers to a cleanup and
15 specifically to the public.
16 That is, does it just keep the radioactivity
17 from moving around; it immobilizes it? Or does it
18 somehow reduce the radioactivity and, therefore,
19 the public health risk? It's my understanding that
20 it keeps it from moving around. If you have other
21 information on that, you might share that with us.
22 But I believe the questions were: I'm hearing
23 about vitrification. How much does this reduce the
24 risk?
25 On the subject of no new waste: This has some

396-2 cont'd

396-3

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

396-3 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

43

1 significant public health implications. It is not
2 strictly "Not in my backyard," although there is
3 certainly that sentiment being expressed. The
4 transportation risk of off-site nuclear waste being
5 brought here, or anywhere else, is significant.
6 And the numbers we heard of 856 cancer deaths
7 or whatever. However you count that, that is the
8 tip of the iceberg. That refers only to cancers;
9 that refers only to deaths. The non-cancer health
10 effects of radiation exposure are much more
11 numerous. And the non-mortality, that is the
12 morbidity aspect, just the illness, is significant
13 also. So the idea of transportation being a
14 significant risk goes way beyond this, you know,
15 856 body count.
16 Another aspect that is relevant to public
17 health is that to be able to ship waste to Hanford,
18 or somewhere else that is not where they
19 originated, gives them the mistaken impression that
20 the health risk has been attenuated or maybe even
21 cured. It hasn't; it's been moved. And the same
22 applies to the decommissioning of the FFTF, the
23 aspect of "Should parts of it be moved to Idaho for
24 further processing?" The answer from a public
25 health point of view would be "No."

396-3 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Thank you very much.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Aaron Morehouse. And after Aaron, Rollean.

COMMENTS BY AARON MOREHOUSE:

First off, thank you to everyone that's brought this all together tonight. My name is Aaron Morehouse.

And as a recent newcomer to the Gorge, this is my first Hanford meeting. And I'm in my thirties. And I'll come back to that at the end.

But I like stories. Before coming here, I was late tonight because I was at home, reading two stories to my children before they went to bed.

And we're told a story; there's been a story that's been formed here for decades. And this is a story that will be told -- it's been formed for decades, but it will be told for generations. And what I want to know is, what's the end of that story? Is it the kind of story that I read tonight to my children?

There's stories that take millennia to form. And this Gorge, this region is full of stories that have taken millennia to form. And needless to say, out of 6,000 pages, and out of as many comments

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

45

tonight and out of every meeting there is and will be about Hanford, there is a story being made.

What we hear from the DOE tonight is not only dishonoring the stories and the legacies that have formed this place, this region, but the legacies that recognize the Columbia as the lifeblood of our region. The preferred alternative is to target the collapse of the ecological integrity of our region. They threaten the economies of our communities. It drains the life -- literally, the lives -- from the generations today, from the generations to come.

So what will be the stories that my children and grandchildren will tell? What will I tell them when they read the story that's being written in these days? What did we do? So bringing it back to the heart of it, what we need to make sure gets written on that little machine over there is what needs to be done.

So no off-site waste; it's absolutely unthinkable. To leave any waste behind is absolutely unthinkable. 100 percent removal of all the waste. Let's go beyond that 99.9999 percent. Let's completely dismantle the FFTF. Endeavor for that hundred percent cleanup. The clean closure is the words, I think, I heard earlier.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

397-1 **397-1** The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all of the SST system, which would effectively remove 100 percent of the waste. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

397-1 cont'd

And let's be expedient. Let's not delay. Because like I mentioned, I am here in my thirties. And if I'm here in my fifties, like the gentleman earlier, I will not be nearly as cordial as he was.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Next, Rollean. And then after that, Theresa North.

COMMENTS BY ROLLEAN:

All right. All right. Yeah, yeah. Nuclear stuff. It's pretty creepy stuff. You're making money off it, huh? Get a nice check. I've worked with the government. I liked getting a check; it was good. Oh, boy. I was in the Army. When I was like 17 or something, I was living in South Carolina, pretty close to the Savannah River Plant. They called it the bomb plant. I was just a kid. My daddy worked back there for DuPont. Have you heard of DuPont? War profiteer. War profiteer.

I think the DOE is kind of, what you would call, a PR firm sort of for the war profiteers, to sort of absorb all the possible reactions from people who kind of come to their senses and go, "Gee, my dog's fur is falling out. Gosh. What should I do?" They don't want you to do anything.

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

I started doing something in 1986. I went on the Great Peace March for Nuclear Disarmament. And I spent a year going cross-country, trying to talk people into -- trying to educate people about nuclear power, and particularly nuclear missiles, this type of thing. Then the next year, I decided I wanted to start getting arrested. I was going to start sticking my neck out more, see if I could maybe go to jail or something like that.

I went down to Florida and I snuck onto, what do you call, Cape Canaveral. Got caught trying to stop some nuclear missiles being flown out of a submarine, so they could go 5,000 miles over to Russia. And they already had a missile that would do that. But this new missile, we spent millions of dollars on, was going to shrink the target area by -- from, I think, a mile down to a hundred yards, so they could knock out hardened missile silos. But they would never admit that. They said they wanted to be more accurate.

I kind of learned that anything I hear from the government is very suspect. Very suspect. In fact, it's pretty much -- I'll just leave it at that.

But then back in the early '90s, I spent the

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

48

night on top of a nuclear power plant itself, in Vermont. Ever heard of Vermont Yankee? It's this crazy-ass, GE-built nuclear reactor. It's a box, concrete box, that's not even got a dome on it. And a guy told me -- After I got arrested for spending the night on that and got taken down and locked up in jail, went to court and had my two days in court, represented myself. Hey, I'm a lawyer. For two days, I was.

And you know what? The guy told me, in court, that we didn't even know this. "What do you do with the spent fuel? What do you do with it?" He said, "We take it out on the top, on this rail on the top of the reactor. And we put it in this swimming pool up on stilts." I had no idea. It sounds crazy, you better believe it. But I mean, that's the truth.

And this particular power plant, they had it in a raised, elevated swimming pool, 80 feet above the ground, where it was going to stay indefinitely. It's still there today, in Brattleboro, Vermont, where I used to live.

And this is the kind of mentality. That's kind of the preferred choice at the moment. What are you going to do? Are you going to truck it

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

398-1 **398-1** Nuclear energy production is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

49

398-1 cont'd

out? That's what they're saying. "Truck it out here to Hanford; it will be safe here." That's so ludicrous. It's like this crazy-ass joke, you know, that -- that -- I don't know what to do about it. I've got to laugh a little bit about it, but it's killing us at the same time.

So I want to, bottom line, say, really, thank you for coming down here and sitting through this. And just listen and keep it up. Keep it going. Put pressure on these folks.

And if you're not involved actively in resisting this kind of death culture, I would really appreciate if you would get involved at some level. Stick your neck out a little bit. And if you don't have the time to please maybe send one of your friends or just, you know, kind of help it build. Because we're probably going to have to eventually deal with this ourselves. Could be.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Theresa North.

COMMENTS BY THERESA NORTH:

399-1

Good evening. I guess I should start out by saying: Clean it up and don't bring anything new. Just so you don't misunderstand my position.

But what I'd like to do is talk to all of you,

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

399-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

who work for the DOE and hold these hearings again and again and again, as people. I'm sure your job probably sucks sometimes; this evening, for example.

And so I'd like you, tonight or this weekend or this month, to go home and look at your kids and your grandkids. And if you don't have those, I'd like you to look at your nephews and nieces. And when you read those statistics about cancer and other illnesses, I would like you to put the faces of the ones you love on those statistics.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. That's the end of our registered list. I'd like to turn to anyone who has not commented yet, who would like to comment now, given the finishing of our official list.

Do you want to start?

Again, after we get done with people who haven't spoken yet, we'll come back to those who have spoken and want to go again.

COMMENTS BY CATHERINE FITZGERALD:

My name is Catherine Fitzgerald. I used to live in the Gorge; I don't anymore. I moved out in 2002. But my son still lives here. He works at

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

51

Skamania Lodge. And he fishes a lot. And he's really active. He used to swim in the river. I didn't like it. Good thing he's healthy still.

But one thing after one of the speakers was commenting that, you know, I think if the government can shift over this nuclear waste to the Columbia Gorge, where it's -- it's -- it's in an earthquake fault; it's in the ring of fire; it's on the river. You know, if we can store it right there where it's really dangerous, maybe this nuclear waste is not so bad. The DOE probably doesn't want you to know how bad it is. Because then nuclear power won't be very popular, and this won't be a very good moneymaker for whoever.

And, Mary Beth, I'm sorry, but I have to comment. If the DOE's intention is to deliver a very bland, emotionless presentation that nobody can understand, they've succeeded. I applaud you on that. And I'm sorry to direct my comment personally toward you. But I had a very hard time understanding anything you were saying. You had no emotion whatsoever. Sorry about that.

I agree with all the other comments that have been given here, in full, to everything they've said. I completely agree. I completely agree that

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

400-1

400-1 Regarding the impacts that seismic events could have on disposal locations at Hanford, the accident analysis in this *Final TC & WM EIS* includes accidents triggered by seismic events and discusses potential impacts on site workers and the general public (see Appendix K). Potential long-term impacts likely would be less than analyzed, as no credit was taken in the groundwater analysis for long-term structural stability of the repository or of any of the waste-form containers.

Regarding leaks in the SST system, the alternatives analysis in this *Final TC & WM EIS* (Chapter 5) presents the impacts of past leaks in the SST system, and discussion has been added to Chapter 7, Section 7.5, to present the changes in those impacts resulting from various mitigation measures.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

this man here has given a lot of his life to be a part of the process. We should completely look at what Oregon's proposal is.

And I know that we -- we can't wait. I know that we must not wait. If there's stuff leaking, we have to stop the leak. If you had a leak in your house, and it was coming down through the ceiling, you would stop the leak first. But then you would clean it up, correct? You'd dry it out; you'd pull the roof down; you'd put a fan in there. For however long it takes, you'd dry it out.

So if there's a leak, stop the leak. Stop the leaks however you have to. Which we all know what that means. And then get to cleaning it up. Because if it's still leaking, it's leaking. You know, I'm not a rocket scientist. I'm a massage therapist and an energy worker and a healer. And I know what needs to be done.

And we're all very emotional about this, including myself. But one thing, I want to make my last point is that we can make this a positive. We really can. If we all come together and work together and bring bigger guns in, whatever it takes, we can make this terrible, terrible, terrible problem that really doesn't -- None of us

400-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

did it. Anybody go out there and dump nuclear waste? I didn't think so. It wasn't me. It wasn't you, it wasn't you, it wasn't you.

But we can make this a positive when we can be the ones that bring in this legacy of this amazing cleanup, this amazing feat. We can build like these huge trains under hundreds of feet of water, but we cannot clean up Hanford? I don't understand. It's 2010. We have the technology. I know we do. So get off your butts and do what needs to be done. I'm really mad. And that's all I have to say.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Let me check to see if anyone hasn't spoken. Anyone else hasn't spoken who would like to?

Yes, sir, come on up.

COMMENTS BY DAN SOLITZ:

My name is Dan Solitz. I'm from Eugene. I was in the Navy with the propulsion service. And after I got out, I was an anti-nuclear activist. And then I followed waste for a while. And I've been following nucleonics ever since, although I haven't been very active in it. And this is my

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

54

first night on the Hanford waste thing for me.

And I guess it must be clear by now to everybody that both sides are holding the waste hostage to the future of the nuclear power. The environmentalists are holding it hostage to the future of nuclear power, and the people who are promoting nuclear power are holding the waste hostage and the environmentalists hostage in the future of nuclear power.

And seems to me like a big picture that needs to be developed, and I think the Department of Energy is in a position to do that. Because all of this "Not in my backyard stuff." The waste exists; it exists in massive amounts. Something has to be done with it. It seems to me like there should be a study made where -- of the most stable geologic formations. And regardless of whose backyards they're in, that's where it should go, to protect the life of however the long the stuff is radioactive.

And it can be done. There's a natural reactor in Gabon, Africa, that is no longer a hazardous waste site; it's in a stable formation. So there are other places on Earth and in this country where that stuff can go. And it needs to be cleaned up.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

401-1 **401-1** The current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

It seems to me that the proper approach to Hanford would have been to stop the spread of the waste to begin with and then clean up what waste you have, so it doesn't spread anymore or endanger anybody. But if it has to go someplace else because it's a geologically unstable area, well, then it has to go someplace else. If this is a geologically stable area, then it has to come here.

People's own interests or prejudices need to have a good, hard look taken at them. That's all I've got to say.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else that's not spoken yet who would like to?

COMMENTS BY DOUG CHARTERS:

My name is Doug Charters. I've been here in the Gorge for almost 50 years. I was born here, lived here all my life. I'm an Oregonian by birth and Washingtonian by residence. We kind of called ourselves river rat kids because we all grew up on the river. I spent many a summer down there, playing in the water. Sometimes it's kind of worrisome, but so far hanging in there.

What worries me is, bringing the waste here is putting all your eggs in one basket. It's a

401-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

56

geological or astrological impact-type thing, you know, something of that disaster level. And you have all of your nuclear waste in one basket, so to speak. It could be far more devastating than what it could be.

And in the immediate terms or whatever, you know, on-site, you know, storage of the other facilities may be more logical until, you know, a more permanent solution is devised in the future. And like Yucca Mountain, you know, at one time they looked at it. But I believe it's shut down or going to be shut down. That one geologically worried me.

But some things take more research in time or whatever. And some of the logic, doesn't seem logical to move it or whatever at this time, because with some of the devices they've built to move or whatever, there may be a better way to do it. But, you know, keep up what you're doing.

And one thing, when you entomb the stuff or whatever, you might want to consider making it reaccessible in the future, you know, in your methods of what do you there. Because you may want to remove it from Hanford or do some other process that's developed scientifically that's more

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

402-1 **402-1** Regarding DOE's cleanup efforts at Hanford and the option to retrieve some of the waste in the future, DOE is working diligently to clean up Hanford and appreciates the support provided. Regarding retrieval of waste disposed of at Hanford, DOE currently has no plans to retrieve the treated waste in the future; however, DOE will maintain disposal records and conduct surveillance and monitoring activities, as necessary.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

57

economical and feasible. So one of the things that you may consider is, you know, your options are viable in the future of what you do do.

But lining things and making sure the groundwater is safe should be a very high priority for not just us, but the people that come after us.

Thank you for your time.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else that has not commented that would like to? If not, we can turn to people that would like to come back up.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY DANIEL LICHTENWALD:

My name is Daniel Lichtenwald. I live in Goldendale, Washington.

This is kind of an administrative addition of the health provider testified about something. I want to clarify when I say "cleanup." It's probably immobilizing and concentrating and isolating as best as possible from the rest of the environment. So that would, in effect, substitute for every time I've mentioned "cleanup" would be that.

The other thing also, someone mentioned about the ESA: Endangered Species Act. Also in the EIS, whether there's been any -- and I don't know

402-1 cont'd

391-4

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

391-4 Commentor 391 (comments continued). This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with specific proposed actions and reasonable alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford. These analyses include impacts on fish and wildlife and their habitat, as well as environmental justice and socioeconomic considerations, consistent with current CEQ and DOE NEPA guidance. Short-term impacts are presented in Chapter 4; long-term impacts, including those associated with a scenario specific to an American Indian hunter-gatherer, are presented in Chapter 5. Chapter 2, Section 2.11, of this *TC & WM EIS* summarizes and compares the relative consolidated costs for continued operation of existing facilities; construction, operation, and deactivation of new or modified facilities; and associated activities to support the proposed actions, including administrative controls, institutional controls, and postclosure care. Any other cost estimates are considered beyond the scope of this EIS.

Impacts on threatened and endangered species are discussed in Chapter 4, Section 4.1, of this EIS. For specific correspondence with USFWS regarding the ESA, see Chapter 8, Section 8.3.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

58

whether it's EIS material, but the cost benefit with respect to the treaties with the tribes. In other words, if over the eons, the millennia, the river becomes -- impacts to the river have an effect on the survival of the tribes' cultures, whether the Department of Energy has analyzed those costs and what they're willing to pay for.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else have additional comments? Yes, sir.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY JURGEN HESS:

Jurgen Hess. I just want to also pick up with what Mr. Lichtenwald said about the tribal treaty rights. My wife and I spend a lot of time at the Celilo Indian Village, which is 40 miles east of here on the Columbia River. We've gotten to know them, several of them, as good friends.

And they basically eat fish. You look in their freezers, they're packed with fish. They eat fish; they sell fish. And when I look at those scenarios of the pollution for the next thousands and thousands of years, I think it's more than treaty rights. I think it goes deeper than that. It goes to our ethics of humanity.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

391-4 cont'd

384-3

384-3 Commentor 384 (comments continued). DOE has not received appropriations to address resource restoration at Hanford. Therefore, DOE's policy is to integrate natural resource and restoration concerns through the CERCLA cleanup process. This process is being conducted at Hanford under the TPA and provides multiple opportunities for tribal governments and other interested parties to participate in decisionmaking regarding cleanup activities.

Comments from the Hood River, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 9, 2010)

Public Hearing February 9, 2010

59

Those pollutants get into the fish. They get into the flesh in especially fish like salmon and steelhead. So I think we, as people that took their lands, we have those obligations to do what's right for them and clean it up, and make sure that for their seventh generation, their children will have healthy food.

Thank you.

384-3 cont'd

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else with additional comments at this time? If not, thanks for being here this evening, and thanks to the Department of Energy and various state officials. And we'll be around here for a few minutes to take additional questions or talk.

So this concludes the formal part of the hearing for now. Thank you.

(COMMENT SESSION CONCLUDED AT 09:25 PM)

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Deelana Johnson, Registered Professional Reporter and Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify that I reported in stenotype the Formal Comment Session of the Public Hearing captioned herein.

I further certify that my stenotype notes were reduced to transcript form by computer-aided transcription under my direction.

And I further certify that pages 1 through 59 contain a full, true, and accurate record of my stenotype notes, to the best of my ability.

Witness my hand at Portland, Oregon, this 17th day of February, 2010.

/s/ Deelana Johnson

Deelana Johnson, CSR, RPR

CSR No. 90-0104

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

February 10, 2010
6:00 p.m.

Doubletree Hotel
1000 N.E. Multnomah Street
Portland, Oregon

Mr. James Parham, Facilitator

PANEL MEMBERS:
Ms. Mary Beth Burandt, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection
Mr. Jeff Lyon, Washington State Department of Ecology, Hanford Project Office

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION

	Page	Line
Mary Gautreaux	5	12
Brent Foster	6	15
Jim McNaughton	10	17
Colm Brennan	12	9
Paul E. Libby	13	1
Gerry Pollet	14	20
Jan Castle	19	11
Gloria Black	22	13
Dvija Bertish	24	7
Madya Panfilio	26	7
Louisa Hamachek	27	9
Breena Satterfield	28	16
Sandy Polishuk	29	13
Sharon Loaiza	30	24
Maja Meyer	33	10
Dr. Rudi Nussbaum	35	17
Kelly Campbell	38	4
David Delk	40	22
Paige Knight	42	18

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

3

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION (Cont'd.)

	Page	Line
Lynn Ford	46	3
Thomas Layne	48	3
Melba Dlugonski	51	1
Chuck Johnson	54	1
Cherie Holenstein	55	19
Dave Bybeey	57	23
Thomas Clark	60	10
Rochelle	62	15
Brett VandenHeuvel	63	24
Lang Davison	66	18
Fred Nussbaum	67	24
Robin Klein	69	11
Chris Henry	71	8
Christine Charneski	74	12
Ross Tewksbury	77	14
Joyce Follingstad	80	3
Laura Feldman	82	19
James Brunkow	84	16
Dorothy Land	85	6
Nancy Johnson	87	6
Lisa Van Dyk	88	1
Norm Santana	88	24
Lori Meserve	89	15

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

1 FORMAL COMMENT SESSION (Cont'd.)

	Page	Line
Holly Hoffman	89	19
Tom Carpenter	90	24
Jim McNaughton	95	4
Chuck Johnson	95	11
Louisa Hamachek	98	4
Gerry Pollet	100	10
Lori Meserve	103	19

* * *

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

5

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION

MR. PARHAM: I think we're going to go ahead and move to the comments. We have a lot of people -- right now, looks about 50 -- who want to comment. And I would like to start with the elected officials.

And I know a representative from Senator Wyden's office is here. And we'd like to have you step to the microphone, please.

COMMENTS BY MARY GAUTREAUX:

Thank you. And, Mary Beth, thank you very much for coming to Portland, to Oregon.

I'm Mary Gautreaux from Senator Ron Wyden's office. And the Senator couldn't be here today, but he did want me to read a statement. As you know, Senator Wyden has spoken out many times over the years for cleanup at Hanford.

And he said: "The Department of Energy has been working on Hanford cleanup for more than 20 years, and at best they have another 20 years to go, and probably a lot more. Now, the DOE is proposing to possibly bring even more radioactive waste from other DOE cleanup sites to Hanford for

274-1

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

274-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. However, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

1 disposal, making this toxic cesspool possibly even
2 worse. That puts Oregon at risk twice: First,
3 when the waste is trucked through Oregon; and again
4 when it seeps back into the Columbia River. If I
5 have said it once, I have said it a dozen times:
6 Hanford should not be turned into a national
7 sacrifice zone. I am not satisfied with the
8 progress at Hanford, and I am absolutely opposed to
9 DOE bringing more waste to Hanford, since they have
10 been unable and unwilling to clean up the
11 radioactive mess that's already there."
12 MR. PARHAM: Next, we would like to have the
13 Attorney General Kroger rep. Is that right?
14
15 COMMENTS BY BRENT FOSTER:
16 My name is Brent Foster. I'm here tonight on
17 behalf of Attorney General John Kroger. And he was
18 sorry that he couldn't make it. I think if we
19 could encapsulate Mary's and Ken's talk together, I
20 could pretty much say "ditto" and be done with it.
21 I've been to many of these meetings. This will be
22 the first representing a state's attorney general;
23 so hopefully, I don't swear or do other things like
24 that. But some of that may actually be appropriate
25 when we're talking about Hanford.

274-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

I do want to point out that Oregon Department of Energy, whom Ken represents tonight, is the agency for the State of Oregon, that is the state's Hanford watchdog. And I just want to thank Ken and everybody that works for him for doing a great job. When the Attorney General asked me what's happening with Hanford, it's Ken and the staff that he works with that are first to get our call.

Just to provide some brief comments: There's no question that Hanford is an incredibly important place. And since I went out there for the first time and actually swam a good section of the Hanford Reach. It's something I've done every year except for last, which I couldn't do it. But next year, I will be back.

So I speak both as a representative and probably -- I don't know how many people actually jump in the Hanford Reach every year. But to me, it's something that I don't necessarily savor, but it's something that reminds me of the importance of keeping -- of keeping our focus on cleanup at Hanford.

Hanford is important not only for salmon, it's important for downstream river users. It's important for honoring tribal treaty rights. And

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

8

1 frankly, the future of what will become even more
2 important: a water source in the future of global
3 warming and water limitations.
4 The decisions that we make today carry with
5 them a sense of legacy that are really unlike many
6 other decisions that we have to make today. I make
7 a lot of decisions, and the Attorney General and
8 many of the agencies represented here make
9 decisions. Very few of them have the direct
10 effects that we can say 10,000 years from now will
11 be significant to the people who live in the
12 Northwest. This is one of them. And so it
13 elevates the importance of the decision to a level
14 I think that is very different than most of the
15 decisionmaking that we think about today.
16 Ken is right that what we have in the EIS is a
17 document that ought to be a call for a shift in
18 timing and urgency, focus, strategy and,
19 ultimately, how we deal with this site. You don't
20 need to look at those maps; I don't need to sit up
21 here and explain what they show you, that the
22 status quo is unacceptable. The status quo is
23 unacceptable, and shipping more waste to Hanford
24 and adding it on top of the status quo borders
25 somewhere between insane and maniacal.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

275-1

275-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

9

These are the things I told my boss might come out when he decided to hire me.

The bottom line though is, I think we have a real need to rethink where we are going. The idea of adding more waste is legally, ethically, and morally unacceptable, given what is contained in this EIS.

I would just end by urging everyone at the Department of Energy who prepared formal comments on behalf of the state, I think that the alternative analysis is there. The proposal needs to be taken seriously. We do want to see them analyzed.

And we would urge the DOE to really take this EIS as an opportunity to reach that focus, engage seriously in the questioning of how the strategies have been implemented to date, what's gone wrong, and come back with a decision that would be respected by future generations and something that they will thank us for and not curse us for.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you very much. Thanks to the elected officials for being here tonight.

I would like to now turn to the whole reason we're here, to hear from the citizens. And again,

275-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

10

I'd ask you to limit your comments to three minutes initially because of the large number of people we need to hear, and I want to make sure we get to everyone. So we'll give you three minutes. And I'll give you a high sign, and if you can finish up.

And remember, when we get through this list, you're more than welcome to come up again and again to make sure you get your comments thoroughly into the record. Dee and I will make sure that happens. At some point, we may take just a finger break for her and I'll stop for a second. And we'll move into that now.

The first person on our list to speak is Jim McNaughton. Jim.

COMMENTS BY JIM McNAUGHTON:

My name is Jim McNaughton. I live in Fairview. I'm a member of the Alliance for Democracy.

Last night, Mary Beth, and tonight, you made a statement there will be a moratorium. Now you're saying that there is a document in this? I have never seen a document in any of your stuff, in any of your material. Is there a document, a legal

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

276-1

276-1 Regarding the moratorium on offsite waste shipment to Hanford, it initially restricted the receipt of offsite waste until issuance of this *Final TC & WM EIS*. In a *Federal Register* notice published on December 18, 2009 (74 FR 67189), DOE modified its Preferred Alternative for waste management and extended the moratorium, at least until the WTP is operational. DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

11

1 document, that will stop the transportation of all
2 grades -- A, B, C, and C-plus -- across the
3 highways? Is there? I'm asking you, Mary Beth.
4 MR. PARHAM: We'll take that as --
5 MR. McNAUGHTON: Can't she answer my question?
6 MR. PARHAM: Mary Beth, do you want to answer?
7 I'm not sure --
8 MR. McNAUGHTON: Is there a document of that
9 in your statement?
10 MS. BURANDT: There was a court settlement in
11 2006. And part of that court settlement said that
12 there would be a moratorium against DOE receiving
13 waste from other -- from Hanford receiving waste
14 from other DOE sites until the Tank Closure and
15 Waste Management EIS was final. What DOE has
16 agreed to is extend that moratorium to the year
17 2022 or when the waste treatment plant is
18 operational.
19 MR. McNAUGHTON: Do you have a document to
20 back up that statement? A legal document.
21 MS. BURANDT: Yes. A copy is back there.
22 MR. PARHAM: The material is in the room.
23 MR. McNAUGHTON: If there is not a legal
24 document, who can make that legal document to back
25 up that statement?

276-1 cont'd

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

12

MS. BURANDT: There was a document filed with the court. So it is a legally binding document.

MR. PARHAM: Charlotte, do we have a copy? Let's get him a copy.

MR. McNAUGHTON: Thank you very much.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Is it Colm Brennan? Is that right?

COMMENTS BY COLM BRENNAN:

My name is Colm Brennan. I'm from Beaverton, Oregon. And I'm also with Alliance for Democracy.

And my question is to Mary Beth: Why do you want people in Oregon and Washington to be exposed, to be jeopardized by nuclear waste that's going to be shipped through Oregon and Washington -- I don't believe what you say about a moratorium; we haven't seen any legal documentation -- for the profit of the nuclear industry?

And that's my comment. Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Paul Libby.

MR. LIBBY: I have somewhat of a solution --

MR. PARHAM: Paul, come up to the microphone so we make sure we get everything on the record for the court reporter. Thanks.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

277-1

277-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

13

COMMENTS BY PAUL LIBBY:

I have some answers to the real problem that we face. And they were developed by Japan after we dropped the nuke on them. And this is spiderwort, which has a very sensitive detection of the radiation. And the Trojan Decommission Alliance spent all summer measuring around Trojan before it was destroyed. And we could pick up the radiation seven miles away from that plant. And if that is happening all over the world, where are we?

I saw the nuke submarine in -- in -- on the Sound up there. And it scared the daylights out of me. We had 1500 people there, picketers picketing it. We had seven small boats around that nuclear sub, and they had the sea guns on us.

How do we face the reality of the nukes? When I first saw them, I went almost crazy. And I began to realize it wasn't me that was crazy; it was the whole world. And this, I read in a study of Trojan. And we found that there was -- right below Trojan and in the Columbia, there was -- there was all these nukes. I've forgotten them all now. But I knew a lot about nukes.

And I don't want my kids to grow up in a nuclear world. And that's -- and we're dealing a

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

278-1

278-1 Nuclear energy and weapons production and the resulting waste generated are beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. This EIS addresses proposed actions to retrieve, treat, and dispose of Hanford tank waste; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate environmental cleanup activities at Hanford and other DOE sites. The disposal of other wastes, including waste associated with commercial nuclear power generation, is beyond the scope of this EIS.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

1 little bit with that. What is happening to all the
2 world? These plants could pick up the radiation.
3 And we took a million samples. And I don't know
4 where it came from, but some of the scientists said
5 that we didn't have enough. And I know that
6 science demands a lot of -- a lot of testing.
7 And this was -- Tokyo University developed
8 these plants. And there's KUY7 and KU10. I tell
9 you, that was back in '78. And the records, I
10 don't know whether there is -- not Oregon
11 University, but Oregon State. And I know they're
12 in the Oregon records. And that's about drove me
13 crazy.
14 MR. PARHAM: Thank you, Paul.
15 MR. LIBBY: And I don't want my kids growing
16 up in a nuclear world.
17 MR. PARHAM: Next up on the list is Gerry
18 Pollet.
19
20 COMMENTS BY GERRY POLLET:
21 I'm Gerry Pollet with Heart of America
22 Northwest.
23 Paul, who just spoke, is 88 years old. And
24 I'm 51. So in 37 years, I hope that I won't have
25 to be coming to these hearings. I've been coming

278-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

15

to them for nearly 30 years.

Unfortunately, under the Energy Department's plans that we're here to object to tonight, we will have to train an entire new generation and another generation to be coming to meetings and saying to our own government, "Clean up your mess before you dump more. It's unacceptable."

Let's roll the slides. Thanks.

We're here because of the Columbia River. As we speak tonight, radiation is also seeping into the Columbia River at 1500 times the drinking water standard. That's DOE's own annual groundwater monitoring report for the area. 1500 times the drinking water standard for radioactive strontium 90.

You've heard about the drinking water standard tonight. It's set at the level at which if you drank the water as an adult, one adult out of every thousand would die of cancer. Do that math yourself.

When we clean up over the next 30 years at Hanford, under the Energy Department's plans to not clean up the billions of gallons of discharges in the high-level waste tanks, just cover it up and install the cap, to not empty the tanks all the way

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

279-1

279-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

16

and to add more waste, we recontaminate the site and the drinking water. The groundwater which is going to be used for drinking in a hundred years, in a thousand years, it's going to be recontaminated.

If I walked into this room with a gun and closed my eyes and pulled the trigger, it would be premeditated murder. I think you should think about that and pass that on to the decisionmakers. Because without any doubt, the evidence shows if you add more waste, if you leave waste to spread from under your caps instead of cleaning up the tank leaks, if you do not remove the tanks, people will die.

279-1 cont'd

Let's go on to the next slide. That's -- Our Energy Department dumped waste in unlined ditches through 2004 at Hanford. When they issued that decision, that they say they're just implementing, to use Hanford as a national radioactive waste dump, it was to use these unlined ditches. Now at least, due to public pressure, they said they're not going to use unlined ditches. But they're not willing to go in and dig them up and retrieve what's in them. That's unacceptable.

279-2

Next slide, please. The voters told

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

279-2 This EIS addresses the environmental impacts of retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste and final closure of the SST system. It also evaluates the impacts of FFTF decommissioning, including management of waste generated by the decommissioning process. Finally, this *TC & WM EIS* evaluates the potential environmental impacts of ongoing solid waste management operations at Hanford, as well as the proposed disposal of Hanford LLW and MLLW and a limited volume of offsite LLW and MLLW. It does not address the cleanup and closure of existing disposal units and past-practice cribs and trenches (ditches). Cleanup and closure of these units will occur using the existing TPA regulatory process that involves EPA, the state, and DOE; integrates the requirements of CERCLA and RCRA; and ensures consideration of NEPA values wherever appropriate.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

17

1 Washington State, "Clean up your waste before you
2 add more." Now we know very clearly that the
3 evidence shows, you cannot leave the waste that's
4 already at Hanford without recontaminating the
5 groundwater to wholly unacceptable levels, and you
6 will never be able to add more waste and not
7 contaminate the groundwater.
8 Next slide, please. This is carbon
9 tetrachloride in the groundwater today. The
10 darkest red areas are 50 times the drinking water
11 standard.
12 The next slide. In 120 years, you see for
13 yourself how much of that is starting towards the
14 Columbia River. Again, that's one contaminant, 50
15 times the drinking water standard. That's just one
16 contaminant.
17 Next slide. Plutonium 239, half-life 24,000
18 years. Their data shows seeps along the Columbia
19 River in a thousand years will be 300 times the
20 drinking water standard from the tank leaks, the
21 waste that they do not clean up, and the burial
22 grounds.
23 Next slide, please. Uranium 238 spreading
24 towards the river 120 years from now, under their
25 half cleanup plan. We'll call it a half cleanup

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

279-3

279-3 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

279-4

279-4 The *Draft TC & WM EIS* presented groundwater model predictions of current conditions for comparison with recent groundwater characterization data. This was intended to provide context for the readers, stakeholders, and decisionmakers to help evaluate the accuracy and precision of the groundwater modeling system. The *Draft TC & WM EIS* also presented groundwater model predictions for future conditions as part of both the alternatives impacts analysis and cumulative impacts analysis. In response to this comment (and similar comments), two discussions have been added to this *Final TC & WM EIS*. The first is an expanded discussion of the comparison of modeled current conditions versus measured current conditions (Appendix U). The second discussion is an evaluation of the impacts on future conditions of certain mitigation measures (Chapter 7, Section 7.5).

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

18

1 plan; it's probably a quarter of a cleanup plan.
2 Next slide. Let's skip ahead to the
3 transportation slides. Right there. Three billion
4 picocuries equals about 17,000 trucks of radioactive
5 waste.
6 Mary Beth, it is a lie to say that the drivers
7 of those trucks do not get a radiation dose. It is
8 a lie. Your own document shows the radiation doses
9 they get.
10 Next slide. The people stuck in traffic. You
11 and I and our children and our grandchildren will
12 be exposed to these trucks. The Energy Department
13 has illegally left out of this EIS the disclosure
14 that it wants to shift highly radioactive waste,
15 called GTCC waste, to Hanford, which is its unspent
16 fuel.
17 Their estimate for shipping spent fuel to
18 Hanford was 816 fatal cancers along the truck
19 route, even if there's no accident or terrorist
20 attack, due to radiation emitted from the trucks.
21 There's their EIS, their data. And notice it says
22 adults. They left out the children. I care about
23 the kids.
24 Next slide shows what happens if there is an
25 accident with a reasonably foreseeable release from

279-4 cont'd

279-5

279-6

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

279-5 This *TC & WM EIS* does not make the statement asserted by the commentor. Rather, the *TC & WM EIS* Summary shows the calculated worker population doses associated with truck drivers transporting radioactive waste for tank closure activities, FFTF decommissioning, and the import of LLW and MLLW to Hanford for disposal. The maximum annual dose to a transportation crew would be limited to 100 millirem per year, unless the individual is a trained radiation worker, which would administratively limit the annual dose to 2 rem (DOE Standard 1098-2008). The risk of developing an LCF from this level of exposure would be 6×10^{-5} to 1.2×10^{-3}, or 1 in 17,000 to 1 in 1,000, which is very small.

279-6 Regarding the commentor's concern about the inclusion of GTCC LLW in this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE has included information from the *Draft GTCC EIS* in the *Final TC & WM EIS* cumulative impacts analysis. For a more comprehensive discussion on GTCC LLW, see Sections 2.1 and 2.12 of this CRD.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

19

a remote-handled plutonium shipment to Hanford, which is part of the GTCC proposal, at the intersection of I-84 and 205. 300 square miles of Portland have to be evacuated, a thousand fatal cancers. You cannot decontaminate 300 square miles of Portland. We have to stop them.

279-6 cont'd

Thank you for being here tonight. Don't stop here. Keep coming. Thank you, all.

MR. PARHAM: Next on the list is Jan Castle.

COMMENTS BY JAN CASTLE:

Gerry, you're a tough act to follow.

My name is Jan Castle. I am a member of the Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, and the Union of Concerned Scientists.

Actually, I'm glad to get all this information. I'm with Ken. I think that this gives us some very helpful confirmation to start to find a way forward. And I appreciate that, Mary Beth, from the Department of Energy. I appreciate the efforts on the behalf of the Department of Ecology from Washington, the Department of Energy from Oregon. I'm very proud of their work.

280-1

I appreciate all the work that Heart of America Northwest has gone to to develop these

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

280-1 Before the *TC & WM EIS* public hearings were held, Heart of America and other stakeholders requested more-extensive collaboration in the hearing planning process and expressed a desire to participate in a conference call with stakeholder groups to begin this collaborative process. In response, DOE held stakeholder teleconferences on December 30, 2009, and January 5 and 6, 2010. Public meeting dates and locations were identified and discussed; it was agreed that meetings would be added in Spokane, Washington, and La Grande and Eugene, Oregon. DOE indicated that the public hearing format would include a 1-hour open house prior to each hearing to allow the public to meet informally with members of the *TC & WM EIS* team and learn more about this

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

20

citizen guides. And just a procedural thing here: I would ask that when you start the procedure for scheduling hearings next time, that you start with Heart of America Northwest in trying to set the appropriate dates so that they have the prescribed 45 days in order to produce these guides.

This is extremely helpful information. It should come to people well in advance of the hearing so that they are prepared and can understand what they're hearing at the hearing. Mine arrived in the mail yesterday. That's not good enough.

So I know the Department of Energy has been responsive before in procedural things. I would ask that you move Gerry Pollet -- who, believe it or not, actually has a working relationship with these people -- to the top of your list so we get this information in a timely manner.

I have detailed comments that I will submit electronically. For now, very quickly, I would just say I support complete cleanup of Hanford to the greatest extent technically possible. I oppose all options for lesser remediation and, of course, making Hanford a national radioactive and mixed waste dump.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

280-1 cont'd

280-2

EIS. A suggestion was made during one of the teleconferences to move the planned January 26, 2010, public hearing in Richland, Washington, to meet the 30- to 45-day notification goal under the TPA Community Relations Plan (the January/February timeframe for public meetings was announced at the December 15, 2009, HAB meeting). During the call, the Hanford communities indicated their support for the January 26 public hearing date and their opposition to changing it. DOE has made an effort to provide the public with timely and useful information regarding development of this *TC & WM EIS* and the time and place of public meetings. Meeting notices were placed in local newspapers and mailed directly to individuals on DOE's mailing list. Informative posters and factsheets were provided to attendees at the open house that preceded each public hearing. Project information also was made available to the public on Hanford's website (http://www.hanford.gov).

280-2 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. DOE's preferred retrieval option (i.e., to retrieve at least 99 percent of the tank waste) is consistent with the TPA goal of residual waste not exceeding 10.2 cubic meters (360 cubic feet) for 100-series tanks or 0.85 cubic meters (30 cubic feet) for the smaller 200-series tanks, corresponding to 99 percent retrieval. DOE has already begun the process of retrieving waste from the tanks, such as tanks located in Waste Management Area C. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed retrieval actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

21

I support removal of 99.9 percent of the waste in the tank -- because I understand that last nine-tenths percent has the most hazardous waste in it -- or to the extent is technically possible. I realize that will move on a tank-by-tank basis. I support starting now for the Department of Energy to plan, fund, and build new capacity for the vitrification plant, with the goal of completing vitrification by 2040 or thereabouts. I do not support the supplemental treatment options.

I support clean closure of the tank farms, and ask the DOE to investigate and remediate the soil around and under the tanks to whatever depth of excavation that is necessary. I understand that this is a tall order. I'm sure it would be the largest such operation in the country. This is the most contaminated area in the western hemisphere. Sorry, in the northern hemisphere.

So yes, it's going to be a massive job. It's going to be difficult. And I just would urge you to keep on it until you find ways to do it safely and to utilize whatever technology you can come up with.

So I also realize that pursuing these options will be very expensive. This is the cost of

280-2 cont'd

280-3

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

280-3 Both DOE and Congress are committed to the cleanup efforts at Hanford, and DOE continues to seek funding for these efforts. Nuclear energy production and its resulting waste are not within the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

22

nuclear weapons production and nuclear power production. This cost needs to be factored in at the beginning of decisions, not at the end of decisions. So I would like to see us -- I'd rather see us spend money on completely cleaning this up, which is our moral obligation, than on loan guarantees for another generation of nuclear power plants.

280-3 cont'd

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Next on the list is Gloria Black, and she will be followed by Dvija Bertish.

COMMENTS BY GLORIA BLACK:

I have some rhetorical questions for the representative. I got a lot of generalizations in what you said. Some of the quotes: In the future, we will need more detailed modeling to evaluate site-specific conditions for making closure decisions. And I heard a lot of hard-to-get information. So my question is: Why are your conclusions different from those, say, of Heart of America Northwest regarding findings?

Regarding the Department of Energy, in talking about going through the 99 percent cleanup versus the 99.9 percent, you made reference to, "Oh, well,

281-1

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

281-1 The actions proposed in this *TC & WM EIS* support the cleanup of Hanford. As noted in Chapter 1, Section 1.3, the purpose and need include long-term actions to permanently reduce the risk to human health and the environment posed by waste in the SSTs and DSTs and to facilitate the cleanup of Hanford. Potential long-term impacts are presented in Chapter 5, with details in Appendix P (ecological) and Appendix Q (human health). It is incumbent on DOE to consider the potential human health impacts associated with normal operations as presented in Chapter 4 of this EIS also. The results of this EIS, including consideration of the long-term impacts, will be one of the factors considered by DOE in selecting alternatives for implementation. Other factors may include technical feasibility, schedule, and cost.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

23

we've got to balance between the short term and the long term." And the short term was, I believe, the lives of the workers who would be dealing with this. And I would just like to point out that it is because of the lack of long-term planning that we have to worry about the lives of those people. And hopefully, we can focus on long term from here on.

I wonder why the Department of Energy said, "Gee, let's wait till 2022." I don't know what's behind that. Why did they pick that year specifically? Whether people just think, "Oh, sounds good. Maybe they're really doing something in the meantime."

And my last comment is, I wonder whether there's anywhere in any of these studies, particularly concerning the shipment of nuclear waste, whether what has been taken into account is emergency services for accidents, be they intentional or not intentional, whether there is preparedness on the part of our federal government and local government all along the routes to take care of any kind of national emergency we might have from any accident.

Thank you.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

281-1 cont'd

281-2

281-3

281-2 The Preferred Alternative for waste management in the *Draft TC & WM EIS* included limitations on, and exemptions for, offsite waste importation at Hanford, at least until the WTP is operational.

281-3 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Can you tell me your first name, please?

MR. BERTISH: Dvija.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Dvija. And after Dvija, Madya Panfilio.

COMMENTS BY DVIJA BERTISH:

I'm Dvija Bertish. I'm with the Rosmere Neighborhood Association. We're a conservation group in Vancouver. I'm also a member of Columbia Riverkeeper.

I want to state very clearly that several of the preferred alternatives proposed for the Environmental Impact Statement are unacceptable. First and foremost, as many people have already spoken, we do not want to have any radioactive waste trucked into Hanford at all. And irregardless of a moratorium for ten years, 20 years, till the year 2022, whatever year it is, it needs to be completely removed and stricken.

As far as I'm aware, the moratorium is subject to change. And they could start shipping stuff even sooner than the date they describe. So it needs to be legally binding. If that does not happen, then I think that the citizens of the

282-1

282-1 DOE recognizes the potential negative impacts on Hanford groundwater posed by shipment of offsite waste to Hanford without mitigation. The *TC & WM EIS* analysis shows that receipt of offsite waste streams containing specific amounts of certain isotopes, specifically iodine-129 and technetium-99, could cause an adverse impact on the environment. One means of mitigating this impact would be for DOE to limit disposal of offsite waste streams at Hanford. Other mitigation measures, such as recycling secondary-waste streams into the primary-waste-stream feeds within the WTP to increase iodine-129 capture in ILAW and bulk vitrification, are discussed in Chapter 7, Section 7.5, of this *Final TC & WM EIS*.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

25

282-1 cont'd

1 states of Oregon and Washington have no other
2 option but to sue. And we should.

282-2

3 The Fast Flux reactor needs to be removed
4 100 percent, not just entombed. In terms of the
5 tank closure, I agree with several of the speakers
6 that we need to remove all of it and remove the
7 shell casings from the ground as well, leave no
8 residue. And that means digging up the soil and
9 trying to remediate out of the groundwater as well.

282-3

10 There are several new technologies from the
11 oil and gas industries that have not been looked at
12 that are available to speed up the process. And I
13 think this process is far too slow.

282-4

14 Get rid of all of the buildings. We need to
15 have no residue of any nuclear reactor facility for
16 a museum, for a public park, for camping, for
17 sight-seeing. It all needs to be stricken.
18 Hanford is a harbinger of what an increased nuclear
19 program will bring to all of us, and people are
20 going to die from it as it is right now. We owe it
21 to the future of our entire community, our states,
22 and our western seaport to get rid of this.

282-5

23 The radioactive isotopes that are being
24 released from places like Hanford are already
25 floating past Portland and Vancouver now. So it's

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

282-2 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

282-3 This EIS addresses the environmental impacts of retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste and final closure of the SST system. It also evaluates the impacts of FFTF decommissioning, including management of waste generated by the decommissioning process. Finally, this *TC & WM EIS* evaluates the potential environmental impacts of ongoing solid waste management operations at Hanford, as well as the proposed disposal of Hanford LLW and MLLW and a limited volume of offsite LLW and MLLW. DOE supports further R&D of technologies for treating nuclear waste and has extensive and continuing R&D activities under way to address the waste issues at Hanford. As described in Appendix E, Section E.1.3.3, DOE has been working to identify and evaluate supplemental LAW treatment and immobilization techniques, including conducting a Technology Readiness Assessment in 2007 (summarized in Section E.1.3.3.1). DOE is committed to continuing its support for development of technologies to stabilize radioactive waste.

282-4 Comment noted.

282-5 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

26

not acceptable to leave any of the residue in the ground. Those are most of my comments. *282-5 cont'd*

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. After Madya Panfilio will be Louisa Hamachek.

COMMENTS BY MADYA PANFILIO:

My name is Madya Panfilio.

There is an epidemic of thyroid disease as it is in the Northwest. And doctors do not even really know how to not only treat it, but they don't even know how to test correctly for it. And we also have an epidemic of breast cancer. And much of this is due to Hanford. *283-1*

How long is this going to take the Department of Energy to do the right thing? The right thing to do is dismantle completely the reactor and do not allow any more waste into Hanford. We simply do not want our children, ourselves, our Earth to be exposed any more than absolutely -- we just don't want it exposed anymore to radioactivity. *283-2*

We need to have the landfill closures, not closed actually, because we want -- you can't have a closure. We need to have complete cleanup. We want 100 percent cleanup. Not 99.6, not 99.7. 100 *283-3*

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

283-1 Summaries of dose and health impacts studies related to Hanford are discussed Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, and the risks of cancer are discussed in Appendix K, Section K.1, of this *TC & WM EIS*. DOE has added information from the National Cancer Institutes to the discussion in Section 3.2 regarding the incidence of cancer in counties near Hanford, in the state of Washington, and in the United States. These data do not indicate that there is a cancer epidemic in the Northwest. However, as indicated in Section 3.2, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or mortalities as a result of Hanford operations is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford. As stated in Appendix K, Section K.1, it is important to know that the American Cancer Society estimates that, in the United States, a person has about a 40 percent lifetime risk of developing an invasive cancer and that approximately 25 percent of all deaths are a result of cancer. Cancer incidence and death rates in the state of Washington are near the national average.

283-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

27

1 percent cleanup.
2 The preferred alternatives seem to be just a
3 matter of manipulation. When we don't plan well
4 for the future, and we don't do the right thing, we
5 have no future.
6 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Louisa, and after
7 that will be Breena Satterfield.
8
9 COMMENTS BY LOUISA HAMACHEK:
10 I'm Louisa Hamachek from Eugene, Oregon. And
11 I'm a mother.
12 And I'm very concerned about transportation of
13 nuclear waste dangerously going through Eugene on
14 I-5. I know your maps have showed that you're not
15 going to be using I-5, but I heard that that could
16 be different. And I find it horrendous to think
17 that we could be getting sick and getting cancer
18 from just driving alongside one of the trucks,
19 unknowingly. And you have no right to do that to
20 any citizen or to the animals along the way.
21 I also am speaking for the animals that live
22 in the Columbia River Basin. And Eugene sits on
23 the Willamette, which isn't downstream of Hanford.
24 But we're doing our best in Eugene to keep the
25 river clean from what's upstream of us and then

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

283-3 cont'd

283-3 A goal of 100 percent of the waste removed from the tanks is not practical. Some residual waste will be left in the tanks. This can be likened to drinking a milkshake through a straw—even though almost all of the milkshake is removed through the straw, some small amount will be left (residual) on the inside of the straw. On a much bigger scale, pumps are used to remove the waste from the tanks, but some residual will be left behind. DOE's preference relative to waste removal includes those Tank Closure alternatives that remove at least 99 percent of the waste from the tanks (see Chapter 2, Section 2.12). Among these are Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which call for the removal of 99.9 percent of the waste. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

284-1

284-1 As shown in Appendix H, solid radioactive waste transports would originate from DOE sites to the east and southeast of Hanford; for this reason, Interstate 5 would not be used for transports analyzed in this EIS. While transportation of the radioactive waste could deviate from the analyzed routes, Interstate 5 is too far west to be practical for shipments. Appendix H, Table H–17, provides an estimate of the maximum dose of 10 millirem to a person stuck in traffic for 30 minutes next to a radioactive waste shipment in a Type B cask. This is considered to be a one-time event. This amount of radiation dose is equivalent to the risk of developing an LCF of 6×10^6, or 6 chances in 1,000,000, which is a very low risk.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

28

what we release to go downstream. And all along the way, people are working very hard for that. When it hits Portland and it gets mixed in with the Columbia, it's -- continuously, it's part of our responsibility to see that it's clean.

And we demand, as part of our Willamette Valley citizenship, that Hanford stop releasing the radioactive fluids into the river, and that there be a 99.9 percent, a 100 percent cleanup of the waste. And the tanks should not be left in the ground, and all the fluid should be cleaned up and sucked out of the tanks.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Breena Satterfield, and then Sandy Polishuk.

COMMENTS BY BREENA SATTERFIELD:

My name is Breena Satterfield. I live in Portland. I live in the area that is shown on the map that if an accident should occur at the meeting place of the 205 and the 84. And most importantly, I'm a member of the human race.

I have a family; I have grandchildren. I want them to have families and grandchildren. I don't want them exposed to the 617,000 trucks. I hope I got the number right. I don't want them exposed to

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

284-2 **284-2** The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all of the SST system, which would effectively remove 100 percent of the waste. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

285-1 **285-1** Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

29

the air contamination, the groundwater contamination from Hanford. I fear that all of us have been already.

And I would like to point out that none of us, as a parent, has ever asked a child to go and wash one hand. It's two hands. You ask them to "Go wash your hands." And if they're dirty, they take a shower as well. Hanford needs to be cleaned up, totally and now.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Sandy Polishuk. And after Sandy will be Sharon.

COMMENTS BY SANDY POLISHUK:

I'm Sandy Polishuk. I live here in Portland. I grew up in Washington state. I've lived in the Northwest my entire life, except for going away to college for a couple of years.

I was diagnosed with breast cancer when I was 46 years old. That's not considered so young anymore. Women are now being diagnosed in their thirties, as we contaminate this planet more and more.

One of the things I find very ironic in this city, I think in this whole state, if it's discovered that your home heating oil tank is

285-1 cont'd

285-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

30

leaking, you are required to completely clean it up. And that means taking it out of the ground and removing all the soil under it. They don't care if it costs you $50,000. I know, $50,000 doesn't sound like much to what Hanford has paid, but we're talking about one homeowner. You can take out a third mortgage if you need to. You've got to do it; and you've got to do it right, too.

We need complete cleanup, clean closure. This capping and leaving the stuff there, leaving anything in those tanks, leaving the contaminated soil so it can further migrate into the river is absolutely unconscionable.

I want to ditto everything that Senator Wyden wrote to you and all the other things that people have been saying. We need a complete cleanup, as much as possible. And it's absolutely ridiculous to even think about bringing more waste to a site on a river.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Sharon. And after Sharon will be Maja Meyer.

COMMENTS BY SHARON LOAIZA:

I'm Sharon Loaiza. Why would we even consider

286-1

286-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

287-1

287-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

31

bringing in more radioactive waste when we still have not cleaned up the mess we made a long time ago? Do we really want to have trucks traveling up I-5, through populated areas, carrying high-level radioactive waste? We talk about fatal cancers to adults, to children. Well, think about when you drive down I-5 and see those red-tailed hawks. There's wildlife we're thinking about too.

My family and I are Hanford downwinders. And we were exposed to radiation through the air, water, and food we ate. We lived in Hermiston between 1950 to '56, during the time major radioactive air releases took place. Five years ago, I was diagnosed with Stage III non-Hodgkin's lymphoma; my deceased mother had leukemia; my sister has thyroid disease. We not only experience the pain and worry of the illness, but we deal with the cost of medical care.

Contamination of the river was greatest during the late 1950s and '60s. In 1956, our family moved to The Dalles, where we were exposed to radiation from the Columbia River. Our mother often took us to the Columbia to swim, and we boated and we swam with our friends. And we regularly ate salmon caught by the Native Americans. And during that

287-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

time, people had no idea; we never thought about contamination of the river.

At Hanford, the radioactive build-up within the reactor was regularly flushed loose and into the Columbia, along with the water used to cool the reactive cores. The HEDR -- Hanford Environmental Dose Reconstruction -- project has estimated the radiation doses the public may have received from Hanford from 1944 to 1992. They figure about 2 million people were exposed, either through the air or the Columbia River or both, as our family was.

We don't see this radioactive poison as it silently moves throughout our soil, our water, and our state. It knows no borders. We live on a jewel of a planet floating ever so delicately in space. We depend on this interconnected system of air, water, and soil to nurture us now and long into the future. Are we going to choose as our legacy a cleaner planet with a pristine Columbia River, or will future generations see a sign that says, "Do not swim, radiation present"? Or even worse, there will be no sign.

Today, we fight to protect our salmon and we fight to protect our bald eagles and we fight to

287-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

preserve the Columbia Gorge. Doesn't it defeat the purpose of our efforts if we allow Hanford to be a national radioactive waste dump? So let's stand up and fight to protect all of our families and the environment. And let's clean up Hanford and close it forever.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Miss Meyer, and then after that will be Dr. Rudi Nussbaum.

COMMENTS BY MAJA MEYER:

My name is Maja Meyer. I'm Sharon's sister. I'm a native Oregonian. And I would like to relay my personal story of being a downwinder to Hanford.

I was born in 1949 and lived in Hermiston until '56. I was exposed, as a baby, to the radioactive iodine that Hanford intentionally released into the air. The exposure affected me tenfold through drinking the milk from the cows, who ate the grass that was contaminated through the air from the Hanford release. Our family had a garden. And we would eat fresh fruit and vegetables, grown from the ground that was contaminated by Hanford.

My family moved to The Dalles in '56. And for the next 11 years, my family and friends swam in

287-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

and ate fish from the Columbia River. The Columbia River was contaminated because Hanford used the river to cool the reactive cores, and then the water was sucked back into the Columbia.

My mother was a fish counter at The Dalles dam. And I remember going with her one day and sitting in the fish-counting elevator with the glass window, watching the schools of fish swim by while she calculated their numbers by species. I remember seeing deformed fish, and she would make a note of it. And I asked, "Why are the fish deformed?" She didn't have an answer at the time.

But that experience flashed into my mind again as I read the documents that were finally released to the public through the Freedom of Information Act in 1986. I was stunned to read that the cancer-causing radiation doses were released from 1944 through the '80s.

In '79, during my physical, my doctor felt a lump in my neck and ordered an ultrasound. They found a nodule on my thyroid. And I remember the doctor asking, "Have you ever been exposed to radiation?" I said, "No." And then remembered this conversation again while reading the documents made public in 1986.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

288-1

288-1 Potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or mortalities is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford. Another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem. The radioactive material released to the Columbia River was attributed to cooling water from reactor operations. With respect to the large number of cancers people observe, as stated in Appendix K, Section K.1, it is important to know that the American Cancer Society estimates that, in the United States, a person has about a 40 percent lifetime risk of developing an invasive cancer and that approximately 25 percent of all deaths are a result of cancer. Cancer incidence and death rates in the state of Washington are near the national average.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

35

I now have five precancerous nodules and a goiter on my thyroid. I see an endocrinologist every year for a painful aspiration of the goiter, and I have had a lot of expense for medications. With my mother's leukemia, my sister's lymphoma, our family has experienced the pain of cancer.

How many more families in the future will suffer with cancer because Hanford continues to be contaminated? We cannot bring additional radioactive waste into Hanford because we haven't cleaned up what was dumped decades ago. We owe it to our children and future generations to clean up Hanford now.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. After Dr. Nussbaum, it will be Kelly Campbell after that.

COMMENTS BY DR. RUDI NUSSBAUM:

I do not want to repeat what other people have said, so I will fully endorse what Senator Wyden has said and what the Heart of America has put together. They did a wonderful job.

It's very easy at meetings like this -- and I have been to too many in my long life -- to get ground in lingo of the administrative kind or the technical one. I want to bring this discussion

288-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

36

1 back to a much broader vision of the problems. And
2 I also think that for citizens, it is important to
3 maintain a degree of outrage rather than one of
4 giving up. And I, therefore, will not start what I
5 have to say with friendly words about thanking
6 everybody, and the Department of Energy in
7 particular.
8 My name is Rudi Nussbaum. I'm a retired
9 professor of physics and environmental sciences at
10 Portland State University. And I'm a member,
11 long-time member of Physicians for Social
12 Responsibility.
13 Why does DOE need to truck nuclear waste to
14 Hanford? Because after all these decades of
15 promises, there is no solution for permanent and
16 safe storage inside. There is no science that even
17 supports at this point the possibility for such a
18 safe, long-time burial of the waste.
19 So I want to point out to you that the DOE's
20 so-called preferred alternative to abandon cleanup
21 of Hanford is directly related to a lavishly
22 financed effort by the entire nuclear establishment
23 to brainwash Congress and the public and our
24 decisionmakers to accept new government-financed
25 nuclear power plants as safe and green energy

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

289-1 **289-1** Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Nuclear energy production is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

37

1 producers. Both of these claims are patently
2 false.
3 I speak here as a scientist who has studied
4 radiation health sciences and has worked with,
5 investigated, and reported on Hanford downwinders'
6 excess thyroid disease, cancers, spontaneous
7 abortions, and others. Such radiation related to
8 human injuries have always been cynically dismissed
9 by the Department of Energy, its contractors and,
10 unfortunately, many corruptible scientists.
11 Together with the undeniable legacy of human
12 suffering from atmospheric nuclear tests, uranium
13 mining, the Chernobyl and Three Mile Island
14 disasters and so forth and so forth. And most
15 recently, we have not heard in media or scientific
16 journals of high standing in this country about the
17 conclusive findings -- and I say again, conclusive
18 findings -- of the government-sponsored study of
19 more than double the childhood leukemia cases in
20 the immediate proximity of all German nuclear power
21 plants. And those reactors are of similar design
22 as U.S. reactors. However, a comparable, powerful
23 study has never been conducted here. You may ask
24 why.
25 Thank you.

289-1 cont'd

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

1 MR. PARHAM: Kelly Campbell. And after Kelly
2 will be David Delk. Thank you.
3
4 COMMENTS BY KELLY CAMPBELL:
5 Thank you. My name is Kelly Campbell, and I'm
6 the executive director of the Oregon Chapter of
7 Physicians for Social Responsibility. We're the
8 local chapter of National PSR, which is the U.S.
9 affiliate of International Physicians for the
10 Prevention of Nuclear War, which was the recipient
11 of the 1985 Nobel Peace Prize for our work to
12 abolish nuclear weapons and prevent nuclear war.
13 The Oregon chapter was founded in 1980 by a
14 group of local physicians and scientists who
15 advocate against nuclear weapons and for the
16 cleanup of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation. They
17 also helped to evaluate the health of those
18 downwind and downstream from radioactive iodine
19 releases from Hanford. And so the issue of Hanford
20 cleanup continues to be an important one to our
21 organization.
22 We base our recommendations on implementation
23 of the precautionary principle. And the lay term
24 for this is simple: It's better safe than sorry.
25 The Hanford site is a glaring example of what

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

39

1 happens when policy is formed without regard to
2 this common-sense principle at all. We're here
3 tonight in this room, having this discussion, due
4 to the disastrous consequences of policy without
5 thought to the public future health -- the future
6 public health implications or environmental
7 implications.
8 The cleanup of Hanford now should embrace the
9 precautionary principle. And in doing so, it needs
10 to clean up the site to the highest standards
11 possible to protect human health and the
12 environment. We would associate our comments with
13 those of Heart of America Northwest and virtually
14 everyone who spoke in here tonight about the
15 specifics.
16 I do want to share with you a story. I'm
17 wearing a bracelet tonight that was given to me by
18 a group of Hibakusha survivors of the atomic bombs
19 in Hiroshima and also in Nagasaki. And in meeting
20 with those survivors, they continue to suffer from
21 the health effects of what was produced at Hanford,
22 just as we continue to deal with the problems of
23 how Hanford has affected our region.
24 And I wanted to mention this tonight just to
25 put this hearing and my comments into a larger

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

290-1

290-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

1 context: That the public health environmental
2 problems we face here, we don't face alone; we face
3 with everyone in the world. And we are linked to
4 the people who are on the other end of the
5 plutonium that was produced here at Hanford.
6 The only way that we're going to remedy the
7 situation, the only way that we can honor the lives
8 of those lost due to this nuclear radiation --
9 whether in Japan, whether from testing elsewhere,
10 or whether from people here in the Hanford
11 region -- is to do a complete and full cleanup of
12 Hanford, to not bring in any more nuclear
13 radioactive waste to Hanford, and to really
14 challenge ourselves to say how do we implement the
15 precautionary principle in the cleanup of Hanford
16 and in going forward with respect to nuclear policy
17 in this country.
18 Thank you.
19 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. David Delk is next.
20 After David is Paige Knight.
21
22 COMMENTS BY DAVID DELK:
23 Hello. My name is David Delk. I am the
24 president of the Portland chapter of the Alliance
25 for Democracy.

290-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

41

I wanted to, first off, express my extreme disappointment with the position of the State of Washington on the issues. I feel like they have just totally rolled over and are not really representing and advocating for the citizens of the state of Washington. Having said that, I also want to acknowledge that Ken Niles and the State of Oregon do appear to be representing the citizens of the state of Oregon. And I want to express my great gratitude for their position.

When I read the preferred alternatives in this Environmental Impact Statement, I was frankly shocked. I was very disappointed almost to the point of not believing what I was reading was actually accurate.

Landfill closure is not adequate. Capping over existing radiation is not adequate. It needs to be cleaned up. We want to have the tanks cleaned to 99.9, virtually 100 percent. Leaving that potent radiation in the tanks is just unacceptable. The Fast Flux facility needs to be removed, not just entombed. The radiation just needs to be cleaned up.

The other thing is that I'm disappointed that the Environmental Impact Statement does not include

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

291-1

291-2

291-3

291-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all of the SST system, which would effectively remove 100 percent of the waste. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

291-2 The commentor's preference for FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3: Removal is noted. However, although nearly all elements of FFTF and the two adjacent support facilities would be removed under this alternative, the lower portion of the RCB concrete shell would remain. This would be backfilled with either soil or grout to minimize void space. The area would be regraded and revegetated, with no need for a barrier.

291-3 Regarding the commentor's concern about the inclusion of GTCC LLW in this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE has included information from the *Draft GTCC EIS* in the *Final TC & WM EIS* cumulative impacts analysis. For a more comprehensive discussion on GTCC LLW, see Sections 2.1 and 2.12 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

42

the Greater-Than-Class-C waste, which has evidently been shunted off into another Environmental Impact Statement to come later on. Those things really cannot be separated, and they should have been considered at the same time.

291-3 cont'd

And the last thing is that we cannot add more waste to that site. The cleanup must be completed, not just saying that we're going to postpone -- that we're not going to bring more waste till 2022, when the vitrification process can actually start. We need to have that process well, well underway -- in fact, completed -- before more waste goes to that site.

291-4

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. After Paige Knight will be Lynn Ford.

COMMENTS BY PAIGE KNIGHT:

My name is Paige Knight, and I'm the president of Hanford Watch here in Portland, Oregon.

The decisions of this Environmental Impact Statement will affect the lives of this region, of all of us, for generations to come. What we want is the protection of human health and the environment for decades -- for the decades and

292-1

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

291-4 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

292-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

43

1 centuries ahead of us. That means long-term
2 protection of the Columbia River, our lifeblood.
3 We do not want contaminants flowing into the
4 groundwater at Hanford and into the Columbia River,
5 its basin, its farmland, our fishing grounds, and
6 our recreational areas. We want the cleanup to
7 occur now, not to be delayed into the proverbial
8 future of politics that puts these decisions off
9 until the next Congress, the next catastrophe, the
10 next generation.
11 We want to protect our natural resources for
12 now and for the future. We want the Department of
13 Energy to fully comply with legal obligations from
14 now to the final state of the site. We want the
15 legal obligations to be more stringent. We want
16 tank waste stored safely in tanks -- new, if
17 needed -- for radioactive waste retrieval in the
18 vitrification facility that is being built and,
19 hopefully, will operate successfully over time.
20 We want tank waste removed from the existing
21 177 tanks to the greatest degree possible. We want
22 the tank waste treatment plant to operate as it was
23 planned, with two high-level waste melters and two
24 low-activity waste melters. We have wasted enough
25 time and money on alternatives that are proving to

292-1 cont'd

292-2

292-3

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

292-2 DOE's preference relative to waste removal includes those alternatives that remove at least 99 percent of the waste from the tanks (see Chapter 2, Section 2.12). Among these are Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which call for the removal of 99.9 percent of the waste. The construction of the WTP has already commenced and its currently planned configuration includes two HLW and two LAW melters. Treatment of tank waste with this configuration without expanded capacity or supplemental treatment is analyzed under Tank Closure Alternative 2A, where treatment through the WTP would last until 2093. However, under this configuration, construction of a replacement WTP and new DSTs would still be required because the design life of these facilities would be exceeded.

Under all action alternatives, either (1) treatment of tank waste would need to be expedited by increasing tank waste treatment capacities (i.e., through WTP expansion and/or constructing supplemental treatment facilities) or (2) construction of facilities to replace those that exceed their design life (i.e., the WTP and/or DSTs) would be required. Without supplemental treatment technologies or expanded WTP capacity, retrieval and treatment of tank waste would take significantly longer to complete, as presented in Chapter 2, Section 2.5. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

292-3 This *Final TC & WM EIS* analyzes the impacts and risks of storing all of the IHLW canisters under each of the Tank Closure alternatives for as long as the WTP operates. Regarding the commentor's concern about the disposition of HLW, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

The operational end date for the WTP varies between the Tank Closure alternatives; from calendar year 2034 under Tank Closure Alternative 5 to calendar year 2163 under Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base and Option Cases.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

44

be fatally flawed. We want high-level waste in canisters stored on site until and if a national burial ground is decided on.

292-3 cont'd

We want the tank farms ultimately closed. This means characterizing contaminated soils and cleaning them up as deeply as possible. We want the waste from the tanks and the piping between the tanks filled with material that will immobilize the waste that remains and that will keep intruders out of the site. We want the waste that is disposed of on site monitored for as long as the wastes are lethal to humans and the ecosystems that we rely on. This will be for hundreds of thousands of years.

292-4

292-5

We want tank farm waste in cribs and trenches to be dealt with in the remove-treat-dispose manner, rather than by using short-lived caps to cover the material, which will eventually harm us. We want all cleanup to be fully protective of the environment, maintaining the standard for long-term protection of the Columbia River, the air shed, the farmland, and the health of the people of this entire region.

292-6

Many of the contaminants at Hanford will be lethal. Some will ebb and peak again over the next

292-7

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

The operational end dates under the other Tank Closure alternatives are between these dates.

292-4 The objective of all of the Tank Closure action alternatives presented in this *TC & WM EIS* is the closure of the SST farms. The specific approach requiring removal of contaminated soils is considered in Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B. Under these alternatives, all 12 SST farms in the 200-East and 200-West Areas would be clean-closed following deactivation. Clean closure of the tank farms would involve removing all SSTs, associated ancillary equipment, and contaminated soil to a depth of 3 meters (10 feet) below the tank base, all of which would be managed as HLW. Where necessary, deep soil excavation would be conducted to remove contamination plumes within the soil column. Clean closure of the SST system would preclude the need for conducting postclosure care. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

292-5 This *TC & WM EIS* assumes several different types of end-state management, as described in Chapter 2, the Glossary, and the Summary. These include administrative controls, institutional controls, and postclosure care, as appropriate. Each of these end-state management options would take place at the completion of an action and is assumed to occur for 100 years following the end of the action (e.g., active institutional controls would be maintained for 100 years following final placement of waste in a storage facility). The 10,000-year time period described in this *TC & WM EIS* represents the period of analysis used for the long-term impact analyses for groundwater, human health, and ecological risk; it does not represent the assumed period of institutional controls. For clarity, the definition of "10,000-year period of analysis" is included in this final EIS in Chapter 2, the Glossary, and the Summary, as appropriate.

292-6 As described in the Summary and Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2, Decisions Not to Be Made, there are six sets of cribs and trenches (ditches) that are contiguous to the SSTs and would fall under the barriers placed over the SSTs during closure. These cribs and trenches (ditches) are CERCLA past-practice units

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

45

hundreds and thousands of years. Much of the waste we are dealing with will have to stay at Hanford with no imminent repository. Many of the alternatives of cleanup in this EIS underestimate the amount of contamination that we are facing and which will feed the groundwater leading to the surrounding areas and the Columbia River for thousands of years.

We need to demand an aggressive cleanup and cleanup dollars now. Time is wasting. Progress has occurred, but not at the pace needed to protect our future. This is our decision, should we choose to demand it and see it through.

Given the centuries of radiological and chemical threats to the agriculture -- agriculturally productive region of the Columbia River and the Columbia River Basin, we refuse to accept the additional burden of adding more waste from other sites to Hanford. Accommodating other national wastes from the weapons complex will take untold time, money, and focus off cleanup, denying us our right to a healthy and safe environment for the rest of time as we know it.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Lynn Ford. And then

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

292-7 cont'd

and are evaluated in this EIS as part of a connected action because they would be influenced by barrier placement. Similarly, closure of these CERCLA past-practice units is not part of the proposed actions evaluated in this EIS. Closure of these units will be addressed at a later date using the best-available information regarding those technologies that are both feasible and appropriate for these units. These six sets of cribs and trenches (ditches) are noted in Chapter 2 and are described in detail in Appendix D.

292-7 DOE is committed to the cleanup efforts at Hanford, and continues to seek funding for these efforts. Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

after Lynn will be Thomas Layne.

COMMENTS BY LYNN FORD:

Hello. My name is Lynn Ford. I live in North Portland. And boy, it seems like I've been coming to these things for a long time.

I just want to add that I endorse Hanford Watch's recommendations. And also, once again, when I come here, I hear the Oregon Department of Energy. And I say, "Well, all my tax moneys don't go to waste."

One thing is that, something I remember hearing at some previous meeting -- They all blur by now, I'm sorry. But people started questioning whether the DOE can even do this. The real duty, the real purpose of the Department of Energy is to promote nuclear weapons. That's what it's about. That's why we have the empire, and that's why we do what we want in the world. When I say "we," I mean the United States government. And cleanup is just not the same kind of job.

On the other hand, you've just seen, what, eight years of, you know, how bad the EPA can be also, which I used to think had some kind of -- So I don't know. I think we need to relook at this.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

293-1 **293-1** Comment noted.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

This is a rerun, in a way. Although I will say that I know from Paige Knight and other people on the Hanford Advisory Board are endeavoring to work out solutions. It has improved; it's really not as bad as it was when we started. But it's just not near fast enough.

And I have to say, 2022 for the end of the moratorium. Some would look at actuarial studies and say, "Well, most of those people will be dead by then, so we don't have to worry about it." And I do want to say I have compassion for the folks who are downwinders and so on, who actually know how much they have suffered. The rest of us are here, waiting to find out.

I just -- It's completely amazing to me that the Department of Energy folks, who have been dealing with this, and I think they're very hard workers. You know, there's some good, honest engineers. But how they can stay dedicated to their mission. I mean, when they get done, maybe they can name the whole thing after President Ahmadinejad of Iran, because he's the only person in the world that is dedicated to things.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. After Thomas Layne

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

will be Melba.

COMMENTS BY THOMAS LAYNE:

My name is Thomas Layne. I'm here as a citizen. And I live in Brightwood, Oregon. I also lived for several years in Washington before moving to Oregon.

I have a stepdaughter who worked at the Hanford plant in the late '60s. In the early '70s, she assured me that the Hanford plant was clean and was of no danger to health. "Hey, Tom, it's okay." But now, of course, we know very well that it is not clean, it is not healthy, and certainly it isn't okay.

And the Hanford Nuclear Reservation is said to be the most polluted piece of land on the planet. It's a deadly risk to the lives of men, women, children, animals, and fish that live in the area at the same time nuclear waste is leaching into the environment.

So it astounds me that this hearing is even being held, this whole series. Whatever the justification for Hanford's existence as far as the World War II war effort, including the dumping and burying of nuclear waste that continues to poison

294-1

294-1 Public hearings, a requirement of DOE's NEPA regulations (10 CFR 1021.313(b)), were conducted to give the public an opportunity to learn more about this *TC & WM EIS*, ask questions, and provide comments.

Both DOE and Congress are committed to the cleanup efforts at Hanford, and DOE continues to seek funding for these efforts.

In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. However, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

49

the air, ground and water, the government you represent created this pestilence in our midst. And your job is to fix it. You don't need a hearing to establish that fact.

I read in this morning's newspaper that this life-threatening pollution will be a risk for the next, what, several thousand years. And you're concerned about the cleanup expense perhaps rising to a hundred billion dollars. Well, in this era of the multitrillion dollar budgets, it should not be so difficult to earmark an annual amount to continue the cleanup of Hanford. Even if it takes several thousand years.

There's a serious discussion today about doing a bit more D and C -- that's dusting and cleaning -- of the site. And that is simply, what, capping it all and walking away, knowing that this is not going to end the risk of deadly radiation to the local environment and its citizens.

When I was a child, I was taught to clean up after myself. Be that as it may, my bike and wagon on the front lawn, the chaos in my bedroom, the milk that I spilled on the kitchen floor. I was not allowed simply to walk away with a job half done or not tended to at all.

294-1 cont'd

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

You guys made this mess, your predecessors did, the government that you work for. You as current members of that government have inherited this mess as well as the high moral imperative to clean up your mess that is still festering in our backyard.

I lived in Germany for several years. And not far from where I lived was a nuclear plant that had been deactivated at the request of the local citizenry. I was astonished to see what they did to it. They made a theme park. The tower was a climbing wall. It's astonishing what you can do.

I want to finish with a question: Do any of you live in the Hanford Nuclear Reservation neighborhood? Do you have or do you know any children that live there? Friends or family? Well, if not, I'm not surprised. But if you do, and you follow through with this kind of a plan, then your hearts are bolder than I could ever imagine.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. After Melba will be Chuck Johnson.

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

COMMENTS BY MELBA DLUGONSKI:

My name is Melba Dlugonski, and I live in Portland.

The first hearing that I attended regarding Hanford was 22 years ago. My son was five years old. At the time we were given a lot of promises. We weren't going to have any open dumping anymore and all that sort of thing. And I consider that the fact that they keep on having these hearings, year after year, maybe a little bit of this gets changed, a little bit of that gets changed. But basically, it's all the same thing.

They're pretending to listen to us. And I'm really not sure why they spend the thousands or hundreds of thousands of dollars it takes to print all that stuff and to bring people here and rent these rooms and that sort of thing, when they really have no intention of listening to us or they would have 22 years ago, because we were talking about it then and we were all saying the same kinds of things that we're saying now.

ATTENDEE: Because it's the law, they have to.

MS. DLUGONSKI: It's the law, they have to.

I think the Department of Energy has made an enormous number of mistakes through the main

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

52

deputies. I'm sure some of the people who are responsible for some of those decisions are very, very sorry. I'd like to hear the Department of Energy say, "We're very sorry. And we're going to be willing to do what it takes to make up for the mistakes that we have admitted that we're making, and not turn around and bring some more stuff here, even if -- whether or not what we already have here gets cleaned up."

I know that most of the things that I might want to say were said over and over again, and we're all repeating one another. And I will just echo the things that Miss Castle said and the Heart of America people, et cetera, all things I agree with.

The only thing I can think of that hasn't been mentioned is what kind of surveillance and militarization we might have to have if we're going to have that many thousands of trucks carrying terrorist harvest through our neighborhoods that can light out forever 300 square miles. They're supposed to be little logos on them, so they are targets. I mean, they have target signs painted on them.

So what responsible thing would our government

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

295-1

295-1 DOE considers the threat of terrorist attack to be credible and makes all efforts to reduce any vulnerability to this threat. DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

53

295-1 cont'd

try to do to protect us from terrorist activity in this kind of situation? I'm not sure. I don't think any -- And I think that it's time for us all to get out in the street, block the freeway, whatever the hell it takes to stop these people from doing these things.

I've been coming here for 22 years. I'm tired of coming to it. I'm tired of being ignored. And I'm tired of the fact that not only do we as people not matter, that the other animals and plants and whatever do not matter. There is no consideration for what the cost of new power plants, new weapons that are going to produce more and more of this crap. And nobody knows where to put it. And no one is standing up and saying that these parts belong together.

At this hearing, I'm not supposed to be talking about those things because that isn't in the Environmental Impact Statement. You see, nobody is allowed to bring the parts together. But we have to, as human beings, stop it.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Chuck Johnson. And after Chuck will be Cherie Holenstein.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

54

COMMENTS BY CHUCK JOHNSON:

I'm Chuck Johnson. I'm a board member of the Columbia Riverkeeper. I live here in Portland, Oregon. And I'm a lifelong Oregonian.

I see this Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management EIS as a major step backwards in DOE's approach to clean up the Hanford site, at a time when such good progress has been made in the river bank cleanup. And it is just really extremely disappointing to see a decision like this -- or a recommendation come out like this.

And the thing that just mystifies me the most, I have to say, just seeing the U.S. DOE do this. Yeah, it's disappointing. But we have a long series of disappointments in dealing with U.S. DOE. So it's not as surprising as the reaction of the State of Washington to this proposal. I have to say, I am mystified.

ATTENDEE: Jobs.

MR. JOHNSON: No, it's not jobs. That's the point. There's a lot of jobs right now, $2 million stimulus, clean up all the river banks. So I am absolutely mystified by your governor and by your agency, sir, in kowtowing to this -- this cover-up instead of insisting on a cleanup. I find it

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

296-1

296-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze the potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms by landfill closure, selective clean closure, or clean closure. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

disgusting. And it's a traitorous act to your neighbors and to your own people to leave this legacy, this toxic legacy in the ground, and paper it over and prepare for, what, another round of nuclear power plants or something at Hanford.

The next shoe that will drop will be "Let's revive WPPSS." No, don't laugh. That is what I think is going to be happening next. And, you know, I'm proud of our Oregon Department of Energy for looking at this EIS and finding the flaws in it. But I'm mystified that the State of Washington would ignore the obvious flaws in this proposed EIS. It's just sickening. And your governor should be ashamed of herself and you should be ashamed of yourself.

MR. PARHAM: Cherie Holenstein. And after that, Susan Nash.

COMMENTS BY CHERIE HOLENSTEIN:

I'm Cherie Holenstein of Portland. I'd like to, first of all, ask for a moment of silence for Paul McAdam. You'll recognize and note one of our videotapers is missing here tonight. He recently died. He spent his own money buying tapes. And he died about a month ago. So may we have a moment of

296-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

56

silence, please.

Thanks very much.

And thank all of you folks for coming. And I do want to say that I'm so encouraged by your outrage. I've been coming to these things for almost 25 years, I don't know. And people have been pleasant and polite and outraged when it's needed. Thank you very much.

This problem is brought to us by the lords of greed and corruption, the lords of arrogance, the lords of moral cowardice and audacity and, of course, the lords of war; otherwise known as the military, industrial, corporate, and congressional complex. One of the "Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse" dropped dead. Now this is transported not on horses, but carried throughout our country by trucks.

The trucks deliver death along the route with their merchandise. The tragedy occurring in Haiti is connected to what is being discussed here tonight. The 20,000 U.S. troops stationed in Haiti are furthering the damage and disinheritance of the Haitian people. And it's all connected to the problem again that's happened here tonight.

So what to do. We've been advised by the

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

297-1

297-1 As shown in the Summary, Section S.5.3; Chapter 2, Section 2.8.3.10; and Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12, of this *TC & WM EIS*, it is unlikely that the estimated total public radiation exposures from transporting radioactive waste to Hanford for disposal would result in any additional LCFs.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

dedicated folks of Heart of America Northwest, Hanford Watch, Columbia Riverkeeper -- I know his last name, but I forgot his first -- and the Oregon agency, Cam and Brett, as to the best solutions. Thank you all for all the work you've done for that. To save time, I'll just say ditto what Brett said he was going to do and did. So ditto, ditto, ditto.

The famous journalist H.L. Mencken said: "For every problem, there is a solution that is simple, direct, and wrong." I don't need to make it clear. Perhaps the folks at the United States Department of Energy have been reading too much Tom Clancy and not enough H.L. Mencken, "The Little Prince," and "Howard's End."

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Susan Nash.

MS. NASH: I'll save my time and send it in writing.

MR. PARHAM: Okay. Dave Bybeey. Followed by Dave will be Thomas Clark.

COMMENTS BY DAVE BYBEEY:

Dave Bybeey here. I live a couple miles north of the Columbia. I've been a life member of the

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

58

Sierra Club for over 35 years, half my life. But I speak here just on my own.

I want to speak to the audience as well as the DOE. I hear the word "cleanup." I don't really know what that means. I hear a fear of them running down the roads, probably legitimate.

But we've got over a hundred nuclear power plants running at this instance in the United States, generating nuclear waste. I've not heard anyone speak tonight about recycling, like we talk about recycling a lot of the rest of our waste. All the nuclear plants we have in the United States are horse-and-buggy instruments. They were all designed before the space shuttle was designed, which we're going to retire later this year.

There are designs on the drawing board, things like moving-phase nuclear reactors, special Generation IV nuclear reactors. Generation IV has a theoretical potential to recycle over 90 percent of the waste that we have. I want to recognize the fear that I've seen in the auditorium tonight. I share that fear, because my scientific background, the nuclear waste that we're generating is far more treacherous than I think you've seen in the press.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

299-1

299-1 The management and potential recycling of nuclear waste resulting from nuclear energy production are beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. The management of waste resulting from environmental cleanup activities is analyzed in this EIS. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve, treat, and dispose of Hanford tank waste; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate environmental cleanup activities at Hanford and other DOE sites. The disposal of other wastes, including waste associated with commercial nuclear power generation, is beyond the scope of this EIS.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

59

We need to figure out a way to recycle it. And I ask you to not just be afraid of nuclear. We're not going to purge our planet of nuclear. It's going to continue to grow. China has announced they're going to start building ten new nuclear reactors a year. They're all going to produce dirty waste.

So when you hear someone talk about the ability to recycle, it's theoretically out there; it needs to be proven. And if we can truly recycle the bulk of the nuclear waste, it will be gone. There will be some residue. And I think we need to have the creative thinking to really think about what we're going to do with what's left.

One of the things I've heard, that I think is very creative and needs to be proven, but we're living in a world of ever-growing robotics. Right now, we have two little rovers roving around on Mars that were designed in 30 days with an operation of four to five years.

One of the creative ideas I've heard is to go out in the Pacific Ocean. You have the Pacific plate, tectonic plate of the planet, sliding underneath the North American plate. Use robotics to take what is left after recycling and

299-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

1 robotically bury it down into the crust of the
2 Earth, so over the millennia, the stuff will
3 continue to exist. It will slide back into the
4 isotopic core of the Earth, from where it first
5 began.
6 Thank you for the opportunity to speak.
7 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Thomas Clark,
8 followed by Barbara Pereira.
9
10 COMMENTS BY THOMAS CLARK:
11 Between 1955 and 1958, I served in the
12 U.S. Marines in Twentynine Palms, California.
13 Okay. In that position, I witnessed aboveground
14 nuclear testing in Nevada. I was in a support
15 capacity. 2500 troops from my base were put into
16 trenches in Nevada and subjected to a tactical
17 nuclear weapon exposure. All 2500 were dosed with
18 radiation, very close. The only solution they had
19 was a water truck brought on site, where they hosed
20 down all the troops. Now, that gives you a little
21 sense of my bias. Okay.
22 Since that time, I have become a cold system
23 engineer. I've worked at Argonne National
24 Laboratory on high-energy physics. I've been at a
25 further enterprise level of control systems,

299-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

61

medical informatics. I know the Department of Energy has read the same accident reports about nuclear effects that I have. We also know that there is very little medically that can be done for anybody in that position. Okay.

What's also irritating to me is in this particular area, I see no environmental sensors, no network of sensors; no training, no facilities for the medical personnel throughout Washington and Oregon, and very little response team efforts. They don't exist. If I go to Germany, France, the UK, I see that. Okay. Why don't we have this?

This is a situation that will not go away. You know as well as I do that what you're dealing with will be here for six-digit time periods. There is nothing that you can do with it. You can't scrub it; you can't destroy it. We don't have the tools. We don't have the procedures. Cleanup is cleanup. It is also encapsulation, package it, get rid of it. Okay.

I'm not suggesting anybody waltz in there and try this, because you'll be dead quickly. But I'm also in systems theory. And complexity is something you must remove from any situation if you want a solution to any particular problem. Okay.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

300-1

300-2

300-1 For the purpose of comparing alternative courses of action, this EIS expresses accident impacts in terms of the radiation dose or chemical exposure that would be received by individuals at specific locations and by the population at large. In such comparative analyses, it is not appropriate to take credit for emergency response measures or medical treatment because the efficacy of those measures are highly situation-dependent and cannot be predicted with any confidence. However, as noted in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.5, DOE maintains comprehensive emergency response programs for all of its fixed facilities and transportation activities, as required by DOE Order 151.1C, *Comprehensive Emergency Management System*. In accordance with this order and other related directives, DOE works with state, local, and tribal governments to plan and prepare for response to emergencies involving Hanford facilities and DOE offsite transportation activities. DOE emergency plans provide for trained specialist personnel, radiological monitoring equipment, communications systems, vehicles, and immediate access to the full range of national response assets based at other DOE sites.

DOE has an environmental monitoring network that includes environmental monitoring locations on the site, near the site boundary, and at distant locations. Environmental monitoring data collected from these locations are reported annually in the Hanford Site environmental reports; the most recent report, for calendar year 2010 is Poston, Duncan, and Dirkes 2011. In an emergency, trained responders would use information from the event scene as well as radiological and meteorological data from installed sensors and ongoing environmental surveillance activities to manage the accident and minimize impacts on workers, the public, and the environment.

DOE provides the States of Oregon and Washington with training and resources to assist them in maintaining their response capabilities, and both states regularly participate in Hanford emergency exercises in which emergency communications, decisionmaking processes, and technical response activities are practiced and refined. Under the Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program, DOE provides specialized training and conducts emergency exercises to help state and local emergency response organizations and medical institutions prepare for transportation emergencies involving radioactive material.

300-2 This EIS addresses the environmental impacts of retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste and final closure of the SST system. It also evaluates the impacts of FFTF decommissioning, including management of waste generated by the decommissioning process. Finally, this *TC & WM EIS* evaluates the

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

62

If you're building a system, you do not make it complex; you make it simple. Okay. The previous suggestion of taking this waste and burying it offshore so that the Earth eats it isn't so bad.

Well, I would like to say that you can Google everything that I've said. What I don't see is any documentation on the exposure for nuclear radiation across this country. I have seen from the NIH maps an incidence of cancer. It's a good place to start looking. But come up with a simple solution.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Barbara? After Barbara will be Rochelle.

Rochelle.

COMMENTS BY ROCHELLE:

So the woman earlier who spoke about the contaminated heating tanks. I'm a Realtor. And I saw a lot of people have to clean up their heating tanks, and it costs a lot of money. And DEQ has their own tolerance for that. And I expect a zero tolerance from my state and my federal government regarding Hanford. I want to see 100 percent cleanup. I want to see no more waste come to Hanford.

In fact, I like to dream. I imagine that a

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

300-3

301-1

potential environmental impacts of ongoing solid waste management operations at Hanford, as well as the proposed disposal of Hanford LLW and MLLW and a limited volume of offsite LLW and MLLW.

300-3 Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10, of this *TC & WM EIS* provides summary information on radiation exposure of an average individual in the United States as estimated by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements. These data indicate that the average dose to an individual is about 670 millirem per year, of which about 311 millirem per year is from ubiquitous sources of background radiation. Appendix K of this EIS provides additional detail on the sources of the radiation dose. Appendix K, Section K.1.1.6, also cites American Cancer Society estimates that, in the United States, a person has about a 40 percent lifetime risk of developing an invasive cancer and that approximately 25 percent of all deaths are a result of cancer. Cancer incidence and death rates in the state of Washington are near the national average.

301-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. This closure includes the tank system, along with the vadose zone as impacted by the tank farms (i.e., past leaks). Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

63

1 world in which we can create waste that we cannot
2 remediate, that we cannot recycle, is not a world
3 that we should tolerate. I believe that people who
4 create waste that cannot be recycled and remediated
5 must be responsible for that waste. In a just
6 world, the world I dream of, people who are
7 responsible for that, who made the choice to create
8 without the ability to do that, should have to come
9 and clean it up. And in a just world, our voices
10 speaking for justice will be heard.
11 I am inspired by "Howard's End." I'm inspired
12 by the models of direct action. I do believe that
13 direct action has made an impact on the nuclear
14 industry for a lot of years. It will continue to
15 do so. But we do have to be organized. I've lived
16 in the Northwest now 20 years this year. If I live
17 here another 20 and it is the same way, I won't be
18 surprised, because the world isn't very just. But
19 I like to dream.
20 And I thank you all for raising your voices.
21 And here's to justice.
22 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Brett VandenHeuvel.
23
24 COMMENTS BY BRETT VANDENHEUVEL:
25 I'm Brett VandenHeuvel. I'm the director of

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

However, as discussed in the Summary, Section S.1.3.2, and Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2, of this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE will not make decisions on groundwater remediation, including the remediation of groundwater contamination resulting from non-tank-farm areas in the 200 Areas, because that is being addressed under the CERCLA (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) process. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford under the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

64

Columbia Riverkeeper.

I've been keeping a little tally tonight, and I've concluded that people don't want more nuclear waste to be sent to Hanford. So if everyone else agrees with me, it looks like the discussion is finished and we can take this back to Richland, Washington, and we win.

The context of Hanford is important. Hanford sits on the banks of the Columbia River. The Columbia River is the lifeblood of the Pacific Northwest. It's critical for our drinking water, for agriculture irrigation, for the communities that live along the river, for the salmon, that our economy depends on. *302-1*

And this critical nature of the Columbia River is not going to change. It's going to be there for generations and generations and generations. And all of these economic values, all of these spiritual values, all of these values for our communities depend on a clean Columbia River. And how are we treating this critical resource? How are we treating this national treasure? We're proposing to import more waste to the banks of the Columbia.

This document, this process, this *302-2*

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

302-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

302-2 The Summary is intended to provide a brief overview of the material contained in this *TC & WM EIS*, and cannot, by nature, include all topics of interest to individual parties. To assist the public in navigating through the complex information presented in this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE has also issued a Reader's Guide. This guide serves as an introduction and guide to the contents of this EIS, highlights the key features of the reasonable alternatives, and helps the reader review the technical analyses presented. Recognizing that many people may not read beyond the EIS Summary, the information presented in both the Summary and Reader's Guide attempts to strike a balance between those readers interested in the more technical details about DOE's proposed actions and alternatives and those who seek a simpler overview. Based on the public comments received on the draft EIS, DOE made revisions in this final EIS that clarify discussions, as well as ensure that the document addresses the relevant considerations and scope of analysis under NEPA.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

65

Environmental Impact Statement is offensive, and it's completely unacceptable. I don't want to ascribe motives to anybody. I don't want to suggest this was done purposefully. But if I wanted to produce a document that jammed in a bunch of confusing, unrelated topics and hid the valuable and important topics, it would look a lot like this document right here, this summary of the 6,000-page document.

302-2 cont'd

These are simple things: Clean up the tanks to 99.999 percent, whatever is technically feasible. It is very clear, the cancer rate is increased by multiple orders of magnitude if we don't do that. That should be a given. That shouldn't even be part of the discussion tonight.

302-3

What I think is a key part of the discussion, what we keep hearing over and over and over, is no new waste to Hanford. No new waste to Hanford. The alternative -- It's offensive to me to have to comment or be asked to comment on whether we want to bring off-site waste and put it in the east or the west landfill. That's a false choice. I refuse to even acknowledge that choice. And the only acceptable alternative is no new waste to Hanford.

302-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

302-3 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

The data show, as Ken Niles mentioned, now we have data to show that there will be environmental consequences. And bringing any new waste to Hanford is an intentional release. We know what is going to happen, and that will be intentionally releasing that waste.

302-1 cont'd

And I'll finish up by saying that Columbia Riverkeeper and others will submit detailed legal comments on this Environmental Impact Statement. But frankly -- I'm going to show my cards here -- if you produce enough drafts and enough words, you can meet the legal standard. But the real standard here, the real test is: Does it meet our moral test? And the answer to that is "No."

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Next is Lang Davison. And after Lang will be Fred Nussbaum.

COMMENTS BY LANG DAVISON:

My name is Lang Davison. I live in Portland. I'm here as a citizen and as a father of two small children.

Frankly, I'm stunned by what the U.S. Department of Energy is proposing in this EIS. This amounts to what is, at best, a half cleanup of Hanford followed by a proposed recontamination.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

67

This is shameful.

I really don't know what employees and officials of the Department of Energy in the U.S. say to themselves to be able to sleep at night when they propose something like this. And the same goes for the Washington Department of Ecology when it makes a bunch of slippery, mealy-mouthed comments about this plan and this proposal.

On behalf of my fellow citizens here in Portland and Oregon, we demand the following three things: immediate cleanup of the tank farm to include 100 percent of the 53 million gallons of waste that are there; clean up what is already leaking into the groundwater; and bring no nuclear waste into Hanford whatsoever, drop the proposal to do so. Adding more waste and/or failing to clean up what's already there, as has been said, is legally, morally, and ethically unacceptable and reprehensible.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Fred Nussbaum, and then Robin Klein.

COMMENTS BY FRED NUSSBAUM:

Good evening. My name is Fred Nussbaum. I'm

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

303-1

303-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all of the SST system, which would effectively remove 100 percent of the waste. Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding the cleanup of the past leaks.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

a resident of Portland, lived here for over 50 years. And I'm also a part-time resident of the state of Washington. I have a vacation home up in Port Townsend.

So the comments from the Washington Department of Ecology, I found very disappointing. And I'm proud of the Oregon Department of Energy's comments.

My background is in transportation. And so the idea of more nuclear waste in trucks or even on rail through Oregon and Washington, through the rest of the country, is just mind boggling; especially to an area, a facility that has been proven to not be able to contain its own waste as it is. *304-1*

And we're looking at a huge undertaking to do a full cleanup, which of course I'm in agreement, too. So everything that the other groups have said -- Heart of America, Hanford group, so on, so forth -- I agree with. *304-2*

And I think one of the major failings of this DEIS and most DEISs is that we don't involve the citizens in working out what the criteria are going to be and what models are going to be and the assumptions that are going to go in there and all *304-3*

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

304-1 The *Draft TC & WM EIS* analyzed the transportation of RH-LLW from INL to Hanford for disposal. Based on the public's input and concerns about offsite waste disposal at Hanford, DOE has included in this *Final TC & WM EIS* an example of a potential mitigation measure that could be taken. Specifically, an offsite waste stream containing a significant inventory of iodine-129 (i.e., RH-LLW resins from INL) was eliminated from the analysis. This mitigation measure has been incorporated into the Waste Management alternatives. In addition, a sensitivity analysis is included that shows the impacts of limiting offsite waste streams containing iodine-129 and technetium-99. The results of this sensitivity analysis illustrate the difference this would make in potential groundwater impacts and are included in Appendix M. Other mitigation measures, such as recycling secondary-waste streams into the primary-waste-stream feeds within the WTP to increase iodine-129 capture in ILAW and bulk vitrification, are discussed in Chapter 7, Section 7.5, of this EIS.

304-2 Comment noted.

304-3 As a NEPA document, this *TC & WM EIS* was prepared in an open manner, with opportunities for public input provided at both the scoping meetings and public hearings on the draft EIS. Two sets of public scoping meetings for this *TC & WM EIS* were held in February 2003 and March 2006. DOE disagrees with the statement that no effort was made to involve the public regarding the models and assumptions. Appendix C, Table C–1, Public Information Outreach Plan, in the *Draft TC & WM EIS* describes one of the many efforts DOE used to seek public input throughout the EIS impacts analysis development process. Appendix C describes communications with American Indian tribes, the HAB, and the Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board. In addition, the groundwater flow model used in this EIS went through a rigorous technical review process that included review and comment by three groups: (1) Ecology, a cooperating agency on this EIS; (2) the Local Users' Group, consisting of hydrogeologists and geologists from the Hanford community; and (3) the Technical Review Group, composed of four experts with commercial, governmental, and academic experience in groundwater modeling and/or environmental engineering.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

69

this stuff. Because as we've heard from people, the environmental consequences in terms of what the impact is on our natural environment, on the people downstream and so on, have not been adequately addressed in this document. And this whole thing is unconscionable.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Robin Klein, and then Chris Henry.

COMMENTS BY ROBIN KLEIN:

Hi. I'm Robin Klein. I'm speaking for myself tonight. Also, I am on the board of Heart of America and Columbia Riverkeeper, and a former director of Hanford Action of Oregon.

First, while it is understood that every potential option could not practically be explored in this EIS, at least you would think that 15 years or more of public hearing and outcry and threats by the state, that today's EIS might include options universally popular here in the Northwest -- especially here in Portland, the largest population center downriver from Hanford -- options popular with all of us outside the Department of Energy, options such as "We'll clean up before ever even

304-3 cont'd

305-1

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

305-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. However, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates. Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

70

1 considering an option that involves bringing in
2 off-site waste."
3 After the ecological assault that has been
4 done to the Northwest and massive threats to the
5 future health of our children, to suggest the
6 Department of Energy and Hanford can handle more
7 waste is without foundation. This EIS was
8 drafted -- it is crafted in such a way as to
9 manipulate or control the outcome by presenting
10 alternatives palatable to the Department of Energy,
11 to enable the Department of Energy to proceed with
12 what it wants to do. I will suggest that that is
13 to bring in new waste, not what the public wants.
14 And the preferred alternatives are clearly the
15 Department's preference, not the public's: limited
16 cleanup of the tanks and the earth; entombing the
17 FFTF rather than fully dismantling it; and analysis
18 to enable importation of more dangerous waste to a
19 site by an agency that has already demonstrated its
20 utter inability to manage, let alone clean up, the
21 waste there.
22 In conclusion, the goal should be set at 100
23 percent cleanup. Do not sell the cleanup short by
24 reducing the goals at the outset. And we are still
25 at the outset. Time and the will to make it

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

305-1 cont'd

305-2

305-2 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses, as are differing approaches to decommissioning FFTF. Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. This approach includes the tank system, along with the vadose zone as impacted by the tank farms (i.e., past leaks). With respect to FFTF, FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3 would remove radioactive and other hazardous components to a level that would negate the need for a barrier. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

However, as discussed in the Summary, Section S.1.3.2, and Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2, of this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE will not make decisions on groundwater remediation, including the remediation of groundwater contamination resulting from non-tank-farm areas in the 200 Areas, because that is being addressed under the CERCLA (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) process. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford under the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

71

1 happen, investment in developing technologies will
2 likely get us there sooner than later in time. And
3 one thing is for sure: This vast, hot radioactive
4 cesspool is with us a ghastly long time.
5 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Chris Henry. And
6 after Chris is Christine Charneski.
7
8 COMMENTS BY CHRIS HENRY:
9 Hi. My name is Chris Henry. I'm here
10 representing the Pacific Green Party of Oregon
11 tonight. And I'm the candidate for the First
12 Congressional District that's currently being held
13 by David Wu. I ran in '08, and I'm running again
14 in 2010.
15 I'm a teamster, and I'm on layoff right now
16 from Yellow Freight. I have a hazardous materials
17 endorsement. I drive truck. My father drove a
18 truck; my grandfather drove a truck; ergo, I drive.
19 I'm going to deputize all of you as truck
20 drivers. Here's the reality: Regardless of what
21 the shipment is, no matter what you're hauling,
22 you're going to be sitting in that chair, like
23 you've been, for two hours at least before you get
24 a break. And if you're a driver driving through
25 the night or any other time, you drive a lot. So

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

305-2 cont'd

306-1

306-1 DOT regulates the shipment of radioactive and hazardous materials. As specified in DOE Manual 460.2-1A, *Radioactive Material Transportation Practices Manual for Use with DOE O 460.2A*, carriers of LLW and MLLW are expected to exercise due caution and care in dispatching shipments. According to the manual, the carrier will determine the acceptability of weather and road conditions, whether a shipment should be held before departure, and when actions should be taken while en route. The manual emphasizes that shipments should not be dispatched if severe weather or bad road conditions make travel hazardous. Current weather conditions, the weather forecast, and road conditions should be considered before dispatching a shipment. Conditions at the point of origin and along the entire route would be considered. In addition, hazardous materials truck drivers are required by Federal (49 CFR 383) and state regulations to be technically qualified and experienced and have completed training in hazardous and radioactive materials transportation. As stated in Appendix H, Section H.5, the maximum dose allowed in the truck cabin (crew dose) is 2 millirem per hour (10 CFR 71.47) unless the crew includes a trained radiation worker, who would be administratively limited to an annual dose of 2 rem per year (DOE Standard 1098-2008). This amount of radiation dose is not expected to result in an LCF. Stops by the truck are expected and may be required, depending on the material being hauled and the distance. Doses to certain members of the public and workers are estimated in Appendix H. It is unlikely that these doses would result in an LCF.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

you're going to drink a lot of coffee. Okay.

And with that coffee, you're going to have to take a bathroom break. Where are you going to do that when you have a radioactive load, a hazardous load? You're going to have to think about that long and hard. What if there's inclement weather? What if you run into snow? What if you run into ice? You're going to have to pull over and chain up.

There are other drivers. There are other people out on the public highway. The company doesn't own the highway; the DOE does not own the highway. You own the highway. When I'm out there driving, I'm cognizant that that is not my company's highway. That's the people's highway. And you have to be very careful when you are driving, because everyone else is at risk. So you have to wonder about when you take detours, what if you blow a tire? There are lots of things that can happen on the highway.

When they bid on a contract, it's not going to be a Teamster organization likely that is going to be hauling these shipments. These are going to be the lowest bidders. They're going to be drivers who haven't been checked as well as teamsters. It

306-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

73

took me years to get into the Teamsters. And I've worked through a lot, an awful lot of organizations. In 15 years, I've held over 20 jobs driving trucks because it's seasonal or they close the plant or whatnot.

So in order to find good drivers, good seasoned drivers who know what they're doing, especially with radioactive shipments. And you've got to know your stuff. You know, they can't tell you, they seriously can't tell you that you are not going to be exposed. You are always at risk, no matter what it is.

So what we're doing is we have this energy that we're shooting for nuclear energy, but it's a short-term solution. And it gives us nukes. So that's what they want. They're worried about worker exposure to clean it up, but they haven't worried about the workers who are mining it, the uranium, who are processing it into usable, fissionable material. They're not worried about the workers who are operating the plants. They're not worried about the workers who process it into weapons, who enrich it.

So there's a deep concern, they say, about cleaning it up. We have to be in this for the long

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

306-1 cont'd

306-2

306-3

306-2 This *TC & WM EIS* evaluates the potential impacts on future workers involved in the actions proposed in this EIS. However, DOE and the Federal Government are also concerned with health impacts on past workers involved in the mining and processing necessary to acquire nuclear materials. Current workers are protected through the application of safety programs designed to comply with protective standards, including requirements to maintain ALARA doses. Through a number of other programs, the Federal Government evaluates past health impacts and provides compensation to past workers who served in building the Nation's nuclear defense. The purpose of these compensation programs is to provide timely, uniform, and adequate compensation to covered employees (and, where applicable, their survivors), who were exposed to beryllium, ionizing radiation, and other hazards unique to nuclear weapons production and testing and have suffered from illnesses incurred as a result of their work for DOE, its predecessor agencies, and certain of its contractors and subcontractors.

306-3 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

1 term in order to clean it up. And it should be
2 done mostly on site. It shouldn't be shipped
3 across the highways. So it's not a carbon
4 neutral -- Nuclear isn't carbon neutral; it's
5 carbon intensive. And we're seeing it here. So
6 anyway, we oppose any proposition to ship it over
7 the highways.
8 Thank you.
9 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Christine. And
10 following Christine will be Jeff Weih.
11
12 COMMENTS BY CHRISTINE CHARNESKI:
13 My name is Christine Charneski. I was born in
14 Portland, at the confluence of the Willamette and
15 Columbia Rivers. I've lived here all of my life.
16 And I think Paul just left. I was with Paul in the
17 Trojan Decommission Alliance a long time ago. He
18 was an esteemed leader of our group, and I just
19 wanted to give him a shout out for that.
20 My mom was a federal employee. She was an
21 administrative person. And I grew up just steeped
22 with the understanding of how difficult it was for
23 government employees, people who were smart,
24 educated, knowledgeable -- scientists especially,
25 my mom worked with a group of scientists -- who

306-3 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

tried to look out for resources, tried to look out for taking care of the planet and the public good.

And how difficult it was to do their jobs sometimes, how undermined they were by the whims of political appointees who would come in as the different administrations came and went. And how -- how horrible it was sometimes for the position that scientists were put in, having to take on policies and deal with issues that they didn't actually support. They had to make career decisions.

My mother came home in tears sometimes. I mean, I was a little kid, watching my mother, who was a secretary, cry over the positions that she saw really dedicated men put in making career decisions, struggling to try to do the best job that they can.

So I'm really sympathetic to what happens when you're working in an agency, and you're trying to put forward some policy the best way you can. And I kind of feel for what it must be like to take a lot of heat for presenting such a miserable, pathetic kind of policy that's being presented tonight.

So I guess really what I want to say, I mean,

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

76

clearly, I support everything that has been said tonight. And I think I've been to these hearings, not as much as everybody but for about as long as everybody. I was really heartbroken. I got the last mailing. I said, Really? We're going to do this again? We're going to talk about trucking waste across our country? I mean, really?

I also was one of those people who thought that maybe now we're going to have a shot. You know, we've had a year. We've got a smart guy in charge again. We've got a really bright guy in charge of DOE. And maybe in this era of being a little more open, a little more reviewing things based on real science and real fact, we've got a shot at going in a new direction.

So I guess the message that I'm thinking maybe you might want to consider as you're looking at this room of people, some of us have been coming here for a long time. We're real tenacious. We're just going to keep coming. But I'm pretty sure that if this really keeps going in the direction that it's looking like, people are going to keep coming. People are not going to go away.

I think you can really take a message to the political directors that you answer to and tell

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

307-1 **307-1** Comment noted.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

77

them, "Look, we'll cover you. It's okay to shift gears. It's okay to go in new directions. It's okay to start really looking at the real alternatives, the really smart, moral -- It's really essential things."

The people out here will cover that. We will back that. We will back whatever kind of tough decisions that you all have to go back with. We'll support you.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Jeff? Is Jeff here? Ross Tewksbury.

COMMENTS BY ROSS TEWKSBURY:

I am Ross Tewksbury from Portland.

And I'm kind of struggling. There's not much left to say, except that I just want to reiterate that they don't need to import any more radioactive waste to Hanford, because they obviously can't handle what they've already got now.

And with the trucking situation as was just eloquently explained, I really doubt that the Department of Energy officials that are so hot on this trucking and transporting stuff would be volunteering to live alongside the roads where the

307-1 cont'd

308-1

308-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

78

trucks go by every month. I think they kind of figure somebody else will be living there, no problem.

And I'm also against this whole idea of, you know, sort of like landfilling it and capping it and then saying, "Wow, we're done. Let's go away now." I mean, that was the impression I got from listening to it. So they need to fully remove the tanks and do the clean closure 99.9 or 100 percent, as much as they possibly can. They need to dismantle the FFTF plant entirely.

So far, the way things have been working, it's just like playing a shell game with this waste. Let's move it over here, move it over there, take that out and move it over there. And I mean, to people back in the '40s and '50s, you know, we're like the future generations dealing with this production that happened back then.

And now there's going to be more future generations, off to our great grandchildren and off into the indefinite future. If we continue to screw it up, they're going to have to deal with it a hundred years from now, 200 years from now. So there's no way to do the shortcut-type of thinking here.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

308-2

308-3

308-2 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all of the SST system, which would effectively remove 100 percent of the waste. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

The commentor's preference for dismantling FFTF entirely (essentially FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3) is noted. Under Alternative 3, nearly all elements of FFTF and the two adjacent support facilities would be removed; however, the lower portion of the RCB concrete shell would remain. This would be backfilled with either soil or grout to minimize void space. The area would be regraded and revegetated, with no need for a barrier.

308-3 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

79

And the one word I found actually kind of offensive, you keep talking about closure. But there is no closure. Certainly from the graphs we've seen, going off of the charts here, the groundwater is still going to be -- whatever we do, it's going to be bad. It's just a matter of whether we can kind of do the defensive measures to slow it down and mitigate it as much as we possibly can.

But there is no closure to this. It's never going to be over. It's always going to be going for thousands and thousands of years, way down into anything we can even imagine here. And so we need to do the maximum we can do with the technology that we've got today, the maximum cleanup we can possibly do.

And some of the stuff, we have to wait for future technology to catch up on so we can do even more, better things. And so it's just -- there's just -- It's going to be going on for thousands and thousands of years. It's not something that's going to be cleaned up and gone over, you know, like that.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Joyce Follingstad.

308-3 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

80

After Joyce will be Laura Feldman.

COMMENTS BY JOYCE FOLLINGSTAD:

Good evening. I'm Joyce Follingstad. I'm a psychologist and a nurse in Portland, Oregon.

And over Christmas this year, one of my dear friends just was informed one day that she had Stage IV thyroid cancer, and had to have it removed immediately. And now I watch her suffer with trying to deal with the levels of hormone that can make her feel somewhat normal again.

As we know, we now have a statistic in the United States that one of every two men will get cancer, and one of every three women will get cancer. How much more can we bear? I say it is time now to clean completely every bit of Hanford. Let's not just clean up the tanks. I believe every bit of the tanks and the soil and the water underneath should be cleaned, but also those trenches need to be cleaned out completely.

And it's just a joke that now we have lined trenches that delay the leaching of those materials into the ground and into the water for maybe ten, 15, 20 years. So I say drop all these considerations of the preferred alternatives. We

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

309-1

309-1 The scope of this *TC & WM EIS* includes analysis of the environmental impacts of storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste and closure of the SST system. With regard to other cleanup actions, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford under the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates. As noted in Chapter 1, the six sets of cribs and trenches (ditches) that are contiguous to the SSTs are CERCLA past-practice units. These would fall under the barriers placed over the SSTs during closure. They are evaluated in this EIS as part of a connected action because they would be influenced by barrier placement. However, closure of these CERCLA past-practice units is not part of the proposed actions for this EIS.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

81

309-1 cont'd

need 100 percent of cleanup. We need cleanup of the soil, the water.

Any new waste brought to Hanford is completely unconscionable. We now have -- thank you for your graphs and your information in the EIS -- the proof that it will impact the environment and cause harm. It will kill truck drivers with a single accident; it will render hundreds of square miles uninhabitable and will kill thousands of individuals.

309-2

And as we know from having done the experiment of dropping bombs in Japan, those of us that do manage to live through the catastrophe and look for a place to go and get help, well, those people were very shunned by the population of Japan. And our neighbors and our relatives aren't going to be offering a place for us to live.

And remember, too, that none of us can ensure our homes or our health from radioactivity. So also, completely remove the FFTF, every bit of it. So I would say "No" to the trucks on the roads. I say clean it all up.

309-3

And also, we need to have the DOE to have a plan to clean up Kuwait and Iraq and Afghanistan, where now we know that, two decades now after the

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

309-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

309-3 Complete removal of FFTF is addressed in this *TC & WM EIS* under FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

war, the first war there, cancers are up 400 percent, birth defects are up 400 percent. And our servicemen and women are bringing home radioactive contamination and giving their children birth defects. So I say "No" to any new nukes.

And I say "No" to any more waste at Hanford. Because also, it's a political decision. And when we accept waste from other states, they can stay living in denial that their wastes somehow don't matter because it's all shunted off to our states that live with the waste.

And so I say, let us clean up now, completely. Let's take as long as it takes to do it right. Because we have children and grandchildren; we have wildlife. We owe it to them to do it right.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Laura Feldman, and then Marian Grebanier.

COMMENTS BY LAURA FELDMAN:

Hi. I want to thank you for coming tonight. It makes me feel less crazy. There's a lot of strength and perseverance and courage and intelligence in this room. And this is a nightmarish thing. This is a nightmare. It's a natural holocaust.

309-2 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

83

1 And I honestly think, at this hearing, I think
2 I realize the latest development is that the
3 gauntlet has been thrown down. DOE isn't going to
4 do the right thing. The movement, the trucking of
5 this waste through our communities is pretty much
6 aligned, for me. And I think that rather than
7 continuing to show patience for this boondoggling
8 and corruption and, you know, greed that drives
9 this whole supposed Hanford cleanup, I think we
10 need to, as others have said, take direct action
11 and make sure this doesn't happen.
12 I think our politicians aren't going to do
13 this for us. DOE certainly is not. And it's just
14 very real, now that they're going to be on the
15 freeway next to you or me or someone you care
16 about. That's one part. I think the buck stops
17 here. We need to put our foot down.
18 Secondly, I need personally to go towards
19 something positive. I think there are solutions to
20 this cleanup. I've heard snatches of it here,
21 which is another reason I love to come to these
22 hearings. Because what I don't get from them, what
23 I get from you, are possible solutions and unique
24 ways of thinking about this problem. So if we can
25 create the most wasteful toxic form of energy, we

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

310-1

310-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

84

ought to be able -- I know we have the creativity and the intelligence to solve this problem.

So as Melba said, as Paul Libby earlier said, it makes me crazy. But I want to do something and I want to do something really tangible. And I don't feel like I'm going to let them truck this waste through Portland. That much I want to say. And I don't know what that means. I don't know exactly what that means, you know. But I think we need to take direct action: suing them, protesting, and working towards actual solutions.

Thanks.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Marian, and then James Brunkow. Marian? James Brunkow.

COMMENTS BY JAMES BRUNKOW:

My name is James Brunkow. I'm a resident of Portland.

It just seems to me that anything less than cleanup is pretty much nothing to actually sacrifice. So I don't like the idea much. I don't think the future generations like it too much, either. I guess that would be tank closure 100 percent.

And I don't know, I get real nervous. I don't

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

311-1

311-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. This closure includes the tank system, along with the vadose zone as impacted by the tank farms (i.e., past leaks). Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

1 think I can speak any longer.
2 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Joanne Keefe?
3 Joanne? Roger Cole? Dorothy Land? Is that right,
4 Dorothy? Thank you.
5
6 COMMENTS BY DOROTHY LAND:
7 I am a downwinder. I'm from what we call the
8 thyroid belt.
9 I've taken thyroid medicine my whole life.
10 I'm always freezing cold when other people are
11 taking off -- they're sleeveless and in shorts, and
12 I'm in like three layers. I'm tired a lot. My
13 adrenals have now gone bad as a result, because
14 they try to take over for your thyroid and then
15 they go. And on it goes. My sister had her
16 thyroid and her parathyroid removed. She's not the
17 only one.
18 We were downwinders. I do not want to be a
19 downstreamer. I don't think I want to live through
20 it all. I've lived along the Columbia River my
21 whole life, pretty much. I'm thinking of moving
22 away if this happens. I don't want to see this. I
23 don't want to suffer anymore. And I don't want to
24 watch other people suffering.
25 They're sacrificing us. I've heard that

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

1 several times tonight: We're being sacrificed.
2 Outraged, I've heard that a lot, too. I think we
3 should stop making it. I don't know what Obama is
4 thinking about, that we need more nuclear. It's
5 crazy. And the clean coal, that doesn't make sense
6 either.
7 There are many kinds of energy that haven't
8 even been looked into. There's all kinds of new
9 energy inventions and stuff. We do not need
10 nuclear. And let's not make any bombs anymore.
11 Let's not fight anymore. Okay, you guys?
12 Also, with the money that has gone to Hanford,
13 my understanding is that we're not doing that kind
14 of priority stuff. Let's spend the money wisely.
15 Clean it up, don't bring any more. Everything
16 everyone's been saying. Let's straighten up and
17 take some moral responsibility.
18 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Miriam German?
19 Miriam?
20 ATTENDEE: She left.
21 MR. PARHAM: Okay. Brooke Jacobson? Brooke?
22 Dru Jones? Dru?
23 Anyone else have a comment that would like to
24 comment at this time? Okay. Let me just ask this
25 question, if there's anyone who hasn't commented

312-1

312-1 Both DOE and Congress are committed to cleanup efforts at Hanford, and DOE continues to seek funding for these efforts. In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. However, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

87

yet? Let the people go who haven't commented yet, and then we'll get right to you.

Ma'am, did you want to comment?

COMMENTS BY NANCY JOHNSON:

I do want to comment. Thank you for everyone who has spoken out. And thank you for being here.

I am a third-grade teacher in Portland, Oregon. And what I'm hearing is just making me sick. And I don't know what other solution there could be than to do a 100 percent cleanup.

I don't know what you're thinking, and I don't know where it comes from. And I definitely don't know how you sleep at night. And I don't want to sleep at night. And I want -- I will do whatever I can do to stop you from doing whatever you're doing.

And that's all I have to say.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: I'm Nancy Johnson.

MR. PARHAM: I believe we've got another person that would like to comment. Yes, ma'am.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

313-1

313-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. This closure includes the tank system, along with the vadose zone as impacted by the tank farms (i.e., past leaks). Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

However, as discussed in the Summary, Section S.1.3.2, and Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2, of this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE will not make decisions on groundwater remediation, including the remediation of groundwater contamination resulting from non-tank-farm areas in the 200 Areas, because that is being addressed under the CERCLA (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) process. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford under the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

COMMENTS BY LISA VAN DYK:

I'm Lisa Van Dyk with Heart of America Northwest. And I'd just like to thank everyone that it still here, and acknowledge the fact that most of the people are not here anymore.

So I would like to clarify something that I also clarified last night about the legality of the moratorium. I think it was a little confusing because there was subtle agreement a while ago that it's a legal, binding document, that the Department of Energy will not bring waste to Hanford until this final EIS is released.

This is the draft. The final will probably come out in about a year. But the extension to the moratorium, which was through 2022 or when the waste treatment is operational, is not legally binding. It is in the cover letter to a legally binding document.

So that is all I wanted to clarify. And thank you to everybody who is still here.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else who would like to comment?

COMMENTS BY NORM SANTANA:

Hi. My name is Norm Santana. I live in

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

314-1

314-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

89

Portland.

You know, I can understand why, you know, you might want to just throw up your hands and say, "Oh, 100 percent cleanup is just too big of a job. It's just going to be too expensive." But I -- I think I couldn't support anything less than a complete, 100 percent cleanup. I know that's a big job and everything. But, you know, it's jobs. What the heck. And it's the right thing to do. 315-1

I also want to thank you for showing up. Really, thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else that would like to comment that hasn't? Yes.

COMMENTS BY LORI MESERVE:

My name is Lori Meserve. I just want to say: Bank bail-out. Thank you. 316-1

COMMENTS BY HOLLY HOFFMAN:

Holly Hoffman, Portland, Oregon.

The last time I was at one of these meetings, it appeared that we were going back and looking at getting a hard look at what the proper thing to do was to clean up, essentially in order to enable to continue dumping. And then as long as the cleanup

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

315-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. This closure includes the tank system, along with the vadose zone as impacted by the tank farms (i.e., past leaks). Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

However, as discussed in the Summary, Section S.1.3.2, and Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2, of this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE will not make decisions on groundwater remediation, including the remediation of groundwater contamination resulting from non-tank-farm areas in the 200 Areas, because that is being addressed under the CERCLA (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) process. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford under the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

316-1 Bank bailouts are not within the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze the potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

hadn't started yet, they would be permitted to dump and continue to dump.

So I appreciate Ecology for bringing suit and bringing the moratorium. And it just seems a little -- I don't know how to characterize it. But it seems like the choice of year when the moratorium will end also coincides with the time that there will be an up-and-running facility. So we'll just be the cleanup -- designated cleanup site for the country, since Yucca Mountain is now off the table.

And I just don't understand the accuracy of the choice of site, when there's so much water going through the site and it's so active. And if we had started cleanup, actually addressing it at the time that we were delaying it, we wouldn't be now facing strontium reaching the river. So I'm very concerned about how long it's taking and the direction that it seems to be going.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else who would like to comment that hasn't yet? Yes, sir.

COMMENTS BY TOM CARPENTER:

My Tom is Tom Carpenter. And I'm from

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

317-1

317-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

The current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

91

Seattle, Washington. And I'm the executive director of Hanford Challenge. And I've also worked in a role as an attorney for the government accountability project, representing nuclear whistle-blowers, especially at the Hanford site since the late 1980s.

And one thing that whistle-blowers have told us is that we have been misled and there have been credibility gaps from government agencies at the Hanford site for some time, starting with the fact that waste that has leaked out of nuclear waste tanks at the Hanford site somehow wasn't migrating through the groundwater. And there was a lot of fighting going on about whether or not that in fact is happening.

So 15, 16 years ago, there was a fairly adamant fight going on between scientists at the site who insisted that there was good evidence that groundwater was contaminated by tank waste. And in fact, that turned out to be true, just like many decades of denial by the Department of Energy.

And we then found out some other painful truths, including that far more waste has leaked from those tanks than was thought. So in 1966, for instance, we know that there was a tank explosion

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

318-1

318-1 Regarding the volume of waste that has leaked from the tanks, as noted by the commentor and discussed in Appendix D of this *TC & WM EIS*, there is uncertainty regarding the volume of tank waste leaked due to the lack of available supporting data.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

from Tank 105A. And over a million gallons of cooling water was put into the tank, because of the heat of the waste, that had leaked out of the tank into the soil beneath the tank. That's not counted in the million gallons that you all have heard about.

318-1 cont'd

And then a Los Alamos scientist issued a draft report saying the tank waste that had leaked from the tanks was probably more on the order of 6 million gallons to as much as 10 million gallons. That report was not officially released; just a draft went out, appeared to be a draft.

I bring all this up because this Environmental Impact Statement has a lot of claims about data. It's got models in it. And I -- I've looked at it. We have scientists who are looking at this. And what we know is that we actually don't know a whole lot about what is in the ground, what is below the tanks. And that worries a lot of us very, very much.

318-1 cont'd

We are talking about waste that is dangerous, in the trillions of curie; seven, eight trillions of curie of strontium 90 in a liter of water. And yet we've got hundreds of millions of curies of this material out there. It lasts a long time.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

93

1 People were talking about iodine 129 that has a
2 half-life of 15 million years. It's around for
3 150 million years. These are scales that it's just
4 hard to get our minds around. And you can't.
5 You know, there haven't been institutions
6 capable of living out that long to be able to
7 protect the site probably for, you know, the next
8 thousand years. I don't know, 500 years, 250
9 years. So when we talk about forever guarding
10 these sites from intrusion, it's just not going to
11 happen.
12 So I agree with the comments that I've heard
13 tonight about needing to do as robust and effective
14 of a remediation. And I've heard this word
15 "cleanup" a lot. Ain't no cleanup is going to be
16 happening. We're going to be stabilizing; we're
17 going to be hopefully setting this waste aside.
18 But we're not going to be able to treat this stuff.
19 It has to go away at some natural rate,
20 because we don't know how to neutralize it or
21 whatever. You can secure it in glass, but we know
22 glass will fail. I mean, these are real long time
23 frames. And the volumes are just so large. So
24 it's a very big problem. And we do know that it's
25 an institutional issue.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

318-1 cont'd

318-2

318-2 This *TC & WM EIS* assumes several different types of end-state management, as described in Chapter 2, the Glossary, and the Summary. These include administrative controls, institutional controls, and postclosure care, as appropriate. Each of these end-state management options would take place at the completion of an action and is assumed to occur for 100 years following the end of the action (e.g., active institutional controls would be maintained for 100 years following final placement of waste in a storage facility). The 10,000-year time period described in this *TC & WM EIS* represents the period of analysis used for the long-term impact analyses for groundwater, human health, and ecological risk; it does not represent the assumed period of institutional controls. For clarity, the definition of "10,000-year period of analysis" is included in this final EIS in Chapter 2, the Glossary, and the Summary, as appropriate.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

94

I also will point out, just for the benefit of this crowd and maybe the Department of Energy, that in 1996, the Brookings Institution released a report that calculated costs of making nuclear weapons at $5.5 trillion. That's what the taxpayers paid to make this mess.

And Hanford isn't the only one; there's other big messes out there. And of course, the United States isn't the only place. Russia, China, France, England, et cetera, they all have large contaminated sites, too. And these are sites that are going to keep on giving unless we do something about it.

And we have to do something about it. We have to spend the money. We have to develop the technologies. We have to think differently and act differently than we have been. And we cannot just give up and walk away on this cleanup. And if that is what this Environmental Impact Statement says we need to do, I disagree. I think this room disagrees. So it's going to be up to us to make that happen.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone who has not had a chance to comment who wants to? If not, then

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

318-3

318-3 Both DOE and Congress are committed to the cleanup efforts at Hanford, and DOE continues to seek funding for these efforts. In general, however, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

This *TC & WM EIS* evaluates various supplemental treatment technologies to augment WTP capabilities. One of the decisions to be made by DOE using the information provided in this EIS will be which technologies will be used to treat the tank waste.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

is there anyone who wants to comment who has already? I'll start here.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY JIM McNAUGHTON:

I just want to back up and make the statement: There is no legal document that will back up your statement there is a moratorium. I just want to make that a fact.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Yes, sir.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY CHUCK JOHNSON:

Chuck Johnson from Columbia Riverkeeper again. Just to be -- You know, generally at these hearings, I've been more positive than I was when I gave my first statement.

And generally, that's been because I felt that, as a region, we made a decision, you know, early '90s that Hanford was a waste site and a site that needed to be cleaned up; and that there was more or less a consensus in the Northwest that we weren't going to be adding waste to that site, and that we were going to be striving to, as best we could -- I think Tom probably said it better. He's right. It isn't cleanup; it isn't remediation. It's trying to make the best of a very bad

276-1 cont'd

296-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

96

1 situation, but not add to it and do everything we
2 can to make it better.
3 And I hope that we can get back to that,
4 because this plan does not do that. It doesn't do
5 that at all. It's a step way in the wrong
6 direction. Because I think if we have
7 accommodation in the Northwest, and we have Oregon
8 and Washington working together, with our
9 Congressional delegations, we can find the money to
10 get the job done here.
11 And it will produce a lot of good, quality
12 jobs, just like it's doing right now with the
13 remediation work that's being done along the river.
14 It's very important work. And we need to do that
15 for the whole site. I see no reason why we should
16 leave waste in the ground and allow it to
17 contaminate the areas we're cleaning up right now.
18 That's ridiculous.
19 So, you know, I really hope you go back to the
20 drawing board. Don't try to sweep this under the
21 rug. Don't let this become a national sacrifice.
22 I thought we were stepping away from that idea.
23 And I hope that we can get back to the regional
24 consensus that we have: This is a society that we
25 want to clean up; we want to restore; we want to

296-1 cont'd

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

use the Hanford Reach as a resource, a recreational resource.

You've got Battelle Labs there that could be researching energy issues of all sorts. And Tri-Cities already is a research capital; it can continue to be so. You know, even this idea of a -- a reactor museum. I think the reactor itself might be contaminated and not necessarily safe to go into, but you can build a replica. It is a part of our heritage. And I think it ought to be honored in that way or at least known as part of our history.

And we ought to be working together. But this is a step of working away. This is, once again, ignoring the wishes of really what I think is the majority of people in the Northwest. And look at The Oregonian editorial today. That's a mainstream paper. And they were very clear about what vision they expect for the cleanup work at Hanford. And I think we all are, here in Oregon especially.

So we call on our brothers and sisters in Washington to work with us. Don't fight us. Don't go back. Don't go back on the road that didn't work.

Thank you.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

98

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else that would like to provide additional comment? Ma'am?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY LOUISA HAMACHEK:

I'm Louisa Hamachek. I spoke a little earlier. I'm from Eugene, Oregon. And I feel myself to be part of the entire Columbia River Basin and a connected responsibility.

And I forgot to inquire whether the Department of Energy has seen -- looked to what's the effect of the radiation on the other toxic chemicals that are the pesticides that are coming down the Columbia River, and the blending and the new chemicals that are being made. And what's the effect on the fish and the animals from that? *284-3*

I also wanted to point out that the Columbia Generating Station is generating waste at the Hanford site now. It is creating electricity for the rest of the area, for the Northwest. And I would like to ask that that station be shut down, that we shouldn't just quietly allow this nuclear power to continue and accept that electricity, and that the research facility should go towards more renewable energy that's actually safe. And so that's nuclear waste right there being generated on *284-4*

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

284-3 Commentor 284 (comments continued). Risk analysis for this EIS was not intended to fully characterize the risk, as might occur in an ecological risk assessment under laws such as CERCLA. The concentrations of radionuclides and chemicals reaching the river under the different alternatives and the calculated risk indices, Hazard Quotients for individual chemical COPCs, and Hazard Indices for all radioactive COPCs combined are presented for the purpose of assessing and comparing those alternatives (see Chapter 5). The evaluation of radionuclide and chemical synergistic effects is not possible, and it is not necessary for comparison of the alternatives. However, it is reasonable to assume that any potential synergistic effects of radionuclides and chemicals from either the site or non–*TC & WM EIS* sources would increase with increasing concentrations of chemicals reaching the river under the different alternatives. Chapter 6, Section 6.4.3, of this EIS presents the results of the analysis of cumulative long-term impacts on ecological resources and receptors (animals and fish) from exposure to chemicals and radionuclides released to the environment as a result of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Appendix R, "Cumulative Impacts: Assessment Methodology," provides key information concerning the many non–*TC & WM EIS* sources surrounding the Columbia River, such as the Umatilla Army Depot and EPA's National Priorities List sites. This EIS evaluates and compares the concentrations of radionuclides and chemicals reaching the river under the different alternatives. The potential for additive effects of chemicals, on the other hand, can be evaluated by calculating Hazard Indices as the sum of the Hazard Quotients of individual chemicals. However, assuming that these effects are additive is not necessary for the purpose of comparing the risks under the *TC & WM EIS* alternatives.

284-4 The Columbia Generating Station is operated by Energy Northwest. Although commercial nuclear power and waste generation are not within the scope of this EIS, DOE considers the operation of the Columbia Generating Station in the cumulative impacts analysis (see Chapter 6 and Appendix R).

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

99

the site.

Also, if the radiation is in the salmon, and the salmon are unsafe in the river, I would like that the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Department of Health, or if that's Ecology, would prevent people from fishing the fish of the -- of the Columbia, and that that honestly be declared to people that that fish is unsafe. And then more of the public would get the point that the river is polluted.

And one last connection. The -- I was reminded about the woman commenting on Kuwait and Iraq, that the depleted uranium is a weapon that's being used now in Iraq and Afghanistan, and it was in the Balkans. And the increase of the radiation and the cancers and the birth deformities in the areas where we have been using that has been -- there has been this enormous jump.

And I would like to know whether Hanford has any part in the creation of the depleted uranium. And I would ask that we don't participate in that, and that there would be a ban on depleted uranium. And that our Department of Energy does not use the creation of depleted uranium weapons as a way to get rid of the waste.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

284-4 cont'd

284-5

284-6

284-5 Consultation and coordination have been conducted with USFWS, NMFS, the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the Washington Natural Heritage Program concerning listed species that are potentially present on Hanford (see Appendix C, Sections C.2.1 and C.2.3). Further, as reported in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.7.4, special studies were undertaken to identify the presence of special status species within areas potentially disturbed under the various Tank Closure, FFTF Decommissioning, and Waste Management alternatives. Potential impacts on special status species at Hanford are addressed in Chapter 4, Section 4.1.

284-6 The production of depleted uranium and its use in munitions are not within the scope of this EIS. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

100

If you're hard up for where to put it, please don't throw it in other countries, as that dust will travel all around the entire world. And it's absolutely horrible that we are using that as a way to get rid of it, that harms the people and the animals of these other countries that we are -- claim to be at war with.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY GERRY POLLET:

Gerry Pollet.

There have been several controversies over the statements made this evening from the front of the room. And I'd like to know if the question-and-answer period and the presentations were on the record and reported by the court reporter.

MR. PARHAM: The question-and-answer period was not on the record, and the formal comment period was on the record. Do you want to add that?

MR. POLLET: I'd like to formally request that from now on, that the question-and-answer period be recorded and transcribed and available.

People are testifying on the basis of what they have been told in the room from the presenters. And the presenters have made

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

279-7

279-7 Commentor 279 (comments continued). Regarding the commentor's request that the question-and-answer periods that preceded the public hearings be recorded and transcribed, both the open house and the question-and-answer period preceding each *TC & WM EIS* hearing were provided by DOE as a mechanism to educate the public on this EIS. Neither was meant to be a mechanism for collecting comments. All comments made during the public comment period, whether given orally at hearings or sent via mail or email, were considered equally by DOE. All comments received on the *Draft TC & WM EIS* and their approved responses are included in this CRD, a volume of this final EIS. DOE has posted this *Final TC & WM EIS*, including this CRD, on the Hanford website (http://www.hanford.gov) and on the DOE NEPA website (http://energy.gov/nepa), and a Notice of Availability will be published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

101

1 conflicting statements between hearings, and
2 statements that are inaccurate. And then people
3 are sitting here and going, "Well, maybe I
4 shouldn't comment. I don't have comments about
5 waste coming to Hanford because I'm not concerned,
6 if it won't come for ten years." That's a legally
7 forceful commitment, a moratorium, they heard.
8 And I'm floored. And I'm embarrassed that
9 none of the officials in the front of the room,
10 including Jeff from the State of Washington. I
11 know you talked to someone else in our organization
12 earlier tonight that the state knows full well that
13 it's not a legally, enforceable moratorium after
14 the final EIS is issued, and that the Energy
15 Department is free to change its mind whenever it
16 wants to and start transporting waste. Right?
17 So I need some comment from someone at the
18 State to correct the Energy Department that they
19 made the wrong impression.
20 And, Mary Beth, I think you know this.
21 And I think there are other issues that the
22 public needs to be able to see and look at and go,
23 "Wait a minute." The presentations had serious
24 inaccuracies; our question-and-answer period had
25 serious inaccuracies.

279-7 cont'd

279-8

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

279-8 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

102

And one of the bottom lines here is, the Energy Department and the State of Washington are here holding public meetings because you'd like to increase trust in government overall. This is a democracy. Openness is vital. And to do that, we have to be honest. You can't have people walking away tonight thinking that they were misled by public official and still have faith in your agency.

I'd like to thank you for being here. I'd like to thank you for holding these hearings. But I think that we need to make sure that when you speak, you're accurate and people are getting an accurate representation. And if you hear a misstatement and you're in the front of the room, I think you need to say that the other agency is mistaken, that State of Washington has a different view than the Energy Department.

And it's very important that we have that record. And I'd like to make sure that the comments are recorded, the questions and answers are recorded at the next meeting, and that we get to see them.

Thank you all for coming and sitting here through the night. Make sure you send a letter to

279-8 cont'd

279-9

279-9 Regarding the commentor's concern about the inclusion of GTCC LLW in this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE has included information from the *Draft GTCC EIS* in the *Final TC & WM EIS* cumulative impacts analysis. For a more comprehensive discussion on GTCC LLW, see Sections 2.1 and 2.12 of this CRD.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

Public Hearing February 10, 2010

103

your members of Congress and governors. And unfortunately, we're going to have to be back here, because they've illegally and improperly piecemealed these decisions and left the Greater-Than-Class-C waste out of this one.

Again, that's something that is just utterly unacceptable in terms of open government to say "Yes, we have another pending proposal. And we didn't disclose it in this proposal. And you have to come to another meeting if you want to testify on the impacts of adding that waste to Hanford." It's wrong, and it violates NEPA, and it needs to be put into this EIS.

Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anybody else? We're at 20 after the hour. Anyone else like to make additional comments?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY LORI MESERVE:

I've got one more word: Transparency.

MR. PARHAM: Okay. If there are no additional comments at this time, I want to thank you for being so patient you stayed to this hour. And thanks to the DOE and the two departments from the

279-9 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

states, and all of you who were very collegial and very polite. Thank you.

(COMMENTS SESSION CONCLUDED AT 10:22 PM)

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Portland, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 10, 2010)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Deelana Johnson, Registered Professional Reporter and Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify that I reported in stenotype the Formal Comment Session of the Public Hearing captioned herein.

I further certify that my stenotype notes were reduced to transcript form by computer-aided transcription under my direction.

And I further certify that pages 1 through 104 contain a full, true, and accurate record of my stenotype notes, to the best of my ability.

Witness my hand at Portland, Oregon, this 117th day of February, 2010.

Deelana Johnson, CSR, RPR
CSR No. 90-0104

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

DATE: FEBRUARY 22, 2010
6:00 p.m.

EASTERN OREGON UNIVERSITY
Hoke Union Building
One University Boulevard
La Grande, Oregon 97850

James Parham, Facilitator

PANEL MEMBERS:
Ms. Mary Beth Burandt, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection

Ms. Suzanne Dahl, Washington State Department of Ecology, Hanford Project Office

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION	PAGE	LINE
Ed Edmo	4	7
Gerry Pollet	9	1
Maxine Hines Huber	15	3
Lance C. Shoemaker	17	17
Shelley Cimon	20	19
Brian Kelly	27	14
Brett VandenHeuvel	29	5
Lauren Goldberg	34	4

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION	PAGE	LINE
Cheryl Simpson	36	19
Sandy Ryma	37	22
Stephen Donnell	38	13
Norm Cimon	41	3
Ted Taylor	44	1
Donald D. Isadore, Jr.	46	20
Mia Turner	49	2
Ed Shaul	49	24
Sandra Moylen	50	25
David Wonk	53	4

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

4

(8:15 p.m.)

FACILITATOR PARHAM: We'll move right into our comments. And I'd like to invite to the microphone up here, to provide comments is Ed Edmo from the Affiliated Tribes of the Northwest Indians of the United States. Ed, are you still here?

MR. EDMO: Thank you. Yes. I'm the right size, they build everything too big. (Facilitator Parham adjusted the microphone).

I am Ed Edmo. I am Shoshone, Bannock, Nez Perce from Yakima. I come with authority, because my bones are made up of depths of this land.

We have been on the Columbia River for 20,000 years. I was raised at Celilo Falls. When the river was a true blue, I'd reach in and drink as a boy. Now I won't do that, because we know the river is polluted.

2010 Winter Conference, Great Wolf Lodge, Grand Mound, Washington Resolution No. 10-02, Tribal input for the 2010 Hanford Clean-up Environmental Impact Statement.

Preamble: We, the members of the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians of the United States, invoking the divine blessing of the Creator upon the efforts and purposes, in order to preserve

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

ourselves and our descendants rights secured under Indian Treaties and benefits to which we are entitled under the laws and constitution of the United States and several states, to enlighten the public toward a better understanding of Indian people, to preserve Indian cultural values, and otherwise promote the welfare of Indian people, do hereby establish and submit the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians (ATNI) are representatives of and advocates for national, regional, and specific tribal concerns; and

WHEREAS, ATNI is a regional organization comprised of American Indians in the states of Washington, Idaho, Oregon, Montana, Nevada, Northern California, and Alaska; and

WHEREAS, the health, safety, welfare, education, economic and employment opportunity, and the preservation of cultural and natural resources are primary goals and objectives of ATNI; and

WHEREAS, the United States Department of Energy's (DOE) Hanford Nuclear Site, located in southeastern Washington along the Columbia River, contains chemical and radioactive waste that has contaminated our people, our water, air, and land;

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

6

and

WHEREAS, the health of the Columbia River and the salmon that spawn in the Hanford Reach are critical to the Indian people; and

WHEREAS, ATNI Member Tribes have invested countless hours and resources fighting to require a faster and more thorough cleanup of the Hanford Site while DOE has disposed of radioactive waste in 149 underground single-shell tanks, among other places, and many tanks are leaking or have leaked radioactive waste which has in the past and currently is contaminating the groundwater, soil, plants, and is leaching into the Columbia River.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that ATNI hereby recommend that Hanford not be the national clearing dump site. Thank you. *403-1*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that ATNI recommends that DOE shall reject any alternatives that propose shipping more waste to Hanford; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that ATNI supports the principles of "cleanup first." *403-2*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that, when making decisions, the risk of exposure to Native Americans should be projected by the Tribes themselves, not DOE's exposure to scenarios because Tribes are in the *403-3*

403-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

403-2 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. However, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

403-3 Regarding the exposure parameters used in the American Indian scenarios, the intent of those scenarios was to collectively reflect American Indian lifestyles for the purpose of comparison. Both the activities and parameters used in those scenarios are based on existing reports and compilation. It was never the intent to analyze all possible American Indian scenarios. Sensitivity analyses using the specific American Indian parameters provided by the Yakama Nation and the Umatilla Tribes were completed for Alternative Combination 2; the results are included in Appendix W of this *TC & WM EIS.*

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

7

1 best position to judge the exposure of risk; and
2 WHEREAS BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that ATNI
3 demands that DOE choose the most aggressive plan to
4 contain and treat radioactive and chemical wastes at
5 Hanford with the goal of making the entire area safe
6 for traditional uses; and
7 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that ATNI demands
8 DOE should remove and treat as much waste contained
9 in the single-shelled tanks as possible to reach the
10 goal of 99.9%; and
11 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the ATNI demands
12 DOE should immediately develop plans to clean up the
13 million gallons of radioactive waste that has already
14 leaked from the storage tanks and completely treat
15 all of the leaked waste and evaluate and treat miles
16 of unlined ditches, trenches containing nuclear waste
17 that DOE currently has no plans to clean up; and
18 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that ATNI demands
19 DOE should ensure that the Waste Treatment Plant create
20 ultra-stable waste forms that are "good as glass,"
21 and DOE should reject all less stable treatment
22 systems; and
23 BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that ATNI demand
24 DOE select cleanup plans that protect the health of
25 all people today and future generations.

403-3 cont'd

403-4

403-5

403-6

403-4 This EIS addresses the environmental impacts of retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste and final closure of the SST system. It also evaluates the impacts of FFTF decommissioning, including management of waste generated by the decommissioning process. Finally, this *TC & WM EIS* evaluates the potential environmental impacts of ongoing solid waste management operations at Hanford, as well as the proposed disposal of Hanford LLW and MLLW and a limited volume of offsite LLW and MLLW. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

403-5 As analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*, 67 of the 149 SSTs at Hanford are known or suspected to have leaked liquid waste to the environment between the 1950s and the present, some of which has reached the groundwater. Estimates of the total leak loss range from less than 2.8 million to as much as 3.97 million liters (750,000 to 1,050,000 gallons). DOE recognizes that groundwater contamination from past leaks is a concern at Hanford. One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks, including remediation of the contamination in the vadose zone. This *TC & WM EIS* does not address the cleanup and closure of existing disposal

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

8

Certify, the foregoing resolution was adopted at the 2010 Winter Conference of the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, held at the Great Wolf Lodge, Grand Mound, Washington, February 8 - 11, 2010 with a quorum present.

And I speak as a father and grandfather. Thank you very much.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Next on the sign-up list -- and we're asking to keep it three to five minutes, please. We've got a number of people who want to speak.

Next is Gerry Pollet, Heart of America. And after that, Maxine Hines Huber will follow.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excuse me, sir.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could we have the speakers in the front if they choose to be?

FACILITATOR PARHAM: We're going to have them at this speaker. We actually need to see their -- she needs to see their mouths moving, so we can catch their sound, so --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. I feel like they're not quite --

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Okay. Well, you can turn around too. Thank you. Go ahead, Gerry.

units and past-practice cribs and trenches (ditches). Cleanup and closure of these units will occur using the existing TPA regulatory process that involves EPA, Washington State, and DOE; integrates the requirements of CERCLA and RCRA; and ensures consideration of NEPA values wherever appropriate.

403-6 Vitrification of radioactive waste into glass is an attractive option because it atomistically bonds the species in a solid glassy matrix. EPA has declared vitrification the best-demonstrated available technology for HLW. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

9

MR. POLLET: That's a great point. We're -- I'm Gerry Pollet with Heart of America Northwest, which is the region's longest lived and largest Hanford cleanup watchdog group.

And I want to thank you all for coming out tonight. It's really incredibly important that you're here to talk about the future, the river, and the health of generations to come.

And without you being here, the Energy Department would persist in its decisions to use Hanford as a national waste dump and to do what I refer to as cover-up, instead of clean up.

As you've heard already tonight, their preferred alternative, which is to say their plan if they can make a decision today, is not to clean up the billions of gallons of waste that has leaked from high-level nuclear waste tanks, but to cover it up. And it will spread through the soil.

Their plan is to use Hanford's national radioactive waste dump and add 3 million cubic feet of radioactive waste to Hanford's problems.

And you're here -- and I'd like to encourage you, even if you didn't sign up yet, to speak from your heart tonight and tell the Energy Department to go home with the message that what

404-1

404-1 As analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*, 67 of the 149 SSTs at Hanford are known or are suspected to have leaked liquid waste to the environment between the 1950s and the present, some of which has reached the groundwater. Estimates of the total leak loss range from less than 2.8 million to as much as 3.97 million liters (750,000 to 1,050,000 gallons). DOE recognizes that groundwater contamination from past leaks is a concern at Hanford. One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms by landfill closure, selective clean closure, or clean closure. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding the cleanup of the past leaks, including remediation of the contamination in the vadose zone.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

10

1 they're proposing to do is unacceptable for now and
2 for hundreds of years and thousands of years to come.
3 And to do the right thing and do it right now.
4 We can jump ahead a couple of slides.
5 Right there is great, (indicating). We're here
6 because right now as we speak tonight, what the
7 Energy Department did not speak -- what the Energy
8 Department did not tell you tonight is that as we're
9 speaking tonight, radioactive strontium-90 is already
10 seeping into your Columbia River.
11 The Columbia River, along with the Yakima,
12 Umatilla, Nez Perce Nations have the right to fish
13 and live along in perpetuity.
14 At 1,500 times the drinking water
15 standard, radioactive strontium-90. What does that
16 mean? The drinking water standard is set at a level
17 at which one adult out of every 10,000 who drink it
18 die of cancer.
19 You're all smart enough to do the math
20 here. That is one contaminant, radioactive
21 strontium-90 in those seeps today.
22 And what you've already seen tonight from
23 Ken Niles is how many contaminants would be added to
24 those plumes, under the Energy Department's cover-up
25 instead of cleanup and the Energy Department's plan

404-1 cont'd

404-2

404-2 Regarding both the predicted risks in the *Draft TC & WM EIS* and disposal of additional materials from offsite sources, there is some conservatism in the predicted concentrations presented in the draft EIS. While refinements in the approach used in this *Final TC & WM EIS* lessen predicted concentrations, modeled exceedances of standards still occur. This is why the regulatory context remains important. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses those laws and requirements that would apply to the proposed actions, depending on the alternative. Issues concerning the ability to meet legal standards or requirements are also discussed, along with potential mitigation measures that may be needed and are feasible for DOE to implement. In particular, additional mitigation measures could be required to obtain future permits issued by the State of Washington, or they may be addressed under the scope of the TPA as part of future remedial actions that are subject to CERCLA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates. In the ROD, DOE will identify and discuss the factors considered in reaching its decisions, such as economic, technical, and national policy considerations, along with the mitigation and monitoring measures that DOE will implement. In all cases, DOE will select a set of activities designed to protect public health and safety.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

11

404-2 cont'd

to dump 3 million cubic feet more radioactive waste into the soil.

Please let's jump ahead a bit. 40 miles of unlined trenches exist at Hanford like this, (indicating).

Your Energy Department, your Energy Department dumps radioactive waste in unlined ditches around the country.

You can't dig a hole in your backyard and put a pizza box in, it's against the law. Your local government can't operate unlined landfills, but your Federal Government thinks that it's okay to dump radioactive waste in unlined trenches.

404-3

In 2004, they stopped doing this at Hanford only because we showed pictures like this during the initiative, to stop Hanford from being a national waste dump.

In other places in the country, they still do this. And their plan for cleanup is just to put dirt over the top and walk away and it will migrate through the soil, into the groundwater.

Let's jump ahead. Let's keep going. Here is carbon tetrachloride in the groundwater today, (indicating). The darkest red area is 50 times the drinking water standard.

404-4

404-3 Since 2004, DOE has buried all LLW in lined trenches (see Appendix E, Section E.3.3, for a description of the evolution of past waste disposal practices). DOE continues to strictly limit the amount of waste Hanford can accept, and ensures that disposal activities are protective of the environment and meet regulatory requirements. Previous use of unlined trenches for disposal was a big concern to stakeholders and Washington and Oregon States; DOE heard and addressed those concerns and is using lined trenches.

404-4 The *Draft TC & WM EIS* presented groundwater model predictions of current conditions for comparison with recent groundwater characterization data. This was intended to provide context for the readers, stakeholders, and decisionmakers to help evaluate the accuracy and precision of the groundwater modeling system. The draft EIS also presented groundwater model predictions for future conditions as part of both the alternatives impacts analysis and cumulative impacts analysis. In response to this comment (and similar comments), two discussions have been added to this *Final TC & WM EIS*. The first is an expanded discussion of the comparison of modeled current conditions versus measured current conditions (Appendix U). The second discussion is an evaluation of the impacts on future conditions of certain mitigation measures (Chapter 7, Section 7.5).

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

12

You see the river going through Hanford for 50 miles. And let's take a look at the next slide. 125 years from now, is their projection, (indicating). We can show the same for uranium.

Plutonium in a thousand years, the Energy Department projects will be 300 times the drinking water standard along the river shore.

That means for your great, great, great, great grandchildren, it is genocide. Because people will be using that river water, people will be living along it, the Tribes with treaty rights will be there, but their children will get cancer from using the water there.

404-4 cont'd

Let's jump ahead to the slides about transportation. The Energy Department proposes to ship 3 million cubic feet of radioactive waste to Hanford.

That waste does not include a separate proposal they have to ship something called greater-than-Class C waste, which is as hot as high-level nuclear waste.

It is deadly hot. And it would come through La Grande on I-84. And how hot is it? Well, a year ago, a year and a half ago, the Energy Department had a proposal to ship high-level nuclear

404-5

404-5 Regarding the commentor's concern about the inclusion of GTCC LLW in this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE has included information from the *Draft GTCC EIS* in the *Final TC & WM EIS* cumulative impacts analysis. For a more comprehensive discussion on GTCC LLW, see Sections 2.1 and 2.12 of this CRD.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

13

waste to Hanford.

Next slide please. And for that proposal, the Energy Department's own estimate is that even if there is no accident, no terrorist attack on a truckload, 816 adults along the truck route would die from radiation that comes through the shipping casks, to the people stuck in traffic, the children, in schools, community centers along the truck routes.

404-5 cont'd

Now, the Energy Department only estimates this for adults. I care about the children and I think the rest of you do.

Children are three to ten times more susceptible to get cancer than an adult, from the same dose. It is unconscionable that the Energy Department only estimates for adults.

404-6

But more unconscionable that the Energy Department has failed to honor its obligation under the National Environmental Policy Act tonight and disclose to you how much greater-than-Class C waste, that really hot radioactive waste, they would also ship to Hanford.

404-7

The Energy Department is supposed to disclose all of this in one impact statement. Not tell you that you can come back out in another few months to another meeting and will separately tell

404-6 DOE acknowledges that the scientific data indicate that health effects of radiation exposure are more pronounced in children than in adults. As discussed in Appendix K, Section K.1.1.6, of this *TC & WM EIS*, a number of authoritative studies provide guidance on risk factors relating health effects to dose. Section K.1.1.6 discusses the scientific evidence relating radiation dose to incidence of cancers, both fatal and nonfatal. The discussion indicates that the fatal cancer risk factor of 0.0006 reflects an age distribution that includes children and is generally regarded as conservative. Appendix Q, Section Q.2.4.2, explains that nuclide-specific risk coefficients, developed using techniques that account for gender and age, were used for the long-term human health impacts analysis.

404-7 At any given time, Federal agencies often conduct numerous ongoing planning activities that are in different stages of development, including preparation of NEPA documents. Agencies are not required to delay planning and conduct of necessary activities for a particular proposed action until other proposals mature to allow all of the proposed actions at any given time to be included in one NEPA document. Chapter 1 of the *Draft TC & WM EIS* fully disclosed the history leading to preparation of this EIS and the relationship of the proposed actions to other NEPA reviews, including the *Draft GTCC EIS* (DOE 2011a). For some of these other actions, the NEPA process has already been completed and decisions have been issued. For others, such as the *GTCC EIS*, the proposals and NEPA process are still ongoing. Regarding the inclusion of GTCC LLW in this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE has included information from the *Draft GTCC EIS* in the *Final TC & WM EIS* cumulative impacts analysis. For a more comprehensive discussion on GTCC LLW, see Sections 2.1 and 2.12 of this CRD.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

14

you the piece of impact to your health from that one, and then another proposal down the road.

They're supposed to put it altogether in one statement, that you get to comment on at one time. And you should demand that your Energy Department meet that obligation.

404-7 cont'd

So please comment. The other reason it's important that you're here tonight is we ask -- my organization asks that there be a hearing in La Grande. It's been years since there's been one.

And having such a great turnout tonight, is a sign that there's interest, that you care. So please speak tonight.

Come to the microphone, even if you didn't sign in. Speak from the heart for two minutes. And tell the Energy Department and the State of Washington what you want.

And I hope that you'll urge them to clean up, not cover up, and put cleanup first before they dump more waste at Hanford. Thank you.

404-1 cont'd

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Maxine Hines Huber. And that will be followed by Lance Shoemaker.

MS. HINES HUBER: Hi. Can you hear me or do we need to adjust it?

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

FACILITATOR PARHAM: I'm going to adjust it a little bit.

MS. HINES HUBER: Okay. So this isn't my favorite part. But, okay. Can you hear me over there?

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Yes.

MS. HINES HUMBER: All right. Good. I live here in La Grande. I've been involved with Hanford issues for 25 years, as long as they've been having their very first meetings here years ago, because of transportation issues.

And Gerry speaks to the worst of it. And I have to agree with a lot of it. But I also want to say there's been a real shift and some real progress made at Hanford.

The fact that USDOE is having a real meeting here with a lot of people is very different than it used to be.

And so I commend the people coming. And if you've taken the time to get here and listen, make sure you take the time to get a comment in.

If you want further information, I live here. Find me. I'll get you whatever you need, if you can't find it on the websites.

But one of the things that I do want to

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

16

say is that, you know, you see the projections out 7,000 years.

Right now Hanford, everybody assumes it's always going to be this dry place. And so the idea of leaving the ground that is so highly contaminated under the tanks is just never going to be acceptable to me. We don't know how it's going to go, we don't know what's going to happen to the dams.

The Tribes have the right to their land back. That land is going to be used by people. People are going to want to build houses and put plants on there. It's really a pretty piece of land.

And we don't have the right to just assume that it's always just going to be this dry, desolate place. The Tribes have the right to their land back.

One of the things that it is -- it's hard to understand a lot of this. And if you get lost -- I've been at this a long time and I'm always lost.

I always feel totally overwhelmed by all the issues. It is so complicated, way more than I ever can grasp. And I know that most of you are just going to get a little taste of it tonight.

But I'm a real believer in that if we -- I'm going to cry -- if we do cleanup with really intense hard action, not just thinking about it, not

405-1

405-1 Regarding the possibility of foreseeable natural events at Hanford and the potential for related impacts on waste treatment and disposal facilities, Chapter 3, Section 3.2, of this *TC & WM EIS* depicts and discusses the ecology and climate at the site. DOE Order 420.1B and its implementing standards require that nuclear and nonnuclear facilities be designed, constructed, and operated to safeguard the facility, public, workers, and environment from natural phenomena hazards, including earthquakes and floods. Appendix V of this EIS also provides an analysis that depicts potential impacts at Hanford that could result from climatic changes, which may increase infiltration rates and the rise of the groundwater table.

In response to the commentor's position that the tribes have the right to their land back, DOE respectfully disagrees with the tribes' position regarding tribal rights at Hanford. There is substantial documentation indicating that the tribes understood at the time the treaty was signed that the lands were no longer "unclaimed" when they were claimed for the purposes of the white settlers' activities. Most of Hanford had been so "claimed" at the time it was acquired for Government purposes in 1943. DOE is not aware of any judicially recognized mechanisms that would allow these lands to revert to "unclaimed" status merely through the process of being acquired by the Federal Government.

The portion of Hanford that remained in the public domain in 1943 (those lands now having underlying U.S. Bureau of Land Management ownership), as well as all the acquired lands, were closed to all access initially under authority of the War Powers Act and then under authority of the Atomic Energy Act. It is, therefore, DOE's position that the Hanford lands are neither "open" nor "unclaimed." DOE included the tribes' positions and views in Appendix W of this *Final TC & WM EIS*.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

1 just taking the short time, but doing it so we're
2 really in sync with Mother Earth, Mother Earth will
3 cooperate. And Mother Earth takes really good care
4 of our planet.
5 Because, you know, we make messes and they
6 get cleaned up. And rivers clean themselves again,
7 if we just quit polluting them.
8 So I want to do the very best we can. We
9 owe it to people and to the planet. And so please
10 make your comments and please stand up and say no,
11 you don't get to leave contamination in the ground
12 under any circumstances. There's a way. It may not
13 be this year, it may not be in ten years. But if the
14 intent is set, we can clean this up.
15 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Next is
16 Lance Shoemaker, followed by Shelley Cimon.
17 DR. SHOEMAKER: Hi, my name is Dr. Lance
18 Shoemaker. My home here is in the Grande Ronde
19 Valley. But I actually grew up in Benton City,
20 Washington, which is very close to the Hanford
21 nuclear site.
22 My grandparents moved to Benton City,
23 Washington in 1936 before the nuclear site ever
24 existed.
25 I used to work out at Hanford. I spent

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

18

1 four summers out there. I actually did research on
2 the 32 of the miscellaneous single-shell waste tanks
3 and I also did occurrence reporting out there. So
4 I've got a little experience. I have numerous
5 relatives that have worked out there.
6 And I'll be honest with you, I really do
7 like Hanford. It is a great facility. It's amazing
8 what goes on out there, and it's not just waste.
9 I do believe that the DOE has a definite
10 responsibility to clean up the mess that's there, to
11 do what they can.
12 But realistically speaking, there's no way
13 it will ever be 100 percent cleaned up. It will
14 probably never be inhabitable.
15 You go out there and there's areas that
16 are contaminated and they have a little plastic chain
17 around them with a sign that hangs there and says,
18 "Contaminated area."
19 And you're over here shooting baskets at
20 lunch, and the dust is blowing over there. So it's
21 kind of ridiculous.
22 And I'm not saying anyone is intentionally
23 responsible. There was a lot of ignorance there. We
24 just didn't know what we were doing.
25 But you know what, I'm proud of the war

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

1 effort that went on there. My grandparents on both
2 sides contributed to that.
3 And I know it saved a lot of lives on both
4 sides of the war for what was done. And I'm proud of
5 what went on out there, but I think we have a
6 responsibility to clean up what we can. But
7 realistically, it's not going to be this ideal,
8 beautiful Pollyanna place.
9 If you start dredging all that stuff up,
10 it's just like tearing up asbestos. It's in the air,
11 it's everywhere.
12 And if you've lived over in that area, you
13 know how dry and arid it is and how easily everything
14 spreads. And if you think that that's not already in
15 the water, you're sadly mistaken.
16 But by the same token, I know for a fact
17 that the earth has a great ability to handle the
18 wastes that are presented.
19 If you look at Chernobyl, if you look at
20 Hiroshima and Nagasaki, you look at how well they're
21 doing.
22 You can't tell me that we think that we're
23 so all powerful and we've got all these great
24 answers, well, we don't.
25 And the technology is not there. And I'll

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

20

1 guarantee you, the technology won't be there in a
2 thousand years to clean it up.
3 But on the other hand, we've got an FFTF
4 out there, Fast Flux Test Facility, that should be
5 reopened, should be making radioisotopes for the
6 medical community. Absolute disaster that it was
7 mothballed.
8 We've got all kinds of research that goes
9 on out there that should continue. Hanford's been
10 good to a lot of people.
11 Unfortunate, and it's just an unfortunate
12 circumstance of history, but it's something we have
13 to deal with. It's something we have to live with.
14 But if you think you're going to build a
15 subdivision out at Hanford, you're sadly mistaken.
16 So there's my comment.
17 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Shelley.
18 And then after that will be Brian Kelly.
19 MS. CIMON: Thanks very much. Shelley
20 Cimon, La Grande, Oregon. My heart is really full,
21 because there's so many people in this room tonight.
22 Thank you so much for turning out for an
23 issue that I have probably worked on now for -- what
24 did you say, Maxine, 25 years? Probably that long.
25 I'm going to speak as a citizen, not as a

406-1

406-1 DOE issued a ROD (66 FR 7877; January 26, 2001) for the *NI PEIS* (DOE 2000a) wherein DOE announced its decision that FFTF would be permanently deactivated. As discussed in Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2, Decisions Not to Be Made, DOE is not considering restarting FFTF, only decommissioning it.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

21

1 member of the Hanford Advisory Board. Although I do
2 have the luxury of all of that information and time
3 with wonderful, disparate beliefs and the opportunity
4 to come together with the consensus in that arena.
5 This is my perspective tonight as a
6 citizen, an Oregonian. I really appreciate your
7 coming.
8 And so we can grapple with what you're
9 grappling with, which is the risk now and thousands
10 of years into the future to human health and the
11 environment of the northwest.
12 We need long-term protection of the
13 Columbia River. It's always been considered to be
14 the lifeblood of the Pacific Northwest.
15 We need the legal milestones to commit to
16 comprehensive characterization and technology
17 development to support all needed cleanup. And we
18 need it now with no delays.
19 I've seen an inertia, and I'm saying this
20 to the Washington Department of Ecology. It's been
21 brought on by the agencies, that I feel are held
22 hostage to the politics of getting the waste
23 treatment plant built.
24 I don't believe that this EIS has the
25 answers to adequately address and commit to the state

407-1

407-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze the potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

22

1 standards for cleanup of groundwater, of the vadose
2 zone, and the waste sites. Gerry talked, showed a
3 picture of -- you know, we've got 43 miles of
4 trenches unlined, full.
5 I believe that it's really Washington
6 Department of Ecology's responsibility not to
7 aggregate their responsibility to this cleanup. And
8 it's their job to comprehensively protect the people
9 of the northwest.
10 There's no one here in this room that's
11 going to deny how compelling 53 million gallons of
12 high-level waste is as a target for an intense
13 focused, you know, cleanup mission that demands
14 vision, it demands the best of science, it demands
15 the best of technology, development, and also public
16 will.
17 And I think we have the will. I think
18 what we need is the commitment from our government,
19 our government, to do the job right.
20 But the rest of the site, the pieces of
21 Hanford that are not included in this EIS, the
22 unlined burial grounds, the Pre-70 TRU transuranic
23 waste, the contaminated vadose zone both shallow and
24 deep, the groundwater under the site that's
25 migrating, plumes moving through to the Columbia

407-1 cont'd

407-2

407-2 Although the focus of this *TC & WM EIS* is on the closure of the SST system and the storage, treatment, and disposal of associated waste, the analyses described in this EIS were conducted within the context of all other activities on and around the site. The sites mentioned by the commentor are analyzed in Chapter 6, Section 6.4.1, and their inventories are listed in Appendix S. This *TC & WM EIS* did not include specific groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated, but contained a qualitative discussion of mitigation measures that may need to be conducted across the site to obtain outcomes that meet a variety of performance objectives. In response to this and similar comments, this *Final TC & WM EIS* contains an expanded, quantitative discussion of mitigation measures at a variety of locations across Hanford (see Chapter 7, Sections 7.1 and 7.5, and Appendix U). As cleanup progresses, this *TC & WM EIS* will provide the broad strategic framework to support more-detailed, site-specific assessments to facilitate closure and permitting under the applicable portions of RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

23

1 River are not the legacy that a society that I live
2 in, wills to the future generations and who will
3 follow us.
4 And I -- you know, sometimes in our
5 discussions, my husband and I says I think -- my
6 husband will say, "I think we're a society in
7 decline." I'm not going to go there. I don't want
8 to believe that.
9 I think we've got the will. I think we've
10 got the opportunities for jobs. Let's look at the
11 deed.
12 Let's move forward with every engineering
13 possibility that we've got, technology that we've got
14 to get the job done.
15 Specific to the tanks, there needs to be
16 an examination of the impacts associated with
17 potential tank leaks due to the delay in the waste
18 treatment plant starting.
19 There is not an adequate contingency, if
20 we see multiple tanks leak. And we see failures
21 occur at one time, prior to the start of the vit
22 plant.
23 I would support the removal of tech-99 as
24 a pretreatment step in the vit process, along with
25 iodine-129.

407-2 cont'd

407-3

407-3 DOE is confident that the WTP will provide the best-available waste immobilization technologies for managing Hanford waste and is working diligently to bring the WTP and selected supplemental treatment technologies online as soon as possible. Regarding contingency planning for potential additional tank leaks, Appendix E, Section E.1.1.1, provides some insight into the tank farms operations, maintenance, surveillance and monitoring, and safety programs that DOE has instituted at Hanford to ensure that, if new tank leaks develop, they do not affect the environment. Regarding the construction of new waste tanks, DOE currently has no plans to do so; however, this *TC & WM EIS* does analyze the impacts of constructing and operating new DSTs, if needed, under Tank Closure Alternatives 2A and 4. Regarding removal of radionuclides such as technetium-99 prior to immobilization, Tank Closure Alternatives 2B and 3B analyze the impacts of this pretreatment.

DOE has taken responsibility for the cleanup of waste at Hanford. In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. However, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

24

And what I see is a situation where the facility at the front-end of the waste treatment plant addresses those issues and also the issue of blending, the potential issues of blending waste prior to the vitrification.

And I think that this is an opportunity to also plan for contingency, that we can look at building new tanks within that front-end system that will help protect us until we get that vit plant up and running.

407-3 cont'd

I support 99 percent retrieval of volume as a goal. But I don't believe that you can assume, as the EIS does, that there's -- what's remaining within the tanks, that rad limit is homogenized over the breadth of the tank system.

407-4

I think that the tank heels have to be evaluated on a case by case basis. Coupled with that is the need to characterize the soils under and around the tanks and look at the leak history of each tank individually.

My preference is to remove, treat, dispose all contaminated soils associated with leaking tanks. Capping's not going to provide long-term protection, the migration through the vadose zone, the groundwater, or the Columbia River. And to my mind,

407-5

407-4 In regard to the disproportionate amount of radioactivity in the residues at the bottom of the tanks, DOE currently does not have a technical basis for making more-specific assumptions about the expected compositions of the waste "heels" that would remain in the tanks after retrieval. Retrieval has been completed for only a small number of SSTs, and not much is known about the behavior of, or ability to remove, small volumes of residual waste. Thus, the uncertainties are high. However, the tank closure process, which includes detailed examinations of the tanks, residual waste, and surrounding waste in the soil, requires preparation of detailed performance assessments and a closure plan. These documents will provide the information and analysis necessary for DOE and the regulators to make specific decisions on what levels of residual tank waste are acceptable in terms of short- and long-term risks.

407-5 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

25

1 capping's really a sign of failure. 407-5 cont'd
2 In terms of importation of waste, no way.
3 There's only one way to achieve the legal standards,
4 SEPA, for the contaminants here at Hanford.
5 And that's to decrease the waste burden
6 remaining or disposed of on site or to remove waste
7 from the site to our yet to be determined geologic
8 repository, which our nation hasn't identified. No
9 further receipt of technetium or iodine-bearing waste
10 should come to the Hanford site.
11 The shell game of transporting 407-6
12 contaminants around the DOE complex without defining
13 ultimate disposition has no merit.
14 This places a higher burden of risk on the
15 public. My home is the Grand Ronde Valley. It's
16 bracketed by two of the worst sections of winter
17 interstate driving in the nation.
18 The truckers, that's what they talk about,
19 Ladd Canyon and Cabbage Hill. We've had an accident
20 within the last 14 months here.
21 There needs to be a separate EIS for both
22 the vadose zone and the groundwater. These issues
23 are not adequately addressed in the EIS. 407-7
24 We need to see points of compliance that
25 are set at the boundary of the operable units or the

407-6 DOE has a national strategy for disposing of radioactive waste that requires transportation of waste between DOE sites. This strategy was analyzed in the *WM PEIS* (DOE 1997). As part of this strategy, radioactive waste could be transported to Hanford for disposal and transported from Hanford for treatment and disposal at other DOE sites. The *Draft TC & WM EIS* analyzed the transportation of RH-LLW from INL to Hanford for disposal. Based on the public's input and concerns about offsite waste disposal at Hanford, DOE has included in this *Final TC & WM EIS* an example of a potential mitigation measure that could be taken. Specifically, an offsite waste stream containing a significant inventory of iodine-129 (i.e., RH-LLW resins from INL) was eliminated from the analysis. This mitigation measure has been incorporated into the Waste Management alternatives. In addition, a sensitivity analysis is included that shows the impacts of limiting offsite waste streams containing iodine-129 and technetium-99. The results of this sensitivity analysis illustrate the difference this would make in potential groundwater impacts and are included in Appendix M. Other mitigation measures, such as recycling secondary-waste streams into the primary-waste-stream feeds within the WTP to increase iodine-129 capture in ILAW and bulk vitrification, are discussed in Chapter 7, Section 7.5, of this EIS.

As specified in DOE Manual 460.2-1A, *Radioactive Material Transportation Practices Manual for Use with DOE O 460.2A*, carriers of LLW and MLLW are expected to exercise due caution and care in dispatching shipments. According to the manual, the carrier will determine the acceptability of weather and road conditions, whether a shipment should be held before departure, and when actions should be taken while en route. The manual emphasizes that shipments should not be dispatched if severe weather or bad road conditions make travel hazardous. Current weather conditions, the weather forecast, and road conditions should be considered before dispatching a shipment. Conditions at the point of origin and along the entire route should be considered. The hazardous materials' truck drivers are technically qualified and experienced and are required to complete training in hazardous and radioactive materials transportation as required by Federal (49 CFR 383) and state regulations.

407-7 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

26

geographic area that's been determined to be cleaned up, not at the edge of the river or at the edge of the Hanford site. *407-7 cont'd*

We haven't talked about hazardous metals. And I don't see that adequately addressed in the EIS. An example out in N area, just beyond the appetite area, there's an increase in arsenic chromium, mercury, selenium, barium, among other things. We've got to look and it's got to be dealt with. *407-8*

There are tremendous data gaps. I do think that this EIS probably should go forward and can go forward towards the building of a record of decision. But the data gaps are fierce. *407-9*

And it's going to take filling those, in order to build that record of decision with any kind of strength and integrity.

FFTF was a dinosaur of a facility, of a reactor. Very expensive. It needed to be decommissioned. And I think it's on the right pathway. *407-10*

It was said, you know, that digging it up would make it the largest dig in the USA. And I think I say, "Why not?"

We paid dearly with lives, with a compromised environment. A river where the salmon

The alternatives analysis and the cumulative impacts analysis both use points of analysis so that the alternatives can be compared with each other in a similar fashion, as required by NEPA. These points of analysis include, as appropriate, the tank farm barriers, FFTF barrier, IDF-East barrier, IDF-West barrier, RPPDF barrier, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River. The points of analysis were identified in the *Technical Guidance Document* (DOE 2005), signed in March 2005 by DOE and Ecology.

407-8 Hazardous metals are analyzed in this EIS, as evidenced by the list of COPCs for tank waste in Appendix D and by the cumulative impacts analysis in Appendix S. Both of these tables include a list of the radionuclide and chemical constituents that were analyzed in this EIS. With regard to hazardous metals, examples included are chromium, mercury, lead, and uranium.

407-9 DOE is confident that the best-available data at the time of its preparation were analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*.

407-10 Comment noted.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

who build their redds, have seepage coming into their nests as we speak.

We have -- already have the dubious honor of being the most radioactive site. Now, why not the biggest dig? It's a jobs project and we can do it.

And we're into areas, we've cleaned up contaminants at Hanford waste sites that 20 years ago many of us scratched our heads and could not even imagine that they would be done. And they are. So forward thinking. That's it.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Brian Kelly. And then after Brian will be Brett from Columbia Riverkeeper.

MR. KELLY: Hi, I'm Brian Kelly. I've lived in La Grande for a long time. And I work for Hell's Canyon Preservation Council.

And I spent a lot of time trying to make sure that when the salmon and the steelhead make their way all the way up into the Blue Mountains and the Wallowas, that they have a place, they have habitat up here, they have a home waiting for them.

And they all come right up the Columbia River. And as was mentioned earlier, the Snake River enters in the Tri-City area just downstream from the Hanford site.

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

28

And so when the fish come up here, we want to make sure that they have a chance to make it past the Hanford site area.

We plan to submit written comments, so I just want to cut to the chase tonight. Basically, clean it up. Clean it up to the best extent possible. And don't bring any more waste in. That's kind of the bottom line. *408-1*

When I was researching over the last couple of weeks -- and I know a lot of you folks are really close to this issue, but when you really first start looking at it, you go, "53 million gallons of waste, okay."

I also read there was a million gallons of contaminated groundwater, is an estimate. And I was just trying to visualize a million gallons, let alone highly radioactive contaminated groundwater heading towards the Columbia River.

I've also read that it was the most contaminated site in the hemisphere. That's impressive. And I've also read that it's the biggest cleanup site in the world. So that's both impressive. *408-2*

And to look at it in a more positive way, that could be inspiring. So let's look at it as a

408-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. However, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

408-2 As analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*, 67 of the 149 SSTs at Hanford are known or suspected to have leaked liquid waste to the environment between the 1950s and the present, some of which has reached the groundwater. Estimates of the total leak loss range from less than 2.8 million to as much as 3.97 million liters (750,000 to 1,050,000 gallons). DOE recognizes that groundwater contamination from past leaks is a concern at Hanford and its potential impact on communities downriver from Hanford. One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms by landfill closure, selective clean closure, or clean closure. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks, including remediation of the contamination in the vadose zone.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

29

408-2 cont'd

1 challenge. Let's clean it up. Let's do the best job
2 humanly possible. Thank you.
3 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. After
4 Brett will be Lauren Goldberg. Brett, then Lauren.
5 MR. VANDENHEUVEL: Hi, I'm Brett
6 VandenHeuvel. I'm the director of Columbia
7 Riverkeeper.
8 We're a river conservation group dedicated
9 at protecting the Columbia. And I live downstream
10 from here in Hood River.
11 I looked at the sign-in sheet back there.
12 And I wanted to thank -- I saw there was some --
13 Representative Walden had a staff member here as does
14 Senator Merkley and Wyden. So I think that's great.
15 And thanks for coming. And it's really important.
16 I also thank Ed Edmo with -- for reading
17 the resolution on behalf of the Affiliated Tribes of
18 the Northwest Indians.
19 If you haven't had a chance, Ed is an
20 accomplished storyteller, poet, and playwright. And
21 if you ever get a chance to see him when he's not
22 just reading a resolution, but actually reading some
23 of his own words, it's quite a show. So I'd
24 recommend that as well.
25 Hanford, you know, there's -- the EIS back

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

30

there is 6,000 pages. There's lots of graphs in it, there's lots of charts and thousands of pages of text.

I think to keep it simple, it's stunning to me and to a lot of people here tonight, in the state of Oregon and Washington, that we're even contemplating bringing more waste to Hanford.

We should have no new waste. We should clean up first. There's currently strontium-90, uranium, tritium, carbon tetrachloride, toxic and radioactive chemicals that are right now leaching into the Columbia River. Right now affecting our fish, right now affecting downstream communities. *409-1*

The Columbia River is the lifeblood of the Pacific Northwest. From the commercial fishermen down in Astoria, to the irrigators right here near La Grande, all of -- a tremendous amount of people, tremendous sections of our economy depend on a clean and healthy Columbia River.

And to even contemplate threatening that with shipping in waste from Tennessee, from California, from New Mexico is absolutely insane.

What we're seeing in this EIS is we're being presented with a false choice. And the false choice is, you know, you read it and it says the

409-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

The impacts of the offsite waste in terms of radiological risk are presented in the Summary, Section S.5.5.3, and Chapter 2, Section 2.10, Key Environmental Findings. These sections discuss the radiological risk differences between including and not including offsite waste disposal at IDF-East.

The *TC & WM EIS* analysis shows that receipt of offsite waste streams that contain specific amounts of certain isotopes, specifically, iodine-129 and technetium-99, could cause an adverse impact on the environment. Therefore, one means of mitigating this impact would be for DOE to limit disposal of offsite waste streams at Hanford. Other mitigation measures, such as recycling secondary-waste streams into the primary-waste-stream feeds within the WTP to increase iodine-129 capture in ILAW and bulk vitrification glass, are discussed in Chapter 7, Section 7.5, of this final EIS.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the inclusion of GTCC LLW in this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE has included information from the *Draft GTCC EIS* in the *Final TC & WM EIS* cumulative impacts analysis. For a more comprehensive discussion on GTCC LLW, see Sections 2.1 and 2.12 of this CRD.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

31

1 alternatives are should we bring in radioactive waste
2 from across the nation, from across the nation, make
3 Hanford the nation's nuclear waste repository, should
4 we bring it in and put it in the east landfill or the
5 west landfill.
6 That is absolutely a false choice. That's
7 unacceptable. I refuse to even contemplate which is
8 the better landfill to make a radioactive waste dump
9 on the banks of the Columbia River. It's simply not
10 appropriate.
11 We should have a full evaluation, not just
12 a no action alternative, but a full evaluation of
13 what to do with this waste that does not include
14 shipping more waste to Hanford.
15 We talk about -- you hear the word
16 moratorium a bit. And they say there's a moratorium
17 on shipping new waste to Hanford.
18 This EIS talks about shipping waste from
19 across the nation to Hanford, as soon as the waste
20 treatment plant is built in 2022. There's not a
21 moratorium. As soon as it's built, it's fair game.
22 We shouldn't have to wait for that to
23 happen to reanalyze it now, so our children have to
24 come back and do the same thing. We need to put an
25 end to this right now.

409-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

32

I just want to talk about risk a little bit. We looked at some of the charts. If you look at the risk scenarios of cleaning up the tanks, the different levels, at 90 percent it's one in a thousand cancer risk.

I mean, one in a thousand people who are using this area in the future would die of cancer. Even looking out in the year 3000, 4000, 5000 -- and in fact, it's shocking, cancer, I'd point this out a little bit, it goes up.

It means, the cancer risk is going to continue to climb. And the one in a thousand risk versus one in a hundred thousand, which do we choose?

If we have the choice to make one in a thousand people die of cancer, one in a hundred thousand, it seems like an obvious choice.

It's going to cost money. But that money, I mean, $2 billion of stimulus money came to Hanford right now this year. It's decades behind schedule. We've just pushed back another 20 years of delay.

It's going to cost money, but it's going to create jobs. And let's do the job right, right now.

It's not fair to push this delay off on to our children, on to the next generation, because it's

409-2

409-3

409-2 There are two aspects that have bearing on both the predicted risks in the draft EIS and their projected impacts. First, there is some conservatism in the predicted concentrations presented in the draft EIS. While refinements in the approach used for this final EIS lessen predicted concentrations, modeled exceedances of standards are still predicted. This is why the second aspect—the regulatory context—remains important. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses those laws and requirements that would apply to the proposed actions, depending on the alternative. Issues concerning the ability to meet legal standards or requirements are also discussed, along with the potential mitigation measures that may be needed and that are feasible for DOE to implement. In particular, additional mitigation measures could be required in future permits issued by the State of Washington, or could be addressed under the scope of the TPA as part of future remedial actions that are subject to CERCLA. In the ROD for this EIS, DOE will identify and discuss the factors considered in reaching its decisions, such as economic, technical, and national policy considerations, along with mitigation and monitoring measures that DOE will implement. In any event, DOE will select a set of activities designed to protect public health and safety.

409-3 Both DOE and Congress are committed to the cleanup efforts at Hanford, and DOE continues to seek funding for these efforts.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

33

1 going to get worse.
2 Even if we do a good job, it's going to
3 get worse. So now is the time to take care of it
4 right now.
5 I'm going to wrap up by just saying that
6 there were some slides earlier showing the Columbia
7 River, the White Bluffs area. Beautiful area. I'm
8 sure some of the folks here have been up there.
9 But if you ever get a chance to do a float
10 trip on the Columbia, there's great fishing there,
11 there's day trips. You can go from the Vernita
12 Bridge.
13 You can take out a half day trip at White
14 Bluffs. It's phenomenal, crystal-clear water,
15 beautiful.
16 You go around corners and there's hulking
17 old nuclear reactors. It's a really stunning
18 experience. I highly recommend you try it.
19 Columbia Riverkeeper leads some trips
20 there each summer. So check out our website, if
21 you're interested in going.
22 But it really shows like the potential
23 beauty or the beauty that's there at this site. And
24 that we need to clean up this site, not only for us,
25 but for future generations. Thank you.

409-3 cont'd

409-3 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

34

1 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Lauren
2 Goldberg. Lauren, and after Lauren will be Cheryl
3 Simpson.
4 MS. GOLDBERG: Thank you. My name's
5 Lauren Goldberg. I'm the staff attorney with
6 Columbia Riverkeeper.
7 And I just want to thank everyone so much
8 for coming out tonight. We had the opportunity to
9 attend a number of Hanford hearings. And it's
10 remarkable throughout the northwest, how many people
11 will come out and encourage you.
12 There's -- if you don't feel like coming
13 up here tonight, you can see the e-mail address up
14 there.
15 It's important that the Department of
16 Energy know how many people here in this region care
17 about these issues. They definitely need to hear
18 from you.
19 And I just want to make a couple of quick
20 points, since the night is getting late. And the
21 first is that we just recently had a major victory in
22 terms of proposals to bring more waste into Hanford.
23 You might have seen it in the papers.
24 Just last year there was a major nationwide proposal
25 to import mercury, elemental mercury, from across the

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

35

1 United States into Hanford.
2 And a number of people like yourselves
3 came out to the public hearings and explained, as Ken
4 explained tonight, why we don't need more waste at
5 Hanford. We have enough on our hands as it is.
6 And the Department of Energy did listen.
7 And they chose the site. It's unfortunate that this
8 waste has to go anywhere.
9 But they chose the site, unlike Hanford,
10 which is located on a major river that serves an
11 entire region, let alone a number of different
12 people.
13 And the second point is, you had the
14 opportunity to hear tonight from one of our officials
15 here in Oregon, which is that we're really at a
16 unique moment in time at Hanford.
17 And that for the first time we have a
18 tremendous amount of data coming from the Department
19 of Energy on the kind of impact that adding more
20 waste will have.
21 And I encourage all of you to use this
22 moment of time to start talking to your elected
23 officials, to folks within your community, because
24 now is the time to be active on these issues.
25 And then the last point is something that

410-1

410-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

410-2 DOE has consulted with USFWS and NMFS, as well as the State of Washington, relative to threatened and endangered species and each organization has been provided a copy of this *TC & WM EIS* to review. While responses to consultation letters were received from the state, none were received from USFWS or NMFS. However, whereas USFWS commented on the *Draft TC & WM EIS*, NMFS did not. The commentor is referred to Chapter 8, Section 8.3, which summarizes consultations involved in preparing this *TC & WM EIS*, and Appendix C, Section C.2, which provides copies of the consultation letters and responses.

The commentor is also referred to Chapter 4 of this *TC & WM EIS* for an analysis of the impacts of the various alternatives on threatened and endangered species. With respect to tank closure, this discussion is presented in Sections 4.1.7.1 (Alternative 1); 4.1.7.2.4 (Alternative 2A); 4.1.7.3.4 (Alternative 2B); 4.1.7.4.4 (Alternative 3A); 4.1.7.5.4 (Alternative 3B); 4.1.7.6.4 (Alternative 3C); 4.1.7.7.4 (Alternative 4); 4.1.7.8.4 (Alternative 5); 4.1.7.9.4 (Alternative 6A); 4.1.7.10.4 (Alternative 6B); and 4.1.7.11.4 (Alternative 6C). FFTF decommissioning impacts on threatened and endangered species are addressed in Sections 4.2.7.1 (Alternative 1: No Action); 4.2.7.2.4 (Alternative 2: Entombment); and 4.2.7.3.4 (Alternative 3: Removal [this was Section 4.2.7.3.3 in the *Draft TC & WM EIS*]). Waste management impacts on threatened and endangered species are addressed in Sections 4.3.7.1 (Alternative 1: No Action); 4.3.7.2.3 (Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only); and 4.3.7.3.3 (Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas). Threatened and endangered species are further addressed in

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

36

the Department of Energy has more or less put into a footnote in the 6,000 page EIS.

And unfortunately it needs to be front and center, which is that we need to have our federal agency complying with all federal laws. And that includes the Endangered Species Act. *410-2*

And unfortunately, the Department of Energy is not consulting with the expert science agencies on the impacts of their cleanup decisions and how much waste is going to be left in the soils.

And so that's a really key issue and an important one for the public to be aware of. That there are a lot of impacts that are disclosed in that document, but they're not entirely being disclosed. And we need to have that from our federal agencies. Thank you. *410-3*

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Cheryl Simpson. And after Cheryl will be Sandy Ryma.

MS. SIMPSON: My name is Cheryl Simpson. I'm a resident of La Grande.

And no more waste. Do it now, do it right. Thanks to all of you who have helped give a balanced perspective to the evening. *411-1*

Hanford is casting a long shadow that we're counting in hundreds of years. It started

Chapter 4, Sections 4.4.6.3 (Combination of Alternatives) and Chapter 6, 6.3.7.2 (Short-Term Cumulative Impacts), and Chapter 7, Sections 7.1.7 (Mitigation) and 7.2.7 (Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Impacts).

410-3 DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates. DOE has consulted with experts in various science fields in the development of this *TC & WM EIS*. For example, the groundwater flow model used in this EIS went through a rigorous technical review process that included review and comment by three groups: (1) Ecology, a cooperating agency on this EIS; (2) the Local Users' Group, consisting of hydrogeologists and geologists from the Hanford community; and (3) the Technical Review Group, composed of four experts with commercial, governmental, and academic experience in groundwater modeling and/or environmental engineering.

411-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

1 casting a shadow on my life in 1946.
2 I was born in Pasco. And I had the
3 dubious right as a citizen of Richland to have
4 iodine-131 in my air and in my food, because we
5 didn't know it was being released over us, for many
6 years.
7 So I don't know if I'll have thyroid
8 cancer. I know many people that are down-wind too.
9 It's atrocious.
10 I think that the people that are here this
11 evening are here with well meaning and good thoughts
12 and good information, but it's just not enough. It
13 doesn't really do it right.
14 So why don't we all write a note. Send an
15 e-mail, we love to send e-mails. I don't know that
16 they're tweeting or twittering or whatever. But
17 let's make sure that everybody knows that we really
18 need to do it better.
19 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.
20 Sandy. After Sandy will be Stephen
21 Donnell. Yes, ma'am.
22 MS. RYMA: I'm Sandy Ryma of La Grande.
23 I've lived here for 35 years as of March 1st of this
24 year.
25 And I can't speak your language, you know.

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

38

I'm really not familiar in detail with this information, but I do have a science background.

And I started out with extreme shock that landfill closure was being recommended for the single-shell tank system. And I would encourage us to have clean closure of that.

And basically overall I would take the stance of extreme cleanup, that would be my preference as a citizen of this area.

So thank you for coming. And thank you for taking our input.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Stephen.

MR. DONNELL: My name is Stephen Donnell. And I live in La Grande.

I've looked through your exhibits here. And I think we've missed a major point. It's not what you're going to do to clean up Hanford, it's how you're going to do it and when.

Because right now you're sitting on a situation, if you should get a major breakthrough from anyone of those plumes into the river, you could shut all commercial shipping, all fishing on a corridor that starts where that leak is, all the way to the sea, shut down the Port of Vancouver, the Port of Portland, and take the whole guts of the whole

412-1

412-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

39

1 northwest out of commission and not usable by anyone
2 or anything.
3 Now, you have classified your material by
4 its severity and its type and kind. I would class
5 it, if I were to do this study -- and I did a couple
6 of studies on the use of radioactive materials when I
7 worked for Lockheed Missiles & Space Company. And we
8 didn't proceed with the programs.
9 But the point I'm getting at is you've got
10 a number of different kinds of materials. You've got
11 those that have feet and walk very easily, those that
12 are semi-fixed, and those that are going to be
13 stationary. And this means they are what they are.
14 The point is that if they are going to be
15 a hazard to the people and the environment, those
16 that have feet, and that would include the liquid
17 materials, those that are soluble, and those that are
18 available to get out into the environment, they're
19 going to move. I don't care what you do with them.
20 Unless you make them into a solid, they won't move.
21 So my point I'm trying to make is very
22 simply this: We originally back in the '40's and the
23 '50's and the '60's, at one time we were going to use
24 atomic energy from the sampling of radioactive
25 materials for a whole lot of things.

413-1

413-1 DOE prepared this *TC & WM EIS* to support a number of decisions, including the treatment (immobilization) and disposal of tank waste at Hanford, and is confident that the best-available immobilization technologies have been identified and analyzed. The rationale for selection of treatment technologies (including supplemental treatment technologies) and the short- and long-term environmental impacts are discussed in Chapter 2 and Appendix E. While assumptions and uncertainties remain regarding each of the radioactive waste immobilization technologies, DOE is confident that this EIS offers the information necessary to make informed decisions concerning their selection.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

40

One of them was a -- blast a nuke canal across Panama with small atomic bombs. I had to do this analysis on whether that was practical and feasible.

Another one we were going to use atomic energy, a small reactor, fill it with hydrogen for propulsion in spaceships. And for very obvious reasons, that didn't go forward either.

But what I'm trying to get at is, you can study all day long. But until you immobilize that material and you put it in a situation where nobody's going to really get to it unless they do it by design, you're sitting on a potential ecological and sociological disaster beyond all comprehension. Chernobyl will be a cake-walk compared to what you will have.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Several people have asked, I encourage you to come up and speak at this time. And we're down to our sign-up list. We've completed with our pre sign-up list.

I'd now like to turn to anyone who would like to comment who hasn't yet. And okay, yeah, come on up.

We will ask those who -- there are several people who may want to go again. We'd ask for those

413-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

41

1 people who haven't gone yet, to come up. And then
2 we'll get to the other people. Thank you.
3 MR. CIMON: Yeah. My name is Norm Cimon.
4 And my wife spoke earlier. She's the one who
5 referred to me as worried about a society in decline.
6 So you have to explain to me why we're not in
7 decline.
8 A little bit about my background. I was
9 trained as a mathematician. I worked for the EPA for
10 quite a few years. And in fact I worked for the
11 Environmental Monitoring and Support Laboratory in
12 Las Vegas.
13 And one of our arms included the public
14 health service officials, who were actually radiation
15 experts working at the test site, at a test site.
16 I have a passing familiarity with the
17 problems of radiation. But a considerably greater
18 familiarity with the mathematics and physics of some
19 of the nonlinear chemistry and physics that you
20 potentially face if the cleanup is not done to a
21 standard that I'll admit is not easily defined.
22 But what I'm going to tell you is this:
23 If you leave even one percent of that 54 million
24 gallons, that's 540,000 gallons or essentially half a
25 tank.

414-1

414-1 The decision to leave 0.1 percent, 1 percent, or more of the waste in the SSTs is one of the decisions supported by this *TC & WM EIS* (see Section S.1.3.1 of the Summary and Chapter 1, Section 1.4.1). In regard to the disproportionate amount of radioactivity in the residues at the bottom of the tanks, DOE currently does not have a technical basis for making more-specific assumptions about the expected compositions of the waste "heels" that would remain in the tanks after retrieval. Retrieval has been completed for only a small number of SSTs, and not much is known about the behavior of, or ability to remove, small volumes of residual waste. Thus, the uncertainties are high. However, the tank closure process includes detailed examinations of the tanks and residual waste, as well as preparation of a performance assessment and a closure plan. These documents will provide the information and analysis necessary for DOE and the regulators to make specific decisions on what levels of residual tank waste are acceptable in terms of short- and long-term risks.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

42

But as my wife pointed out, it's not just the idea of leaving a certain amount in there. The deposition of the sediments has not been uniform.

I'm quite aware of some of the nonlinear sort of reactions that were going on a few years back, when there was all kinds of interesting bubbling and boiling that was very poorly understood.

That, I think, is a very significant potential problem from leaving the crusts at the bottom when they are poorly characterized and people simply have no idea how they might in fact react to something as simple as exposure to air. Now, that needs to be honestly delineated and discussed.

I'm also in agreement, great agreement with my wife about how the EIS really fails to deal with the much larger issue of the vadose zone, the current movements that are already in the ground, and the idea of bounding the areas themselves for sampling purposes and purposes of characterization, I think is the right way to go with this.

Using the whole of Hanford by sort of monitoring at the fringes is cheating, as far as I'm concerned.

It's time to start delineating the problems much more carefully than they have been

414-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

43

414-1 cont'd

delineated in the past.

I am absolutely and adamantly opposed to the transportation of additional high-level waste for the very simple reason that, from a mathematical point of view, all you do is compound the probability of just another catastrophic event along the road somewhere.

Every transfer event simply adds to the probabilistic risk of an additional load being dumped somewhere in a river.

Let's face it, our roads all go along rivers or they go in canyons. That means those are sinks.

When you go dumping something, what you're going to do is end up dumping it into a sink, some kind of channel that transports something somewhere.

That's also where we put so much of our infrastructure, that it also potentially puts that at risk.

In any case, I'm adamantly opposed to the idea of additional transport. And I think everybody in the northwest will be also. Thank you very much for the time.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Yes, sir, come on up.

414-2

414-2 Only LLW, MLLW, and TRU waste would be transported under the alternatives analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*. The existing inventories of HLW located at Hanford would be stored on site pending development of a suitable geologic repository. Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

44

MR. TAYLOR: Good evening. I'm Ted Taylor. I live in La Grande. I retired from the U.S. Department of Energy, where I did environmental cleanup at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Our cleanup was under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and DOE orders.

And from what I've heard tonight, it appears that the EIS is really in very good shape. The alternatives considered, are pretty much bounding.

My comment is going to relate more on what I would term interim actions. From the time a site or sites are characterized and radiation plans are made, there are times when something called an interim action is appropriate.

I've heard a lot of comment tonight about continued migration of contaminants into the Columbia River and down into the vadose zone. *415-1*

And I think I'm addressing this mainly to the Washington Department of Ecology, but also to the Department of Energy, such that when the permits are issued, I hope that DOE will take the opportunity when a site is fairly well characterized, if some of these action levels are triggered, that it would be appropriate to develop interim actions to try to --

415-1 Chapter 7, Section 7.1, discusses potential mitigation measures that could be used to avoid or reduce adverse environmental impacts associated with implementation of the alternatives. In response to comments received on the *Draft TC & WM EIS* concerning these potential impacts on groundwater resources, additional sensitivity analyses have been added to this EIS. Consequently, Chapter 7, Section 7.5, was added to summarize these results and discuss additional long-term mitigation strategies.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

45

1 you probably can't neutralize the waste, but you can
2 maybe slow down the path of migration.
3 And to me this is something that's very
4 important to do, because it's fairly immediate. I
5 see the modeling results that go out to the year
6 5500.
7 I can't imagine that we're really worried
8 about something that's going to happen in 3,000
9 years.
10 I mean, there's no technological society
11 that's ever existed for a thousand years. Ours has
12 existed, sort of, for 230 years, at least as a
13 nation.
14 We have real problems that can be
15 addressed in the fairly short term. And if it
16 weren't for radioactive waste, under the EPA
17 regulations, you think in terms of one average human
18 lifetime, 70 years.
19 And that's the basis for your risk
20 assessments, that's the basis for the cleanup, and
21 that's the basis for the monitoring.
22 It's only because of these radionuclides
23 that we're thinking in terms of 3,000, 4,000 years,
24 which I quite frankly think is ridiculous.
25 The requirements -- I understand the

415-1 cont'd

415-2

415-2 This *TC & WM EIS* assumes several different types of end-state management, as described in Chapter 2, the Glossary, and the Summary. These include administrative controls, institutional controls, and postclosure care, as appropriate. Each of these end-state management options would take place at the completion of an action and is assumed to occur for 100 years following the end of the action (e.g., active institutional controls would be maintained for 100 years following final placement of waste in a storage facility). The 10,000-year time period described in this *TC & WM EIS* represents the period of analysis used for the long-term impact analyses for groundwater, human health, and ecological risk; it does not represent the assumed period of institutional controls. For clarity, the definition of "10,000-year period of analysis" is included in this final EIS in Chapter 2, the Glossary, and the Summary, as appropriate.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

46

1 requirements, 10,000 year containment, and that sort
2 of thing.
3 But when the opportunity presents itself
4 with $2 billion. And as you said, Ms. Burandt,
5 there's only so much work you can actually do, even
6 with $2 billion.
7 And I'm saying that one thing that could
8 be done as the EIS is finished and the action plan is
9 done, and the mitigation plan is done, is focus
10 wherever possible on interim actions to forestall the
11 migration of contaminants, so the problem doesn't get
12 worse in the fairly near future and then worry about
13 the actual remediations.
14 Because I think that's where the benefit
15 to society will be the best, because the so-called
16 accessible environment can be protected in the near
17 term as well as in the long term.
18 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. To you,
19 okay.
20 MR. ISADORE, JR.: Good evening. My name
21 is Donald D. Isadore, Jr. I'm a Tribal council
22 member for the Yakima Nation Confederated Tribes and
23 Bands of the Yakima Nation.
24 And I truly am glad to be here this
25 evening for the comments that are being made here by

415-2 cont'd

415-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

47

the public.

I just wanted to advise the panel that I just spoke with Russell Jim, which I know all of you are very familiar with.

The Yakima Nation will be submitting a written form regarding our comments to the cleanup here, what we're discussing this evening.

One thing I wanted to advise, you know, the United States Department of Energy, to remind you as I've reminded Mr. Brockman as well, the United States has a responsibility to the Yakima Nation because we're a treaty Tribe. *416-1*

And that treaty has some very strong language within it. And to remind you as well that Hanford sits on what once was our land, which is now called ceded land. So to remind you of that.

And I appreciate the comments that are being made here this evening. You know, I've heard many positive comments. It's very heartening, to say the least, to hear what I've heard here this evening.

You know, as a parent as well, I will inform you that I know what it's like to lose a child of cancer.

My wife and I, yesterday was 31 months that we lost our daughter to acute lymphoblastic

416-1 Chapter 8 identifies and discusses the laws and legal requirements that are potentially applicable to the proposed actions and alternatives, as well as the permits and approvals DOE must obtain from Federal, state, and local agencies. In Sections 8.1.7 and 8.3, DOE identifies the consultations and coordination that DOE has undertaken with American Indian tribes and would need to continue for the purpose of implementing the proposed actions and alternatives. The Yakama Tribe and other Hanford-area tribes have had the opportunity to provide, and have provided, extensive input to the *TC & WM EIS* preparation process and analysis. Chapter 8, Section 8.3, and Appendix C, Section C.3, of this *TC & WM EIS* identify the process for tribal interaction and the primary occasions for DOE's interactions with the tribes on the subject of the *TC & WM EIS* preparation process. In addition, Chapter 8 of this *Final TC & WM EIS* includes a description of the outcomes of the meetings with the tribes, and a new appendix, Appendix W, describes the tribal perspective as provided by the Hanford-area tribes, as well as provide copies of the treaties. DOE recognizes that some tribes have treaty-protected and other federally recognized rights to resources and resource interests located within reservation boundaries and outside reservation and jurisdictional boundaries. DOE will, to the extent of its authority, protect and promote these treaty and trust resources and resource interests and related concerns in these areas.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

48

leukemia.

So I've been on the Tribal Council for two and a half years now. I'm currently the chairman of the Radioactive Hazardous Waste Program, which is the program that oversees Russell.

So when you want to talk about cancer, I know firsthand what cancer does, what it's all about.

And I will let you know that since I've become an elected official for the Yakima Nation, and I sit on the Hanford topics, I have truly taken heart to read everything to be sure that our voices are heard. That, you know, this is real.

Contamination is very real to each and every one of us. It doesn't matter what color our skins are, what race or denomination we come from.

We're here for one purpose. And that's what we want you to do as the Federal Government, is to clean up your mess. And I can't stress that enough. *416-2*

So with that all being said, I just want to again thank you for the opportunity to be here. You will be receiving our written comments. But just to let you know, that Yakima Nation was present here this evening. Thank you.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Come on

416-2 The clean closure alternatives considered for the SST system are represented by Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, Base and Option Cases. For both Base Cases, the assumption is that the SST system would be cleaned to levels that would allow for unrestricted use, which is represented by the removal of the tanks, ancillary equipment, and soils beneath the tanks (contaminated as a result of past leaks) down to the groundwater table. The two Option Cases represent this type of clean closure along with removal of soils beneath the tank farms (contaminated as a result of infiltration from the contiguous cribs and trenches [ditches]). The analysis shows that removal of the contaminants from the vadose zone would not capture those contaminants that may have already reached the groundwater table due to past practices (i.e., past leaks and contiguous cribs and trenches [ditches]).

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

49

1 up.
2 MS. TURNER: Hi. My name is Mia Turner.
3 I'm a 13 year old girl of La Grande, Oregon. I'm a
4 child of my generation.
5 And we are talking about a generation yet
6 to come. We're not talking about my generation. I'm
7 wondering about me.
8 What is going to happen to me when the
9 millions of gallons of radioactive stuff is coming
10 through our roads and polluting our rivers, our
11 lakes, our air.
12 The cancer that can come is going to be
13 painful, I can probably tell you that. Millions, not
14 millions, but hundreds of people are going to die a
15 painful death because of this stuff. *417-1*
16 And I may be young, but I do know what's
17 coming. And I don't want to have my children, me, my
18 great grandchildren to have to deal with this stuff
19 that has happened and what we put here.
20 I truly believe that we need to stop this.
21 I mean, we have the income to stop it. I think we
22 need to stop it now.
23 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.
24 MR. SHAUL: She inspires me to speak. My
25 name is Ed Shaul, La Grande.

417-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

50

And in a past life before I was retired, I worked 17 years for the Foxboro Company, which was then a 110 year old company, incidence controls systems. 63 percent of our business was outside the United States, based in Foxboro, Massachusetts.

And I was the public relations manager when the Wall Street Journal called me one morning and asked me why our control systems failed at Three Mile Island. And I had to answer that.

Fortunately it was a human error, not an instrument error. It was people that did not know how to control an automatic to manual control systems.

Since that time, there's been a lot of simulators built. Now everything is triple redundancy in nuclear plants around the world.

And I'm very dismayed that our present administration, having voted for the administration, is thinking about future nuclear plants, which further complicates the problem for your generation.

Until we find a way to do continuous processing to neutralize the byproducts and a place to put the product, we should not be building any more nuclear plants at this time. Thank you.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.

MS. MOYLEN: My name is Sandra Moylen.

418-1

418-1 Construction of more nuclear energy facilities is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

51

I'm presently from Elgin. I grew up on the lower Columbia River in Clatskanie. I'm 60 years old. I'm a survivor. I'm a down-winder.

I previous commented on EISs. We could look at all the numbers, all the statistics. My family has been those statistics. You can say all minus to the fifth degree.

My aunt, my uncle, my cousin, all who lived in The Dalles and Pendleton and we're down-winders, all died of cancer.

My aunt at about 40 years old. My uncle luckily lived into his 70's. My cousin died at 50 years old, ten years younger than me.

My other cousin currently has a rare form of lymphoma. He was a commercial fisherman on the lower Columbia. He's 48.

My aunt who is about 42 years old also died of cancer. She loved swimming in the river. All of us ate far more fish and clams, and so forth, out of the river than any of the so-called alleged 2.2 pounds or whatever per week.

You know, statistics lie. They really lie a lot. No more waste here. No more nuclear plants. We need to clean up the river now. *419-1*

I can no longer eat the fish from the

419-1 DOE notes that data indicate that Hanford operations do not represent a serious health threat for Columbia River users. Monitoring data and potential doses to a variety of receptors are reported annually in the Hanford Site environmental reports (Poston, Duncan, and Dirkes 2011). As presented in Chapter 3, Table 3–13, of this *TC & WM EIS*, the estimated dose from liquid releases from Hanford waste to the MEI in 2010 was 0.056 millirem; the associated risk of a fatal cancer from this dose is less than 1 in 35 million.

DOE also notes that Jones and Mayger Beaches are to the west-southwest, essentially upwind, of Hanford, and more than 402 kilometers (250 miles) downstream on the Columbia River. Luminescence observed in water and soil, such as that noted by the commentor, is typically of biological origin and has not been associated with radioactivity in the environment. The actions proposed in this EIS support the cleanup of Hanford. As noted in Chapter 1, Section 1.3, the purpose and need include long-term actions to permanently reduce the risk to human health and the environment posed by waste in the SSTs and DSTs and to facilitate the cleanup of Hanford. DOE intends to pursue the selected alternatives as expeditiously as technology and funding allow following issuance of a ROD on the actions proposed in this EIS.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

52

1 river. My family no longer fishes the river. We're
2 afraid of it. We don't hardly ever swim in it.
3 We used to laugh as children when we'd
4 walk on Jones Beach or Mayger Beach and we'd scuff
5 our feet in the sand. And it glowed in the dark.
6 And we'd laugh and say, "Oh, we wonder if this sand's
7 radioactive." Gee, guess what, it was.
8 I've already myself suffered from a rare
9 form of bladder cancer, which I'm recovered from or
10 recovering from.
11 My family -- and I haven't even mentioned
12 the other cousins -- oh, talk about low birth rates.
13 Clatskanie had some of the highest low birth rates
14 and low baby rates in the entire nation.
15 We are down-winders of Hanford. Several
16 of my cousins have had babies that were two pounds,
17 three pounds, four pounds.
18 No more waste, clean it up now, get it
19 started. Prioritize stuff near the river. Stop it,
20 whatever. Use whatever technology. Get it started
21 now.
22 The EIS, we can look at future
23 containment. But let's start doing stuff now. Put
24 people to work. Quit just BS'ing for another 20
25 years. Thank you.

419-1 cont'd

419-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

53

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else who would like to comment at this time? Yes, sir.

MR. WONK: Hi. My name is David Wonk. And I don't know that I would be in disagreement with the gentleman that -- he left. I saw -- that said that we should think in a lifetime sort of thing.

But I couldn't help, and I've thought about this for sometime, that there's a real ethical concern here about responsibility to future generations.

And so I do think we need to think about thousands of years. He did mention, which I appreciate that, you know, we've managed to hold this nation safe together for a little over 200 years. We've had a lot of unusual advantages to be able to do that.

And I also appreciated the courage of this gentleman that, you know, kind of played the devil's advocate, because we've all been the beneficiaries of some of these things that have happened.

But in terms of ethics, we don't know what's going to happen a hundred years from now. I know recently the financial crisis, there were a lot of us that were saying, "Wow, you know, how is this

420-1

420-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

Public Hearing February 22, 2010

54

one going to sort itself out?"

We really don't know what it's going to be like a hundred years from now, 500 years from now. We don't know. We just don't know.

420-1 cont'd

And that's the main reason why we have an obligation to countless unknown people in the future to do whatever we can, however we can.

To make sure that if they're wandering around in more of a tribal existence, up and down the river, trying to make a living however they can, that they don't have to deal with what we benefited from. And that's an ethical question.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Would anybody else like to comment at this time? Anybody whose commented previously, want to comment?

If not, we thank you very much. The Department of Energy and the two states. But mostly thanks to you for coming out tonight and taking your evening to do this. Thank you very much.

(9:15 p.m.)

* * *

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the La Grande, Oregon, Public Hearing (February 22, 2010)

STATE OF OREGON)
)
County of Umatilla)

I, Susanne Starkweather, do hereby certify that at the time and place heretofore mentioned in the caption of the foregoing matter, I was a Professional Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public for Oregon; that at said time and place I reported in stenotype all testimony adduced and proceedings had in the foregoing matter; that thereafter my notes were reduced to typewriting and that the foregoing transcript consisting of 54 pages is a true and correct transcript of all such testimony adduced and proceedings had and of the whole thereof.

Witness my hand at Pendleton, Oregon, on this 4th day of March, 2010.

/s/ Susanne Starkweather
Susanne Starkweather
Professional Court Reporter
Notary Public for Oregon
My commission expires: 12-21-2012

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

DATE: FEBRUARY 23, 2010
6:00 p.m.
RED LION INN AT THE PARK
303 WEST NORTH RIVER DRIVE
SPOKANE, WA 99206

James Parham, Facilitator

PANEL MEMBERS:
Ms. Mary Beth Burandt, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection
Jeff Lyon, Washington State Department of Ecology, Hanford Project Office

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION	PAGE	LINE
Bob Apple	3	19
Jeanine Wade	8	2
Walt Kloefkorn	8	12
Linda Greene	10	8
Charles Fisk	11	14
	54	15
Rosemarie Bisiar	13	3
	48	25
Harvey L. Brown	16	4
Bill Johns	18	11
Gerry Pollet	19	5
	49	25
Amber Waldref	25	1
Buell Hollister	28	8
Bill Houff	29	14
Steve Corker	29	20
Jamison Shamara	31	18
Bart Haggin	33	21
	54	7
Lindell Haggin	25	24
Kate Johnston	36	20
Lauri Costello	39	6
Bob Batty	41	8
Angela Mageras	42	22
Mike Nuess	43	23
Unknown Speaker	47	14

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

(8:04 p.m.)

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Let's turn to our comment period. And I'd like you to keep it, if possible, to three to five minutes. We have a large number of people who want to speak, about half of you, it looks like. That's a great thing.

And Amy, you're ready to get started here?

If you'd like to give your name, great. I'm going to maim some of these pronunciations pretty badly, so if we ask you to spell your name, if we can't read it here or I can't seem to pronounce it.

But the first person we call generally is elected officials, and I have a Bob Apple, who is a Spokane City Council Member.

Bob, would you please step to the mic. And after Bob is Jeanine Wade.

MR. APPLE: Hello. My name is Bob Apple, but most of you know me. I'm on the Spokane City Council.

Also here tonight is Amber Waldref and Steve Corker. We constitute just under a quorum, so there can only be three of us. One more would be too many. So you have garnered our attention.

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

4

I am also known on the council for criticizing staff, and tonight I want to criticize staff.

Excuse me. In my past life I was a Teamster member with Local 690 here in Spokane, and I know a lot of truck drivers still. It's been over 15 years since I have been a member of the Local.

But I want you to know that the easiest route to Hanford is the I-90 corridor, and for rail transport, the easiest route, also, is through Spokane, and to ignore that fact is ridiculous, to say the least.

And to say that the drivers won't have some say in the route that they choose, I know is also ridiculous. They will choose the route.

And the important part here that I want you to know is that truck drivers, history is if they were to be in an accident, it's due to stress, so a lot of latitude is given to them to how to drive, where to drive, and get to where they need to go at their choice and discretion.

And when you're dealing with hazardous waste, that probably is more important for them to be able to decide that. Unfortunately, giving them that option here where we live in Spokane and where this area is, it is very difficult. In fact, very dangerous.

From Coeur d'Alene to the West Plains, which includes Spokane, the City of Spokane Valley, Airway

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

421-1 **421-1** Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Heights, Medical Lake, is a very metropolitan area. We have the freeway corridor of I-90. We also have the rail line, and it is through the City of Spokane and most of the Valley in the lowest area of a larger area, the lowest elevation.

And the difficulty we have is that we're on top of an aquifer, a sole source aquifer that flows through this region, and through the Spokane area in particular we have a raised freeway. I-90 is raised. It is not ground level.

So if an accident were to occur, maybe stress from a driver, whatever, and say we had an accident here, the difficulty I have is that where would this waste, if it were to break loose from its confinement, go?

If for any reason or in anyway it were to escape the tanks and/or somehow with the rain or in its own form get into our wastewater system, we have one sewage treatment plant, and the water that runs off of our highway, our raised freeway, goes directly into that system.

There is no way to restrict it. And if that were to happen, I don't think it would take more than a half hour for that waste to reach our sewage treatment plant and make it totally inoperable, depending upon the amount of radiation that would be there.

I don't know how we would recover from that and, for

421-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

6

your information, we have just put in roughly a half a billion dollars into improvements there to fit the needs of this region and our city.

So that becomes a real major problem. I can top that off with the fact that I know very well as a Spokane City Councilman our police, our fire, our public works, I've talked with them about our emergency preparedness. And our County runs an emergency preparedness operation, of which they have said "We are not capable of dealing with radioactive waste in a spill or in any other fashion."

So we are not capable of dealing with it. And if the federal government wants to make us capable of dealing with it, that would be fine; I just don't think that's going to happen. It would be extremely costly, and I just don't see it. My people are telling me that all the time.

Right now I think our fire department would be able to determine if there were radioactive waste in a spill, and the only thing we could really do is try to restrict the area, but of course if it happens in the central area, depending upon what the material is, it's just a matter of evacuating people in our major transport areas.

So I want to point out how hazardous this is and what a real devastating effect you could have on this entire metropolitan area because this is not very well

421-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

7

thought out.

And secondly and lastly, I want to make sure you understand that I've grown up in Spokane. I've testified at these hearings since the '70s. I've listened to legislators talk to my family members since the '60s.

Quite frankly, they're gone. The problem has never been resolved, and it doesn't look like it will be. Even these most recent solutions of the glassification plant -- and it's not the first time we've had the talk of a glassification plant. It just simply hasn't occurred. It's now been put off to 2024, and who knows how many more delays will occur.

I don't want any more waste at Hanford than is there now. I want all waste stopped. And I think the citizens of the State of Washington voted in a toxic waste initiative just a few years ago to say the same thing.

So I want you to understand we need to stop waste dumping at Hanford, nuclear waste dumping, and we need to stop it cold until the problem is corrected.

Presently, it is the most toxic waste site in the Northern Hemisphere. The radioactive waste has leached in the air, it has leached into the aquifer and the water and into the Columbia River. It is not being contained. All the talk, they say it is. The evidence proves otherwise.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.

421-1 cont'd

421-2

421-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

421-2 DOE is working diligently to bring the WTP online to treat the tank waste at the site as soon as possible. Chapter 1, Section 1.2, provides a brief history and background on DOE's efforts to reduce costs and speed up Hanford cleanup efforts. As discussed in the *TC & WM EIS* Summary, Chapter 1, and Chapter 2, this EIS analyzes additional waste treatment capability that includes expanding the vitrification process capability currently being constructed in the WTP or supplementing the WTP's capability with supplemental treatment technologies. Thus, decisions to be made by DOE regarding whether to treat all waste in the WTP, as is or expanded, or to supplement its capacity by adding new treatment capability depend on demonstrating the feasibility of supplemental treatment technologies. As noted in the Summary, Section S.3.1.4, and Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2.2, of this *TC & WM EIS*, the WTP is currently being constructed in Hanford's 200-East Area. Site work associated with the project began in late 2001. As of early 2012, construction was more than 62 percent complete. However, DOE acknowledges the WTP is a first-of-its-kind radioactive and chemical waste treatment facility and there are issues that have not yet been addressed. Details regarding the WTP are provided in Appendix E, including design, processes, waste-form performance, waste forms/disposal packages, assumptions, and uncertainties.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

8

Jeanine, and after Jeanine would be Walt.

MS. WADE: Thank you. My name is Jeanine Wade. I live in Millwood, not far from the freeway, and I would like to echo what Mr. Apple just said.

I am adamantly opposed to the importation of additional waste into Hanford, and I am even more adamantly opposed to trucking this garbage through our county. Thank you. *422-1*

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Walter, and then Linda Greene after that.

MR. KLOEFKORN: Hi. I'm Walt Kloefkorn from Springdale.

And I've only lived there for 16 years, but I can vouch for the fact that there's many people in that area who are my age who suffer from thyroid cancer and other diseases as a consequence of living downwind from previous Hanford releases.

They were going through all this down there, have been for 10, 20 years, more than that, and will be for hundreds, thousands of more years, and yet we're actually considering making more of this stuff by building more nuclear weapons and by building more nuclear power plants. It's absolutely, 100 percent insane. *423-1*

The DOE licenses these things, and you need to stop. *423-2*

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

422-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

423-1 Nuclear power plants and nuclear weapons are not within the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. This EIS evaluates the potential impacts of alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense plutonium production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford. The potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers of past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this *TC & WM EIS*. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One past study showed no elevated levels of cancer around nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

9

I favor as complete cleanup as possible. I want to see the tanks emptied as completely as possible. I want to see the tanks and the pipes removed, and I want to see the spilled waste cleaned up, and I want the moratorium on importation of any additional waste to be made permanent.

I understand that it's pretty much generally agreed that the vitrification plant in process can only do about half the job, so I want you to start building another one tomorrow. I don't want you to wait until 2016 to make a decision on that.

And since I generally try to find both sides of an issue, I'm going to leave you with some helpful suggestions as to where exactly this waste might be able to go.

We seem to think that we can throw stuff away, and I know of no place more away than Dick Cheney's undisclosed location. It may not hold all of it, but I think we should fill it up first.

Greenwich, Connecticut, is the richest community in the country because of the high percentage of Wall Street bankers that live there. I think you would find huge amounts of public support to site this waste depository there.

Georgia seems to think that they were going to be the first state to build new nuclear power plants, and I

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

423-2 cont'd

423-2 The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the doses from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 rad were to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600.

The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. This closure includes the tank system, along with the vadose zone as impacted by the tank farms (i.e., past leaks). Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

However, as discussed in the Summary, Section S.1.3.2, and Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2, of this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE will not make decisions on groundwater remediation, including the remediation of groundwater contamination resulting from non-tank-farm areas in the 200 Areas, because that is being addressed under the CERCLA (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) process. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford under the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Initially, the moratorium on offsite waste shipment to Hanford restricted the receipt of offsite waste until issuance of this *Final TC & WM EIS*. In a *Federal Register* notice published on December 18, 2009 (74 FR 67189), DOE modified its Preferred Alternative for waste management and extended the moratorium, at least until the WTP is operational. The *TC & WM EIS* analysis shows that, without a moratorium in place, receipt of offsite waste streams

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

can think of nothing more appropriate than a Stone Mountain nuclear waste dump.

And lastly, I hear there's a ranchette outside of Crawford, Texas, that's no longer needed for propaganda purposes. The brush is already cleared. Thank you.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Linda Greene and then Charles Fisk.

MS. GREENE: That guy is a hard act to follow. I'm not going to be funny, I'm afraid.

My problem is that the EIS doesn't actually have an alternative of not having a nuclear waste dump at Hanford. That doesn't seem like an alternative that you have thought about.

The number one thing you want to do is to not truck other nuclear waste into Hanford. This has been something that was talked about and voted upon by the people of the State of Washington. They all agreed we don't want any more waste here. So I just wish that you would listen to the people of Washington. *424-1*

We are supposed to first clean up the waste, and the way we do that is with a clean closure model instead of the landfill closure of the model, and I mean 99.9 percent, rather than 99 percent. I saw on the chart there that showed 99 percent looked pretty good. But 99.9 percent looks a lot better as far as cleaning up. *424-2*

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

that contain specific amounts of certain isotopes, in particular iodine-129 and technetium-99, could cause an adverse impact on the environment. Therefore, one means of mitigating this impact would be for DOE to limit disposal of offsite waste streams at Hanford. Other mitigation measures, such as recycling secondary-waste streams into the primary-waste-stream feeds within the WTP to increase iodine-129 capture in ILAW and bulk vitrification, are discussed in Chapter 7, Section 7.5, of this final EIS.

424-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

424-2 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

11

And the moratorium here we're talking about, well, maybe they'll continue the moratorium after that vitrification plant is all started up, but that doesn't sound quite right because we still have to have at least half of that. *424-3*

The waste at Hanford is not going to be cleaned up with the vitrification plant that's currently there, so we need to build another vitrification plant. That needs to be done before any moratorium is stopped.

So I would say we should have a moratorium forever. Thanks.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Charles Fisk. After Mr. Fisk will be Rosemarie.

MR. FISK: I am Charles Fisk. I'm a citizen here of Spokane, and I would like to amplify all of the comments that have been made so far, particularly Greenwich, Connecticut.

To me one of the only really practical alternatives to this insanity of continuing to produce nuclear fission -- nuclear fission materials is to get it buried on site no matter how many thousand feet you have to go down. *425-1*

Your consideration of transportation, what we're concerned about here is Spokane, but you magnify that by all the other transportation corridors that you showed on *425-2*

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

424-3 Tank Closure Alternative 2B would provide additional vitrification capacity by adding four LAW melters to supplement the existing WTP configuration. Please see response to comment 424-1 regarding the moratorium.

425-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

425-2 As shown in the Summary, Section S.5.3; Chapter 2, Section 2.8.3.10; and Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12, of this *TC & WM EIS*, it is unlikely that the estimated total public radiation exposures from transporting radioactive waste to Hanford for disposal would result in any additional LCFs.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

12

panel number 9, it's a huge risk, not only here in Spokane, but all over the United States. *425-2 cont'd*

My feeling is that if they produce this kind of things at Oakridge and the other DOE sites, you darn well better figure out some way of putting -- or keeping it on site, however deep you have to go. *425-1 cont'd*

You're not just thinking about 100 years. The way the Hanford -- or, rather, the Heart of America people are looking at projections down 125 years, but you're looking at 1,000 and 2,000 years of radioactivity. *425-3*

It's my understanding that the salt deposits in New Mexico probably under the current management will melt. Yucca Mountain has been discarded. I seriously doubt that you know what a really good alternative site is, and therefore a lot more consideration needs to go into this process than just the draft EIS here. *425-4*

You people really need to think far ahead. It's not just our children or grandchildren; it's hundreds of generations that you're dealing with and I don't think any of you are really taking this seriously.

So my request would be a permanent moratorium on messing up the sites that are already damaged, to clean up the ones to the best of our ability now and in the future, and certainly to consider those future generations. *425-1 cont'd*

Thank you for coming to Spokane.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

425-3 This *TC & WM EIS* assumes several different types of end-state management, as described in Chapter 2, the Glossary, and the Summary. These include administrative controls, institutional controls, and postclosure care, as appropriate. Each of these end-state management options would take place at the completion of an action and is assumed to occur for 100 years following the end of the action (e.g., active institutional controls would be maintained for 100 years following final placement of waste in a storage facility). The 10,000-year time period described in this *TC & WM EIS* represents the period of analysis used for the long-term impact analyses for groundwater, human health, and ecological risk; it does not represent the assumed period of institutional controls. For clarity, the definition of "10,000-year period of analysis" is included in this final EIS in Chapter 2, the Glossary, and the Summary, as appropriate.

425-4 Regarding the commentor's concern about the disposition of HLW, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

13

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Rosemarie, and followed by Harvey Brown.

MS. BISIAR: First of all, I really want to thank you for coming to Spokane because I kind of got the impression that we were the lost child out there that everybody seemed to be ignoring. And since we are on a major interstate highway that runs right through Spokane, we needed to have our voices heard here.

So thank you very much for allowing us to come and speak our mind.

My name is Rosemarie Bisiar, and I won't expect you to spell that.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: I have it spelled here.

MS. BISIAR: You have it spelled there, and I write clearly enough.

And I am here to represent Eastern Washington Voters. We are a non-partisan progressive political organization that tries to bring out what we feel Eastern Washington needs to do governmentally or whatever in a progressive manner.

We are concerned that the U.S. Department of Energy is not proposing to adequately clean up the Hanford Superfund site, which we all know is the biggest mess around, and as the people of Washington State expressed

426-1

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

426-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford as required under RCRA, CERCLA (which includes requirements for cleanup of Superfund sites), and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the disposition of HLW, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

14

426-1 cont'd

their desire in Initiative 297 in 2004, it was overwhelmingly passed that we did not want this. We wanted it cleaned up.

I learned in college many years ago that our world is a complex, integrated, natural system. I come from a science background. Not to say that I have a Ph.D. You don't need a Ph.D. to understand that what we have on our hands is devastating.

I have not read nor heard anywhere where we as a people have yet figured out how to safely deal with these toxic wastes where it will not adversely affect the environment in which they're placed, or living organisms that may have long-sustained exposure or short-term intense exposure.

We should know by now. And I don't want to tell you how many years ago I was in college, but if they were telling me it was a very integrated system, we should know by now that you can't mess up one part and not mess up another part along with it.

We cannot just put toxic waste, quote, out of sight, out of mind, without the dire consequences down the road, and down the road I mean hundreds of thousands of years, in this case.

426-2

Bringing more toxic waste to Hanford is not acceptable until the current Superfund site can be cleaned

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

426-2 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

1 up to our fullest ability and there is a safe and
2 effective way to treat all incoming radioactive waste and
3 contain it to the extent that it cannot elevate the risk
4 of further contaminating the Columbia River and the
5 Hanford Central Plateau.

426-2 cont'd

6 Transporting the radioactive waste via I-90 through
7 the heart of Spokane, Spokane Valley -- and I'm
8 disappointed to find that we don't have any Spokane Valley
9 mayor or council people here that I'm aware of -- Coeur
10 d'Alene exposes -- and Coeur d'Alene, not to mention all
11 the cities that were on your, your diagram showing your
12 route, and ours was not included, exposes our citizens,
13 but you also did not mention risk to children, and they
14 are our future generation.
15 Elevated risks of cancer. It would be a national
16 security risk in our current tourist -- terrorist-prone
17 world, and I take that extremely gravely because I think
18 it's going to be a short time before we find terrorism
19 within our own country. So this is a national security
20 issue as far as I'm concerned.
21 The Spokane area is completely incapable of handling
22 such -- any kind of an incident that would effectively
23 shutdown I-90, it's major link for evacuation, for days,
24 weeks, or months. We would like to see you come up with
25 an alternative that would more appropriately address these

426-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

426-1 cont'd

issues. Thank you.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Mr. Brown, Harvey Brown, and then after that Bill Johns.

MR. BROWN: Yes. I'm Harvey Brown. I live in Greenacres, Washington. I'm active in the Republicans For Environmental Protection and Eastern Washington Voters, but these remarks are my own and don't reflect the views of those organizations.

Also, I should say that in my career as an engineer, this was the thing that I would schedule a root canal to avoid, so it is that important to me. So, again, I also thank you for holding the hearings in Spokane and giving us an opportunity to get some input into the process.

In my preparation I found the impact on Spokane is much more than just being 130 miles downwind. There's very complex issues, and at this point my remarks are preliminary observations and I'll submit a more detailed written comment later.

427-1

Cleaning the single-shell tanks to 99 percent with landfill closure sounds good, but the long-term groundwater contamination would be an order of magnitude less if the tanks were cleaned to 99 percent, the leaks were cleaned up, and clean closure were made. The Figure S-16 in the EIS shows this. Alternative 6-B looks best to me at this time.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

427-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all of the SST system, which would effectively remove 100 percent of the waste. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

17

I'm only going to risk trying to say "Fast Flux Test Facility" once. I'm leaning toward Alternative 3, disassembly and removal, rather than entombment; however, the risks involved with taking it apart and transporting some of the parts off site need to be weighed, and in all of this, the safety of those who do the work is a concern. *427-2*

But then I remembered last spring visiting a park west of Portland where the Trojan plant was disassembled and removed. That would be a nice addition to the Hanford facility.

I'm disappointed that the waste treatment plant has been delayed so long. The problem started shortly after I was born and it looks like it will be -- that it will outlive me by quite a bit. *427-3*

The excuse for abandoning Yucca Mountain was -- as a disposal site -- was sometime beyond 10,000 years from now the EPA's safe drinking water standards could be exceeded. At Hanford, water contamination is way over this standard. Groundwater entering the Columbia now is thousands of times higher radioactive contamination than drinking water standards. *427-4*

Using Hanford as a national waste dump will increase groundwater contamination another order of magnitude. We have a lot of radioactive waste scattered around the country that should be treated, but there must be

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

427-2 For a discussion of the potential impacts on workers under the three FFTF Decommissioning alternatives, please see Chapter 4 of this EIS.

427-3 DOE is working diligently to bring the WTP online to treat the tank waste at the site as soon as possible. Chapter 1, Section 1.2, provides a brief history and background on DOE's efforts to reduce costs and speed up Hanford cleanup efforts. As discussed in the *TC & WM EIS* Summary, Chapter 1, and Chapter 2, this EIS analyzes additional waste treatment capability that includes expanding the vitrification process capability currently being constructed in the WTP or supplementing the WTP's capability with supplemental treatment technologies. Thus, decisions to be made by DOE regarding whether to treat all waste in the WTP, as is or expanded, or to supplement its capacity by adding new treatment capability depend on demonstrating the feasibility of supplemental treatment technologies. As noted in the Summary, Section S.3.1.4, and Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2.2, of this *TC & WM EIS*, the WTP is currently being constructed in Hanford's 200-East Area. Site work associated with the project began in late 2001. As of early 2012, construction was more than 62 percent complete. However, DOE acknowledges the WTP is a first-of-its-kind radioactive and chemical waste treatment facility and there are issues that have not yet been addressed. Details regarding the WTP are provided in Appendix E, including design, processes, waste-form performance, waste forms/disposal packages, assumptions, and uncertainties.

427-4 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

18

427-4 cont'd

alternatives to this that do not contaminate a major river and does not endanger those that are near it. Just waiting around until I'm not here to watch doesn't count.

I appreciate the work that's gone into this document. There are some parts that I wish I had the trees rather than the paper that went into it, but at this point I can only ask that alternatives be chosen and developed that do more than just -- do a more thorough job of cleaning up and protecting us.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Bill Johns, and after Mr. Johns will be Gerry Pollet.

428-1

MR. JOHNS: Bill Johns, and I am for the preferred alternatives that the DOE has come up with, except for the FFTF. I'd like to have that in the no-action alternative.

And I've worked on several landfill closures. I would support the landfill closures over taking the tanks out. They've been very effective, and when you take stuff out of the ground like that, you've got to put it someplace. So -- and especially how deep she was saying it was in some cases. I'm not sure how you do that.

So thank you.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Okay. Thank you. Okay. After Mr. Pollet will be Amber Waldorf, I believe.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

428-1 Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

19

Amber Waldorf.

MR. POLLET: It's Amber Waldref.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you, sir. Waldref.

MR. POLLET: She is a member of the Spokane City Council, and I want to thank her and Council Member Bob Apple and Steve Conway for being here tonight. See, it's a problem. I have a friend named --

We have asked for several years that the Energy Department and Ecology hold hearings in Spokane. And I'm Gerry Pollet with Heart of America Northwest. It's the region's largest citizen watchdog group for Hanford cleanup, and we've asked for that not just because of transportation concerns, but because, as everyone here knows, you're all downwind.

And the downwind potential impacts did not just end in 1965 from Hanford. If there is a serious earthquake that is reasonably projectable and the tanks of nuclear waste are not emptied, we do not know what the impact would be if a dome collapsed on a single-shell tank. It has been analyzed about whether or not they could collapse. *429-1*

We don't know what the impact would be if the K Basins, where spent nuclear fuel was stored, failed in the event of an earthquake, but we got the waste out of there

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

429-1 The potential impacts of an earthquake-induced collapse of an SST dome (scenario TK53) are presented in Chapter 4, Section 4.1.11, under each alternative, and the basis for analysis is provided in Appendix K. The scenario is described and the radiological consequences and risk are presented in Appendix K, Section K.3.7. The analysis assumes that the tank has not been emptied and contains 408,823 liters (108,000 gallons) of salt cake, sludge, and liquids at the time of the dome collapse. Other earthquake-induced accidents are also analyzed in Appendix K and the results are presented in Chapter 4, Sections 4.1.11 and 4.3.11. The accidents include failures of the HLW Vitrification Facility melter feed preparation vessels (scenario HL11), collapse of the LAW Vitrification Facility (scenario LA31), collapse of the entire WTP (scenario WT41), and damage to solid-waste management facilities resulting from both design-basis and beyond-design-basis earthquakes (scenarios SWOC NPH-1 and SWOC NPH-2).

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

20

because we couldn't wait.

We don't have that luxury with the single-shell tanks. We can't take until 2040. But the Energy Department has failed in this impact statement to analyze what are the risks for everyone downwind and the entire region from its proposed delay taking until 2040 to empty the single-shell tanks.

429-1 cont'd

Let's jump ahead here. I want to show you some slides -- keep going -- that the Energy Department hasn't wanted to show you in these meetings, apparently, from their own EIS.

First off, as was mentioned early today -- tonight, radioactive strontium-90, according to DOE's own groundwater monitoring report from last year, is now entering the Columbia River and springs at 1,500 times the drinking water standard.

The drinking water standard is not some strange thing that's out there. It's hard for people to get their hands around this -- "It's just a standard. What does it mean? Oh, they violated." It means that one person out of every 10,000 adults who drink that water would die of cancer.

429-2

Children are three to ten times more susceptible to get cancer from the same dose than an adult is. This is just one contaminant flowing into the river today.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

429-2 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

21

What we see in this EIS is if we don't empty the tanks and remove tanks, if we don't clean up the leaks and billions, that's billions with a B, of gallons of waste that's discharged from the tanks, if we add 3 million cubic feet of waste to the landfill at Hanford, we have enormous impacts to the groundwater. After we spend billions cleaning up Hanford, it gets recontaminated.

429-2 cont'd

Let's jump ahead here.

This is a picture of one of the 40 miles of unlined soil trenches at Hanford into which radioactive wastes were dumped. 40 miles when they're stacked end to end. The Energy Department's plan is to cap them, not dig them up and retrieve what is leaking from them.

429-3

Let's keep going. Keep going.

This is just an illustrative map that was not shown to you tonight by the agencies. This is carbon tetrachloride, a poison and carcinogen, in the groundwater today. That's the Columbia River flowing through Hanford for 50 miles, as you see along the top and along the right side of the map, which would be the east -- north and east sides of the Hanford site.

429-4

The dark red is 50 times the drinking water standard in the groundwater today, and this is the projection for 125 years from now. Next slide. You see it gets worse. Next slide.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

429-3 Since 2004, DOE has buried all LLW in lined trenches (see Appendix E, Section E.3.3, for a description of the evolution of past waste disposal practices). DOE continues to strictly limit the amount of waste Hanford can accept, and ensures that disposal activities are protective of the environment and meet regulatory requirements. Previous use of unlined trenches for disposal was a big concern to stakeholders and Washington and Oregon States; DOE heard and addressed those concerns and is using lined trenches.

The scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include the remediation of the burial grounds as part of the proposed action evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates. However, Appendix S includes DOE's inventory estimates for the burial grounds, and Appendix U provides supporting information on long-term cumulative impacts that includes the burial ground inventories. DOE received comments on the potential impacts of future remediation activities that are in various stages of planning (which, given the inherent uncertainty, were not included in the cumulative impacts analysis). In response, DOE performed a sensitivity analysis to evaluate the potential impacts if certain remediation activities were conducted at some of the more prominent waste sites on the Central Plateau and along the river corridor. The goal of the sensitivity analysis is to help DOE, EPA, and Ecology prioritize cleanup efforts in the future. This analysis is provided in Appendix U of this EIS and is discussed further in Chapter 7, Section 7.5.

429-4 See response to comment 429-2 for full site cleanup and mitigation information.

The EIS projects that under the preferred alternatives and the actions the Energy Department wishes to take, that plutonium-239 levels entering the river shore in the year 2983 would be 300 times the drinking water standard.

429-4 cont'd

That's after we've spent billions to clean up Hanford, it gets recontaminated from what the Energy Department would leave in the tank residues because 1 percent by volume is far more than 1 percent in terms of the radionuclide and toxic waste that is in the tanks, and from the tank leaks and from those burial grounds that they cap but they don't clean up.

429-5

And the waste continues to seep through the soil into the groundwater if you just put a cap over it. It's already 100 to 200 feet deep in many places, the contamination. Next slide.

This is uranium-238 125 years from now projected due to the tank leaks, releases, discharges, and the failure to clean them up under Alternative 2.

Next slide.

That's 2,000 years from now, uranium-238 in the groundwater. Another spread of plume from the tanks themselves and from what's in the ground under the tanks if you don't clean them up.

429-6

Next slide.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

429-5 DOE recognizes three concerns expressed in this comment. The first is the concern that 1 percent residuals (following retrieval from the SSTs) represents far greater than 1 percent in terms of the total radionuclide and chemical inventories. DOE is not in agreement with this supposition based on characterization data from the SSTs that have been retrieved in Waste Management Area C and based on modeling results. DOE does agree that there is uncertainty in the estimates of inventory following retrieval of 99 percent of the waste by volume (or the maximum extent practicable), but notes that this uncertainty is probably smaller (in terms of comparison among the alternatives) than other uncertainties in the total inventory estimates, release models, vadose zone flow and transport models, and groundwater flow and transport models. As stated in Appendix E, Section E.1.1.1.1, of this *TC & WM EIS*, monitoring and characterization of residuals during retrieval are important components of the closure process.

Regarding the second concern, DOE recognizes and agrees with the commentor's observation regarding deep vadose zone contamination. DOE's view is that this finding is supported by groundwater monitoring data, vadose zone monitoring data, and model results. DOE notes that reduction of flux from the deep vadose zone to the groundwater system is an important component of mitigation measures that may need to be deployed during the closure process for a variety of source locations across the site (see Chapter 7, Sections 7.1 and 7.5, in this *Final TC & WM EIS*).

Regarding the third concern, DOE recognizes the commentor's supposition regarding infiltration barriers. DOE notes that the main purpose of infiltration barriers is to slow the migration of contamination through the vadose zone and reduce peak concentrations prior to entry of the contaminant plume into the groundwater system. DOE is in agreement that infiltration barriers alone (with the characteristics analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*) may not be sufficient to reduce vadose zone fluxes to levels that result in groundwater concentrations below benchmark levels at the Core Zone Boundary. However, DOE is of the view that infiltration barriers are an important component of the overall strategy of site closure, in conjunction with removal, treatment, and disposal of source and near-surface materials; with postclosure monitoring; and with potential mitigation measures as site conditions warrant and as expressed in applicable closure requirements.

429-6 DOE is convinced that vitrification of radioactive waste into glass is the best-available and -proven technology for immobilizing liquid radioactive waste

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

23

Let's just jump ahead to the transportation slide. Here. The Energy Department is in gross violation of NEPA.

And I'd appreciate it if you could just at least listen, Mary Beth.

The Energy Department is in violation of NEPA by failing to analyze the specific routes that trucks may take to Hanford. The Energy Department tried to pull this once before saying we only have to analyze representative, in quotes, routes, which is what was said tonight by Mary Beth Burandt in response to a question. I want to make sure that's now on the record that was the word she used. *429-7*

Representative routes don't cut it because people don't live in representative cities. You live in Spokane where, as we've heard tonight, you're in a specific valley. The trucks will go right past the front doors of L.C. High School. They will go right past the hospitals.

People live on specific routes, not representative routes, and they're entitled to have a specific route analyzed when it is likely to be used --

FACILITATOR PARHAM: One minute.

MR. POLLET: -- have already ruled on this.

And the final slide I'll just show is that the Energy Department's own EIS for shipping high-level *429-8*

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

because it atomistically bonds the species in a solid glassy matrix. Because the radioactive constituents are bonded within the glass structure, the waste forms produced are very durable and environmentally stable over long time periods, yet they remain toxic. EPA has declared vitrification the best-demonstrated available technology for HLW. DOE has extensive experience with vitrifying liquid radioactive waste at two DOE sites, the Savannah River Site and the West Valley Demonstration Project. At the Savannah River Site, the Defense Waste Processing Facility has been operating since 1996 and, to date, has produced over 2,000 IHLW canisters that meet the geologic repository waste acceptance standards. Similarly, the West Valley Demonstration Project operated for approximately 4 years and produced approximately 375 repository-acceptable IHLW canisters. The lessons learned from operating these facilities, as well as the knowledge being shared by European vitrification facilities, have been and continue to be incorporated into the WTP vitrification design and plans for operations.

429-7 DOE is not in violation of meeting the requirements of NEPA. This *TC & WM EIS* contains an analysis of transportation routes of specific origination/destination sites to and from Hanford, as shown in Appendix H, Figure H–4, Waste Management Alternatives – Analyzed Truck and Rail Routes. The associated assumptions are applied to all of the alternatives analyzed in this EIS so that a reasonable comparison can be made among the alternatives. The actual routes used could vary due to changes in route characteristics and highway construction, but the risk results are expected to remain essentially the same. To obtain an approximation of the possible impacts on certain individuals, the commentor can refer to the estimated risks to an MEI as shown in Appendix H. A resident (or someone residing in a single location 30 meters [98 feet] from the transportation route) would receive a dose from incident-free transportation of 3.0×10^{-7} rem per truck shipment or 6.3×10^{-7} rem per rail shipment. These risks are considered very small.

429-8 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

24

1 radioactive waste to Hanford last -- in 2008 showed that
2 it would cause 816 fatal cancers without a transportation
3 accident, without a terrorist attack, just from the
4 radiation that comes out of the shipping casks for
5 high-level waste.
6 The greater-than-Class-C waste, which you left out
7 of this EIS, the Energy Department is proposing to look at
8 shipping it and burying it at Hanford. The Energy
9 Department said it has already made the decision that all
10 radioactive waste mixed with hazardous waste will be
11 disposed at Hanford from these sites.
12 It belonged in this EIS. It should have been
13 disclosed. And the risks from these wastes are as high as
14 the same risks as the 816 fatal cancers from high-level
15 nuclear waste.
16 FACILITATOR PARHAM: We have to
17 finish, Gerry.
18 MR. POLLET: I urge you to not mislead
19 the public any further. I urge the public to contact your
20 state officials. Tell your State of Washington officials
21 tonight, and go home, send an e-mail to the Governor
22 saying everything you said here tonight. Thank you.
23 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Amber
24 Waldref. I'll get your name this time. Thank you. And
25 after that Buell Hollister.

429-8 cont'd

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Regarding the commentor's concern about the inclusion of GTCC LLW in this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE has included information from the *Draft GTCC EIS* in the *Final TC & WM EIS* cumulative impacts analysis. For a more comprehensive discussion on GTCC LLW, see Sections 2.1 and 2.12 of this CRD.

Additionally, on December 18, 2009, DOE announced a modification of the *TC & WM EIS* Preferred Alternatives in the *Federal Register* (74 FR 67189). In this announcement, DOE modified its Preferred Alternative for waste management in the *Draft TC & WM EIS* by stating that DOE would not ship GTCC LLW to Hanford, at least until the WTP is operational. It was noted in the announcement that DOE is analyzing the disposal of GTCC LLW in a separate EIS.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

25

MS. WALDREF: Well, thank you. My name is Amber Waldref. I'm a Spokane City Council member here with a couple of my colleagues that have been around a lot longer than I have. I've been on the job about eight weeks, so I have a ways to go. But I have been coming to Hanford meetings for ten years and I appreciate that the Department of Energy came to Spokane and held a hearing on this EIS.

It's a very important EIS, and I do appreciate that it was completed. And the goal was to look at a cumulative analysis, look at all the waste on the entire Hanford site from the tanks, from waste that was dumped into the ground, waste that's in the groundwater currently, and potential waste that could come to Hanford.

And so having that cumulative look is really important, and that information is pretty scary, though. And, you know, just the existing waste at Hanford, Plutonium contamination entering the river will grow to over 300 times the drinking water standards just with the existing wastes that are there, before you even look at additional waste. *430-1*

So that to me is a real concern. We -- we know based on this EIS about the huge health and environmental risks that are going to come in the future, if not now, entering the Columbia River just from the current waste *430-2*

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

430-1 There are two aspects that have bearing on both the predicted impacts of the existing materials at the site and, potentially, offsite waste. First, there is some conservatism in the predicted concentrations presented in the draft EIS. While refinements in the approach used on this final EIS lessen predicted concentrations, modeled exceedances of standards still occur. This is why the second aspect—the regulatory context—remains important. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses those laws and requirements that would apply to the proposed actions, depending on the alternative. Issues concerning the ability to meet legal standards or requirements are also discussed, along with the potential mitigation measures that may be needed and that are feasible for DOE to implement. In particular, additional mitigation measures could be required in future permits issued by the State of Washington, or could be addressed under the scope of the TPA as part of future remedial actions that are subject to CERCLA. In the ROD, DOE will identify and discuss the factors considered in reaching its decisions, such as economic, technical, and national policy considerations, along with mitigation and monitoring measures that DOE will implement. In any event, DOE will select a set of activities designed to protect public health and safety.

430-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

26

that we have, and that's why I feel like adding more waste to Hanford is just -- it shouldn't even be an option, and that's another comment.

It didn't seem like that was even an option in the EIS, just to consider not bringing it. The option was "Do you want it here or do you want it here?" Well, I'd like it not to come at all and I'd like that moratorium to be a permanent moratorium on bringing more waste to Hanford.

So in 2004, I think other people have mentioned here tonight already, that Washington State voters overwhelmingly said no to adding more waste to Hanford until we cleaned up what we had there. And I still feel like this EIS doesn't, to me, adequately address the tank waste.

We know we can only vitrify or turn into glass half the waste in those tanks. We still have to do something with the other half of that waste. And I know the Department of Energy says they will continue to look at a preferred alternative for that, but I would like to see that addressed in this EIS.

I think a lot of people have already touched on the transportation issues. I feel like it's really hard to comment when this EIS didn't include looking at I-90 as a route and what the risk would be to folks along I-90 and in Spokane and the whole Spokane Valley area.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

430-2 cont'd

430-3

430-4

430-3 Options analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS* range from treating none of the tank waste (Tank Closure Alternative 1: No Action) to treating all of the waste to the extent required to meet disposal requirements. Tank waste could be treated using a variety of technologies, in addition to vitrification, to make it safe for disposal, resulting in one or many waste forms. Supplemental treatment technologies include cast stone, bulk vitrification, and steam reforming. Chapter 2 of this EIS provides a description of all of the proposed technologies for treating the tank waste.

430-4 This *TC & WM EIS* contains an analysis of transportation routes of specific origination/destination sites to and from Hanford, as shown in Appendix H, Figure H–4, Waste Management Alternatives – Analyzed Truck and Rail Routes. The associated assumptions are applied to all of the alternatives analyzed in this EIS so that a reasonable comparison can be made among the alternatives. The actual routes used could vary due to changes in route characteristics and highway construction, but the risk results are expected to remain essentially the same. As shown in the Summary, Section S.5.3; Chapter 2, Section 2.8.3.10; and Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12, of this *TC & WM EIS*, it is unlikely that the estimated total public radiation exposures from transporting radioactive waste to Hanford for disposal would result in any additional LCFs. To obtain an approximation of the possible impacts on certain individuals, such as someone living along Interstate 90 in Spokane, Washington, the commentor can refer to the estimated risks to an MEI as shown in Appendix H. A resident (or someone residing in a single location 30 meters [98 feet] from the transportation route) would receive a dose from incident-free transportation of 3.0×10^{-7} rem per truck shipment or 6.3×10^{-7} rem per rail shipment. These risks are considered very small.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

27

And so it's really hard to comment when that information wasn't even in the EIS. I don't believe that just looking at kind of, you know, certain suggested routes is adequate. So I think we need to make sure that that is done and that we can have another chance to comment on that. *430-4 cont'd*

So, again, for the closure, I would advocate for as much clean closure as possible, removing as much as we can of the waste, cleaning up the waste and the leaks.

It just seems like a waste of our taxpayer money to be spending billions of dollars cleaning up all this waste and then leaving it in the ground to then just recontaminate the groundwater that we hopefully have been cleaning up over the next ten years. *430-5*

So it just doesn't make a lot of sense to me to leave it in there and then recontaminate it, all the time and energy we've put into cleaning up everything along the river.

And just a couple of other things. The -- I thought that Mr. Houff here had a really good question earlier that didn't get on the record about just long-term monitoring of this site.

If in 50 years the Department of Energy is no longer -- you know, 50 years after the site is closed, no one is there watching or telling people "Don't go here. Don't *430-6*

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

430-5 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

430-6 This EIS assumes several different types of end-state management, as described in Chapter 2, the Glossary, and the Summary. These include administrative controls, institutional controls, and postclosure care, as appropriate. Each of these end-state management options would take place at the completion of an action and was assumed to occur for 100 years following the end of the action (e.g., active institutional controls would be maintained for 100 years following final placement of waste in a storage facility). For analysis purposes, the period of time assumed for postclosure care is 100 years. For disposal facilities licensed by NRC for the disposal of Class A and Class B low-level waste without special provisions for intrusion protection, institutional control of access to the site is required for up to 100 years. For hazardous waste management disposal units, RCRA and Ecology hazardous waste regulations require a 30-year postclosure care period; however, due to the types of waste planned for disposal, it was assumed that this period would be extended to 100 years.

drink the water here." That's a huge concern.

So we need to have a better sense of how that site is going to be monitored in the long term for future generations.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Buell Hollister, and after Buell will be Bill Houff.

MR. HOLLISTER: Well, thanks for the chance to speak.

In reflecting on the history of this whole scenario, it's been 65 years since they started putting all that contaminated waste in the Hanford -- at the Hanford site, and here we're talking about vitrification in another 12 years.

It seems to me like this is a project that's turned into a cash cow for a lot of interested contractors and communities that have a lot at stake here.

The initial estimate was 50 billion dollars. I must confess, I don't know, but I do know that the multiple contractors got generous cost overruns in there. So I have no idea what the ultimate cost, if there is an ultimate cost, if this thing ever comes to a conclusion.

I -- of course I don't want to repeat a lot of things that have been said, but I think highway transportation should be prohibited. I think we've got to

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

430-6 cont'd

431-1

431-1 The transportation of radioactive materials and waste, both coming to and leaving Hanford, must comply with DOT and NRC regulations that promote the protection of human health and the environment. This includes requiring the use of certified packaging that minimizes the radiation dose rate outside the transportation package. These packages do not release any of their content while in transit; however, they do emanate a low-level radiation that is already considered in estimating the radiation doses to the public residing along the routes. As indicated in the *TC & WM EIS* Summary, Section S.5.3; Chapter 2, Section 2.8.3.10; and Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12, it is unlikely that transportation of radioactive waste would cause an additional fatality as a result of radiation from either incident-free transportation or postulated transportation accidents.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

29

assure a measure of safety.

These vehicles are emitting radioactive, you know, releases, and I understand there's no security there for, you know, minimizing the release, no lead shielding within those tanks. So I think that there shouldn't be any highway, any highway transportation.

431-1 cont'd

I'm going to end my comments now, but I just want to recognize Bill Houff, who will be speaking next. Bill started Hanford Education Action League way back with a sermon at the Unitarian Church, and I applaud Bill for all he's done in this effort.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Bill Houff, and after Bill Houff will be Steve Corker.

MR. HOUFF: Thank you, Buell.

My sentiments and concerns have already been well expressed in the excellent statements that have been made. Let's get on with the meeting.

432-1

432-1 Comment noted.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Okay. Thank you. Steve Corker, and after Steve will be Jamison.

MR. CORKER: Thank you very much.

And I'm coming here tonight really with three hats on. First, as a city council member representing a city of 205,000, a majority of citizens who aren't comfortable in testifying in events like this. Many of them who really don't fully understand the impact.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

But part of our responsibility as elected officials is to serve our community, and probably more importantly to serve future generations.

The second hat I'm wearing is the president of Radiochemical Health Effects Archives, a foundation that just completed a study funded by Resolve that looked into potential effects and impacts of the Hanford facility on the 32,000 young people under the age of 5 who were exposed during that period of 1945, '44 and '46 with an unbelievable amount of toxic materials that I think have been impacted.

And, third, I was one of those 32,000 young people under the age of 5 in Walla Walla. And in that study and my life I've seen the impact or the potential impact of what that radiation has caused on a number of citizens.

This state has done its share in terms of dealing with all the responsibilities and impact of the facility at Hanford. We've paid our dues, and I think this area, this region, is entitled to have an attitude on the part of our federal government that removes the impact of this activity and that facility on our lives. I think we've earned it. *433-1*

I'm concerned about the transport, both rail and truck. I'm more concerned about the impact on the Columbia River long term as a vital waterway, something *433-2* *433-3*

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

433-1 Comment noted.

433-2 As shown in the Summary, Section S.5.3; Chapter 2, Section 2.8.3.10; and Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12, of this *TC & WM EIS*, it is unlikely that the estimated total public radiation exposures from transporting radioactive waste to Hanford for disposal would result in any additional LCFs.

433-3 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding the cleanup of the past leaks.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

31

1 critically important for the livelihood of this
2 neighborhood.
3 I would urge you to remove an unlimited amount,
4 coming close to perfection as possible, from that site.
5 And to our representative from the State of Washington, I
6 urge that the full authority of the Governor and your
7 department represent the interests of our citizens in
8 whatever decisions or actions evolve out of this study and
9 of the site in the future.
10 Again, I appreciate the fact that you've come here.
11 I think we would have had three more council members
12 participating if we didn't create that quorum that we all
13 seem to be concerned about. But I do appreciate the
14 opportunity to be a part of tonight's facilities.
15 Thank you.
16 FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.
17 Jamison, and after Jamison will be Bart Haggin.
18 MR. SHAMARA: Shalom, everybody. It's
19 kind of like saying hi, and more.
20 I first of all want to thank everybody that showed
21 up. I'm an SCC student. My name is Jamison Shamara. We
22 currently had a guest speaker come to SCC and he talked
23 about them bringing waste to -- through Spokane and
24 bringing it into Washington.
25 And I feel really humbled because, like most of you,

433-3 cont'd

433-4

433-5

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

433-4 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

433-5 Ecology's foreword, located in the front section of the *Draft TC & WM EIS*, provides information on Ecology's role as a cooperating agency and also includes Ecology's insights on the development of the draft EIS. The foreword presented in this final EIS provides additional insights from Ecology as a result of DOE's responses to Ecology's comments on the draft EIS and on DOE's decisions to be made.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

32

I haven't been alive over 23 years yet. I don't know too much about the topics we've been talking about, but I don't know what kind of law they use here downtown but I know the difference between right and wrong.

I'm not the wisest person, but when I look at an apple, I can look at an apple and I can say, "That's a good apple; it looks yummy to eat. You know, it's got a worm in it, maybe I shouldn't eat that." I'm not going to eat it, hopefully.

But I realize that we do live in times where we have a lot of the waste coming in, we have a lot of these things happening, so I'm very, very thankful that we have the DOE here and I'm very grateful for all the hard work they do in bringing us drinks, the cookies, and everything involved.

However, listening to everything tonight and listening to the guest speaker, I feel -- I feel very much that it is absolutely not wisdom to bring the nuclear waste through here. It's absolutely not wisdom to bring the nuclear waste and drop it off where there's already 53 million gallons of it. And I think, personally, that strikes me as common sense.

I look at -- I look at the statistics. I listen to the speakers, and it was obvious that they also knew much more than I did about the topics; however, I feel that

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

434-1

434-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

33

it's common sense that if we already have all these issues at hand, we should not settle with our health, we should not settle with our lives, with our children, and with the people that we love, that we should do our best.

There may be a lot of contributing factors the DOE has that they can't -- you know, there's certain things that even if it were in their power and control, which it is now, that it may go out of their control. Maybe, maybe not.

But I'm saying personally from what I understand now, I'm going to have to definitely say don't bring them trucks through here, don't bring them trains through here, don't drop that garbage off here. Do something with that garbage, if you will.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Okay. Thank you. Let's see. Bart Haggin, and after Bart will be Lindell Haggin, I think. Is that right?

MR. HAGGIN: That's right.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Yes, sir.

MR. HAGGIN: Well, I'm just here to really express our complete outrage. I think it's pretty obvious what's happened over the years, and I want to call you into account for that.

I mean, the reality is that for over 60 years you've

434-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

34

1 done a lousy job at Hanford, and you know it. And the
2 idea here is right now that we know that we have no trust
3 in you. We don't believe you. We can't trust you because
4 of the track record that you've done over the years.
5 We've always had to sue you in order to get any kind
6 of a decent resolution of our concerns about Hanford, and
7 you overruled the will of the people of the State of
8 Washington to come in here and do the lousy job that
9 you've got looking at us here tonight.
10 I call your attention, for example, to the fact that
11 you're going to deal with unlined -- unlined reservoirs
12 for this material. Why, it's been 20, 30 years since
13 municipalities have had to line all of their areas for
14 disposal.
15 I mean, how do you get away with that? You know, we
16 have -- we have no trust.
17 And you're going to leave this all to us for
18 thousands of years, not just a couple thousand of years.
19 The half-life of some of this stuff is 10,000 years and
20 you're reluctant to tear into this and get rid of it, take
21 care of it and ensure it doesn't get into the drinking
22 water, into the Columbia River, into the -- you know, a
23 great fishery.
24 I mean, how do you -- what kind of conscience do you
25 have for something like that? I can't believe it.

435-1

435-2

435-3

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

435-1 Initiative 297, known as the Cleanup Priority Act, was passed by Washington State voters in November 2004. This act would have restricted the importation of offsite waste to Hanford, among other things. DOJ challenged the initiative, arguing it violated the U.S. Constitution. The Federal District Court agreed and ruled the initiative "invalid in its entirety." The State of Washington appealed the ruling, but the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the lower court, declaring the initiative was preempted by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

DOE must comply with certain legal requirements to undertake specific activities that are part of the proposed actions and alternatives; these requirements are identified throughout this EIS. For example, Chapter 1, Section 1.2.1, discusses Hanford regulatory compliance requirements such as the WAC regulations DOE must meet for the proposed closure of the SSTs. Section 1.9, which describes the alternatives evaluated in this EIS, refers to the RCRA, WAC, and DOE order requirements that must be met for DOE to implement Tank Closure alternatives. The very nature of "environmental impact analysis" requires DOE to analyze and describe in the EIS how proposed processes and technologies would operate; what results they are expected to achieve; what end products or byproducts might result; and how these measure up against the legal requirements that apply. Statutory, regulatory, Executive order, and DOE requirements are discussed in the context of each chapter and are listed in the references at the end of each chapter.

435-2 Since 2004, DOE has buried all LLW in lined trenches (see Appendix E, Section E.3.3, for a description of the evolution of past waste disposal practices). DOE continues to strictly limit the amount of waste Hanford can accept, and ensures that disposal activities are protective of the environment and meet regulatory requirements. Previous use of unlined trenches for disposal was a big concern to stakeholders and Washington and Oregon States; DOE heard and addressed those concerns and is using lined trenches.

435-3 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding the cleanup of the past leaks.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

35

The trucks kill. People drive past them and the radiation from them can affect them as they pass the trucks on the road. You know that. And you know that you're going to expect a number of people to die from trucking that material just because of their exposure to the radiation. *435-4*

And let's not talk about vitrification. You're talking about eight years? Come on, you've been at this vitrification thing for years and years and years. The mis-management at Hanford is legion. The incredible mis-management there has resulted in the problems with vitrification being bungled and destroyed for years and years and years. *435-5*

And you expect us to believe that in eight years now it's going to be okay and then you're going to underfund the eight years because it's not going to be adequate to take care of the job that you have for it for 100 years.

It's just laughable. I really can't believe that you're here to give us a half-baked, incomplete kind of a program for this kind of thing. I mean, I just -- I don't see how you have the testicular fortitude to show up.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Lindell and then Kate Johnston after that.

MS. HAGGIN: Well, I moved here in 1970. We were talking about cleaning up the waste then.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

435-4 As shown in the Summary, Section S.5.3; Chapter 2, Section 2.8.3.10; and Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12, of this *TC & WM EIS*, it is unlikely that the estimated total public radiation exposures from transporting radioactive waste to Hanford for disposal would result in any additional LCFs. Appendix H, Table H–17, provides an estimate of the maximum dose of 10 millirem to a person stuck in traffic for 30 minutes next to a radioactive waste shipment in a Type B cask. This is considered to be a one-time event. This amount of radiation dose is equivalent to the risk of developing an LCF of 6×10^{-6}, or 6 chances in 1,000,000, which is a very low risk.

435-5 DOE is working diligently to bring the WTP online to treat the tank waste at the site as soon as possible. Chapter 1, Section 1.2, provides a brief history and background on DOE's efforts to reduce costs and speed up the cleanup of Hanford. As discussed in the *TC & WM EIS* Summary, Chapter 1, and Chapter 2, this EIS analyzes additional waste treatment capability that includes expanding the vitrification process capability currently being constructed in the WTP or supplementing the WTP's capability with supplemental treatment technologies. Thus, decisions to be made by DOE regarding whether to treat all waste in the WTP, as is or expanded, or to supplement its capacity by adding new treatment capability depend on demonstrating the feasibility of supplemental treatment technologies. DOE, therefore, has no plans to build "more than one such plant." As noted in the Summary of this *TC & WM EIS*, Section S.3.1.4, and Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2.2, the WTP is currently being constructed in the 200-East Area of Hanford. Site work associated with the project began in late 2001 and construction of the WTP was more than 62 percent complete as of early 2012. However, DOE acknowledges the WTP is a first-of-its-kind radioactive and chemical waste treatment facility with issues that have not yet been addressed. Details of the WTP are provided in Appendix E, including design, processes, waste-form performance, waste forms/disposal packages, and assumptions and uncertainties.

It's 40 years later. I've got a grandchild now. It's going to be before his grandchildren are around before we get this cleaned up. It's not acceptable.

We need to have 99.9 percent cleanup. We need a second vitrification plant. Capping is not sufficient and we cannot accept any future waste.

It seems that it's alright to bring waste to Hanford but there was a comment made it's too dangerous to take waste away from Hanford, and I'm wondering what the difference is between bringing waste to Hanford and taking waste away from Hanford. *436-1*

And we need to make sure that we take care of the water table, the Columbia River, a vital part of our Northwest economy and livelihood. And it's just criminal that things are continuing to go on 40, 60, 80 years later.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Kate Johnston and after Kate will be Lauri Costello.

MS. JOHNSTON: Hi. I'm a student at Eastern Washington University, despite my WSU sweatshirt. And I'm studying to be a teacher right now. I'm student teaching on the north side of Spokane, and I've lived here all my life.

And I'm not good at speaking in front of a lot of

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

436-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

As discussed in the *TC & WM EIS* Summary, Chapter 1, and Chapter 2, this EIS analyzes additional waste treatment capability that includes expanding the vitrification process capability currently being constructed in the WTP or supplementing the WTP's capability with supplemental treatment technologies. Thus, decisions to be made by DOE regarding whether to treat all waste in the WTP, as is or expanded, or to supplement its capacity by adding new treatment capability depend on demonstrating the feasibility of supplemental treatment technologies.

Regarding bringing waste to Hanford, DOE issued a ROD (65 FR 10061; February 25, 2000) for the *WM PEIS* (DOE 1997) choosing Hanford and NNSS as the regional locations for the disposal of LLW and MLLW from across the DOE complex. In the *WM PEIS*, DOE indicated that additional analyses would be prepared to implement these programmatic decisions. This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with a number of proposed actions, including disposal of LLW and MLLW potentially shipped to Hanford from offsite DOE locations. DOE recognizes the importance of protection of the water table and Columbia River, and is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford under the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

1 people, so I'll just continue. Make sure you know that.
2 So as a future teacher, I really care about the
3 future of our community and our people in our community
4 and our country, for that matter, and I know that we face
5 a serious energy crisis and I know that deciding how to
6 provide that energy for our country is not an easy
7 decision, so I realize that you guys don't have an easy
8 job.
9 But I trust that you have some sense in terms of how
10 to keep people safe in communities and keep the
11 environment safe for those people in communities.
12 And we're dealing with radioactive waste. I think
13 it's got a half-life of 500 years? More than 500 years?
14 More? I just heard it tonight. That's a long time.
15 That's very -- that's not good for the environment,
16 anyway. I don't know what to say about that.
17 So it's not uncommon for me to meet students from
18 the Tri-Cities who they're quick to describe themselves as
19 glowing, and they have family members with what I've heard
20 are a lot higher rates of cancer and various other health
21 problems, and that's a serious issue. And this would only
22 make it worse if we don't clean it -- clean the tanks more
23 than 99 percent.
24 I also go to school with members of the Wanapum
25 Nation of Native Americans from whom I've heard that the

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

United States government is borrowing the Hanford land from, technically. Don't quote me on that, but I did hear that from a Wanapum Nation member.

And I know that the glowing students from the Tri-Cities don't want the future Tri-Cities citizens to glow more than they already do, and I know that the Wanapum Nation still wants the use of its land back at some point and want it to be productive and healthy land.

And I know that as a teacher it's my responsibility to teach our kids about the world they're growing up in, and I urge you to simply prepare adequately.

So I guess by doing that, clean the tanks more than 99 percent. 99 percent point 9, at least. Alternative 3, I think it was, is the disassembly and removal of the tanks. That's looking good. I imagine there's more alternatives. *437-1*

I think the word "preferred alternative" is just weird. It's just, like, obnoxious. I'll just throw that in there. And a permanent moratorium would be good.

And, please, I urge you to continue to let us know and articulate it explicitly at something like below a college level. I haven't read all the documents but I imagine that like a lot of the citizens, the adults in Spokane with grade school level reading levels, may not be able to get through documents like that. *437-2*

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

437-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all of the SST system. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

437-2 For those who may not want to read through the entire EIS, DOE published the *TC & WM EIS* Summary, which is intended to provide a brief overview of what is contained in the *Draft TC & WM EIS*. For those interested in reading the entire EIS, DOE has also issued a Reader's Guide that is intended to assist the public in navigating through the complex information presented. This guide serves as an introduction and guide to the contents of this EIS, highlights the key features of the reasonable alternatives, and helps readers review the technical analyses presented. Recognizing that many people may not read beyond the *TC & WM EIS* Summary, the information presented in both the Summary and Reader's Guide attempts to strike a balance between those readers interested in the more technical details about DOE's proposed actions and alternatives and those who seek a simpler overview. DOE also included a 1-hour open house prior to each public hearing on the draft EIS to allow the public to meet informally with members of the *TC & WM EIS* team, ask questions, and learn more about this EIS. Informative factsheets were provided at the open house as well.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

39

Please explicitly communicate what you're doing at an understandable level, and clean it up. *437-2 cont'd*

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Okay. Thank you. Now we have Lauri Costello and after Lauri Costello will be Bob Barry.

MS. COSTELLO: Hi. Lauri Costello. I'm a family physician here in Spokane and admit my ignorance about a lot of this.

I was at the hearings and the discussion years ago before Initiative 297 and thought when we overwhelmingly passed that things were over, and then got an e-mail yesterday saying this hearing was happening.

And so I appreciate all the previous speakers and all the science and all the knowledge about everything to do with waste and half-lifes and all that, but my concern is more for prevention of problems.

And it seems really clear to me that we could prevent a lot of problems by bringing in not only no more waste, but taking out the waste that is already there.

So when we've overwhelmingly spoken that we don't want further waste at Hanford, I would take that to say it's not because Hanford is in our backyard and it's not the "not in my backyard" argument. It's the "not in America," it's the "not in the world" argument. *438-1*

So I would urge the DOE to be talking about why we

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

438-1 This EIS addresses the environmental impacts of retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste and final closure of the SST system. It also evaluates the impacts of FFTF decommissioning, including management of waste generated by the decommissioning process. Finally, this *TC & WM EIS* evaluates the potential environmental impacts of ongoing solid waste management operations at Hanford, as well as the proposed disposal of Hanford LLW and MLLW and a limited volume of offsite LLW and MLLW.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

438-1 cont'd

are continuing to produce waste that we can't get rid of at the cost of lives. Not just human life, but all of the life along the Columbia River and anywhere that's exposed to radioactivity is threatened.

And I feel like everyone in this room gets it. I mean, you don't want to be exposed to radioactive waste. You don't want it in your backyard, literally at your house. You don't want your friends and loved ones exposed to it. So why does it feel like we come here as a group of concerned citizens, educated, concerned citizens, who can't understand 1,000 pages of rhetoric.

And somebody asked for a one-sentence statement. I understand that you may not be able to condense it to one sentence, but ten pages of scientific words, shall we say, is not acceptable for us as concerned citizens to understand what's going on. I get the distinct sense that you don't want us to understand it because we wouldn't agree with it.

So I get the concept of us as concerned citizens debating with the Department of Energy, but I don't get that the Department of Ecology doesn't seem to be coming from our point of view, either.

I really appreciate you doing these hearings in Spokane. As I said, I thought it was a done deal and here it is back, so thank you for coming here to listen to our

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

41

comments.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Bob Barry and after --

MR. BATTY: It's Bob Batty, B-A-T-T-Y. My R's look like T's.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Yes. That's okay. And Angela let's see, Mageras, after that, I think.

MR. BATTY: My name is Bob Batty. I'm the immediate past president of the Washington Chapter of Republicans for Environmental Protection.

This thing I have in my hand is the EIS summary. I spent probably 20 hours on it developing a statement for our group. I will be submitting a written comments letter. I've got to draft that Saturday, and I'm not looking forward to it.

And I appreciate you coming to Spokane to give me new insight. I can't say anything that hasn't been said already, but maybe just from a little bit different angle.

Our letter is probably going to support Alternative 6-B, and it goes along, it has some of the things I talked about and commented on. But one of them I was a little weak on.

439-1 But I was wondering -- our position is we do not think any more waste should be shipped into Hanford or the State of Washington until the cleanup is in fact complete.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

439-1 The Waste Management alternatives that include using Hanford for national LLW and MLLW disposal were based on implementation of the ROD (65 FR 10061; February 25, 2000) for the *WM PEIS* (DOE 1997) choosing Hanford and NNSS as the regional locations for the disposal of LLW and MLLW from across the DOE complex. In the *WM PEIS*, DOE indicated that additional analyses would be prepared to implement these programmatic decisions. This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with a number of proposed actions, including disposal of LLW and MLLW potentially shipped to Hanford from offsite DOE locations.

And I thought that was just my own little hang-up, and it's primarily because I don't think you can focus on your huge job and deal with other waste. But when I hear all these people saying the exact same thing from 57 different angles, I don't think I need any more support.

Your job would be so much easier at the DOE and Ecology if you just gave up on that. You keep harping on shipping waste in from other places. We have plenty of waste.

I'd also like to say that Ecology's positions are very similar to ours and I commend you for that. I think you were a little guarded today, but we could have gotten onboard on it.

I could have gotten onboard with a couple of your other preferred alternatives, except for this outside waste thing. If you'd lighten up on that and just get rid of it, I think you'd have a lot more community support and a lot more State support.

Thanks for coming.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Angela, and after Angela will be Mike Nuess.

MS. MAGERAS: Hello. Well, I'm not really sure what to say. I don't really know anything about Hanford or what its intention was before coming here tonight. I just wanted to say to everybody else, good job

439-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

43

at explaining what I wanted to say. So that's really great.

I definitely don't support Hanford importing more waste. I would like to see everything cleaned up that's able to be cleaned up, because we need to look out for the future. And we can't -- even if to bury it underground, we can't just bury it and forget about it because that's going to come to the surface one day.

And we need to invest in ways that aren't creating waste that we can't get rid of, like you said. And I appreciate you coming here today, and it's really great to get my voice out there, as well.

And I think that we're battling a larger issue here, especially of special interest, and I think that's why this keeps coming up and why you keep suggesting that we keep importing more waste, is, you know, because the people's voice doesn't matter as much as the people who have money. But hopeful that's changing and hopefully our voice is mattering now.

That's everything. Thank you.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Mike, and after Mike will be Brian Burke.

MR. NUESS: Hi. I'm Mike Nuess, and although I live downwind and near I-90, I don't feel that this is a "in my backyard" issue. It's a "not in my

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

440-1

440-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. However, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Public input is important to DOE, and DOE appreciates the public's participation. All comments made during the public comment period, whether given orally at hearings or sent via mail or email, were considered equally by DOE. All comments received on the *Draft TC & WM EIS* and their approved responses are included in this CRD, a volume of this final EIS. DOE has posted this *Final TC & WM EIS*, including this CRD, on the Hanford website (http://www.hanford.gov) and on the DOE NEPA website (http://energy.gov/nepa), and a Notice of Availability will be published in the *Federal Register*.

1 planet" issue.
2 The science is incontrovertibly clear that, you
3 know, the dis-associative nuclear forces of the
4 transuranics simply tear asunder the more -- the more
5 weaker but more sophisticated and complex electronic bond
6 between atoms that build the entire biosphere and all our
7 bodies and everything that's alive on the thin film around
8 our planet.
9 And the universe was wise in putting the Earth's
10 nuclear furnace 93 million miles away. And perhaps the
11 greatest scientist of the 20th Century -- his peers called
12 him the Michelangelo of our times. You know, one of those
13 guys with dozens of Ph.D.'s, honorary Ph.D.'s and patents
14 and books.
15 But he also predicted the atom's structure before
16 the electron microscope proved him right, and he also
17 discovered what might be nature's own mathematics, because
18 there are no irrational numbers for the physical
19 constants. So he's no dummy.
20 And he had something to say about nuclear waste. He
21 said that one day humanity will recognize that we have to
22 rocket the waste back to the sun where they belong. So
23 there it is. That's how you get rid of nuclear waste.
24 And that is a very difficult thing for humanity to
25 try to think about doing. Hugely difficult. So then why

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

45

1 do we keep making more? We must stop making more. He
2 said this in the middle of the last century.
3 Yeah, we need to take care of it, the mess we have,
4 store it leak-proof, monitor it, retrieve and move it as
5 necessary for thousands of years to preserve biological
6 life, and you want to go and throw some concrete caps over
7 it and walk away.
8 And trucking waste from new nuclear weapons
9 production and new nuclear power plants, what for? Why do
10 you want to do this? Do we need energy that bad?
11 Again, the science is incontrovertibly clear, there
12 is as much energy yielded from a single pound of silicone
13 deployed in the useful life of a solar electric panel as
14 there is in a pound of uranium consumed in a nuclear
15 plant. But there's 5,000 times more silicone in the
16 Earth's crust than there is uranium, and the renewables
17 family of solar electric, wind and geothermal are
18 engineeringly proven that they can expand cleanly, safely,
19 to a capacity that resiliently meets all human energy
20 needs.
21 Another of the greatest scientific minds, acclaimed
22 by his peers as the Einstein of linguistics, another one
23 of those guys with lots of Ph.D.'s and books, recently
24 outlined three urgent threats to the survival of the human
25 species that nearly all of us, Republican, Democrat, of

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

441-1

441-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Nuclear energy production is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

any political or social persuasion, could agree upon.

Those three are nuclear war is imminent and more dangerous than ever before, environmental devastation from not just carbon sources but from nuclear sources, and the democratic deficit of the government of this country that doesn't listen to the polls when most of us say we do want the clean, renewable energies, that most of us say we don't want nuclear power, when we vote to say no more waste at Hanford, get all the waste cleaned up first, we want complete and comprehensive cleanup.

There is a huge deficit between what we want and what our government tells you to do and does to us. And those are the three greatest threats that I think most of us would agree on.

Sophisticated polling tells us we're willing to listen. The majority says no nukes, clean up the waste, advance renewables, give us comprehensive healthcare, et cetera, et cetera.

So why? What's left to explain why the cleanup is so underfunded and mis-managed? Why is there a collective sense we picked up in this room tonight of conflict between us and those charged with the responsibility for cleaning it up?

Rather than all of us sort of rowing together, we're in this conflict. New waste and new weapons still come.

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

47

So who benefits? Why? What for? Who sends you out to test the litmus of our resistance to bottling the nuclear genie -- of our desire to bottling the nuclear genie.

We already voted on this and here you come again to run us down. Could it be Greenwich, Connecticut, wants you to run us down? Hmmm. Nuclear energy and weapons are a cash cow for those who are too big to fail.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Brian Burke. Brian Burke? No? Okay.

At this time, that's the end of our list so we would like to ask the people who have not commented yet who would like to. Is there someone who would like to provide comments who has not spoken yet?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I would like to just make one observation.

You have our young people in tears. That's our future. You have our old people so frustrated they're probably on hypertensive medication.

What more do you need? Okay? We don't want it here. I'm grateful that you came. Honestly, I am. But, you know what, when I see my young people -- I'm the mother of somebody 30-something. Now, okay?

And they stand here, they're smarter than a whip. They can multitask like you wouldn't believe. You know what, they're in tears. People, our future is in tears.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

442-1

442-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

What more do you need?

That's all I've got to say.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else who would like to provide a comment? Yes, ma'am. Go ahead.

MS. WIREMAN: I just wanted to let you know --

FACILITATOR PARHAM: If you could go to the microphone. Yeah. Please.

MS. WIREMAN: I'm Ginger Wireman. I'm with the Washington State Department of Ecology. And we do have -- I'm sorry it's not on a nice, printed table, but I put on the back table some paper if you want to be on the Hanford listserv for any Hanford comment period or any Hanford related activity.

And also, I have my business card back there. If any of you are with Rotary or something, we do try to do public outreach if we can, realizing, of course, that we've got the budget crisis and travel is kind of limited. But if we could get a couple of presentations on one day, we might be able to come back, especially like classrooms, so.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Okay. Thank you. Yes? Additional comment, ma'am?

MS. BISIAR: I really appreciate you

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

49

being here tonight, I think way more than you realize. And I think all of us in this room really do appreciate you being here tonight and taking our comments.

I have a request. I spent a good share of this weekend trying to get the word out about this public hearing because I just got a little wind in the wisp that told me it was coming and I saw it nowhere else.

And if it's a public hearing, the people need to know it's coming. And I spent really a good share of the weekend, and I think it was because of my work and my husband's work this weekend that the majority of you people are here. Thank you.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.

MS. BISIAR: I just want you to find a way to get it on the airwaves, to get it on TV, to get it out that there is a public hearing coming and give us time to get the public to come to these, because the weekend before you just don't have the time.

People already have something else lined up and you just don't have the time. I think we could have more than filled this room.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Okay. Thank you. Any additional comments from people who have not commented yet? Is there anyone yet? Yes, sir.

MR. POLLET: I want to thank all the

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

426-3

426-3 Commentor 426 (comments continued). Public notice of the *Draft TC & WM EIS* hearings was published in the *Federal Register*, mailings to interested parties, and local newspapers. Public input is important to DOE, and DOE appreciates the public's participation in these hearings. All comments made during the public comment period, whether given orally at hearings or sent via mail or email, were considered equally by DOE. All comments received on the *Draft TC & WM EIS* and their approved responses are included in this CRD, a volume of this final EIS. DOE has posted this *Final TC & WM EIS*, including this CRD, on the Hanford website (http://www.hanford.gov) and on the DOE NEPA website (http://energy.gov/nepa), and a Notice of Availability will be published in the *Federal Register*.

1 people who made phone calls, Rosemarie, Chuck, and all of
2 you who did to get people here.
3 I would like to ask: How many of you came to the
4 hearing on the last impact statement that the Energy
5 Department did in 2003 about Hanford being national waste
6 dump?
7 And keep your hand up for a moment if you -- now,
8 how many of you -- put your hand down if you did not
9 receive a new notice for this hearing. How many of you
10 received a notice from the Energy Department for this
11 hearing tonight?
12 We were promised, Mary Beth, from the Energy
13 Department, that the people who were on the list who
14 testified at these hearings 2003, 2002/2003 on your prior
15 failed draft EIS would be on the list and receive notice
16 of these hearings from the Energy Department.
17 Either the notice was so ineffective that people
18 threw it out because it was lousy or that promise was not
19 met that these people were going to get notice.
20 We need to redo this EIS and we need to do it with
21 proper notice that is effective that says what the impacts
22 of the decisions are right upfront and is mailed to the
23 hundreds -- excuse me, thousands of people commented on
24 the last EIS, and they were denied notice from the Energy
25 Department of this EIS, which is a redo of the past one.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

429-9

429-9 Commentor 429 (comments continued). Public notice of the *Draft TC & WM EIS* comment period and hearings was given in the *Federal Register*. This notification was supplemented with local newspaper ads and notices mailed directly to individuals on DOE's mailing list. Informative posters and factsheets were provided to attendees at the open house that preceded each public hearing. Project information was also made available to the public on ORP's website (http://www.hanford.gov/orp). Public input is important to DOE, and DOE appreciates the public's participation in these hearings. All comments made during the public comment period, whether given orally at hearings or sent via mail or email, were considered equally by DOE. All comments received on the *Draft TC & WM EIS* and their approved responses are included in this CRD, a volume of this final EIS. DOE has posted this *Final TC & WM EIS*, including this CRD, on the Hanford website (http://www.hanford.gov) and the DOE NEPA website (http://energy.gov/nepa), and a Notice of Availability will be published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

51

And this is a very serious failing of the Energy Department. You have not met the spirit of the open government initiative of the president. You have not met the spirit of the Hanford management that said that we would make every effort to contact all the people who came to the hearings last time around, and we're very disappointed in that.

I want to also, for the record, clarify what I was saying at the end of my testimony previously.

429-9 cont'd

I had a slide up that showed the Energy Department's analysis for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, which was their plan to take high-level nuclear waste, spent fuel from reactors, ship it to one of several locations for reprocessing, melting it down in acid. Making more liquid high-level nuclear waste is the dream of the nuclear renaissance for some people.

And the EIS said if Hanford was used the announcement was 816 fatal cancers along the truck route. That is from the radiation emitted from the shipping casks for spent nuclear fuel.

429-8 cont'd

This proposal in front of us tonight in this Environmental Impact Statement leaves out the most radioactive waste that the Energy Department is looking at shipping to Hanford, called greater-than-Class-C waste. And you should be allowed to see what the impacts are of

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

52

that.

They are as hot as those other shipments, is what I was trying to explain. Not that high-level nuclear waste fuel rods would come, but shipments just as hot would come with similar radiation levels. *429-8 cont'd*

But even without the greater-than-Class-C waste, the details in the appendices somewhere around page 5,000 of the EIS when you get that far deep into it, show that the Energy Department expects to ship what is called remote-handled waste to Hanford, within 82,000 cubic meters of waste that is proposed to be shipped to Hanford.

"Remote handled" means that it is so radioactive that it cannot be handled by people, it needs to be handled by machinery. It is all presumed to be mixed radioactive chemical waste under DOE's analyses because it is so radioactive that they can not analyze its chemical composition, so it has to be presumed to be mixed with hazardous chemical waste, and it is proposed to be shipped to Hanford. *429-10*

I've heard state officials say that they didn't think it was the same, those high-level radioactive waste shipments, nothing would be shipped to Hanford. That's not bags and slightly contaminated stuff. That is not so. Look at Appendix D and you'll see.

And finally what you see in Appendix D of the EIS is *429-11*

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

429-10 Appendix D, Section D.3.6, Projected Volumes, Radioactive and Chemical Inventories for Offsite Waste, does include some projections of LLW and MLLW that, per the *Hanford Site Solid Waste Acceptance Criteria (HSSWAC)*, Revision 12 (Fluor Hanford 2005), may be remotely handled. RH waste is defined as packaged waste whose external surface dose rate exceeds the limits for contact-handled waste. Per the HSSWAC, the contact-handled waste limit is a packaged waste external surface dose rate not exceeding 200 millirem per hour. It was assumed in this EIS that no onsite handling of the offsite waste would be necessary; i.e., the offsite waste would be fully characterized and packaged to meet Revision 12 of the HSSWAC. RH-LLW and RH-MLLW are not HLW.

429-11 The *TC & WM EIS* analysis shows that receipt of offsite waste streams generated from cleanup activities, not operations activities, at other DOE sites that contain specific amounts of certain isotopes, particularly iodine-129 and technetium-99, could cause an adverse impact on the environment. Therefore, one means of mitigating this impact would be for DOE to limit disposal of offsite waste streams at Hanford.

In a *Federal Register* notice published on December 18, 2009 (74 FR 67189), DOE modified its Preferred Alternative for waste management and extended the duration of the moratorium until the WTP is operational. DOE also included GTCC waste as part of that moratorium. DOE has not changed its Preferred Alternative in this final EIS concerning this extended moratorium. DOE's inclusion of the moratorium in its ROD following issuance of this final EIS would result in its enforceability.

The impacts of the offsite waste in terms of radiological risk are presented in the Summary, Section S.5.5.3, and Chapter 2, Section 2.10, Key Environmental Findings. These sections discuss the radiological risk differences between including and not including offsite waste disposal at IDF-East.

The *TC & WM EIS* analysis shows that receipt of offsite waste streams that contain specific amounts of certain isotopes, specifically, iodine-129 and technetium-99, could cause an adverse impact on the environment. Therefore, one means of mitigating this impact would be for DOE to limit disposal of offsite waste streams at Hanford. Other mitigation measures, such as recycling secondary-waste streams into the primary-waste-stream feeds within the WTP to increase iodine-129 capture in ILAW and bulk vitrification glass, are discussed in Chapter 7, Section 7.5, of this final EIS.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

53

1 this: The Energy Department is proposing to use Hanford
2 as a national radioactive waste dump not to help clean up
3 other contaminated sites somewhere around the country.
4 That's a myth they've put out there.
5 It is newly-generated waste that will be coming to
6 Hanford, waste from its nuclear weapons plants and its
7 nuclear energy programs, and it is not, oh, you should
8 help clean up some other site that is -- what's in their
9 soil. It is newly-generated waste that would be coming to
10 Hanford.
11 Very little of it therefore -- very little is known,
12 therefore, about its chemical composition. We don't know
13 exactly what the radionuclide composition is. But the
14 estimates are that it does include the remote-handled
15 waste, which is extremely radioactive.
16 And it should not -- and Washington State needs to
17 say you cannot allow any of these wastes to go into a
18 burial ground at Hanford because the state law requires
19 that you have a dangerous waste permit that specifies what
20 type of activity and what type of chemical components are
21 going in.
22 The Energy Department's EIS in Appendix D admits
23 that they don't know it because what they want to do is
24 use Hanford for 25 years or more of newly-generated waste.
25 What is the right alternative here? The right

429-11 cont'd

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Ecology's foreword to the draft EIS included its views and positions concerning DOE's analysis in the document and has been updated in this final EIS.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

54

alternative, folks, is don't create it.

And the law says you have to look at reducing your wastes, and you failed to do that, once again. Not surprising. It is the Energy Department. It never looks at reducing its waste generation. Thank you. *429-11 cont'd*

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you.

MR. HAGGIN: I'd just like to add that the history of Hanford is just a tragic history and tremendous corruption and people that have been arrested for malfeasance and so forth there. And, you know, it really comes down to the fact that Hanford, for years and years, has really been a crime scene.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Thank you. If there's no -- an additional comment? Yes, sir?

MR. FISK: This may be more of a question than a comment, but I'm one of the ones that raised their hands.

I think I was here in 2003 or 2004 statements and I remember a statement by a British corporation, -- "Ah, we have this thing all solved. We can vitrify this and it's all going to be accomplished real quick."

And I guess my question or my comment is: What under the sun makes you people think that the vitrification is going to work? Has the technology really improved that much over four years where absolutely *425-5*

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

425-5 Commentor 425 (comments continued). DOE is convinced that vitrification of radioactive waste into glass is the best-available and -proven technology for immobilizing liquid radioactive waste because it atomistically bonds the species in a solid glassy matrix. Because the radioactive constituents are bonded within the glass structure, the waste forms produced are very durable and environmentally stable over long time periods, yet they remain toxic. EPA has declared vitrification the best-demonstrated available technology for HLW. DOE has extensive experience with vitrifying liquid radioactive waste at two DOE sites, the Savannah River Site and the West Valley Demonstration Project. At the Savannah River Site, the Defense Waste Processing Facility has been operating since 1996 and, to date, has produced over 2,000 IHLW canisters that meet the geologic repository waste acceptance standards. Similarly, the West Valley Demonstration Project operated for approximately 4 years and produced approximately 375 repository-acceptable IHLW canisters. The lessons learned from operating these facilities, as well as the knowledge being shared by European vitrification facilities, have been and continue to be incorporated into the WTP vitrification design and plans for operations.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

Public Hearing February 23, 2010

55

425-5 cont'd

nothing that I can see that's really foolproof has happened?

And I really doubt -- as Bart Haggin says, I don't think you've given us much cause for trust. Thank you.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Okay. Thank you for that comment. Sir, your name, again?

MR. FISK: Oh, I'm Charles Fisk.

FACILITATOR PARHAM: Charles Fisk. Thanks. Okay.

Anyone else with additional comments?

If not, on behalf of the Department of Energy and Washington State, thank you for coming out. Its been a great evening and a great city. Thank you very much.

(9:24 p.m.)

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Spokane, Washington, Public Hearing (February 23, 2010)

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
) ss.
County of Spokane)

I, Amy J. Brown, do hereby certify that at the time and place heretofore mentioned in the caption of the above-entitled matter, I was a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public for Washington and Idaho; that at said time and place I reported in stenotype all testimony adduced and proceedings had in the foregoing matter; that thereafter my notes were reduced to typewriting and that the foregoing transcript consisting of 56 typewritten pages is a true and correct transcript of all such testimony adduced and proceedings had and of the whole thereof.

I further certify that I am herewith securely sealing the said original deposition transcript and promptly delivering the same to

Witness my hand at Spokane, Washington, on this _____ day of _____, 2010.

Amy J. Brown, RPR
WA CCR NO. 2133, ID CCR NO. 700
Certified Court Reporter
Notary Public for Washington
My commission expires: 3-29-11

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING
March 1, 2010
6:00 P.M.

The Hilton Hotel
66 East Sixth Avenue
Eugene, Oregon

James Parham, Facilitator

PANEL MEMBERS:
Ms. Mary Beth Burandt, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection

Ms. Suzanne Dahl, Washington State Department of Ecology, Hanford Project Office

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

FORMAL COMMENT INDEX

SPEAKER	PAGE	LINE
Gerry Pollet	4	19
Marilyn Cohen	10	15
Loretta Huston	12	21
Timothy Shinabarger	14	13
Lynn Porter	16	23
Kathy Ging	18	12
Moshe Immerman	21	16
Michael Gannon	26	2
Louisa Hamachek	29	24
Larry Deckman	31	22
Jack Dresser	33	14
Max Smoot	37	21
Cat Koehn	42	13
James Kane	45	6
Alex Bark	45	21
Unidentified speaker	48	2
Janna Thrift	50	20
Lucas	55	8
Unidentified speaker	56	3
Patrick Delshaw	56	8
Erica Elliott	57	24
David Walla	61	21

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

3

FORMAL COMMENT INDEX (CONT.)

SPEAKER	PAGE	LINE
Gerry Pollet	63	8
Loretta Huston	64	24
Moshe Immerman	65	13
Jeshua Hubbard	71	13
Kathy Ging	72	16
Louisa Hamachek	74	11
Michael Gannon	75	22
Moshe Immerman	79	19

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

JAMES PARHAM: Marilynn is here with me and she is the court reporter, and at this point we move to this formal stage where DOE and Washington and others listen, you talk, and we record.

If you want to give your name, that's great; if you don't, fine. If you want to state your affiliation with an organization, if you're representing that organization, that's good for us to know, so we know that you're doing such in that capacity or you're just representing yourself.

With that said, we would go ahead and get started and ask you to come to this microphone here. And the first person on our list is Gerry Pollet from Heart of America. After Gerry will be Marilyn Cohen of the Global Resources Institute. And Marilynn after Gerry.

GERRY POLLET: So I'm going to be showing some slides. I'm Gerry Pollet with the citizen Hanford cleanup watchdog group Heart of America Northwest. I want to thank you all for coming out tonight. There's never been a hearing in Eugene on Hanford before, and a lot of people were saying, "Oh, don't think people care."

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

5

1 Well, thank you for coming out and showing that
2 people do care.
3 We're here tonight because we all do care
4 about being responsible and not putting off
5 decisions that will cause cancer in future
6 generations, making -- foisting our mistakes
7 off into the future over and over again.
8 That's what the last generation did with the
9 waste that's sitting in Hanford's leaky
10 high-level nuclear waste tanks, and it's up to
11 use to make sure it doesn't happen again.
12 So I'm going to show a few slides, and
13 let's jump ahead here. Next. We're here of
14 course because we're concerned about the
15 Columbia River. It flows past Hanford for over
16 50 miles, past nine full-scale nuclear
17 reactors, hundreds of landfill sites and liquid
18 waste discharge sites. And while we're here
19 tonight, radioactive strontium 90 is seeping
20 into the Columbia River at 1500 times the
21 drinking water standard.
22 The drinking water standard is set at a
23 level at which one adult out of every 10,000
24 who drank 2 liters a day would die of cancer.
25 So just from that one contaminant, if you were

359-1

359-1 Two aspects have bearing on the predicted concentrations of contaminants in the groundwater and in the Columbia River and the projected impacts. First, there is some conservatism in the predicted concentrations presented in the draft EIS. While refinements in the approach used to prepare this *Final TC & WM EIS* lessened the predicted concentrations, modeled exceedances of standards are still predicted. This is why the second aspect—the regulatory context—remains important.

The alternatives presented in this *TC & WM EIS* were developed under NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to address the essential components of DOE's three sets of proposed actions (tank closure, FFTF decommissioning, and waste management) and to provide an understanding of the differences between the potential environmental impacts of the range of reasonable alternatives. Consistent with CEQ guidance, this EIS analyzes the range of reasonable alternatives that covers the full spectrum of potential combinations. The alternatives considered by DOE in this EIS are "reasonable" in the sense that they are practical or feasible from a technical and economic standpoint and meet the agency's purposes and needs. Potential conflicts with laws and regulations do not necessarily cause an alternative to be unreasonable, but additional mitigation commitments may be required if it is selected for implementation. For a more comprehensive discussion on compliance with regulatory requirements, see Section 2.7 of this CRD.

In all cases, DOE will select a set of activities designed to protect public health and safety.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

6

drinking the water, we'd expect 15 percent of the adults to get cancer over their lifetime. That's one contaminant. There are dozens of contaminants that the Energy Department's own analysis reveals under its preferred alternatives will grow horribly worse over the next hundred, hundreds, and thousands of years.

359-1 cont'd

Let's keep going. There are 40 miles of unlined ditches at Hanford, like this one, that the Energy Department has dumped radioactive waste into. Forty miles. The Energy Department's proposal is to simply cap them rather than clean them up.

Now, it's against the law for your municipal government to operate an unlined landfill, but your federal government thought it was okay to do this right up until 2004. Your municipal government, if it has a leaking landfill, it has to meet the environmental laws that say dig it up, clean it up, treat it, redispose of it. The Energy Department thinks it's above the law, apparently. It just wants to cap it.

359-2

The Energy Department's proposals for high-level nuclear waste tanks, where billions,

359-2 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include (nor will the potential NEPA ROD) remediation of the burial grounds as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates. Appendix S includes DOE's inventory estimates for the burial grounds, and Appendix U provides supporting information concerning the long-term cumulative impact analyses that includes the burial ground inventories.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

7

with a B, of gallons of high-level nuclear waste liquids were dumped out of the tanks and into the soil, over a million gallons has leaked from the tanks, and the Energy Department's proposal is, as you heard tonight, to cap it, cover it up. It's a cover-up, not a cleanup; and it's unacceptable for the future. *359-2 cont'd*

Next. Let's keep coming. You've seen some slides of the groundwater contamination flowing into the Columbia River. Here this one is for carbon tetrachloride. The Department of Energy has failed to reveal in the EIS numerous volatile organic chemicals which we know are disposed in landfills. There are a score of volatile organic chemicals that are seeping out of U.S. ecology landfill documented at levels immediately dangerous to human health and the environment in the soil gases, and there isn't even a mention of them in the environmental impact statement in the inventory. Uranium is not treated in the inventory as a chemical concern, although its toxicity is very high. *359-3*

Keep going. And the -- Let's keep going. Let's keep going. Let's jump ahead to -- I'll keep you going. Here we go.

359-3 Appendix S of this *TC & WM EIS* explains the process used to develop the inventory data set for the cumulative impact analyses. All disposal sites for which an inventory was identified and considered a potential contributor to cumulative impacts on groundwater are included in the inventory listing provided in Appendix S and, therefore, were modeled. The inventories listed in Appendix S represent the radionuclide inventories (measured in curies) and chemical inventories (measured in kilograms), including total uranium, that were identified for those sites and for those constituents that were screened (described in Section S.3.6 as COPCs, i.e., those constituents that control groundwater impacts). The source cited for the information listed in the Appendix S tables is SAIC 2011, which is a more extensive database of the inventory information used by DOE to accomplish the screening and identify the COPCs. These COPCs, as well as other constituents determined not to be COPCs, particularly other volatile organic chemicals, can be found in this source documentation for the sites noted.

As explained in Appendix S, the inventories for the sites were identified using the most recent information available. As stated in Appendix S, the inventories were obtained from solid waste inventories that were taken from (1) the *Summary of Radioactive Solid Waste Received in the 200 Areas During Calendar Year 1995* (Anderson and Hagel 1996) or other site-specific solid waste references; (2) the *Hanford Site Waste Management Units Report* (DOE 1987); (3) technical baseline documents; (4) the latest version of WIDS; or (5) other sources. However, DOE again reviewed the data and revised the ERDF and US Ecology inventories to include a calculated total uranium inventory. This inventory was included in this *Final TC & WM EIS* and analyzed appropriately.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

8

1 The Energy Department proposes to ship
2 3 million cubic feet of radioactive waste to
3 Hanford to be buried. It is not okay for the
4 state of Washington or the Energy Department to
5 try to pretend that, if we just put it in the
6 east landfill instead of the west landfill, the
7 alternative is okay.
8 The east landfill, even without the
9 off-site waste, will cause contamination of
10 Hanford's groundwater flowing into the Columbia
11 River at many, many times the state's cancer
12 risk cleanup standards. The addition of the
13 off-site waste increases that to 100 times our
14 Washington state cancer risk cleanup standard.
15 It is grossly unacceptable.
16 But, wait, what's left out? The Energy
17 Department decided not to disclose in this
18 environmental impact statement that it is also
19 considering shipping to Hanford extremely
20 radioactive waste as hot as spent nuclear fuel.
21 Next slide. These are called greater than
22 class C GTC wastes. They would come up from
23 California on I-5 as well. The Energy
24 Department did an environmental impact
25 statement in 2008, considering what would be

359-4

359-5

359-4 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

The impacts of the offsite waste in terms of radiological risk are presented in the Summary, Section S.5.5.3, and Chapter 2, Section 2.10, Key Environmental Findings. These sections discuss the radiological risk differences between including and not including offsite waste disposal at IDF-East.

The *TC & WM EIS* analysis shows that receipt of offsite waste streams that contain specific amounts of certain isotopes, specifically, iodine-129 and technetium-99, could cause an adverse impact on the environment. Therefore, one means of mitigating this impact would be for DOE to limit disposal of offsite waste streams at Hanford. Other mitigation measures, such as recycling secondary-waste streams into the primary-waste-stream feeds within the WTP to increase iodine-129 capture in ILAW and bulk vitrification glass, are discussed in Chapter 7, Section 7.5, of this final EIS.

Ecology's foreword to the draft EIS included its views and positions concerning DOE's analysis in the document and has been updated in this final EIS.

359-5 Regarding the commentor's concern about the inclusion of GTCC LLW in this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE has included information from the *Draft GTCC EIS* in the *Final TC & WM EIS* cumulative impacts analysis. For a more comprehensive discussion on GTCC LLW, see Sections 2.1 and 2.12 of this CRD.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

9

the risk of shipping high-level nuclear waste to Hanford from commercial reactors for reprocessing. It estimated that 816 fatal cancers would occur in the adults along the truck route to Hanford just from radiation exposure when you're stuck in traffic or you're -- the trucks go by your schools. That's in adults. They left out the analysis for cancer in our children, who are three to ten times more susceptible to get cancer from the same as does an adult.

JAMES PARHAM: Five minutes, sir.

GERRY POLLET: It is outrageous that the Energy Department decided to try to hide the ball and not show the greater than class C wastes also coming to Hanford.

Our National Environment Policy Act says all related proposals have to be disclosed to you for comment in an environmental impact statement. These wastes add a tremendous risk to the 3 million cubic feet of waste the Energy Department proposes to ship to Hanford, some of which are also as hot as spent nuclear fuel.

I urge you to get up here tonight, speak from the heart, tell them that you want a full

359-5 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

10

cleanup. You don't want wastes capped, you want them retrieved. After all, if you have a leaky oil tank, or any oil tank, when you sell your home, and it's no longer in use, what does the law require? It has to be pulled. You might have to take out a mortgage to do it. Why doesn't the Energy Department have to pull its tanks and fully empty them?

JAMES PARHAM: Okay.

GERRY POLLET: Thank you very much for being here tonight.

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Next to the microphone, Marilyn Cohen; and after Marilyn will be Loretta Huston. Yes, ma'am.

MARILYN COHEN: I'd really like to urge you to put all your efforts into cleaning up completely -- not just capping, not just sort of, as someone said, covering over.

I understand that Hanford's the most contaminated site in the western hemisphere, and it's time to just clean it up. To add more fuel is just absolutely appalling. I mean, just -- if you can't clean up what you've got, and it's going to be leeching into the water for the next 10,000, 20,000 years, what are we

360-1 **360-1** Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

11

1 talking about, as Americans, about putting more
2 into the soil?
3 And then the question of trucking more.
4 You're talking about going up the entire
5 population coast of Oregon. You're going
6 through Roseburg, Eugene, Portland. I don't
7 know if you hit as far as Seattle.
8 I learned tonight that the trucks going
9 through actually leak radiation as they go. If
10 a driver stops in a place to eat, the truck is
11 leaking out of those containers, as far as I
12 understand. The driver decides what the
13 weather will be like, whether he'll continue.
14 I don't know if you've ever driven the I-5
15 corridor behind a triple trailer in rainy
16 weather and thought you were safe. I don't
17 know if you've driven in Portland conditions --
18 weather -- traffic conditions in rainy weather
19 and thought you were safe. That would be from
20 an accident. But just if you were stopped in
21 traffic next to one of these leaking radiation
22 trucks, you'd be exposed to it. That's one of
23 the craziest things I've heard coming from our
24 U.S. government.
25 I have a niece who is suffering from

360-1 cont'd

360-2

360-2 This *TC & WM EIS* contains an analysis of transportation routes of specific origination/destination sites to and from Hanford, as shown in Appendix H, Figure H–4, Waste Management Alternatives – Analyzed Truck and Rail Routes. The analyzed routes include routes that pass through the northeastern part of the state of Oregon (i.e., Interstate 84). The actual routes used could vary due to changes in route characteristics and highway construction, but the risk results are expected to remain essentially the same. Note that the transportation activities analyzed in this EIS would not occur on Interstate 5 or Interstate 205 because shipments would originate from the east and southeast of Hanford.

The transportation of radioactive materials and waste, both coming to and leaving Hanford, must comply with DOT and NRC regulations that promote the protection of human health and the environment. This includes requiring the use of certified packaging that minimizes the radiation dose rate outside the transportation package. As indicated in the *TC & WM EIS* Summary, Section S.5.3; Chapter 2, Section 2.8.3.10; and Chapter 4, Section 4.3.12, it is unlikely that transportation of radioactive waste would cause an additional fatality as a result of radiation from either incident-free transportation or postulated transportation accidents. Appendix H, Table H–17, provides an estimate of the maximum dose of 10 millirem to a person stuck in traffic for 30 minutes next to a radioactive waste shipment in a Type B cask. This is considered to be a one-time event. This amount of radiation dose is equivalent to the risk of developing an LCF of 6×10^{-6}, or 6 chances in 1,000,000, which is a very low risk.

multiple sclerosis. Her dad was a waste management scientist at Hanford. I just learned tonight that epidemiology studies link multiple sclerosis with nuclear waste. I never knew that before.

My husband has cancer. There are other people who have cancer. This is a human issue that we're talking about. It's not just some scientific, "Can we come up with the greatest world answer and spend $500 billion here and another $500 billion there." These are real people we're talking about, and the real harm, and so I urge you to please do all you can, spend all the money you can, and put all the effort you can to clean this up and stop it.

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

(Applause.)

JAMES PARHAM: Loretta Huston, and after Loretta will be Timothy Shinabarger. Yes, ma'am.

LORETTA HUSTON: Just a moment to pause.

It's extremely, extremely complex, the problems that we're facing with in today's modern world. We had a little glimmer of hope when we voted our President that said he was

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

13

willing to listen to us, the people. And he was running on the campaign of the urgency of now.

We're running out of time. We're running out of money. We're running out of solutions. It doesn't take layers and layers and layers and layers of details to understand what's going on. Our world is toxic, and we have choices to remove ourselves from this very dangerous lethal direction.

I can't be more uproared with hearing our President during the state of the union speech, being so inspired by a clean renewable future, to then just flip it around and allocate billions of dollars in a direction where we all know the consequences of where this goes. We can't even deal with the problems that we already have with 40 miles of contaminated waste that's leeching into our water, and children that are playing along the riverbanks and there's not even a sign that says these waters are contaminated. Just simple basic things; it's common sense.

And it's time to -- I'm just wondering, how can we more directly get our message

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

14

1 across? Can we bring the administration to the
2 Hanford nuclear site and educate them and show
3 them exactly what's going on and the
4 complexities of what we're facing with --
5 facing in today's world?
6 It's time. It's time to direct action.
7 It's time -- We have more than enough
8 information to deal with.
9 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.
10 (Applause.)
11 JAMES PARHAM: Timothy Shinabarger, and
12 then after Timothy will be Lynn Porter.
13 TIMOTHY SHINABARGER: Good evening. Tim
14 Shenenbarger.
15 My comments address the Department of
16 Energy's preferred alternative regarding waste
17 management, which calls for the disposal at
18 Hanford of radioactive waste from off-site DOE
19 facilities. Obviously, disposal at Hanford of
20 off-site waste includes shipment of such waste,
21 so I'll also address shipment.
22 The EIS makes clear that Department of
23 Energy is looking for someplace to store waste,
24 not just from Hanford, but from all of its
25 facilities nationwide. According to the EIS

361-1 **361-1** Comment noted.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

15

summary page S57, I'm quoting, "There is a substantial uncertainty associated with the sources, volumes, and potential long-term performance of radiological and chemical off-site waste inventories forecast for disposal at Hanford," unquote.

Although the map Ms. Burandt showed, displayed, does not show Interstate 5, I-5 is the logical shipment route for DOE facilities in California. Interstate 5 passes through the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area and bisects Lane County. The EIS does not even analyze impacts of using Interstate 5 as a shipping corridor for nuclear waste from other DOE facilities.

What are the dangers posed by DOE radiological and chemical wastes being transported to Hanford through the Eugene-Springfield Metro Area and Lane County?

My daughter volunteers with a local fire district. I need to know whether local emergency responders can safely respond to accidental release of radioactive or chemical material shipped for the DOE.

I request the DOE expand this

362-1

362-1 This EIS does not analyze the transport of radioactive waste from DOE sites in California. Additional NEPA documentation would be required before any radioactive waste could be shipped from DOE sites in California to Hanford.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

16

1 environmental impact statement to do two
2 things: First, analyze the impacts of using
3 Interstate 5 to transport radioactive waste to
4 Hanford, and specifically to analyze the
5 impacts specific to this portion of I-5 that
6 passes through Lane County and the
7 Eugene-Springfield Metro Area. And, second,
8 analyze what materials and training the local
9 emergency responders will need, and who is
10 going to pay for those material and training,
11 so local responders can safely handle
12 radioactive releases from materials shipped for
13 the DOE.
14 Lacking such analysis, the EIS cannot
15 justify it's preferred alternative and cannot
16 justify any other waste management alternative,
17 except the no-action alternative one.
18 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.
19 (Applause.)
20 JAMES PARHAM: Lynn Porter, and after Lynn
21 would be Kathy -- and I think the last name is
22 Gui, G-U-I, after that.
23 LYNN PORTER: Okay. I'm Lynn Porter with
24 Hanford Watch. We're a Portland
25 environmentalist group. We've been following

362-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

17

Hanford for -- since 1992. Our Web site is hanfordwatch.org and we have an e-mail list on our Web site that you can sign up for.

Our president, Paige Knight's, comments on the EIS are on our Web site, and I'm sure she's also sent them to DOE. If anyone would like to read them, please go to our Web site.

I'm just going to make a few brief personal comments.

We don't want any more waste imported to Hanford. This is a no-brainer. You don't add any more waste to the largest nuclear waste dump in the western hemisphere. Okay? You just don't do it. And that also eliminates all the concerns about shipping. The moratorium should be extended indefinitely, past 2022. *363-1*

There also should be no more waste generated at Hanford from things like reprocessing nuclear fuel rods from civilian power plants. And we can forget that idea too. *363-2*

We would like you to somehow keep the waste treatment plant on schedule and on budget, because they -- the things that have happened with this over the years have just been mind-boggling. The increases in the *363-3*

363-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

The impacts of the offsite waste in terms of radiological risk are presented in the Summary, Section S.5.5.3, and Chapter 2, Section 2.10, Key Environmental Findings. These sections discuss the radiological risk differences between including and not including offsite waste disposal at IDF-East.

The *TC & WM EIS* analysis shows that receipt of offsite waste streams that contain specific amounts of certain isotopes, specifically, iodine-129 and technetium-99, could cause an adverse impact on the environment. Therefore, one means of mitigating this impact would be for DOE to limit disposal of offsite waste streams at Hanford. Other mitigation measures, such as recycling secondary-waste streams into the primary-waste-stream feeds within the WTP to increase iodine-129 capture in ILAW and bulk vitrification glass, are discussed in Chapter 7, Section 7.5, of this final EIS.

363-2 Reprocessing nuclear fuel is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze the potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites.

363-3 DOE is working diligently to bring the WTP online to treat the tank waste at the site. Chapter 1, Section 1.2, provides a brief history and background on DOE's efforts to reduce costs and speed up Hanford cleanup efforts. As discussed in the *TC & WM EIS* Summary, Chapter 1, and Chapter 2, this EIS analyzes additional waste treatment capability that includes expanding the vitrification process capability currently being constructed in the WTP or supplementing the WTP's capability with supplemental treatment technologies. Thus, decisions to be made by DOE regarding whether to treat all waste in the WTP, as is or expanded, or to supplement its capacity by adding new treatment capability depend on demonstrating the feasibility of supplemental treatment

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

18

1 schedule far into the future and the billions
2 of dollars keep going up. **363-3 cont'd**
3 We would also like you to clean up the
4 cribs, the trenches, and the groundwater which **363-4**
5 eventually flows into the river. And please
6 try to tell the public more about the impact of
7 radioactive releases from Hanford on the fish **363-5**
8 in the river and the public who use the river.
9 Thank you.
10 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Kathy, and
11 after Kathy will be Moshe Immerman.
12 KATHY GING: Kathy Ging. I was director
13 of the Lane County --
14 JAMES PARHAM: We're going to have to have
15 you slow down a little bit.
16 KATHY GING: Kathy Ging. I was the
17 director of the recent Lane County energy
18 roundups and the Oregon energy roundups at the
19 state fair, and I'm a real estate agent. I
20 helped initiate the tax credit in the
21 legislature in the late '80s, and it's still in
22 effect.
23 My recommendations on -- First of all, I
24 wanted you to consider the fact that the
25 devalued real property base in Washington state

technologies. As noted in the Summary, Section S.3.1.4, and Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2.2, of this *TC & WM EIS*, the WTP is currently being constructed in Hanford's 200-East Area. Site work associated with the project began in late 2001. As of early 2012, construction was more than 62 percent complete. However, DOE acknowledges the WTP is a first-of-its-kind radioactive and chemical waste treatment facility and there are issues that have not yet been addressed. Details regarding the WTP are provided in Appendix E, including design, processes, waste-form performance, waste forms/disposal packages, assumptions, and uncertainties.

363-4 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. However, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

363-5 Potential short-term human health and safety impacts, as well as short-term impacts on ecological resources, of the *TC & WM EIS* proposed actions are summarized in Chapter 4. Potential long-term impacts on human health and long-term ecological risk are discussed in Chapter 5.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

19

and possibly northern Oregon could mean that there would be less government revenues in the future if you don't do a more thorough cleanup. And my recommendations follow those of Heart of America, including dropping all consideration of using Hanford as a national radioactive waste dump, and thank God we got (indiscernible) at least temporarily. *364-1*

We should -- You should also adopt the incremental 0.9 percent of the waste cleanup, not just the 99 percent cleanup scenario. Significant contamination is found in that one percent, but it seems that you would rather ignore that part of the cleanup. *364-2*

Next I would like to say that you should not try to save dollars, our dollars, by marginal cleanup, because it is a certainty, according to government protections, that cleanup costs will rise exponentially over the years, resulting in more deaths from cancer. The enormous sums that have already been spent will already be wasted, and mediation now must involve not just capping but clean closure, removing waste from tanks, cleaning all the links leaks and discharges. This is not your *364-3*

364-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

364-2 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

364-3 Both DOE and Congress are committed to cleanup efforts at Hanford, and DOE continues to seek funding for these efforts. In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. However, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

20

1 garden variety of leachate from the dump that
2 contains about 150 pollutants; this is much
3 more dangerous, and some of it could last for
4 hundreds of thousands of years, not just 10,000
5 like we've been told tonight.
6 I want to mention again about the Roy --
7 the Roy process, and I will be sending you
8 information about that.
9 And, also, I'd like to ask you: What is
10 your plan for the time when the tanks are all
11 full and no more waste can be sent to the
12 pre-treatment plant?
13 Also, do you have a backup plan for when
14 the waste treatment plant has a failure?
15 To quote an old English saying: "The best
16 made plans of mice and men gang aft agley."
17 There is an earthquake hazard at Hanford, and
18 the vit plant did not have to meet the seismic
19 standards. As you remember, Trojan was shut
20 down partly because of the earthquake hazards.
21 Misguided government policy made nuclear
22 power plants even feasible, remember. It was
23 the Price Anderson Act passed by Congress that
24 enabled the building and operation of over 70
25 nuclear power plants because of limited

364-4

364-4 Regarding the impacts that seismic events could have on disposal locations at Hanford, the accident analysis in this *Final TC & WM EIS* includes accidents triggered by seismic events and discusses potential impacts on operational facilities, site workers, and the general public (see Appendix K, Section K.3). For example, the seismic standards developed for the WTP are discussed in detail. Potential long-term impacts likely would be less than analyzed, as no credit was taken in the groundwater analysis for long-term structural stability of the repository or of any of the waste-form containers.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

21

1 insurance company liability. We all need to
2 urge the Obama administration not to finance
3 any new nukes. This is setting a bad example
4 for nations worldwide.
5 When Dennis Hayes, who was the director of
6 the Solar Energy Research Institute, was here
7 last week, he said the photovoltaics will be in
8 the next generation covering most of our energy
9 needs; and that we, the United States, started
10 the ball in PV and dropped it, and that Japan
11 and Germany and the other countries do it. So
12 we need to restart our solar future. Thank
13 you.
14 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. After Moshe
15 Immerman will be Michael Gannon.
16 MOSHE IMMERMAN: Thank you, friends, and
17 good evening. And thanks to everyone for
18 coming here and bringing your heart and your
19 soul, and you're willing just to learn and
20 cooperate and hopefully break through levels.
21 I'm the founder, convenor, and chair of
22 Citizens for Public Accountability. We've done
23 some good things in this county. And I did the
24 second acid rain study on planet Earth at
25 Williams College, at our 2500 acre research

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

1 forest. I also operated an anatomic absorption
2 spectra photometer at Williams College, which
3 measures, you know, metals and other things
4 down to parts per billion.
5 We face an opportunity here, and of course
6 an on going crisis. The opportunity has to do
7 with rethinking what radiation radionuclides
8 really is. We can't see it, we can't feel it,
9 we can't taste it. We genuinely don't think
10 about it. We weren't evolved in our biology to
11 sense it, and so it's usually off our personal
12 radar unless you are into science or something
13 like that.
14 I'm asking us to please consider a few
15 basic realities -- I believe, realities --
16 about being human on planet Earth.
17 Life is sacred, which means our body is
18 sacred. I'm not Christian -- I'm a Buddhist
19 priest and I'm a biologist and Jewish -- but
20 Christ said, "For your body is the temple of
21 the living God." He did not say, "So impair
22 your genetic endowment for the next several
23 tens of thousands of years with radiation
24 because your body is sacred."
25 The body in Tibetan is called "trulkhor,"

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

23

T-R-U-L-K-H-O-R, transliterated. It means magic wheel. This body has amazing capacities, unless you waste it trying to deal with cancer and impaired immune systems.

And then of course there's over 10 million species on the planet, and we're supposed to be their safekeepers, their guardians, their protectors. We're self species now. I think the biggest mistake humanity every made was nuclear power and nuclear weapons, and we have to look at it more deeply; and that means probably all of us need to go home and cry -- cry because we've inherited the insanity of World War II and so-called "peaceful atom."

One of my huge concerns is the fact that we are in one of the world's most dangerous subduction zone. Earthquakes, 8.8 in Chile -- here is bad. Go look at the Nature magazine article of a few years back. What they found from six sites along a 600 kilometer zone from northern California from British Columbia is that we had on January 26, 1700, a Richter 9.0 or better earthquake that dropped those six sites one to two meters instantaneously. And they know that from the cedar trees that

365-1

365-1 DOE agrees that the intensity and frequency of seismic events are important factors in evaluating disposal facilities and locations at Hanford. Appendix K of this *Final TC & WM EIS* contains an analysis of the potential impacts on site workers and the general public that could be triggered by seismic events. Both the frequencies and intensities of potential seismic events are discussed, as well as the uncertainties in those estimates. The intensity and frequency of seismic events are not a factor in the long-term groundwater analysis. In the groundwater analysis no credit was taken for long-term structural stability of the disposal facility, waste-form containers, or infiltration barriers (caps).

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

24

1 dropped. Take the 7,000 years ago that our
2 Oregon environment people pointed out. That
3 means 24 of those events over 7,000 years -- if
4 they happen every 300 years, which is what they
5 said -- 24 of those. What happens to Hanford
6 in one of them, let alone 24. But it's not
7 7,000 years: Because what's the half-life of
8 plutonium? It's a little over three times
9 7,000 years. So we're talking about 75 events
10 that we're going to bless our descendants with.
11 And who's going to deal with it?
12 Now, as I mentioned in my question, we
13 need to understand better the biology of
14 radionuclides, how they migrate through the
15 food web, the food chain; how they migrate up
16 the trophic levels seven to 12 times, so about
17 ten times concentration of each level; where
18 they go in our organ system -- cesium going
19 into our muscles, iodine going into our
20 thyroid. Most people don't know that. Again,
21 we need to look at the full spectrum of what
22 these nuclides are doing.
23 Just a few seconds. Thank you.
24 So please think about the long-term
25 future. If the Iroquois, the Hodona Soni, say

365-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

25

seven generations, that's 210 years. We need to be talking about a hundred times that, 21,000 years.

And the last thing is the terrorism risk. I was on a government committee here concerned with continuity of government. I was asked to prepare a civil unrest preparedness plan for the whole county, by the county administrator. This thing is an ideal terrorist target. You don't want it on the road. If it's unescorted, then you're in trouble if it gets attacked. If it is escorted, you're advertising what's in there. So please think about the terrorism attack.

And the last thing I'll say is: Please, it is not time for more commercial nukes. And if we give this thing permission to be the storage ground for our national, we're saying to Georgia, to South Carolina: You build more, and the waste will come here to the most ecologically attuned part of the country, and you're the least. We're saying: No. If you can't handle it at home, don't do it, because we don't want it here. Thank you very much.

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Michael Gannon,

365-2

365-3

365-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

365-3 Nuclear energy production and the safe storage of waste generated from it are beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. The management of waste resulting from environmental cleanup activities is analyzed in this EIS.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

and after Michael will be Louisa Hamachek.

MICHAEL GANNON: Hi. Thanks for having this here in Eugene.

I wanted to first of all point out that Eugene is a nuclear free zone, the result of a very hard-fought political matter in Eugene over about a 15-year period.

JAMES PARHAM: Could you move closer to the microphone just a bit, please.

MICHAEL GANNON: Sure. I want to make -- try to make some comments, that may seem a little bit off the wall, but I think if you can stay with me and I can squeeze them into the three and a half minutes, it might be understandable.

The hearings that you're having are, to me, a step in the right direction; but it's like one of many tiny little steps, because you've had many hearings. And you're having them to analyze an ongoing analysis that, as other people have pointed out, is increasing in costs and keeps being set further back in time. So I want to say that I do sympathize with all of you for tackling one of the most difficult problems in our western civilization.

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

27

And also I want to try to, because of who I am -- and the older you get, the more you want to have some impact on the total craziness that we see in our society and maybe tame some of it somewhere. So I would say that I'm roughly -- my age is about the same as this site. And I remember really well when I was in high school and the Sputnik phenomenon hit. And my Latin teacher, who I prized very much, was taken from Medford and put into an intensive Russian language program at Reed College, and then I started taking Russian in high school.

I'd like to suggest that the contamination of the Columbia River on the Hanford side is our Sputnik of today. It actually appeared a while ago, and I'm not sure when the scientific study showed the contamination was actually reaching the Columbia River. But I did grow up studying Oregon history in the sixth grade, way down in southern Oregon in the Rogue River Valley; and the Columbia River was this enormous icon, and the other one is the salmon, which I knew.

So I wanted to suggest that perhaps you're

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

28

1 still asking us to put our fingers in the dike
2 of this contamination, this contamination that
3 is bewilderingly complex to all of us. And the
4 proposal you're presenting and you want us to
5 comment on is inadequate to deal with the
6 impact of this site on our civilization and
7 perhaps the perishability of humans on the
8 planet.
9 So I want to jump back quickly to where we
10 are today having this hearing and saying, "Yes,
11 this is right on. Have these hearings." But
12 we have to have a lot of them, because you
13 can't go to the -- for example, the
14 down-winders in La Grande and Walla Walla,
15 after they started to have cancer treatments,
16 and get them to help you solve this problem.
17 So, really, folks, we're the solution to
18 this problem. We're stepping forward, learning
19 the complexities, and going forward, and at the
20 same time asking you to stop. So no new wastes
21 created at Hanford, brought to Hanford.
22 I wanted to jump into --
23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No nukes.
24 JAMES PARHAM: Okay. Let's go. Thirty
25 seconds left. Go ahead.

366-1 **366-1** Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

29

MICHAEL GANNON: Thirty seconds.

Jeremy FiveCrows of the Nez Perce Nation presented at the Eugene library last fall a really dynamic example of the Nez Perce Nation growing hatchling salmon in a wavy fish tank lined with stones, that they paid for themselves; and it was dramatically in contrast to the square long trenches of salmon hatchlings, and their results were much better. And I doubt if the Roosevelt administration asked the Nez Perce for help in growing salmon to make up for those that didn't come up the fish ladder.

So when Ken Niles, whom I respect from the Oregon Department of Energy, suggests that we're going to ask the Department of Energy to study these issues more, I think that's misdirected. We need to have the people of Oregon and Washington and the western hemisphere study it more. Thank you.

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Louisa Hamachek, please, and then Larry Deckman. Thank you.

LOUISA HAMACHEK: I'm Louisa Hamachek from Eugene, and I've been concerned about the

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

30

1 mistreatment and neglect of the down-winders,
2 who are about my age now, who suffered from,
3 when they were children, the intentional
4 neglectful release of radioactive iodine gas
5 during the production era time at Hanford;
6 that, knowingly, releases of radioactive
7 material went out into the land and blew to the
8 surrounding areas that the former speaker was
9 referring to, Walla Walla and Spokane and that
10 area.
11 Many of these people have not been taken
12 care of medically, financially. And they have
13 been broken. They've had the working father or
14 mother of their family -- so many of the
15 down-winders have -- all their sisters, their
16 cousins, everybody's gotten cancer and been
17 taken out. And they have not been paid for.
18 So in our town, if there's an accident of
19 one of the nuclear trucks in our town, how
20 would the people in our town be taken care of
21 for their medical needs when -- And how much
22 has the EIS studied the entire route system of
23 nuclear waste coming to Hanford and each of the
24 communities? And how much will that cost the
25 Department of Energy?

367-1

367-1 Performing a cost analysis for transportation accidents was not within the scope of this EIS. The Price–Anderson Act of 1957 (revised in 1967, 1975, and 1988, and extended by the Energy Policy Act of 2005) requires all NRC licensees and DOE contractors to enter into agreements of indemnification for personal injury and property damage due to any nuclear or radiological incident regardless of who may be liable. Section 604 of the Price–Anderson Act limits the indemnity provided by DOE for its contractors to $10 billion, subject to adjustment for inflation, for each nuclear incident, including legal costs.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

31

And so I think it's irresponsible financially of our federal tax dollars to embark on this program, because there would be a huge medical expense that really is the responsibility of the Department of Energy. That was my first comment. *367-1 cont'd*

And my second one goes along with what many of the people have said: That this is not the time to look to nuclear power for our means of making electricity, and the Department of Energy is in charge of that and our program with our country. And so I'm not quite sure why you are taking care of the military waste and having to deal with that. It seems like it should be the Department of Defense and you should put the money that you're spending on this into solar panels and wind development and renewable resources, and I'd like to see an appropriate department take care of this. *367-2*

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Larry Deckman. And after Larry Deckman will be Jack Dresser.

LARRY DECKMAN: Having listened to various speakers tonight and their presentations, I get two basic impressions. One is that the strong message from the community is: Clean up *368-1*

367-2 The use of renewable energy sources in the United States is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

368-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. However, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

32

Hanford. Just clean it up. The techniques, how you're going to do it -- people of goodwill, high intelligence -- focus that effort and clean it up.

But the second message is: Definitely transport nothing new to the site. And in reference to that -- and the question I asked earlier about seven exceptions, moratorium, it sounds like maybe some waste will be brought, even during the moratorium period, to Hanford.

368-1 cont'd

You know, for the last nine years, terrorism has been in the forefront of our consciousness. And I think about going to the airport and having to take my shoes off, and that's kind of troubling -- terrorism. And I read -- or watch the news, and I think about the Middle East and Iran getting a nuke. Terrorism, it's a theme it plays over and over. But if you're transporting trucks to Hanford -- if you'd go with me on just a simple scenario -- how difficult would it be for somebody to hijack one of those trucks? It wouldn't be difficult to pull a car -- If they were so intentioned, and I guess there are people like this, or so I've been told the past nine years:

368-1 cont'd

cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Some waste will be brought to Hanford during the moratorium period. The Settlement Agreement referenced in Section 2.1 also specified exemptions (8a through g) for waste from seven sources that could be imported to Hanford. The Settlement Agreement was revised in 2008 to allow for one additional shipment of waste to Hanford that was stored at the Areva facility, which is located next to Hanford. This waste, however, originated at Hanford. (Also note that some of these exemptions do not involve ongoing shipments and have already been completed.)

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

33

Somebody stops in front of that truck, has the driver get out, and then says, "We hold the truck hostage and I have a bomb." What would the government do? What could they do in that circumstance?

So that's a chilling prospect, and it's one that is raised by transporting this type of waste to the site. So, again, I would repeat: Cleanup the site, number one; but for goodness' sake, don't transport anything more to it. So thank you.

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Jack Dresser, and after Jack will be Max Smoot.

JACK DRESSER: Yeah, I'm Jack Dresser. I'm a member of Veterans for Peace. So what I wanted to do is expand the horizon of thinking beyond Oregon and Washington, to the international level, and to talk about these pathological symbioses between the DOE and the DOD.

Almost all of the waste, so-called nuclear waste, U-238, that everybody's trying to get rid of here and everyone wants to give it to somebody else and nobody wants it, much of it is given to the arms industry because depleted

368-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

1 uranium, so-called, U-238, is harder than
2 steel. It penetrates armor and it's given
3 virtually free or extremely low cost to weapons
4 manufacturers, so they love it. And then the
5 Pentagon loves it because it penetrates enemy
6 armor. And most of our -- most of our
7 projectiles, from missiles to bullets, are
8 tipped with depleted uranium. It cuts through
9 steel like butter. It heats up to an
10 extraordinary high temperature. About 40
11 percent of it atomizes, blows all over the
12 place. It's in the air, it's in the soil, it's
13 in the water, and it has -- Moshe, what is the
14 half-line of depleted uranium?
15 MOSHE IMMERMAN: I don't know.
16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think it's four
17 and a half billion years.
18 JACK DRESSER: Four and a half billion is
19 the figure I've heard. It's all over Iraq.
20 During the first Gulf War, we dumped 350
21 tons of this stuff in Iraq. Between -- at the
22 Bosra hospital, the cancer rates -- between
23 from 1989, before we did this, to 1999 -- '99,
24 right, which was eight years after the
25 so-called Gulf War, the cancer rates increased

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

35

1 over tenfold, cancer deaths, from something
2 like three dozen in 1989, to over 400 in the
3 1999.
4 It also -- This stuff is breathed in,
5 ingested, or it comes in through the food
6 supply because it's in the soil. It can
7 deposit itself in any organ of the body,
8 including the semen. It can be transmitted to
9 the children. It is producing enormously
10 increased rates of the most grotesque birth
11 defects you've ever seen. And when I go and do
12 lectures of this, I show slides of it. They're
13 hideous. Babies born with eyes in the middle
14 -- Cyclopian eyes, babies born with arms
15 sticking out all over the place. It's
16 absolutely bizarre. This is what we're doing
17 to human beings in an other part of the world
18 that we like to call terrorists.
19 Now, this will probably go down as the
20 greatest war crime in the history of mankind
21 due that half-life. And the Department of
22 Energy is complicit with the DOD in those war
23 crimes. Depleted uranium was declared an
24 illegal weapon by the United Nations in 1996.
25 Now, we need to think about this. I

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

1 wanted to add this to all the other things
2 everybody else has said: Because this data and
3 Jerry's data, Heart of America Northwest data,
4 this should be spread all over the country --
5 because this doesn't need more study; it needs
6 to be stopped.
7 (Applause.)
8 JACK DRESSER: And Obama's -- Obama's plan
9 to expand nuclear energy plants needs to be
10 stopped in its tracks. And we can't depend on
11 Obama; and, hopefully, all of you have figured
12 that out by now. We can't depend on Obama for
13 anything; it has to come from below. And if
14 the people of Oregon and Washington know the
15 most about this because of Hanford, if this
16 data gets spread all over the country, and
17 people in all 50 states stand up and say, "We
18 don't want this stuff" -- There's plenty of
19 other sources of energy. We've got sunshine
20 every day all over the world. About, what, 80
21 to 90 percent of the water, which is moving.
22 There's an enormous energy source with tidal
23 energy. There's an enormous energy source from
24 geothermal. We're sitting on a hot planet.
25 It's hot under there, all over the world, in

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

37

1 addition to sun -- to solar and wind and so
2 forth. There's plenty of energy sources other
3 than nuclear, that are clean, renewable, and
4 sensible, and moral, and do not contribute to
5 the death and devastation of other human beings
6 around the world.
7 JAMES PARHAM: Five minutes.
8 JACK DRESSER: So I just want to remind
9 the Department of Energy that you are not the
10 "Department of Nuclear Energy," so get with
11 these other programs and pour your money into
12 that, and forget these absolutely insane and
13 unpredictable risks and costs of nuclear
14 energy. Look at what it's cost just to try to
15 clean this stuff up afterward. I mean, it's
16 absolutely bizarre.
17 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.
18 (Applause.)
19 JAMES PARHAM: Max Smoot. And after Max
20 will be Cat Koehn.
21 MAX SMOOT: Hello. This is really
22 interesting, how you get all nervous when you
23 come up in front of the microphone and forget
24 everything you were going to say.
25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Talk louder.

369-1

369-1 DOE's funding for alternative energy programs is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

The scope of this *TC & WM EIS* includes proposed actions to retrieve, treat, and dispose of Hanford tank waste; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate environmental cleanup activities at Hanford and other DOE sites. The disposal of other wastes, including waste associated with commercial nuclear power generation, is beyond the scope of this EIS.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

38

1 MAX SMOOT: I was going to say -- Thanks.
2 The first thing I wanted to say is it's silly
3 to have all these panels up here with these
4 little words on them about all these different
5 -- different ideas of how we can deal with
6 this, when it's so obvious. And when I talk to
7 people about this, they usually go, "Oh, well,
8 they use big containers that they test and they
9 drop from thousands of feet in the air or
10 something and make sure they're not going to
11 break and all that." And so the public is
12 obviously really misled about this, if what we
13 saw tonight is actually true.
14 And so I wanted to -- I'm really glad that
15 there isn't a nuclear waste place here in
16 Eugene, and I'm glad to see that we can do
17 without these things and we're demonstrating
18 the grassroots -- the only real way to stop
19 things like this. And I heard somebody say
20 something about direct action, and that seems
21 to be the only real front against these kind of
22 things.
23 Because it's all based on money. Right?
24 The gross domestic product. And if one of
25 those things does blow up, it will make our

370-1

370-1 CEQ regulations for implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1502.14) require Federal agencies to evaluate all reasonable alternatives. To assist the public in navigating through the large number of alternatives and the complex information presented in the *Draft TC & WM EIS*, DOE issued a Reader's Guide. This guide serves as an introduction and guide to the contents of this EIS, highlights the key features of the reasonable alternatives, and helps readers review the technical analyses presented. DOE also held a 1-hour open house prior to each public hearing on the draft EIS to allow the public to meet informally with members of the *TC & WM EIS* team, ask questions, and learn more about the EIS. Informative posters and factsheets were provided at these open houses, and DOE contractors were available to walk interested persons through the alternatives posters.

Radioactive waste is transported in DOT-certified containers that meet strenuous technical standards established by NRC.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

39

gross domestic product go up, and that's like what they're all about. Right? The Department of Energy seems to be interested in making that kind of thing happen, like the gross domestic product. And that's that whole problem with escalating progressing society or something.

I was going to come in here dressed up as a robot and try to say: This is against the eternal logic of reality. It's not going to work. Trust the robots that you trust every day about all these mathematical eternal logic -- or universal logic that people kind of construct. But that was a bad idea, so I didn't do it. Yeah, I just wanted to come up with some kind of thing to be humorous and ridicule this idea, because I think that's one of the only ways of direct action that we can do, at least on the intellectual front.

And I know a lot of people that are really not interested in coming up and speaking to some impersonal people like robots that want to make more nuclear energy and stuff. And I represent those people. There's a lot of them. And they would rather ridicule it. And I think that's the only -- I don't know. It's just so

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

1 divisive, you know.
2 And one more thing I wanted to do was kind
3 of represent my interpretation of the
4 progression, this kind of escalating gross
5 domestic product that capitalism is based on
6 that we're doing and the radioactive
7 decomposition. And it kind of -- I mean, it's
8 kind of inspired by this sound I heard on a
9 sound synthesizer that my friend bought
10 recently; and it's kind of an abrasive noise,
11 so I encourage you all to cover your ears if
12 you want to protect yourself from this. It
13 goes like this. (Indicating.) Sorry, that was
14 a really bad representation of it. But,
15 anyway, it goes on and on; and as long as you
16 keep holding the button down, it keeps
17 progressing and it's (indicating) and it just
18 keeps changing and mutating and getting crazier
19 and crazier. And I thought that would be a
20 good representation of at least --
21 JAMES PARHAM: We may have a hard time
22 getting that on the record, but we're going to
23 try.
24 MAX SMOOT: Silly. Yeah. I should have
25 brought the synthesizer in; maybe that would

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

41

have worked.

JAMES PARHAM: Send us a digital copy and we can do it.

MAX SMOOT: Yeah. Anyway, thanks for hearing us, I guess.

For what it's worth, I think there will be direct action. I don't know why they would think that there wouldn't -- or why anybody would think that people aren't going to try to stop this. And of course those people will be labeled terrorists, I'm sure.

But, yeah, I work with kids, and I really like working with kids, and I have to tell them, "No, that's not appropriate for school," or, "That's not appropriate. We need to stop this. You're not supposed to hit each other," or whatever. And this is the kind of thing that our people that are operating nuclear power plants don't want to hear, and so we have to do something.

JAMES PARHAM: Last five minutes.

MAX SMOOT: And the direct action grassroots stuff seems to be the only way, and I'm glad people are actually hear to listen and talk about this and not just say, "Oh, well,

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

they have these big tanks, right, they put them in and it really contains it from the water and everything," when they're totally not even getting the information because it's not being expressed.

JAMES PARHAM: You're done, five minutes.

MAX SMOOT: Oh, I'm done?

JAMES PARHAM: Yeah.

MAX SMOOT: Okay.

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

MAX SMOOT: Thank you.

JAMES PARHAM: Cat Koehn.

CAT KOEHN: Good evening. And for the record, my name is pronounced Cat Koehn, even though I agree it does look like Kohen.

JAMES PARHAM: Okay. Thank you.

CAT KOEHN: I'm the director of a nonprofit called Artists 4 Action, and we're a group that encourages the public to get involved about environmental problems. And we have a "save the salmon" project right now, and so that's why I'm very glad that you are allowing us to come and speak before you, because what I want to tell you is that we're mad. We're mad about the leaks that have

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

43

1 happened, the millions of gallons. We're mad
2 about the money, billions of dollars that have
3 been wasted, just poured down a hole, and we
4 don't seem to be too much further than we were
5 the last decades. We're mad about the risks
6 that you're asking us to assume, and our
7 children to assume, with thousands of trucks
8 rolling down major highways. We're mad about
9 the down-winders that have had to live with
10 this all of their life. And the Native
11 Americans of that area of the Columbia River --
12 you don't even want to get me started about
13 them.
14 But mostly the salmon: The salmon are an
15 icon in the Northwest, and you can't -- Their
16 position shows us that this is a human health
17 risk. The fact that it's in the salmon gets *371-1*
18 into the Native Americans, because they eat the
19 whole fish, and they're having a lot of
20 problems, including cancers.
21 And one of the things that we want to tell
22 you is we do not want any more waste. We want
23 you to clean it up, all of it. And I was very *371-2*
24 entrenched with this man's idea about the
25 pathological symbiosis of DOD and DOE as being

371-1 DOE notes that data indicate that current Hanford operations do not represent a serious health threat for Columbia River users. Monitoring data and potential doses to a variety of receptors are reported annually in the Hanford Site environmental reports (Poston, Duncan, and Dirkes 2011). As presented in Chapter 3, Table 3–13, of this *TC & WM EIS*, the estimated dose from liquid releases from Hanford waste to the MEI in 2010 was 0.056 millirem; the associated risk of a fatal cancer from this dose is less than 1 in 35 million. The dose to an American Indian could be a few percent higher if a large portion of the diet came from fish taken from the Columbia River. The potential doses to, and health impacts on, the public and workers from past Hanford operations have been the subject of a number of studies. Summaries of these studies are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.3, of this EIS. As indicated in that section, the question of whether the population around Hanford has elevated cancer incidence or cancer mortality is unresolved. One study showed no elevated levels of cancer around U.S. nuclear facilities, including Hanford; another study of 16 counties near Hanford determined that cancer incidence in white males and females was below the national average in most counties. The counties in which the incidences of cancer were higher than the national average were not those downwind of Hanford.

The Hanford Dose Reconstruction Project evaluated doses to, but not health effects on, members of the public from releases from 1944 through 1972. Airborne releases of iodine-131 from 1944 through 1957 were responsible for most of the dose from air emissions. The largest organ doses of 24 to 350 radwere to the thyroid. The maximum total effective dose equivalent to an adult from air emissions over the period from 1944 through 1972 was estimated to be 1 rem. The risk of a fatal cancer associated with a dose of 1 rem is about 1 in 1,600. The maximum dose through releases to the Columbia River (from eating nonmigratory fish) was estimated to be 1.4 rem. The radioactive material released to the Columbia River was attributed to cooling water from reactor operations. With respect to the large number of cancers people observe, it is important to know that the American Cancer Society estimates that, in the United States, a person has about a 40 percent lifetime risk of developing an invasive cancer and that approximately 25 percent of all deaths are a result of cancer. Cancer incidence and death rates in the state of Washington are near the national average.

371-2 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. DOE is

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

44

a rather sort of hot potato game -- and what I wrote in my notes is "shell game" -- because we think this is a cover-up, not a clean-up. And the public is appalled if you don't clean it up.

371-2 cont'd

Obama and his idea, he's just bringing up another unproven techno fix. I only wish that it were true, making a little smiley face on it. But you're going to have to convince me. It's more of the same type of thing that you've been telling us from this site for decades. And on the news tonight, of all things, some waste -- professional waste person was granted a court judgment because they were not allowed to put their transuranic nuclear waste into Yucca Mountain. But that's because Yucca Mountain sits in the middle of a detachment fault and is one of the worst places in the world to put nuclear waste.

And so it just brings up the point that the fundamental truth that you can't get away from that no government agency is above the law, especially not above the endangered species law; and the nuclear power industry just cannot hide anymore that there is no good

371-3

implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

As a NEPA document, this EIS has been prepared in an open manner, and opportunities for the public to comment on the *Draft TC & WM EIS* were provided at scoping meetings and public hearings. The public will have future opportunities to comment at public meetings regarding implementation of the TPA cleanup actions and any permits that the State of Washington proposes to issue to implement the selected actions announced in DOE's ROD for this EIS.

371-3 Operations at Hanford are affected and, in many cases, regulated by numerous Federal legal requirements addressing environmental compliance, remediation, planning, preservation, and waste management. The major Federal laws and regulations and Executive orders that apply to the alternatives analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS* are presented in Chapter 8. Certain laws, such as the Endangered Species Act, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, and National Historic Preservation Act, require consultation and coordination by DOE with other governmental entities, including other Federal agencies, state and local agencies, and federally recognized American Indian governments. Chapter 8 and Appendix C of this *TC & WM EIS* identify the process of the interaction and the primary occasions for DOE's interactions with the agencies on the subject of the *TC & WM EIS* preparation process.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

45

place for nuclear waste. Clean up Hanford and clean it up now. Thank you. *371-3 cont'd*

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

(Applause.)

JAMES PARHAM: James Kane. James.

JAMES KANE: Good evening, folks. My name is Jimmy Kane. I'm a farmer and I was a teacher of young children. You've got a nice joint here. It cost a lot, didn't it? Why don't we do this all day long, bring the kids to the show at the county fairgrounds. Okay? They got to live with this crap. We're sick of it, we're tired of it, we don't want to pay for it. Stop shitting in our water, stop shitting in our air, stop shitting on our earth. *372-1*

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. That's the end of our people that have signed up. Now we'd like to turn to anyone who would like to comment, who hasn't had the chance yet. Yes, sir come on up.

ALEX BARK: Hello there. I'm Alex Bark. I'm a University of Oregon student.

I just wanted to go over into some of these management strategies that have been talked about, some of these alternatives.

372-1 Comment noted.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

46

I'd like to encourage that all alternatives considered include clean closure as part of their management strategy. I think, since NEPA was designed to protect the quality of the human environment -- which is ecology, human health, and the physical environment -- you have to invest all of your allocable resources today with this, the most contaminated site in the western hemisphere. I think failure to do so increases probabilities of increased cumulative impacts. And I know it's really, really important that we prevent these cumulative impacts, especially in reference to the salmonid species in the Columbia Basin. *373-1*

Any alternatives that do not -- that do not include a full, clean closure of underground storage tanks should include the costs to long-term decline in fishery production in the Columbia Basin. I mean, if we don't take care of it now, you're -- and the time lines we're looking at, 5,000 to 10,000 years, what does that impact the salmonid species? Take the cost of that and include it into the alternative. I think that's a fair *373-2*

373-1 The alternatives presented in this *TC & WM EIS* were developed under NEPA to provide an understanding of the differences among the potential environmental impacts of the range of reasonable alternatives. Consistent with CEQ guidance, this EIS analyzes the range of reasonable alternatives that covers the full spectrum of potential combinations. The clean closure alternatives considered for the SST system are represented by Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, while selective clean closure is represented by Tank Closure Alternative 4. This EIS presents impact analyses for the ecological, human, and physical environments under each of the alternatives. Specifically, potential long-term impacts on salmonids of actions taken under the various alternatives are presented in Appendix P and Chapter 5, of this EIS. Chapter 6 of this EIS addresses the cumulative impacts of the alternatives when added to the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions at Hanford.

373-2 Chapter 2, Section 2.11, of this *TC & WM EIS* summarizes and compares the relative consolidated costs for continued operation of existing facilities; construction, operation, and deactivation of new or modified facilities; and associated activities to support the proposed actions. For analysis purposes, these cost estimates were calculated using constant 2008 dollars, and used existing cost information where applicable. Where cost information was not directly applicable, relevant data were scaled to estimate costs, or, where appropriate, scoping-level cost estimates were developed. However, cost estimates of future fishery production in the Columbia Basin would be highly speculative and are considered beyond the scope of this EIS. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

47

373-2 cont'd

assessment as well.

In addition, I think that the cultural resources need to be investigated further. I didn't -- Even in the synopsis in this manual, obviously I haven't read 6,000 pages of -- I'm sure it's not 6,000 pages -- of cultural impacts, but I think that it would be really important to include the synopsis impacts to native -- native tribes in the region that consume these salmonid species on a regular basis. That's part of their heritage. And to not include that in this is a really -- is a failure on the DOE's part.

I think that's basically it. In summary, please invest all resources -- please more than $2 billion that Obama has included. If he's investing $54 billion into future nuclear policy, he can invest more than $2 billion into cleaning up this super contaminated site. I live downstream from the contamination; I'd really appreciate if more money were involved in it. Thank you.

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

(Applause.)

JAMES PARHAM: Anyone else who hasn't come

373-3

373-3 This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with specific proposed actions and reasonable alternatives for the storage, retrieval, treatment, and disposal of tank waste generated from defense materials production activities; closure of SSTs containing HLW; decommissioning of FFTF; and continued management of LLW and MLLW at Hanford. These analyses include impacts on ecological species (including fish) and habitat, as well as environmental justice and socioeconomic considerations, consistent with current CEQ and DOE NEPA guidance. Short-term impacts are presented in Chapter 4, including impacts on cultural and paleontological resources, visual resources, and ecological resources; long-term impacts, including those associated with a scenario specific to an American Indian hunter-gatherer, are presented in Chapter 5. The analysis of long-term impacts on Columbia River ecological resources, including salmonids, is discussed in Chapter 6, Section 6.4.3, and Appendix P.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

and who would like to? Yes, ma'am. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm having, I guess, conference shock, because I just came from the ELOA conference and I attended the session on public trust doctrine, where the government -- and this is an old law -- has a duty and an obligation to give us clean air, water, and land.

And I understand all the difficulties that you're having for cleaning up something that basically none of us really know how to clean up. And my culture shock is simple: I'm looking at the whole issue of climate change and haven't factored in how climate change and your EIS relate to each other. And I'm seeing that, if we don't do the climate change right really soon, I think your whole plan becomes moot in a sense. Because, if I understand climate change correctly, Oregon -- every place is going to get way warmer, which means way less water because it evaporates, so maybe the Columbia River itself would evaporate and you can only live in Greenland.

And I think we can reconceptualize a whole lot of things if we figure out how to do the

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

49

pieces, the priority that we have to do first in order to stabilize our planet, and then figure out -- I know it may be a good idea to build a plant, but I'm worried. Because I went up to Sanford -- Hanford when we were trying to persuade them; and I don't think we really persuaded them, if you're going to build this plant.

But what we were worried about was that we were going to ship out a waste to third world countries so they could build nuclear plants, and we were trying to stop that. One person in the audience can back me, because he was there too.

So what I hear is that when you design your environmental impact statement, you don't keep all the factors in -- that's what everybody else has been saying -- you really don't see the picture whole. And I don't know how many stakeholders would have to be present to see the picture whole, because I don't know that little groups like this, who you go from town to town and listen to them -- I don't know that that gives us seeing the picture whole. But we have to have a new democratic device so

374-1

374-1 The public hearings on the *Draft TC & WM EIS* were intended not only to collect comments, but to inform and educate the public regarding the proposed alternatives. In addition to a DOE presentation at the beginning of each public hearing, an hour was provided before the start of each hearing to allow the public to ask questions of some of the staff supporting development of this EIS. Posters and factsheets were made available at each meeting as well. The Hanford website (http://www.hanford.gov) is also available to inform the public regarding project activities, including development of this *TC & WM EIS*.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

50

we begin to have solutions that are commensurate to the problem. Thank you.

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

(Applause.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just want to say: We're paying the price for the people's life style back East and their damn overbreeding habits, their religions, their nuclear power plants to keep up their life style.

There's only a hundred nuclear power plants. How many commercial airplanes do we need to put into them? You know, the biggest statement would be to put a commercial airplane into a Georgia nuclear power plant. Let's keep the waste there. That's what I think. And these fuckers deserve to die for shipping it here.

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else with additional comment? Yes.

JANNA THRIFT: Hello. My name is Janna Thrift. And I live in Eugene now. I have six kids, and I raised them mostly in Alaska; and then when I came here, I was pretty overwhelmed by pollution and the reality of things like nuclear waste and smokes pouring into the air

375-1

375-1 Nuclear energy production is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. This EIS addresses proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate environmental cleanup activities at Hanford and other DOE sites.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

51

1 out of smokestacks all over the place, and
2 things I'd never really seen before. So I
3 think that, to a certain degree, maybe we --
4 you know, maybe you guys, working with this
5 stuff, get a little desensitized to what is
6 really going on. Like, you know, when you work
7 with poison and the idea of cleaning up poison
8 for so long, maybe it doesn't seem like such a
9 big deal after a while; or maybe, you know, you
10 can put the date out a little bit, spend a
11 little bit more money on it, and come up with a
12 new plan.
13 But I think that the biggest, most
14 important part is what everybody seems to be
15 saying here, which is we all know that it's a
16 disaster and it's really bad, and it's time
17 that it just gets cleaned up. And I think that
18 any mother knows that when you're telling your
19 kid to clean up the mess, you are also
20 encouraging them not to make a new one while
21 they're cleaning it up.
22 So it doesn't make a lot of sense to me.
23 Because, like a lot of people have said, it's
24 very elementary. Like we've got all these
25 scientists on the job and everybody thinking

376-1

376-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. However, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

about it, but the bottom line is it's really simple: If it's the largest nuclear waste area in the western hemisphere, then our energy and our money needs to go to cleaning that up; and if we're allocating billions of dollars into making new nuclear waste, there's a very big missing part to that puzzle.

So I'm thinking about a couple of things. When I think about the impact on the salmon and our rivers, I think there's nothing that could possibly make this idea cost efficient, there's absolutely nothing. Because if you're counting in those things, then there is nothing that will pay that back for us. We're not going to be able to fix the water or replace the salmon when they die, because we just continue to make choices to poison them.

And I have been studying about energy. I went to school. I'm really into alternative transportation ideas, which is all about energy. And when I think about all these amazing choices that there are out there, that I've been learning about over the last half a dozen years, I think there's so many choices. Is this poisonous, dangerous substance the best

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

53

idea we can come up with to meet our energy needs? I mean, we have millions of scientists going on with amazing thought processes and very smart people, and it seems to me like we've got to be able to come up with a better idea than this.

So one thing that I really want to be sure to say to the Department of Energy is that we have made a little grassroots effort trying to get people to know about this hearing tonight. It seemed really futile. We were like, "Don't really know a lot about it ourselves. We're just doing our best to get the word out there." But I think the Department of Energy should be spending some money letting people know what's going on; because when I talked to people about Hanford, nobody knows a thing. Like why is it that the entire general public is completely ignorant of this situation? I mean, we live just barely over the border; but yet if you ask people in Eugene, almost nobody has a clue about this process, about you guys cleaning things up, about where it is, about the idea of opening it up again to bring in more radioactive waste. And when I listened to your

376-2

376-2 The public hearings on the *Draft TC & WM EIS* were intended not only to collect comments, but to inform and educate the public regarding the proposed alternatives. In addition to a DOE presentation at the beginning of each public hearing, an hour was provided before the start of each hearing to allow the public to ask questions of some of the staff supporting development of this EIS. Posters and factsheets were made available at each meeting as well. The Hanford website (http://www.hanford.gov) is also available to inform the public regarding project activities, including development of this *TC & WM EIS*.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Nuclear energy production is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

54

1 guys's presentation, I hardly was sure I was in
2 the right room until people started commenting.
3 Like, I thought, "They're talking about the old
4 cleanup, but they're" -- "are we forgetting
5 about what this" -- I mean, a big part of what
6 this is about is the idea there is a
7 proposition that we create -- recreate Hanford
8 as the national radioactive waste dump and we
9 start moving waste there, as well as creating
10 more fuel there, I guess. I would imagine,
11 hopefully you're going to create it there
12 rather than move the waste somewhere else to
13 create it.
14 So, I mean, it's really, really important
15 that you let people know what's going on and
16 that some resources go that direction; because
17 it almost seems like it's meant to be a secret
18 -- especially this global nuclear energy
19 program and the idea that we would bring it
20 from all over the world. I mean, this is big
21 stuff. Why doesn't everybody know this? And
22 why, if the Department of Energy wants to have
23 a real hearing where everybody's real opinions
24 are heard, why don't we publicize things so
25 people really know this is going on?

376-2 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

55

And I guess that's pretty well all I have to say. I just want to add my voice to a lot of voices out there that say that we really need to clean up the mess before we even think about doing anything else.

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

(Applause.)

LUCAS: Greetings. My name is Lucas. I have lived here in Eugene 25 years, more or less. And if I could make things more clear: This was all part of a vast conspiracy -- vast, vast, vast. We're talking many millions of years for the depleted uranium. That's a pretty insignificant number. All these genetic experiments and on animals and nanotechnology and creating new trees and all that kind of stuff.

Well, does anybody know the word "faux pas"? Well, there are many faux pas, on grand levels, for sure, definitely. So this is a chapter in the book where we are unraveling or unveiling deceptions and revealing -- wait, what's the word -- fulfilling -- fulfilling, yes, fulfilling "my cup is half full, half empty" prophecies. That's all I have to say.

376-1 cont'd

377-1

377-1 Comment noted.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

56

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else with additional comments? Yes, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The experiments were for the purpose of creating -- super soldiers, you know, all that kind of stuff. We all remember World War II.

JAMES PARHAM: Okay. Thanks. Yes, sir.

PATRICK DELASHAW: Yeah, I'm Patrick Delashaw, a student at the University of Oregon. And, as a student, I have gone on many road trips, including all the way down on I-5 to southern California, to Colorado, Minnesota. And even though I'm 22 years old, my mother still makes me call at every rest stop to make sure I'm safe.

The idea that you can transport this nuclear waste across these roads and not have an accident -- Forget about the terrorists; I'm not afraid of terrorists. I've seen so many accidents, close to accidents, been even a part of accidents, on those roads, that it is infuriating that people think that you can safely transport this stuff on a truck that is top-heavy and go all the way across the United States with it. Not only do you contaminate

378-1 **378-1** Comment noted.

379-1 **379-1** Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

57

just by driving by people, but there is going to be a crash. In the pamphlet it says two trucks a day for 20 years. I just can't even fathom how those trucks are going to all make it across.

And if you want to talk about the terrorist thing, I mean, I've been making bombs since I was 12 years old, just to blow up stuff for fun. And that's fine and all right. But it is really fricken easy to make a bomb. It doesn't take any brains to set up a big mass terrorist attack. All it takes is the willingness to die. And there are people out there that would love to see the world end, they'd love to see it go down in flames. So I'm just appalled that anybody thinks that it's even remotely a good idea to transport these containers on a truck. It's just -- It's sickening. That's all I have to say.

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

(Applause.)

JAMES PARHAM: Anyone else who would like to comment? Yes, ma'am.

ERICA ELLIOTT: You'll to have excuse me for sort of reading here. My name is Erica

379-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Elliott. I'm a Ph.D. student in environmental studies at the University of Oregon. And I went to a meeting like this in Hood River last year -- it was about the Hanford site and the global nuclear energy partnerships -- and I was really struck by the fact that no academics, at least in the liberal arts tradition, spoke at the meeting and didn't -- I didn't really meet any in attendance there. So I thought I could speak from my experience what I know about Hanford and interacting with students talking about Hanford.

So in the spring of last year, I taught a course to seniors at UO called The Hanford Nuclear Site: Environmental Disaster in the American West. It focused on the environmental, social, and historical issues at Hanford, as well as current cleanup efforts, as well as broader concerns about how the U.S. Government and its citizens -- well, at least some of them, who've profited from war and environmental destruction -- have turned the atomic West into a national sacrifice area.

Hanford is an excellent case study for environmental study students because of the

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

59

1 convergence of so many social and environmental
2 issues, including risks to public health and
3 wildlife, indigenous rights, and contamination
4 that challenges us intellectually and
5 emotionally with its permanence -- let's just
6 be honest -- permanence on a time scale that we
7 can understand.
8 It's very intellectually interesting to
9 look at how discourses of national security,
10 Western science, and environmentalism have
11 shaped the current landscape at places like
12 Hanford; but, ultimately, my students left
13 feeling defeated, not knowing what kind of
14 meaningful action they could take about issues
15 like Hanford. And that was my failure, but I
16 think it was also yours and, you could even
17 say, the President's.
18 So during my class, we looked up Hanford
19 on YouTube, just a quick basic search, and
20 there was a video of -- the first video that
21 came up. It was a video of Obama at a stump
22 speech. Someone asked him about the Hanford
23 cleanup, and he said, "Actually, I don't know
24 what Hanford is, but you'd better believe that
25 I'll know by the time I get back on the bus."

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

60

Great answer from a politician. So could you please tell him what Hanford is. Maybe you have more of an influence on his awareness of these issues than I do.

I also wanted to just say I'm writing on the vast cover-up of environmental destruction and treaty violations that's represented by turning former nuclear sites in their buffer zones into wildlife refuges. And let's not even get into our treatment of animals and violations of the Endangered Species Act, which fails even when it's supposedly working. *380-1*

Just know that we in academia, in this community, and in the Northwest, are watching you, and we care. The failure to clean up the waste at Hanford, and the storage of more waste, absolutely encourage, support, and condone the creation of even more waste in this country and in other parts of the world, if initiative like the GNEP go through -- although I know that's sort of been tabled at this point.

Also, this would seem impractical, but putting scientists, engineers, and managers to work on these issues is not enough. We need *380-2*

380-1 As a NEPA document, this EIS has been prepared in an open manner, with opportunities for the public to comment provided at scoping meetings and public hearings on the draft EIS. The public will also have an opportunity to comment following publication of this *Final TC & WM EIS*.

Hanford was initially set aside as part of the Manhattan Project during World War II. It required vast open areas to provide security. As a consequence of this, only about 6 percent of the site is developed, leaving large areas that are in a more natural state. In fact, these areas of undisturbed land are quite rare in eastern Washington and, as a result, on June 9, 2000, the President, not DOE, issued a proclamation establishing the Hanford Reach National Monument (65 FR 37253) on approximately 78,900 hectares (195,000 acres) of the site. USFWS manages the monument under existing agreements with DOE. DOE recognizes the importance of rare habitat and species and follows the requirements set forth in the *Hanford Site Biological Resources Management Plan* (DOE 2001) on those portions of the site not managed by USFWS.

380-2 DOE appreciates the commentor's views on the need for "humanists" in the DOE workforce and more opportunities for public education and input. DOE strives for a diverse, well-balanced workforce and employs both social scientists and technical experts. To reach a broader public, DOE held additional public hearings in Spokane, Washington, and La Grande and Eugene, Oregon. The public hearing format included a 1-hour open house prior to each hearing that allowed the public to meet informally with members of the *TC & WM EIS* team, ask questions, and learn more about this EIS. Informative posters and factsheets also were provided at these open houses. In addition, DOE maintains a website (http://www.hanford.gov) to provide the public with information regarding project activities, including development of this *TC & WM EIS*. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

61

ethicists, historians, and other so-called humanists working for the DOE, as well as more opportunities for input from citizens who will, in every city where jobs aren't directly dependent on waste production and cleanup, deliver heartfelt speeches against actions like those taken at Hanford, based on their experience, religious, ethical, and moral traditions, as well as their feelings and intuitions -- all of which matter.

Please engage in more initiatives to educate the citizens you serve about what's going on at Hanford. Please choose alternatives that promote the health of people and ecosystems as well as peace. Thank you.

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

(Applause.)

JAMES PARHAM: Anyone who hasn't spoken, that would like to speak at this time? Yes, sir.

DAVID WALLA: Hi. I just wanted to thank everyone for being here. It's nice to see at least some people concerned about the future state of things.

My name is David Walla. I'm a University

380-2 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

62

of Oregon Ph.D. student in chemistry, new to Oregon. I actually rode my bike out here in the summer, because I was just wowed by the beauty of the Pacific Northwest.

And I was staring at the periodic table one day and looking at the element plutonium and realized that it's not naturally found on Earth. And so I started doing some searching and research and started -- came across the Hanover site and I was -- I mean, coming from out East, was completely unaware of what was going on and just felt like this information was not up front. I wasn't -- you know, I wasn't aware of intentional test releases; I was not aware of all the problems that happened back in the '50s, that we're still cleaning up with now, let alone putting more there.

But I just -- I don't know. I just want to reiterate what everybody else has said tonight, that capping is not enough, that these recommendations aren't sufficient to deal with the severity of the problem that exists right now. I mean, I've just been sitting here on the edge of tears, I guess, because I don't think that this is adequate enough. This is

381-1

381-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. This closure includes the tank system, along with the vadose zone as impacted by the tank farms (i.e., past leaks). Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

However, as discussed in the Summary, Section S.1.3.2, and Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2, of this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE will not make decisions on groundwater remediation, including the remediation of groundwater contamination resulting from non-tank-farm areas in the 200 Areas, because that is being addressed under the CERCLA (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) process. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford under the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

63

1 just going to -- This is saying we're content
2 with letting the shit hit the fan, and I don't
3 think that's okay. That's all I've got to say.
4 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else who
5 hasn't commented, who would like to? If not,
6 is there's anyone who's commented, who wants to
7 comment again? Yes, sir.
8 GERRY POLLET: The comments tonight have
9 been absolutely fabulous. And you can't stop
10 here, folks. We've got a lot of work to do.
11 So please, A, go home and commit to put on
12 your Facebook the link. You can use the link
13 from the hoanw.org, Heart of America Northwest,
14 and how to comment, and suggest to your friends
15 comments and give them some resources. Copy
16 your comments to the governor and to your
17 congressional delegation. Send a letter to the
18 editor.
19 We will do a follow-up e-mail to people
20 who are not on our list, to organize a meeting.
21 It was just suggested. And we'll do that with
22 people and we'll ask for the city council
23 members to join in commenting.
24 So let's not go home tonight and think
25 that we did it. Because I've been coming to

381-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

64

1 meetings since 1987, trying to get Hanford
2 cleaned up. We stopped Hanford from dumping
3 nuclear waste in unlined ditches. It took all
4 the way into 2004 and a lot of meetings.
5 The Energy Department has been seeking to
6 use Hanford as a national radioactive waste
7 dump since before 2000, and I think we've got
8 them where they understand that their
9 credibility is shot if they don't rescind their
10 decision to use Hanford as a national waste
11 dump, based on the evidence and the fact that
12 everyone, everyone, just sees right through
13 this claim that we have -- "Oh, trust us, we
14 have a moratorium. We promise not to ship
15 waste to Hanford till the vitrification plant
16 operates. Trust us" -- as if you should trust
17 the number one environmental law violator on
18 EPA's environmental (indiscernible) list for
19 the entire United States.
20 Okay. So go home, we'll do more meetings,
21 and please get the word out. Thank you for
22 being here.
23 JAMES PARHAM: Okay. Thank you.
24 LORETTA HUSTON: Just as a summary to
25 everything that we've all commented about: I

359-6

359-6 Commentor 359 (comments continued). DOE explained in the *WM PEIS* (DOE 1997) that additional analyses would be prepared to implement DOE's programmatic decisions. The *Draft TC & WM EIS* analyzed the potential environmental impacts associated with a number of proposed actions, including disposal of LLW and MLLW potentially shipped to Hanford from offsite DOE locations. Depending on the outcome of this *Final TC & WM EIS* and its ROD, DOE will evaluate whether additional NEPA reviews or updates to previous decisions are appropriate, as needed. Any additional NEPA reviews or considerations will be conducted consistent with CEQ and DOE NEPA requirements.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

65

would like to invite our politicians on a field trip, just -- not just to Hanford, but there's mountaintop removal. Take them to the sites, show them what is going on on this planet. It's not just -- We're a checkerboard, everything is piecemealed, it's all the same story. The earth, life, is under attack, and we need to bring our politicians here on planet Earth and show them what is happening right now. Because all these meetings and comments just don't seem to reach them.

JAMES PARHAM: Okay. Thank you.

MOSHE IMMERMAN: Thank you for the very loving and respectful way you've conducted this night. You guys are awesome. So thank you for being really human and caring. You're obviously deep, genuine listeners, and this is one of the best I've ever been to.

I'm a very practical person, and there's lots of practical people, but it's being bred out of our species as we move into virtual reality, sometimes. The sister just mentioned the idea of going on a field trip, to make the field trip very useful. How many people here have ever been to Hanford or talked to anybody

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

who works there? Show of hands. A tiny bit of you.

I was up in Yakima. Somebody said go to breakfast at a particular place. And there was a man there who looked very strong, very intelligent, on the verge of cancer; and he ran one of the highest waste processing facilities there. He told me some interesting stories.

What I encourage you to do is be ready for field trips and take them often up to Hanford to find out what's going. Pool your money, hold a party, and buy a Geiger counter, buy a really good Geiger counter. The Geiger counters that are normally bought by chem stores, the physics department, the environmental researchers at the University of Oregon are from Ludlum Measurements -- L-U-D-L-U-M, measurements. There's more expensive ones, that they say are not any better, from Everline. These are considered really reliable. The number for Ludlum Measurements is 325-235-5494 -- again, 325-235-5494. They're in Sweetwater, Texas. Nice people. The Nuclear Trigger is made in Texas and a lot of other things like that are

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

67

1 made in Texas.
2 If you get a Geiger counter, you can see
3 for yourself experientially what is going on as
4 you drive around the broader perimeter, you
5 know, and along the Columbia River. You might
6 be surprised. And do this just to document,
7 you know, doc it there in your PDA or your pad
8 what is going on. Okay. That's useful.
9 Number one.
10 Number two, I was given $100,000 worth of
11 a set of enzymes, a ton of them, to give to the
12 people of Chernobyl. I went to Jim Fahy, the
13 president of Biotec, in Hawaii, that used to
14 exist. And he gave me a paper that's never
15 been published, that he paid to have done in
16 Florida. And none of the people in this room
17 probably know about this -- I'm not boasting.
18 But his enzymes were given to GSA, DOD, so
19 forth, and they went into the most high-level
20 nuclear shelters for our highest government
21 officials. You can buy these in the store.
22 It's called Biotec, B-I-O-T-E-C, Cell Guard.
23 It may extend your life. They contain -- I
24 don't want to be technical, but it's relevant
25 -- methionine reductase, glutathione

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

peroxidase, superoxide dismutase and catalases. They'll protect your joints, your liver, things like that, but also they'll help reduce our risk for what we're exposed to.

Foodwise, one of the best things you can do is go to Friendly Street Market, get organic petite peas. Don't cook them; thaw them. They're loaded with superoxide dismutase. Have it around.

Practical level: America is very regional. And this region, this bioregion, Cascadia, is a little bit different, a little bit ahead of the curve. And I think that we make a commitment now: We don't like nuclear. Our fantastic congressperson, Peter DiFazio, he was involved with his prior congressman, Jim Weaver, stopping the five WPS plants. Now there's only one commercial nuke here. We've made our choice: We don't like that future. Vermont, just a couple days ago, made their choice. Their one commercial nuke, their Senate just a few days ago said, 24 to 3: "We're not relicensing it. You're done in 2012." Vermont, Oregon, and Washington are leading the way. The South and Southeast are

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

69

more conservative and, like I shared, for the most part, are less ecologically attuned. Again, I say, if they want to vote for, partly pay for, get federal money to pay for, a new commercial nuke future and all the insanity and danger that's in that, say: Charity begins at home. You take responsibility for it there. You take care of your waste in Georgia or wherever it is down there. Okay? We've made a different choice, and I think we should accentuate our regionalism. We have a terrific person here from our state energy department, and other great people here.

Another thing. I want to thank you very much for being so warm and intelligent and humane in the way you presented what the DOE does. I also know that there's different kinds of people at the DOE, and I don't think you're here to greenwash, but there are other people there that might not care about us as much as you do, and there's a slight of hand sometimes that goes on. So I'm not saying anything negative about you, but I'm saying there's all kinds of people there. I've been a park ranger in four national parks, as a biologist and

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

70

incident commander of interagency federal investigation teams protecting national parks. There's lots of different kinds of people.

The other thing is: For heaven's sake, do everything you can to get online, go to the science laboratory at the University of Oregon or OSU, and read everything you can about human biology related to radiation. There's so much there. There's really so much there, and most of us, including me, know very little about it. I used to study the biology of nuclear war at Williams College, using federal documents, and what I saw there was like just this vast reality -- or unreality. But we don't think about it enough. But we need to have powwows, we need to have teach-ins where we teach each other about the real effects of radiation; and once you do that, you realize the only thing to do is 99.999 percent of what's already there at Hanford, and not to add anything more. And the one big reason why I say "add nothing more" is we're in this crucial thing now where they want to build, what, 34 or 40 some odd new commercial nukes in the country, and if we say moratorium on any new waste for the next 20

365-4

365-4 Commentor 365 (comments continued). The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all of the SST system. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

See response to comment 365-2 for more information on transportation and disposal of offsite waste.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

71

years, we'll force everyone to take responsibility where they are, force our brother Barack Obama, who's mostly a good man, to take responsibility, and say, "Hi, we're not just shoving it off to the desert where they get these Richter 9.5 earthquakes." We're saying, "Take care of it at home. You're not sending it here, because we want a minimum two decade moratorium on anything new."

Thanks for your patience and your love.

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Okay. Anyone else who wants to comment?

JESHUA HUBBARD: Hello. I'm another University of Oregon student. My name is Jeshua Hubbard, and I just want to say that this whole issue is definitely a matter of education. And we call this the information age, but I feel like we have a very problematic situation of not having people know the information, what's actually going on here.

And I think anyone in their right mind, that actually knew what was going on, the effects of nuclear waste on all life on the entire planet, everyone would want to be cleaned up completely, everyone would want to

382-1

382-1 The public hearings on the *Draft TC & WM EIS* were intended not only to collect comments, but to inform and educate the public as well. In addition to a DOE presentation at the beginning of each public hearing, an hour was provided before each hearing to allow the public to ask questions of staff who supported the development of this EIS. Posters and factsheets were made available at each hearing as well. The Hanford website is also available (http://www.hanford.gov) that informs the public of project activities, including development of this *TC & WM EIS*. This *TC & WM EIS* addresses proposed actions to retrieve, treat, and dispose of Hanford tank waste; decommission FFTF; and expand waste disposal capacity at Hanford to provide for disposal of on- and offsite DOE waste. The complete elimination and cleanup of all nuclear waste is beyond the scope of this EIS.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

eliminate nuclear waste completely, and not have any of it continue at all.

And so I just want to say that this can't end here, and every single person needs to know what's going on before anyone makes any decision to the best of our ability to be able to make that kind of thing happen. If it means making Saturday morning cartoons about it, you know, to teach our children about it, we need to do everything we can to get it out there; otherwise, no one can really make an informed decision about what to do about it. That's all I have to say.

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

JESHUA HUBBARD: And thank you.

KATHY GING: I would like to add two more comments: One, for those of us who were in the anti-nuclear power business and nonprofit community and activist community 30 years ago, it was found out that if they built the other 70 nuclear power plants they wanted to build in this country, it would have used all the available fresh water in the country, without any fresh water being available for agricultural use.

382-1 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

73

1 And I have to agree with the people that
2 criticized your plan for the lack of attention
3 to climate. Even the Washington state studies
4 that showed that the snow pack would be
5 declining -- and I think we're down 12 inches
6 just in Eugene for the rain year that ended
7 this past October, and wells are already going
8 down. So I think we have to look at the water
9 use for nuclear plants and the cooling rods and
10 all --
11 And, second, I want to refer to you a book
12 called "Small is Profitable," by Rocky Mountain
13 Institute. And smallisprofitable.org is the
14 Web site. In there, you will find 207 reasons
15 why distributed utilities and distributed
16 energy is the modus operandi of how to get
17 energy out to the people. And Rocky Mountain
18 Institute of course was hired by the Department
19 of Defense to try to figure out how to make the
20 DOD energy independent regarding fossil fuels
21 and all that by the year 2050.
22 But there, again, smallisprofitable.org.
23 There's a $30 PDF or a $70 paperback, and all
24 207 reasons are printed in the frontispiece of
25 the back cover of the book, so you don't even

364-5

364-5 Commentor 364 (comments continued). Regarding the effects of climate change on various resources at Hanford and the possible effects on environmental impacts of the Tank Closure and Waste Management alternatives considered in this EIS, DOE has reviewed and revised, as necessary, its analyses on the effects of climate change on various resources at Hanford and the possible effects on environmental impacts of the *TC & WM EIS* alternatives. As described in Chapter 6, Section 6.3.4, DOE has reviewed climate studies that forecast general trends in Hanford regional climate change. However, there are no reliable methodologies for projections of specific future climate changes in the Hanford region, and thus such changes have not been quantified in this EIS. To account for this uncertainty, Appendix O, Section O.6.2, describes the effects of enhanced infiltration such as that which may occur during a wetter climate. In the *Draft TC & WM EIS*, Appendix V focused on the potential impacts of a rising water table from a proposed Black Rock Reservoir. Following the retraction of this proposal, the focus of Appendix V was changed to analyze potential impacts of infiltration increases resulting from climate change under three different scenarios. Appendix V includes sensitivity analyses of potential impacts at Hanford that could result from climate changes that may increase model boundary recharge parameters and the rise of the groundwater table. Additional qualitative discussion of the potential effects of climate change on human health, erosion, water resources, air quality, ecological resources, and environmental justice has been added to Chapter 6 of this final EIS. Additional discussion of the types of regional climate change that could be expected has also been added to Chapter 6, Section 6.5.2, Global Climate Change. The potential impacts of the alternatives on climate change are addressed in Chapter 6, Section 6.5.2, and Appendix G, Section G.5, of this *TC & WM EIS*.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

74

have to read the whole book to get the 207 reasons. The point is that we, back in the '70s, doing energy activism, knew that decentral power was the way to go, and the petro-geographic agenda prevented that from happening. We've got to wake up and see that this is the time to start this again, the nuclear -- I mean, the anti-nuclear and more of solar energy. Thank you.

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.

LOUISA HAMACHEK: I'm Louisa Hamachek returning up here. I wanted to -- While I'm in my home watershed, I wanted to reiterate the sense of stewardship that I have as a Eugenian for the Columbia River, as we're on the Willamette, that's a tributary of the Columbia. And we're doing all that we can here to keep it clean and safe, and it's insulting, and we feel -- we feel responsible for it all the way to the sea and then out from Astoria out to the ocean. That it has to join up with the Columbia River nuclear waste in the river is exhausting for the work that we're doing.

My concern is also about the pesticides that are used, in the agricultural world, of

367-3

367-3 Commentor 367 (comments continued). The current distribution of radionuclides and organic chemicals in and around Hanford is discussed in detail in annually published groundwater monitoring reports and environmental monitoring reports (Poston, Duncan, and Dirkes 2011). The current distribution of pesticides in the mid-Columbia basin is not well documented. The issue of pesticide distribution from agriculture is commonly referred to as a "non-point source" problem, and methods for dealing with such problems in general are not well developed in environmental modeling and monitoring. In this *TC & WM EIS*, the concentrations of a number of COPCs from hundreds of point sources are calculated at selected lines of analysis (i.e., the tank farm barrier boundaries, the Core Zone Boundary, and the Columbia River nearshore). In the human health calculation, the doses to a human receptor resulting from those concentrations are calculated. All of the chemicals and radionuclides that are known or suspected to have carcinogenic impacts contribute to the calculated incremental risk of developing a cancer over a 70-year lifetime. All of the chemicals and radionuclides that have toxic impacts contribute to the calculated Hazard Index.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

75

1 our valley and how they will be affected when
2 blended with the radioactive waste, and I'd
3 like to hear what the chemical reaction is.
4 Likewise, what's up-river of Hanford -- in
5 a sense up-river, but not really -- up the
6 Snake River in Idaho is the INEL, the Idaho
7 Nuclear --
8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The Idaho National
9 Engineering Laboratory.
10 LOUISA HAMACHEK: -- the Idaho National
11 Engineering Laboratory. It's changed its name
12 over the years.
13 But, anyway, I was wondering if, in your
14 studies, you are taking note of the radioactive
15 pollution that's gone into the Snake River from
16 INEL navy projects and what the combined effect
17 of that is into the Columbia from the Hanford
18 waste. And if that can be disclosed to the
19 public, I would appreciate that.
20 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Sir, are you
21 wanting to make a comment?
22 MICHAEL GANNON: Yes. Thank you. For
23 letting us add.
24 I realized that my little example of
25 Sputnik was not very clear, and I wanted to

367-3 cont'd

367-4

367-4 As described in Chapter 3, surface water along the Snake River is sampled for gross alpha, gross beta, and tritium. In 2006, gross alpha was not detected in any of the samples. Tritium was detected at concentrations well below the Idaho primary constituent standards and the EPA MCL for tritium of 20,000 picocuries per liter. Gross beta was measured at concentrations well below the EPA gross beta screening level of 50 picocuries per liter in drinking water. Concentrations are consistent with those measured in the past and cannot be differentiated from concentrations of natural radionuclides and from worldwide fallout. Therefore, there is no indication that activities at INL have contributed significant contamination to the Snake River, and evaluation of cumulative impacts is unwarranted.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

76

1 make sure that you understood and the people
2 here understood that Sputnik -- when I compare
3 Sputnik to the leakage of contamination and
4 radioactive contamination into the Columbia,
5 that's our Sputnik today, here. Because
6 Sputnik, when I was in high school, scared the
7 nation and resulted in a massive investment by
8 the federal government and educating people and
9 developing the space program, which, under
10 President Kennedy, went to the moon. So people
11 thought it was impossible and Kennedy was
12 crazy. So it's very easy for many of us to be
13 thought of in the same way.
14 And what we're really saying, I think, and
15 I'm trying also now to coalesce or reaffirm
16 some of the other comments, is that this
17 incredibly bewildering, complex problem can be
18 solved, but we're not satisfied that you're
19 trying to solve it. We want way higher
20 priority made for the solution of this problem.
21 And I also suggested that the solution was to
22 talk to the rest of the state, like everybody
23 here, and get -- and in a sense educate the
24 state, the nation, the world, to what's going
25 on, so that we have an understanding, a much

366-2

366-2 Commentor 366 (comments continued). Both DOE and Congress are committed to cleanup efforts at Hanford, and DOE continues to seek funding for these efforts. DOE also appreciates the commentor's concern regarding public awareness of Hanford activities. The public hearings on the *Draft TC & WM EIS* were intended not only to collect comments, but to inform and educate the public. In addition to a DOE presentation at the beginning of each public meeting, an hour was provided before each meeting to allow the public to ask questions of staff who supported the development of this EIS. Posters and factsheets were made available at each meeting as well. In addition, the Hanford website is available to the public (http://www.hanford.gov) to provide information regarding project activities, including development of this *TC & WM EIS*.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

77

more complex understanding, of how nuclear elements work. *366-2 cont'd*

So I wanted to also say that I -- that I think that the percent of waste that you're proposing to clean up is confusing. And I think that maybe the standard, not the percent of waste that you clean up, but the percent of radiation creating -- or radioactive wastes that you clean up, so that the volume is not confused with the radioactivity, and that way, I think -- well, I guess that's pretty clear. *366-3*

The other thing I wanted to point out is that the attitude and approach to nuclear power in this country, nuclear activity, has not been labor intensive. And so what I'm suggesting by an educational program similar to what the nation did after Sputnik is labor intensive; and at this particular moment in our history, we're looking for things people could do.

So I think that the actual conduct of the hearing is like a tiny step in that direction, and so we need to ask ourselves: Why aren't you having this in Roseburg High School? And why aren't you having it in Florence High School? That's why I mentioned a little bit of *366-4*

366-3 While a generic parameter that could characterize the residual waste could possibly be defined and provided, it would be difficult because the tank waste constituents include a host of both radioactive and chemical constituents. Therefore, DOE has chosen to provide a number of tables in Appendix D that quantify, by COPC, the radioactive and chemical constituents in curies and grams, respectively. For example, for the 99.9 percent retrieval case, Tables D–18 and D–19 provide the residual radioactive inventory in curies and Tables D–24 and D–25 provide the residual chemical inventory in grams.

366-4 In response to requests from interest groups for additional public hearings on the *Draft TC & WM EIS*, hearings were added in Spokane, Washington, and La Grande and Eugene, Oregon. DOE tried to choose locations for these hearings that were convenient to as many citizens as possible. For those who could not attend the *Draft TC & WM EIS* hearings, the Hanford website (http://www.hanford.gov) is available to inform the public regarding project activities, including development of this *TC & WM EIS*, through factsheets and other informative materials.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

78

1 my history about growing up in the Rogue River.
2 So I don't want to hear about trucks crossing
3 the Rogue River and falling off into the Rogue
4 River so that the contamination there is
5 similar to the Columbia River or the Umpqua
6 River or the Siuslaw River or the John Day
7 River, and on and on. And that isn't in the
8 impact statement, and it isn't in the analysis.
9 And so I would -- at a minimum, I would
10 ask you and staff people for the agencies
11 working on this to go back and ask that all of
12 these posters be reproduced and sent down to
13 Eugene and Salem. Let the Oregon Department of
14 Energy have duplicate copies of them so we can
15 circulate them throughout the state of Oregon.
16 And I suggest that, really, we need to do that
17 across the nation, because it is --
18 Well, maybe one of the other things I
19 don't think we really addressed sufficiently
20 here tonight was that this was where the
21 plutonium was created to destroy the Japanese
22 military machine, and, in the process, an
23 extraordinary number of citizens died. So the
24 legacy of Hanford is pretty gloomy, and it is
25 -- I think it's absolutely necessary for us to

366-4 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

Public Hearing March 1, 2010

79

1 come out from under that cloud of darkness, and
2 the only way to do it is to clean up the plant, 366-5
3 clean it up entirely.
4 The other thing that's happening there,
5 not only is the negative history of it, but the
6 continuation of the hearings -- and some people
7 have brought this up, but I just want to
8 emphasize it again -- the continuation of the
9 hearings, the continuation of the expenditures,
10 to analyze how to clean it up, proceeds while
11 the rest of the -- many parts of the rest of
12 the nation think it's possible to have safe
13 nuclear energy. And so if there's no action
14 deadline to clean it up, then it permits that
15 other discussion that we can nuclear energy to
16 continue. That's unacceptable.
17 JAMES PARHAM: Thank you.
18 (Applause.)
19 MOSHE IMMERMAN: I have an extremely brief
20 comment, if you don't mind.
21 If we look at the unlined trenches and
22 pits and assume that there's stable terrain
23 there, stable geomorphology there, that's an 365-1 cont'd
24 incorrect assumption. And so if they're capped
25 but unlined, what happens if there is a large

366-5 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. This closure includes the tank system, along with the vadose zone as impacted by the tank farms (i.e., past leaks). Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

seismic event? What happens if the cap is breached and then you have water coming down through it?

So, please, in your analyses, in the -- I guess it's called in the corporate and informally in the military world, in your scenario planning, look at what kind of seismic events have occurred over the last several thousand years in that Hanford area, and what would it do to the pits that are not in optimal care. Thanks for your patience.

365-1 cont'd

JAMES PARHAM: Thank you. Thank you for coming out this evening, and I think that concludes the hearing. So thank you very much. Thanks to everyone that came out tonight and spent their evening here with us. Thank you.

(HEARING CONCLUDED AT 9:44 P.M.)

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Eugene, Oregon, Public Hearing (March 1, 2010)

CERTIFICATE

I, MARILYNN T. HOOVER, a Registered Professional Reporter and an Oregon Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing hearing before the moderator was reported by me in shorthand and thereafter transcribed by means of computer-aided transcription.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in the said hearing, nor am in any way interested in the outcome of said hearing.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 8th day of March 2010

/s/ Marilynn T. Hoover

MARILYNN T. HOOVER, RPR
OR CSR LICENSE NO. 04-0387

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT
ENVIORNMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

March 8, 2010
6:00 p.m.

Seattle Center
305 Harrison Street
Seattle, Washington 98109

Mr. James Parham, Facilitator

PANEL MEMBERS:

Ms. Mary Beth Burandt, U.S. Department of Energy.
Office of River Protection
Mr. Jeff Lyon, Washington State Departement of Ecology,
Hanford Project Office

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DRAFT TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

FORMAL COMMENT SESSION

1	Toby Nixon	4	19
2	Eva Kosmas	6	22
3	Elizabeth Heffron	7	8
4	Lisa Van Dyk	8	5
5	Lisa Lightner	9	7
6	Janice Faris	9	25
7	David Ortman	11	17
8	Cherie Eichholz	14	6
9	Thomas Buchanan	16	21
10	Michael Baron	20	6
11	Joan Lawson	21	21
12	Al Rasmussen	22	25
13	Valerie Shubert	23	25
14	Bobbie Morgan	25	5
15	Adrian Villarreal	26	8
16	Robert Stagman	28	19
17	Oliver Bazinet	30	11
18	Richard Frith	31	11
19	Dorli Rainey	33	21
20	Richard Ellison	34	20

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

21	Lane Rasberry	38	7
22	Casey Howard	40	8
23	Kate Hellenthal	40	24
24	Frank Zucher	42	1
25	Jacinta Heath	43	4
26	Reed O'Beirne	44	21
27	Carol Isaac	46	20
28	Phoebe Warren	49	6
29	Merry Ann Peterson	51	8
30	Roxy Giddings	51	13
31	Ryan Jarvis	54	4
32	Helga Kahr	55	24
33	Brian Bessembinders	57	24
34	Ruth Yarrow	60	17
35	Barbara Zepeda	62	8
36	Jim Kelley	64	25
37	Fred Miller	67	6
38	Richard Heggen	69	9
39	Jim Dipeso	70	23
40	Gerry Pollet	71	23
41	Lane Rasberry	75	8
42	Carol Isaac	76	11

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

4

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. So we are going to get started with that, okay. I have said this a couple of times, three minutes on comments, period.

This is a -- you have heard a lot of people up here talk, now it is time for you to talk. Our first person to speak is someone who has already been up and that is Gerry Pollet from Heart of America Northwest.

Gerry, do you want to make any additional comments?

MS. POLLET: I prefer someone else and I will come back.

MR. PARHAM: He will come back.

Richard Heggen, any additional comments at this time?

MR. HEGGEN: Not at this time.

MR. PARHAM: Okay, thank you.

Next, Toby Nixon.

MR. NIXON: I am Toby Nixon from Kirkland, Washington, former state representative for the 45th Legislative District of Washington, member of the board of directors of Heart of America Northwest, and former board member for Republicans for Environmental Protection.

We just saw the results of a magnitude 319-1

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

319-1 Eastern Washington State is not at all geologically or seismically similar to the Concepción, Chile, area, which suffered the worst effects of the February 27, 2010, magnitude 8.8 earthquake. That earthquake was centered offshore of Chile's Maule region and on an active crustal subduction zone where the oceanic Nazca Plate dives beneath the South American Plate, a process that continues to give rise to the Andes Mountains. That region has a long history of producing great (magnitude greater than 8.0) earthquakes, including the largest earthquake ever instrumentally recorded, the May 22, 1960, magnitude 9.5 earthquake that occurred offshore, south of Concepción. The geologic setting of Hanford is somewhat different because the site is located a greater distance from the subduction zone offshore of Washington State.

Chapter 3, Section 3.2.5.1.1, of this *TC & WM EIS* depicts and discusses the locations of geologic faults relative to Hanford and their potential for producing earthquakes. Further, Section 3.2 discusses the historical seismicity of the Hanford region, including the frequency and magnitude of historic and recent earthquakes, as well as the most recent seismic risk estimates for Hanford. As noted by the commentor and discussed in Section 3.2, NRC ascribed a maximum earthquake magnitude of 6.5 to the faults associated with the Rattlesnake-Wallula alignment that traverses the southwestern portion of Hanford. It should be noted that earthquake magnitude scales are logarithmic in nature rather than linear. As such, compared to the maximum theoretical earthquake of magnitude 6.5 referenced by the commentor, the February 27, 2010, Chilean earthquake was nearly 200 times bigger in amplitude, but over 2,800 times stronger in the amount of energy released. This is based on formulae for comparing relative earthquake sizes and strengths used by USGS. Further, recent site-specific seismic hazard analyses indicate that an earthquake producing a peak horizontal (ground) acceleration of 0.2 *g* has an annual probability of occurrence of 1 in 2,500 (i.e., once every 2,500 years) in the central Hanford 200 Area location. DOE Order 420.1B and its implementing standards require nuclear and nonnuclear facilities to be designed, constructed, and operated to safeguard the facility, public, workers, and environment from natural phenomena hazards, including earthquakes.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

5

8.8 earthquake in Chile. It was quite impressive and we just learned in the newspaper today that the city of Concepcion actually moved ten feet west, so we can see -- and our area is geologically similar to that area -- that my understanding is that the draft EIS shows that there is an earthquake fault right on the site that could produce up to a magnitude 6.5 earthquake right on the Hanford site, so imagine what that kind of a quake would produce in the way of disturbance of the soil, liquefaction, those types of things.

I think it is terribly irresponsible for us to even consider leaving any of this radioactive waste behind when the potential for a very large earthquake, it could happen today, we are told it happens about every 300 years in this area and it has been 300 years since the last one. We owe it to the future generations to do everything we can to clean up our mess as much as possible. We need to remove 99.9 percent or more of the waste from the tanks and not leave it behind, and that is to be simply in compliance with Washington State law. We need to have a clean closure and restoration of the Hanford site as much as possible to what it was before the Department of Defense took it over.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

319-1 cont'd

319-2

319-2 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. This closure includes the tank system, along with the vadose zone as impacted by the tank farms (i.e., past leaks). Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

However, as discussed in the Summary, Section S.1.3.2, and Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2, of this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE will not make decisions on groundwater remediation, including the remediation of groundwater contamination resulting from non-tank-farm areas in the 200 Areas, because that is being addressed under the CERCLA (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) process. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford under the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

6

You have got to keep in mind, back on the earthquake issue, they didn't choose that site because of its geological stability, they chose it because of plentiful cold water, plentiful electricity and its remoteness so they could just move everybody off the site. Geological stability just wasn't the issue.

319-1 cont'd

I have recently, just to conclude my comments, read an article in the IEEE Spectrum magazine in which they talked about the deep geological storage of radioactive materials in Finland. And Finland isn't, you know, considered to be a real conservative area, they're very concerned about radioactive materials there, too, and yet they, in Finland, have figured out how to deal with this kind of a problem. We are a wealthier country, we are at least as smart as the Fins, we should be able to figure this out, too, and I expect that the Department of Energy and the Department of Ecology to do exactly that. Thank you.

319-3

MR. PARHAM: Thank you, sir. Next up is Eva Kosmos, and after Eva will be Jim Kelley. So, Eva.

MS. KOSMAS: I am Eva Kosmas, I am from Portland, Oregon, and I just have a real quick statement. I feel that clean closure is the best solution to this issue and is the absolute best to

320-1

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

319-3 Regarding the commentor's concern about the disposition of HLW, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

320-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all of the SST system. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

7

1 preserve the health and safety of our environment and
2 the future populations of the Pacific Northwest. If
3 99.9 percent cleanup is a possibility, which it is,
4 then it is the best and should be the only solution.
5 MR. PARHAM: Thank you.
6 Jim Kelley, followed by Elizabeth Heffron.
7 Jim? No? How about Elizabeth, are you here?
8 MS. HEFFRON: Hi, I'm Elizabeth Heffron, I am
9 a writer and a teacher and I live in Washington State
10 with my husband and two children. I feel it is
11 extremely important that Governor Gregoire and you
12 guys with the Washington State Department of Ecology
13 take an active, not a passive stance in protecting
14 current and future Washington citizens. I think you
15 should take all steps necessary to fight for a full
16 cleanup of the existing waste, so that includes a
17 clean closure of the tanks and cleaning up all of that
18 soil that is under those tanks and everywhere else in
19 those unlined ditches.
20 I also would like you to do everything in
21 your power to prevent the DOE from importing
22 additional off-site waste to Hanford, no matter what
23 classification it is. Over the last 50 years,
24 Washington citizens have taken on more than their fair
25 share of the hazards from our national nuclear

320-1 cont'd

321-1

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

321-1 Ecology's foreword, located in the front section of this *TC & WM EIS*, provides information on Ecology's role as a cooperating agency in the development of this EIS.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

8

1 policies. It is time for our state to stand up and
2 say "no more." Thank you.
3 MR. PARHAM: Thank you.
4 Lisa? After Lisa, will be Lisa Lightner.
5 MS. VAN DYK: Hi, I am Lisa Van Dyk, I am a
6 field organizer at Heart of America Northwest. I just
7 wanted to thank the Department of Energy for holding
8 eight hearings on this document, even though I am
9 absolutely exhausted after organizing for all of them,
10 and thank everyone who's here for coming out tonight.
11 The more I learn about this EIS, and I've
12 written down some of the more detailed written
13 comments later, but as a resident of Washington, I am
14 simply stunned. When I look at the maps of
15 groundwater of contamination in the EIS, it is
16 extremely obvious that Hanford is an inappropriate
17 location for a national radioactive waste dump. It
18 simply doesn't make any sense that the Department of
19 Energy is taking this decades old plan to import waste
20 to Hanford. That is assuming that DOE has looked at
21 the impact analysis in the EIS. So tonight, I just
22 have a few points.
23 Empty the tanks to the limit of technology,
24 which is 99.9 percent or more; do not leave the tanks
25 and tank leaks in the ground where they will only

321-1 cont'd

322-1

322-2

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

322-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

322-2 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

9

contaminate the groundwater again in the future; vitrify all of the waste; and please, make an enforceable ban on no off-site waste coming to Hanford. Thank you. *322-2 cont'd* *322-1 cont'd*

MR. PARHAM: Lisa Lightner. After Lisa will be Janice Faris.

MS. LIGHTNER: Thank you. My name is Lisa Lightner, I am a resident of Seattle, Washington. Upon learning the history of Hanford, I have found that there are way too many examples of the US DOE using flawed and piecemeal EIS reports and not following through with what is necessary to protect our health and our environment. We need clean closure. The preferred alternative does not go far enough. The reason for not using clean closure is risk to workers, but I wonder what impact and risks to further generations will follow. Somehow this seems more of a political play than a concern for our future and our generations -- and following generations. But most importantly, do not add off-site waste to this site. Not in ten years, not ever. *323-1* *323-2*

MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

Janice Faris. After Janice will be David Ortman.

MS. FARIS: I am Janice Faris from Renton,

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

323-1 Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

323-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

10

Washington. I have had many friends and relatives who were so-called downwinders, who were cut from here down to their chest when they were 18 years old to remove cancerous tumors and their thyroid gland. Okay.

Passing on nuclear waste to future generations is cruel. It is our moral responsibility to not create more waste and to treat and dispose of current waste in the safest manner possible. That means on-site, not hauling radioactive waste down the freeway to Idaho National Lab or bringing more to Hanford. We all know the hazards involved with highway travel and with rail travel, too. Given the vulnerability of any cargo container that is in motion, one can easily imagine it to be a perfect target for a terrorist or mentally unstable person, to say nothing of weather-related accidents or driver error -- which, of course, never happens.

So what about the vitrification plant? How many years behind and millions of dollars overbudget is it? How are the design plans coming? These are all rhetorical questions. Are there design plans or does it continue to be design-as-you-go, or should we really be calling it the Forever Project? We have all feared an insane sociopathic leader whose finger could

324-1

324-2

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

324-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

324-2 DOE is working diligently to bring the WTP online to treat the tank waste at the site as soon as possible. Chapter 1, Section 1.2, provides a brief history and background on DOE's efforts to reduce costs and speed up Hanford cleanup efforts. As discussed in the *TC & WM EIS* Summary, Chapter 1, and Chapter 2, this EIS analyzes additional waste treatment capability that includes expanding the vitrification process capability currently being constructed in the WTP or supplementing the WTP's capability with supplemental treatment technologies. Thus, decisions to be made by DOE regarding whether to treat all waste in the WTP, as is or expanded, or to supplement its capacity by adding new treatment capability depend on demonstrating the feasibility of supplemental treatment technologies. As noted in the Summary, Section S.3.1.4, and Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2.2, of this *TC & WM EIS*, the WTP is currently being constructed in Hanford's 200-East Area. Site work associated with the project began in late 2001. As of early 2012, construction was more than 62 percent complete. Details regarding the WTP are provided in Appendix E, including design, processes, waste-form performance, waste forms/disposal packages, assumptions, and uncertainties.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

ignite a worldwide nuclear war, but now we are faced with an insane sociopathic alternative presented by DOE which are just as fatal. "This is the way the world ends. This is the way the world ends. This is the way the world ends. Not with a bang but a whimper," T.S. Elliott.

Check out how-to websites and books to learn how radioactive contamination acts on all living cells. Google depleted uranium and birth defects in Fallujah to see what uses our spent nuclear waste have been put to. I think once you are informed, you will agree that the use of depleted uranium should be declared a crime against humanity, as should many of these DOE alternatives. Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: David Ortman. And after David will be Robert MacDonald.

MR. ORTMAN: Thank you. My name is David Ortman, I live here in Seattle, Washington, and after following Hanford issues for about 35 years, I have concluded that Hanford must stand for half-ass energy foot-dragging on radioactive decontamination. Three minutes to cover 6,000 --

MR. BLANK: That is brilliant.

MS. BLANK: Could you say that again?

MR. ORTMAN: You can put it on a bumper

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

12

sticker.

Three minutes for 6,000 pages is a bit formidable, so let me just cover four short points here. One is looking through the summary and the DOE material, Department of Energy material that is out there, it is very clear they have a preference for the word closure, not cleanup. I think most members of the public would be surprised to learn that somehow these tanks are still open for business. I think there was an assumption that these tanks had long since been closed, and the use of the term closure, I think, just simply muddied the water in terms of what it is really needed, which is cleanup, because the time for cleanup is now and no new waste should be imported into Hanford. *325-1*

Secondly, there is virtually nothing except for the occasional pretty picture on the Columbia River. The ecology documents talk about things that have leaked and where waste may reach the Columbia River, but even the history of Hanford in the summary document really has nothing about the Columbia River, which is one of the main things we are trying to protect. *325-2*

Third is you have to go through those 6,000 pages all the way through Appendix Q to find out any *325-3*

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

325-1 The purpose of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze the potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve and treat the Hanford tank waste; close the Hanford SST system; store and/or dispose of the waste generated from these tank waste activities; decommission FFTF; and expand or upgrade waste management capabilities to support ongoing and planned waste management activities for on- and offsite waste to facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites. In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. However, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

325-2 The Summary is intended to provide a brief overview of the material contained in this *TC & WM EIS*, and cannot, by nature, include all topics of interest to individual parties. More information on the Columbia River can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.6.1, of this EIS, which describes the water resources at Hanford, including the Columbia River.

325-3 The Summary is intended to provide a brief overview of what is contained in the *Draft TC & WM EIS* and cannot, by nature, include all topics of interest to individual parties. To assist the public in navigating through the information presented in this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE has issued a Reader's Guide. This guide serves as an introduction and guide to the contents of this EIS, highlights the key features of the reasonable alternatives, and provides references to specific sections of the document to assist the reader in reviewing the technical analyses presented.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

13

1 useful information or useful can be about half-lives
2 of the radionuclides that are filtering through the
3 groundwater and elsewhere. This type of information
4 needs to be summarized and put into the summary and
5 into the fact sheets in a much better fashion so
6 people can understand what is at risk, not having to
7 plow through to some Appendix Q in some Alice and
8 Wonderland hole to find out what is going on.
9 Finally, although there is a mention that the
10 Bureau of Reclamation's EIS in the Yakima Basin water
11 storage has determined that no new irrigation dams in
12 the Yakima Basin has had a positive benefit cost
13 ratio, which is no kidding, including the proposed
14 black water project, the Yakima Irrigation District
15 lobbied the Bureau of Reclamation not to make a
16 finding record of decision on this particular
17 conclusion, which simply keeps the door open, and I am
18 here to tell you that former Congressman Sid Morrison
19 has not given up on this project and this is going to
20 come back and I would like to encourage both Ecology
21 and Department of Energy to keep the lid on that
22 particular irrigation proposal as it would potentially
23 have an adverse impact on Hanford as water may seep
24 out of the dam through Hanford and take things back.
25 Thank you very much for the opportunity and we will

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

325-3 cont'd

325-4

325-4 Chapter 1, Section 1.10, of this *TC & WM EIS* describes the results of the *Final Planning Report/Environmental Impact Statement, Yakima River Basin Water Storage Feasibility Study, Yakima Project, Washington* (BOR 2008), stating that the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation identified the No Action Alternative as the Preferred Alternative, which, in effect, canceled the Black Rock Reservoir project.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

1 see what happens next.
2 MR. PARHAM: Robert MacDonald? Robert?
3 Robert MacDonald? No? Cherie Eichholz, from
4 Physicians of Washington, and after Cherie will be
5 Thomas Buchanan.
6 MS. EICHHOLZ: Hello, my name is
7 Cherie Eichholz, I am with Washington Physicians for
8 Social Responsibility, I am the executive director.
9 PSR is a nonprofit advocacy organization that is a
10 medical and public health voice for policies to
11 prevent nuclear war and proliferation and to slow,
12 stop or reverse global warming and toxic degradation
13 of the environment.
14 As a public organization, we represent
15 approximately 5,000 health care professionals
16 throughout Washington State. We have worked hard to
17 promote the safe, effective and timely cleanup of the
18 Hanford Nuclear Reservation and to educate the public
19 regarding the disastrous consequences of nuclear
20 weapons. We strongly believe that failing to take
21 action today is a prescription for a deadly future.
22 In addition to my work at PSR, I'm a veteran
23 of the US Army. I served in 2003 and 2004, and since
24 serving, I have had the opportunity to meet many other
25 veterans, including many poisoned by depleted uranium

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

15

and Agent Orange. These men and women carry these effects of these poisons, and some may have cancer, others have had trouble conceiving children. These veterans carry scars similar to many residents of the Columbia corridor who have been poisoned by waste hidden on the Hanford Reservation which has seeped into the soil and water. Most veterans who have been poisoned by DU or Agent Orange had no choice in the matter, nor did the native victims of those respective countries, but the people of Washington State have a choice.

The EIS as presented and if it's accepted will poison hundreds of people in the near future and thousands within a generation. In effect, in accepting this EIS, we will sign the death sentence for thousands when other alternatives are available.

What specifically am I advocating? I am asking that this panel and the powers that be consider this EIS with an eye on the future and respect for the millions of people who will be impacted. Permitting anything less than 99.9 percent of tank waste to be removed would be a danger to public health and unconscionable. Using the clean closure standards is the best way to protect current and future generations.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

326-1

326-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of the SST system. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*. With respect to public and occupational health effects of normal operations and facility accidents, the commentor is referred to the discussion presented in Chapter 4, Section 4.1.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

16

In addition, the idea of transporting hazardous waste to Hanford should be taken off of the table. The dangers to those who live along the shipping roads, coupled with the risks associated with adding additional waste to a still contaminated area make this an unreasonable proposal. Hanford cleanup must center on removing the toxic threat that already exists and is still not adequately dealt with.

Veterans know that war is easy to start, hard to stop, and that those most often hurt are bystanders, and physicians similarly recognize that taking action after the fact or after harm has been caused is a poor second choice to taking preventive action. I urge the US DOE to consider the standards involved and take action that prevents further harm. Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Thomas Buchanan, and after Thomas Buchanan will be Amy Easton.

MR. BUCHANAN: Can I face the people?

MR. PARHAM: Just there.

MR. BUCHANAN: My name is Thomas Buchanan, also with Physicians for Social Responsibility. Thank you to the panel for at least giving citizens of this Seattle area a time to comment on the 6,000-page document. But let's be perfectly clear about some of

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

326-2

326-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Based on the public's input and concerns about offsite waste disposal at Hanford, DOE has included in this *Final TC & WM EIS* an example of a potential mitigation measure that could be taken. Specifically, an offsite waste stream containing a significant inventory of iodine-129 (i.e., RH-LLW resins from INL) was eliminated from the analysis. This mitigation measure has been incorporated into the Waste Management alternatives.

In addition, a sensitivity analysis is included that shows the impacts of limiting offsite waste streams containing iodine-129 and technetium-99. The results of this sensitivity analysis illustrate the difference this would make in potential groundwater impacts and are included in Appendix M. Other mitigation measures, such as recycling secondary-waste streams into the primary-waste-stream feeds within the WTP to increase iodine-129 capture in ILAW and bulk vitrification, are discussed in Chapter 7, Section 7.5, of this EIS. Regarding Hanford cleanup, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

17

the proposed actions and the options. Given the unsafe and intensively radioactive waste in the forms of leaking single- and double-shell tanks and the billions of gallons of radioactive and chemical toxic waste already escaping from Hanford, we will not accept any more importing of so-called off-site waste until the present storage is safe in the environment that it is in now. Imagine 17,000 truckloads of radioactive waste on our nation's highways from private nuclear waste to Hanford. That is a nightmare waiting to happen. We will oppose any new shipments of these new wastes into Hanford.

Further, this EIS has no consideration for an option of dry test storage on radioactive waste sites, including the power plant sites, as an option not to store it in a central repository. That dry option is safe, it is above ground, it is can be easily monitored, and there's no -- not a mention of it in this 6,000-page document.

With all of the high-tech equipment, processing buildings, tank farms, and storage cribs storage at Hanford already, the principal storage medium of radioactive wastes at the Hanford site, just like the rest of America, is cardboard and dirt. From the most extremely radioactive nuclear fuel cell, to a

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

327-1

327-2

327-3

327-4

327-1 As analyzed in this *TC & WM EIS*, 67 of the 149 SSTs at Hanford are known or suspected to have leaked liquid waste to the environment between the 1950s and the present, some of which has reached the groundwater. Estimates of the total leak loss range from less than 2.8 million to as much as 3.97 million liters (750,000 to 1,050,000 gallons). DOE recognizes that groundwater contamination from past leaks is a concern at Hanford and its potential impact on communities downriver from Hanford. One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze the potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms by landfill closure, selective clean closure, or clean closure. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks, including remediation of the contamination in the vadose zone. Tank farm past leaks and associated contamination in the vadose zone are being evaluated under the RCRA Facility Investigation/Corrective Measures Study process. As such, the vadose zone contamination associated with tank farm past leaks is considered an RCRA operable unit rather than a CERCLA operable unit and is assessed in this *TC & WM EIS*.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

327-2 On average, up to 2 trucks per day for 20 years would be involved in transporting about 14,200 truck shipments to Hanford, as presented in this *Final TC & WM EIS*, Chapter 4, Section 4.3. The transportation of radioactive materials and waste, both coming to and leaving Hanford, must comply with DOT and NRC regulations that promote the protection of human health and the environment. This includes requiring the use of certified packaging that minimizes the radiation dose rate outside the transportation package.

327-3 This *TC & WM EIS* analyzes interim, short-term storage of IHLW following treatment under all of the Tank Closure alternatives. However, DOE does not consider long-term storage of IHLW at Hanford or any other site. In addition, storage of commercial nuclear power plant waste is not within the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. The current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

18

Mason jar of plutonium found in a safe in a trench at Hanford, to the corroding barrels of waste and Tank 105A, most of the wastes are kept in over 40 miles of unlined trenches, ditches, and holes at Hanford.

Most of these -- most importantly, these dirt and cardboard mediums leak into the environment and are now seeping into the Columbia. This national treasure, our Columbia River, is currently carrying micro curies of radioactive plutonium, uranium, iodine, tritium, technetium, cesium, zinc, and strontium downstream. These radionuclides have been detected as far as the Puget Sound and the Willapa Bay on the Washington coast.

I am going to skip a couple and then I will go to the final issues. When we also suggest that the first tank that be cleaned -- that should be cleaned, containing its wastes and leaks be Tank 105A. And the reason we suggest that is this a double-shelled tank, that when its contents were heated up in 1965, the emergency demanded more water be poured into the tank to cool it off and some of it was intentionally dumped into the ground. The excess heat still caused an explosion. That explosion, which blew out a hole in the tank about the size of a mini bus and dumped more waste and the zone of the surrounding soil, it still

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

327-4 cont'd

327-5

recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

327-4 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

327-5 Regarding the prioritization of waste retrieval from this SST, such ranking is outside the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. DOE continually reviews and monitors the status of the SSTs and updates the retrieval sequence to fit the results of such analysis. Different sequencing of the SSTs was analyzed in this EIS. With regard to the construction of a small vitrification facility, DOE is confident that the WTP currently under construction will provide the best resolution to the tank waste issues at Hanford.

Regarding the cleanup of the cribs and trenches (ditches), as stated in Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2, of this EIS, groundwater contamination in the non-tank-farm areas of the 200 Areas (which include cribs, trenches [ditches], and unlined solid-waste trenches), as well as sources of plutonium, are being addressed under CERCLA, which will also satisfy substantive RCRA and Washington State Hazardous Waste Management Act corrective action requirements. Contamination in the vadose zone resulting from tank farm past leaks would be addressed during the SST closure process. The cumulative impacts analysis for this *TC & WM EIS* (see Appendix U and Chapter 6) includes the vadose zone of the 200 Areas, in addition to other areas of Hanford. The alternatives analyses and the cumulative impacts analysis use points of analysis to allow comparison of alternatives in a similar fashion, as required by NEPA.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

1 measures now, that soil, at over 200 degrees of
2 temperature near that tank. This tank and some of its
3 known faults are an ideal test case of prototype. We
4 want to take the worst case and solve that and do it
5 safely.
6 So we want a small vitrification plant
7 facility, not the whole big project all at once. Make
8 it safe and a smaller operation, and we recommend that
9 the contractors also begin stabilizing the trenches
10 and begin the so-called capped landfills and dig
11 underneath and start emptying and cleaning up the
12 soils. These so-called low radioactive waste sites
13 are the principal storage of mediums right now for all
14 the radioactive waste and they need to be cleaned up
15 because it is not just a soil column that is
16 contaminated, the column has moved and it is in many
17 ways approaching and is already contaminating the
18 Columbia. So finally --
19 MR. PARHAM: Three minutes.
20 MR. BUCHANAN: -- this cleanup matters to all
21 of us.
22 We get started safely and with no more
23 radioactive waste imported into Hanford, no more
24 radioactive waste into the Columbia, make the cleaning
25 process legal, and accept outside state and EPA

327-5 cont'd

327-5 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

20

inspectors on-site to monitor all parts of the cleanup process. Thank you very much.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Next is Amy Easton, and after Amy would be Michael Baron. Amy? No? Michael Baron? After Michael will be Joan Lawson.

MR. BARON: Thank you, Mr. Moderator, panelists, fellow speakers, fellow citizens, thank you for this opportunity to put my views into the record.

Hanford was created by the Department of Defense under their responsibility to protect our borders and our citizenry. I am a member of that population, as is my wife, my two children, my 83-year-old mother, my friends, my 1800 co-workers, as well as the six-and-a-half million citizens of Washington and the more than three-and-a-half million citizens of Oregon. With the transfer of the Hanford site to DOE, the responsibility for our protection that justified the very creation and the operation of that facility does not just evaporate as if we had made an investment with dirty math. That responsibility to no small degree is now in your hands, therefore, you have two choices.

Option one, cleanup Hanford completely and without delay. Completely means clean closure. Treating this exceptional site as if it were an

327-5 cont'd

328-1

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

328-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. This closure includes the tank system along with the vadose zone as impacted by the tank farms (i.e., past leaks). Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

However, as discussed in the Summary, Section S.1.3.2, and Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2, of this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE will not make decisions on groundwater remediation, including the remediation of groundwater contamination resulting from non-tank-farm areas in the 200 Areas, because that is being addressed under the CERCLA (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) process. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford under the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

21

ordinary landfill is an approach worthy of Milo Minderbinder. Completely means dismantle site cleanup -- dismantle and site cleanup for FFTF. Completely means not bringing in more radioactive waste to the shores of the Columbia River.

Or option two -- I hope you like this -- reinstate the draft. Then draft all citizens whose health will be negatively impacted by radiation releases you're allowing so that their injury or deaths can be rationalized as the unavoidable consequences of war.

If you cannot muster the political will to enact option one, then at least arm us with option two. That way the Geneva Convention might afford the 10 million residents of the states through which the Columbia River flows, the protection these vocal citizen advocates have been fighting for for over three decades and will continue to fight for.

MR. PARHAM: Joan Lawson. After Joan is Al Rasmussen.

MS. LAWSON: Hello, my name is Joan Lawson, I am from Seattle, Washington. I have a friend whose neighbor probably said to his dog, "not in my back yard," so the dog dumps his waste in my friend's back yard. My friend takes his shovel and throws the poop

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

328-1 cont'd

The commentor's preference for totally dismantling FFTF (essentially FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3) is noted. However, although nearly all elements of FFTF and the two adjacent support facilities would be removed under this alternative, the lower portion of the RCB concrete shell would remain. This would be backfilled with either soil or grout to minimize void space. The area would be regraded and revegetated, with no need for a barrier. DOE's preference is for FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2, under which some below-grade structures would remain; however, these would be grouted in place to immobilize the hazardous constituents. The filled area would then be covered with a modified RCRA Subtitle C barrier to further isolate the entombed structures and prevent infiltration of water. These actions (grouting and barrier placement) would prevent the migration of any contaminants to the environment.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

22

back over the fence. If only we could do the same with the nuclear waste. We in Washington State do not even want our own nuclear waste and are waiting, waiting, waiting, for the solution for its disposal, so surely we don't want our neighbors' waste.

My brother worked at Hanford some years ago, making good money as those whose tyranny for Hanford also did, the contractors, the people who make the tanks and build the facilities, and the executives from companies with names like Clean Energy. He said to me one day another container of liquid waste was opened up and it too was empty. Where did the contents go?

I saw a billboard today that said Washington Poison Center. I looked it up on the web and see that national poison prevention week begins March 14. I suggest it begin tonight and that large signs be put all over Hanford announcing Washington Poison Center.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Al Rasmussen, and after Mr. Rasmussen will be Valerie Schubert.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Up here in Seattle we say Rasmussen.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. I am not from here, that's true.

MR. RASMUSSEN: I know, you said that.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

329-1

329-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

23

As with all important issues, the questions of cleanup at Hanford should be considered very broadly instead of with just narrow focus on the technical issues. A basic step in correcting a bad situation is simply to stop doing the things that make it worse. In the case of radioactive waste at Hanford, this basic step is simply to stop bringing in more waste. Considering the question broadly, which is how I started, this leads to examining the creation elsewhere of waste that cannot be successfully stored or treated. Weapons development and new nuclear power generation programs should both be abandoned --

(Audience applauds.)

MR. BUCHANAN: -- for substantial reasons of their own, as well as the addition of nuclear radioactive wastes that they produce.

Instead of sending radioactive waste from those places to Hanford, money saved by abandoning those projects instead should be sent to Hanford to accelerate the cleanup here.

(Audience applauds.)

MR. PARHAM: Thank you, sir. Valerie Shubert, and after Valerie will be Bobbie Morgan.

MS. SHUBERT: I have already sent in some

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

330-1

330-1 Weapons and nuclear power production is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

24

written comments on this and I'm assuming that -- I am hoping that the comments I made on earlier versions have also been forwarded and are still being kept on file. Basically I have not been able to get through this document. I don't have a stable of readers, I don't have the time to do it myself, so I have gotten through most of the summary and there is a couple more comments I wanted to make before at this point and then I will make more later.

One was that I am getting through the definitions and I am glad there is a glossary, because frankly those definitions are nothing like the vernacular definition of the terms would be, and I would like to have some indication in the document of who developed those definitions and what the input was. *331-1*

And the other thing is that there are statements in several places about endangered and threatened species, but they're not listed. Maybe they are listed somewhere else, I haven't gotten to that part yet, but they are not listed in the summary. *331-2*

And furthermore, they're not -- they are parts of communities and there are species that are not endangered or threatened yet that may be in the future and I would like to see an overall study of

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

331-1 Chapter 10 of this *TC & WM EIS*, "List of Preparers," identifies the individuals who prepared this EIS, as well as their EIS responsibilities and their education and experience. The definitions included in *TC & WM EIS* glossaries (Section S.9 of the Summary and Chapter 9 of this *TC & WM EIS*) were provided by the technical experts/preparers and compiled by a senior editor. DOE staff reviewed all of these definitions as part of its internal review process prior to approving the release of the *Draft TC & WM EIS* for public review and comment.

331-2 The commentor is correct in stating that endangered and threatened species are not listed in the Summary of the *Draft TC & WM EIS*. Rather, they are listed in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.7.4 (for Hanford), and Section 3.3.7.4 (for INL). These tables include not only federally and state-listed threatened and endangered species, but also those species that have other classifications indicating their level of "rarity." Included among those listed are "candidate species" for which current information indicates the probable appropriateness of listing them as endangered or threatened. As noted in the above-cited sections, specific studies were conducted to identify any special species potentially found on the various sites that could be impacted by the proposed actions addressed in this *TC & WM EIS*. Analyses of the impacts on threatened, endangered, and other special status species are presented in Chapter 4. With respect to a broader discussion of the impacts of the *TC & WM EIS* alternatives on ecological resources, the commentor is referred to Sections 4.1 and 4.2 for Hanford and INL, respectively. Additionally, Chapter 4, Section 4.4, and Chapter 6, Section 6.3.7, respectively address combined and cumulative impacts on ecological resources.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

25

331-2 cont'd

what impacts these things will have on the environment in general. And that is basically what I had to say.

MR. PARHAM: Okay. Thank you. Bobbie Morgan and then Adrian Villarreal.

MS. MORGAN: Hello, my name is Bobbie Morgan and I live on Bainbridge Island. I am a retired speech language pathologist and so I have a long commitment to good communication. I am here with what seems to be a very simple message. We know what the right thing to do is here. This EIS statement needs to go back to the drawing board and you need to just cleanup Hanford, period.

332-1

I am also here because I am a grandmother, a brand-new grandmother. Last week our first grandchild was born and I want to be able to imagine her future, and I want to be able to pretend that 50 or 75 years from now, that I look back on her as a grown woman and possibly a grandmother, and I want to be able to say we did the right thing for you, sweetheart. You are able to drink water here, enjoy delicious salmon, play safely in our gem of the Columbia River. I don't want to have to imagine myself looking back from the mists of time and say I am sorry that you have cancer, we didn't do the right thing.

So I am here as a person, I want to call you

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

332-1 In general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. However, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

26

Mary Beth, I want to call you Jeff, that we have had a lot of facts, a lot of initials and acronyms, but we are here as people to remind you to do the right thing. Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

Adrian Villarreal, and after Adrian, it will be Robert Stagman.

MR. VILLARREAL: Good evening, everyone. I am from Bellingham, Washington, and I am a registered nurse, and when I first learned about this at the University of Washington, Bothell, when Gerry came over to do a presentation on the subject matter, after the end of the presentation, I was kind of like ready to hit my head up against the wall, because I couldn't understand how this complex matter was actually made into a bigger problem than it needs to be. I mean, it is not rocket science, okay? I mean, when it comes down to it, you have nuclear waste that is in the ground, okay, it is going to our groundwater, okay, and it is already contaminating the Columbia River, okay? Any type of radiation, okay, that human beings come in contact with, besides any other type of life form, okay, it puts that organism at risk for developing cancer, if not dying. I mean, there is no reason that the preferred plan should be just

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

333-1

333-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. DOE's preferred retrieval option (i.e., to retrieve at least 99 percent of the tank waste) is consistent with the TPA goal of residual waste not exceeding 10.2 cubic meters (360 cubic feet) for 100-series tanks or 0.85 cubic meters (30 cubic feet) for the smaller 200-series tanks, corresponding to 99 percent retrieval. DOE has already begun the process of retrieving waste from the tanks, such as tanks located in Waste Management Area C. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed retrieval actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

99 percent, okay, removal of nuclear waste. It should be 99.9 percent or that 100 percent, okay? Whatever is humanly possible.

To hear this evening that the concept of the preferred plan was accepted because of minimal risk to the workers that are currently going ahead to do the cleanup process, I think we are slapping the workers in the face by going ahead and allowing the work that they are currently doing to go ahead and cleanup Hanford, okay, to just be cut short. So therefore, they think what are they doing then? And they are already risking their lives now. We already have over 30 workers that have been subjected to beryllium poisoning, okay, because that toxic metal that is in the environment, you know.

The tanks, they need to be clean closure, okay? The environment needs to be cleaned up. The flux capacitator, no contaminants need to be shipped over to Oregon or Utah or any other state, okay, everything needs to be contained, okay, we need to clean this environment. There are too many -- right now, our biggest environmental issue is that the United States is facing a water shortage. We need to make sure that our underground water supplies that are available, okay, are clean and able to be used, okay?

333-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

28

1 We do not need to go ahead and continue to pollute a
2 valued underground water supply. Every state is
3 pretty much activating, okay, laws to prevent the
4 exportation of water. We need to conserve the water
5 that we have and we need to prevent the spread of
6 radiation to our population, okay, because we don't
7 need to promote a society built on cancer, okay.
8 It's -- Rachel Carson clearly said it, we
9 have the right not to be poisoned. We have the right
10 not to be exposed to toxins. At the same time that
11 Hanford was being developed, our government clearly
12 went ahead and was reckless with the use of
13 pesticides. Let's not be reckless about forming
14 another plan, okay, that does a half-ass job of
15 cleaning up the issue. Thank you.
16 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Robert Stagman, and
17 after Robert will be Oliver Bazinet from Hanford
18 Challenge.
19 MR. STAGMAN: My name is Bob Stagman and I am
20 a retired surgeon, specializing in diseases of the
21 head and neck. Included in my responsibilities was
22 the management of tumors of the thyroid gland, which
23 have been unequivocally associated with radiation
24 exposure and most importantly during childhood.
25 My personal health history includes a course

333-1 cont'd

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

29

of low level radiation therapy to the head at age five as part of a national misadventure to treat enlarged tonsils and adenoids. The unintended result of this treatment has included a plethora of thyroid tumors, among other conditions, occurring usually after a lag period of many many years, and that lag is important to understand.

At the age of 42, I was diagnosed with a tumor of the inner ear, and at the age of 44, with a tumor of the thyroid gland, both clearly linked to childhood radiation exposure by multiple clinical studies. Radiation exposure is a potentially lethal risk for our citizens, particularly for our children. We need not be unduly alarmed by a vague potential threat from Al-Qaeda when we are being subjected to continuous chemical nuclear terror being inflicted upon us by our own United States Department of Energy, via tragically and misguided and irresponsible plans to transport through our communities and dump vast quantities of dangerous radioactive material into Hanford, where responsible cleanup of all nuclear waste has never been accomplished and active nuclear contamination of our soil and groundwater continues unabated and certainly encroaches the lifeline of the Columbia River.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

334-1

334-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

30

Radiation exposure of our Northwest citizens currently is certainly much higher than generally conceded and will escalate dramatically as current leakage continues and escalate incredibly if new waste is added. The only acceptable action for Hanford is clean closure of all existing waste sites and no addition of any further nuclear waste at Hanford. Thank you.

334-1 cont'd

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Oliver is next, and after Oliver, Richard Frith, I believe.

MR. BAZINET: Hello, my name is Oliver Bazinet and I am a volunteer with Hanford Challenge. I've read the summary of the draft EIS. I didn't get through all 6,000 pages of the actual document, and I guess I have two things that I would like to focus on. First of all, one percent of 54 million gallons is still 540,000 gallons, and that is a totally unacceptable amount of waste to leave in the tanks. I am very disappointed with that aspect of the cleanup proposal, as well as just the clean closure alternative presented in the EIS in general. I believe that it only includes remediating the soils three meters below the surface of the tank. Some of these tanks have been leaking for over 30 years or more. It seems like three meters is awfully shallow

335-1

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

335-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. Under Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, contaminated soil would be excavated to a depth of 3 meters (10 feet) below the tank base at all tank farms. In the case of Alternative 4, soil would be removed from beneath the BX and SX tank farms. In all cases, the soil would be managed as HLW. Where necessary, deep soil excavation would be conducted to remove contamination plumes within the soil column.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

31

335-1 cont'd

to dig. We should probably dig a little bit deeper.

I would also like to address the new waste that DOE is proposing bringing on-site. As Toby Nixon pointed out, Hanford is a very geologically active site, not to mention in the flood plain of a river that is dammed quite a bit upstream. It doesn't seem like a very good idea to put more waste there.

335-2

MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

Richard, I messed up your last name, and then after Richard is Dorli Rainey.

MR. FRITH: Hi, my name is Richard Frith, I am from Seattle. Unlike a lot of the other speakers here, I am going to have to identify myself as a strong supporter of nuclear energy. I believe that nuclear energy is valuable and has great possibilities for the future, as soon as we show that we can clean it up. Now, as soon as you can show you can clean it up, this is the time and place to show you can clean it up. This site was contaminated 50 years ago and this is the time and the place to show you can clean it up. In the meantime, we should not put any more waste here until you can show you can clean it up.

336-1

Formerly I was a certified residential heating oil tank remediation specialist. I did that for myself and also for the city. When you remediate

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

335-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Regarding the geologic stability of Hanford, DOE Order 420.1B and its implementing standards require nuclear and nonnuclear facilities to be designed, constructed, and operated to safeguard the facility, public, workers, and environment from natural phenomena hazards, including earthquakes. Consequently, impacts of earthquakes on waste management and disposal facilities, tank farms, and the WTP are evaluated in this EIS in Chapter 4, Sections 4.1.11 and 4.3.11. More-detailed information can be found in Appendix K.

336-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

32

a tank, frequently at the bottom of the tank you will find a tiny little hole, usually smaller than a quarter. Under that, you find a humongous plume of contaminate, and those you start digging and you dig for a long time. Three meters, I have done that for a 300-gallon residential tank. For the City of Seattle, we did sub-subbasements, we dug up entire city blocks down near Westlake. The contamination underground can be massive, and we all know this, we're not -- lots of us here have had our tanks yanked out of our own yards here. There is nothing here that needs us to be so disingenuous as to say we will remove the tank or the contents of the tanks and somehow magically we won't look underneath because there won't be any problems down there.

The DOE -- or Department of Ecology would not let us get away with that here, the City of Seattle would not let me get away with that here, why on earth would the feds be allowed of being that disingenuous. There should not be any new waste when we clean up the old.

The problem about why not clean it up completely? Well, there are two reasons I hear about. It costs a lot of money -- a complete cleanup would cost a lot of money. It is better to just hide the

336-2

336-3

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

336-2 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. Under Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, contaminated soil would be excavated to a depth of 3 meters (10 feet) below the tank base at all tank farms. In the case of Alternative 4, soil would be removed from beneath the BX and SX tank farms. In all cases, the soil would be managed as HLW. Where necessary, deep soil excavation would be conducted to remove contamination plumes within the soil column.

336-3 Although not within the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Chapter 3, Section 3.2.5, describes the geology of Hanford, including regional geologic structure and tectonic stability. Section 3.2.5.1.4 specifically describes geologic hazards in the Hanford region, including historical seismicity (i.e., the frequency and locations of earthquakes) and the site's proximity to active faults. Chapter 4, Section 4.3.5, evaluates the potential impacts on geology and soils, as well as the effects of geologic hazards on the proposed Waste Management alternatives, including the proposed disposal of offsite waste in the existing LLBG 218-W-5 trenches. As noted in Section 4.3, DOE Order 420.1B and its implementing standards require that nuclear and nonnuclear facilities be designed, constructed, and operated to safeguard the facility, public, workers, and environment from natural phenomena hazards, including earthquakes and other geologic hazards. Consequently, impacts of geologic hazards are evaluated for waste management and disposal facilities with a focus on seismic risk. Detailed information can be found in Section 4.3.5. The accident analysis in this *Final TC & WM EIS* includes accidents triggered by seismic events and discusses potential impacts on site workers and the general public (see Appendix K, Section K.3). Potential long-term impacts likely would be less than analyzed, as no credit was taken in the groundwater analysis for long-term structural stability of the repository or of any of the waste-form containers.

1 problem and take part of it out and cover the rest up
2 with dirt and concrete so you can't see the problem.
3 There is a lot of money available. It is DOE's
4 bailiwick now, but this is the military that did this
5 and we have a huge military budget. The amount of
6 money in the military budget, we should clean this
7 site up and we should because this was a military
8 project. So there is not a money problem here. There
9 is a lack of will and a lack of willingness to show
10 just how bad the situation is. We have the money, we
11 have the ability, it is the military's budget, that is
12 where the money comes from.
13 In closing, when we clean this site up, we
14 will have to recognize that geologically this is a
15 terrible place for the waste. In the meantime, let's
16 not bring any more new waste in until they clean it
17 up, and the problem with our new waste will be moot
18 because this is a lousy place geologically.
19 MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Dorli and then
20 Richard Ellison after that.
21 MS. RAINEY: Hello, I am Dorli Rainey, I'm a
22 citizen of Seattle. I have a brand-new hobby, it is
23 going back a few years, I attend Hanford meetings. I
24 have learned language that I never thought I would
25 ever hear and my children say mom, you go around the

336-3 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

34

house mumbling things like fast flux and covered stuff and names of contaminants, what is this with you, you used to be fun.

Now, I look at what is going on now. We have this problem with cleanup, and just recently the Department of Energy has decided that they were going to permit a new nuclear power plant. Will they try to send their spent uranium here? Why are we now allowing new nuclear power plants after Chernobyl, after Three Mile Island, after the problems of Hanford? I think we need to once and for all say we need clean energy, but not through nuclear energy, and I think we need to also cleanup Hanford once and for all, and not 99.9 percent, but 100 percent and get it done, and this man who said take it out of the military budget, he is right on.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

Richard Ellison, and after Richard will be Lane Rasberry.

MR. ELLISON: Hello, my name is Richard Ellison, I would like to encourage, first of all, that these hearings in the future be televised. I think we are at that level of technology now and I think we'd have more input from citizenry if people were able to observe hearings.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

337-1

337-1 The use of clean energy sources in the United States is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

35

I -- I am a professor who teaches biology and environmental science at a local community college, and I had the honor of visiting Hanford about 25 years ago. I was a graduate student with a congressional aide, and it was very interesting because the head of the Environmental Services there assured me that from the leaks that occurred at Hanford, none of it could ever reach the groundwater, that was the lingo at the time. So my experience from that meeting, many things that were said to both of us, the congressional aide and myself, is that Hanford has a long history of wishful thinking.

Hanford will never be safe. You can tell me you are going to clean it to 99 percent, 99.9 percent, or 100 percent, I don't believe it. I don't believe that we are capable of doing that, because for one, I have observed this process for a long time, it has taken a long time to cleanup. I see numbers dallying up, well, the year 3890, this and that and that and this, where civilization is barely a thousand or two thousand years old.

I see -- the question I wanted to address was, what are the effects of climate change on Hanford? Because we don't really know how things are going to swing, and I think a lot of the repository

338-1

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

338-1 DOE has reviewed and revised, as necessary, its analyses on the effects of climate change on various resources at Hanford and the possible effects on environmental impacts of the *TC & WM EIS* alternatives. As described in Chapter 6, Section 6.3.4, DOE has reviewed climate studies that forecast general trends in Hanford regional climate change. However, there are no reliable methodologies for projections of specific future climate changes in the Hanford region, and thus such changes have not been quantified in this EIS.; To account for this uncertainty, Appendix O, Section O.6.2, describes the effects of enhanced infiltration such as that which may occur during a wetter climate. In the *Draft TC & WM EIS*, Appendix V focused on the potential impacts of a rising water table from a proposed Black Rock Reservoir. Following the retraction of this proposal, the focus of Appendix V was changed in this final EIS to analysis of potential impacts of infiltration increases resulting from climate change under three different scenarios. Appendix V includes sensitivity analyses of potential impacts at Hanford that could result from climate changes that may increase model boundary recharge parameters and the rise of the groundwater table. Additional qualitative discussion of the potential effects of climate change on human health, erosion, water resources, air quality, ecological resources, and environmental justice has been added to Chapter 6 of this final EIS. Additional discussion of the types of regional climate change that could be expected has also been added to Chapter 6, Section 6.5.2, Global Climate Change. The potential impacts of the alternatives on climate change are addressed in Chapter 6, Section 6.5.2, and Appendix G, Section G.5, of this *TC & WM EIS*.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

36

338-1 cont'd

nature of Hanford is to no rainfall, nine inches or ten inches of rainfall. What if the rainfall rate was to increase? What if the Columbia River was to raise in level, because part of the problem is that the water table is so close to the surface.

I think we can only go for full clean closure and I think that is a very modest and noble goal should we ever actually get there. I think the best available technology, what we are looking at, I think we can only try and use the best available technology, and as the years go by, as we go towards 3890, we will see more technology will come forward to help us clean it up. I don't think you can put a cap on it and it'll go away.

338-2

I think when we call a waste nuclear reactor from a submarine as low level nuclear waste, as it's defined, I think that's a misnomer, and I think part of the problem is there is so much waste at Hanford that really it is an impossibility to try to cleanup and make it safe. So how do we make it as safe as we can I think is what we are trying do. I think we need to support as much full closure as we can get.

338-3

I agree that the money can come from a lot of places like the war in Iran and Iraq, from a lot of all of these places that we want to have fun in. I

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

338-2 Regarding the commentor's statement pertaining to clean closure and the potential for future technologies, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

338-3 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

1 don't think we should have any more nuclear waste
2 imported into Hanford. I don't think we should be
3 generating nuclear waste. I don't think that one
4 percent left behind is a good idea in any storage
5 tanks. I would agree that any plumes underneath
6 leaks.
7 I mean, part of the leaks that occurred that
8 made science magazines, I think in the '70s were
9 130,000-gallon high level liquid waste leak was that
10 the technician was out there everyday, recording down
11 the levels of the tank were going down everyday. He
12 would write the number as it would go down everyday,
13 but his boss is away on vacation for a month. When he
14 came back from vacation, he saw oh, my gosh, we have
15 lost all of this high level nuclear waste. Well,
16 human error is a big factor. Chernobyl was a big
17 factor, Three Mile Island was a big factor and human
18 error was involved very much in the causality of a
19 huge problem, so I don't believe that we can just
20 science away this thing, and I think that as much
21 money as we can spend, as much as we can do, I applaud
22 your efforts of trying to do something to clean it up,
23 but the reality is we are still waiting, and the
24 citizens of the state have said in a citizens'
25 initiative, we don't want any more nuclear waste. We

338-3 cont'd

338-3 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

38

338-3 cont'd

don't want anyone's nuclear waste. We didn't want it in the first place. We don't want anymore. Thank you very much.

MR. PARHAM: Okay. Thank you.

Lane Rasberry. After Lane, it'll be Casey Howard.

MR. RASBERRY: My name is Lane Rasberry, I live in Seattle. I don't like toxic waste and I don't want any more brought here, but I don't think that is really what you are asking about. Unfortunately, I don't know why you are here. I -- just to say something about myself, I don't want to talk about myself, but I studied chemistry at the University of Washington, I have got a degree, I work in science. I feel like I ought to be able to understand something about what you are saying, but when you were speaking at the beginning of this hearing, I couldn't understand you. I don't know what you are talking about.

339-1

I read the Hanford website before I came here -- I went to Hanford, I took the tour last year, and I have been reading about Hanford in my free time, I am interested, I am an interested person. I can't understand your website. I don't understand these posters you have. They are beyond my understanding.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

339-1 For those who may not want to read through this entire EIS, DOE published a Summary. The Summary is intended to provide a brief overview of the material contained in the *Draft TC & WM EIS*. For those interested in reading this entire EIS, DOE also issued a Reader's Guide to assist the public in navigating through the complex information presented. This guide serves as an introduction and guide to the contents of this EIS, highlights the key features of the reasonable alternatives, and helps readers review the technical analyses presented. Recognizing that many people may not read beyond the EIS Summary, the information presented in both the Summary and the Reader's Guide attempts to strike a balance between those readers interested in the more technical details regarding DOE's proposed actions and alternatives and readers seeking a simpler overview. DOE also held a 1-hour open house prior to each public hearing on the draft EIS to allow the public to meet informally with members of the *Draft TC & WM EIS* team, ask questions, and learn more about this EIS. Informative factsheets also were provided at these open houses.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

39

And I really tried. You've got that book back there, it is 6,000 pages, I can't read that. Who is your target audience? It doesn't seem to be me. I don't know who you are writing these things for or who you are speaking to.

I don't have any comment about what this proposal or what you are talking about doing, because I just don't understand it, and I don't know how to get that understanding. I could propose some things. I really wish that you could advise someone to revise your website, make it comprehensible, more comprehensible to laymen. You can't make it too simple. I think if your target audience was maybe high school kids, that would be appropriate for me. I am glad that you have a Facebook account, I don't know if any of you know this, but Hanford has a Facebook account, and I understand you also have a Twitter account, I am following you, thank you.

Your use of electronics is first rate. I really like your videographer. You have a lot of videos, continuing ed. videos. Why don't you have a DVD of your videos here? Not everyone can access YouTube and I really wish that I could take a DVD of your videos and show them to other people. It's really not fair that you are not distributing these

339-1 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

40

1 things.
2 I really want to understand, but you make it
3 very difficult for me. I wish you could do more to
4 meet me. Thank you very much.
5 MR. PARHAM: Thank you.
6 Casey Howard? After Casey, we will do Kate
7 Hellenthal.
8 MS. HOWARD: Hi, I am Casey Howard. I am a
9 UW student and I am representing the growing number of
10 citizens with a vested interest in Hanford cleanup.
11 We are next in a long line of generations to deal with
12 the contamination in the future.
13 Hanford is scary, all of us here think that.
14 We are concerned that the transport of new waste will
15 affect the way we can clean now and in the future.
16 The radiation will be there forever. We need to do
17 all we can to remove all of the current waste. We
18 didn't ask for this mess to cleanup, and I don't want
19 to leave an even bigger mess for future generations.
20 Thank you.
21 MR. PARHAM: Thank you.
22 Kate Hellenthal, and after Kate will be
23 Warren Jories.
24 MS. HELLENTHAL: So as an aside, I'm Kate
25 Hellenthal, I am from Spokane, Washington, and I am a

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

340-1 **340-1** Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

41

Seattle University undergraduate student and I am involved with Heart of America Northwest. Despite that, this EIS really confounds me. I feel that it is extremely inadequate in addressing the dangers that Hanford presents. Entombing it does not solve the problem. It's a Band-Aid approach that only postpones the true impact. Clean closure is the only feasible option, and the contamination of the lands and water needs to be addressed. *341-1*

Furthermore, outside waste from around the country cannot be transported to Hanford. If Hanford becomes a national nuclear waste dump site, especially before the current mess is cleaned up, our health, the health of future generations, and our environment are then sacrificed for the DOE's purposes. *341-2*

Hanford must be cleaned and cleaned fully. The tanks must be emptied completely, the contamination in the land and groundwater must be alleviated, and the proposal to transport national nuclear waste to Hanford must be dropped. Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

Warren Jones? No? Frank Zucher; is that right? Frank?

MR. ZUCHER: That is fine.

MR. PARHAM: Okay.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

341-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. This closure includes the tank system, along with the vadose zone as impacted by the tank farms (i.e., past leaks). Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

However, as discussed in the Summary, Section S.1.3.2, and Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2, of this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE will not make decisions on groundwater remediation, including the remediation of groundwater contamination resulting from non-tank-farm areas in the 200 Areas, because that is being addressed under the CERCLA (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) process. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford under the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

341-2 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Although some contamination has reached Hanford's groundwater, efforts are ongoing to prevent existing plumes from reaching the Columbia River. For example, groundwater pump-and-treat systems are currently in place or under construction, and temporary caps are being placed on the tank farms as part of RCRA corrective action. These and other short-term cleanup measures are being conducted while longer-term cleanup decisions are being addressed. The analyses presented in this *TC & WM EIS* will aid DOE in making these

longer-term decisions regarding the treatment and disposal of tank waste and the closure of the SST farms (by landfill closure, selective clean closure, or clean closure). The EIS analyses are also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of contamination from past leaks, including remediation of the contamination in the vadose zone. Because uncertainties are associated with implementing the proposed actions described in this EIS, the analyses presented therein were based on conservative assumptions that tend to overestimate potential environmental impacts. These uncertainties are summarized in Chapter 2, Section 2.7.4; more-detailed discussions are provided in Chapters 4 and 5 and associated appendices.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

42

MR. ZUCHER: My name is Frank Zucher and I live in Seattle with my wife and child. I find it disturbing that we have to keep coming back here to these hearings to remind the Department of Energy, which is now run by Nobel physicist, we have to remind them about lessons that we should have all learned in kindergarten, and I find that they're now teaching in preschool, and these include, if you make a mess, clean it up. Before we bring out the new toys, put away your old ones, and don't run with scissors. They are fairly simple.

Specifically, I urge the Department of Energy to reconsider their preferred options to cleanup to 99.9 percent of the toxic waste, the tank waste, excuse me. Don't leave the worst one percent of the tanks to leak and kill future generations. Clean up the contaminated soil. Clean closure, not sweeping it under the rug with a capping. Start vitrification as soon as possible and start planning for building more vitrification plants immediately, not five years from now.

In terms of no running with scissors, don't chop up the FTFF and send it to Idaho and bring it back. Don't bring in more waste until you cleanup what you have got. Thank you very much.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

342-1

342-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

As discussed in the *TC & WM EIS* Summary, Chapter 1, and Chapter 2, this EIS analyzes additional waste treatment capability that includes expanding the vitrification process capability currently being constructed in the WTP or supplementing the WTP's capability with supplemental treatment technologies. Thus, decisions to be made by DOE regarding whether to treat all waste in the WTP, as is or expanded, or to supplement its capacity by adding new treatment capability depend on demonstrating the feasibility of supplemental treatment technologies.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Let's see here, Jacinta Heath; is that right? And after that, Reed O -- O'-B-e-i-r-n-e.

MS. HEATH: Hello, my name is Jacinta Heath, I am a student here at the University of Washington, and I am pursuing a career in international environmental law. I'd just like to retouch on an issue that I think is really important and we haven't spent enough time on, and that is the concept of environmental justice. I am going to use your own words from your summary, "Environmental justice, the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people, regardless of race, color, national origin, or income, with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Fair treatment means no group of people, including racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic groups should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations, or the agencies to make achieving environmental -- I am sorry, I lost my place -- should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environment consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, or commercial operations, or the execution

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

44

of federal, state or local or tribal programs or policies.

"Executive Order 12898 directs federal agencies to make achieving environmental justice part of their mission by identifying and addressing agencies disproportionately higher than groups in the agency programs, policies and activities on minority and low income populations."

So if we take that into account, I would like you to -- I challenge you to attempt to view this from different perspectives and create more incentives for clean closure, not the development of new nuclear energy plants. I think we should all consider changing our views of nuclear energy and realize that it is not clean or safe, and that it is disproportionately affecting people that aren't reflected in your policies.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

Reed? And after Reed will be Lex Voorhoeve. Did I blow that one too?

MR. O'BIERNE: Hello, my name is Reed O'Bierne, I live in Seattle, Washington, thank you all for being here.

In the last two months, I live in a house nearby here, actually we found that the heating fuel

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

343-1

343-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

45

tank in my front yard, which was actually, ironically, put in the ground around the time that World War II ended, that tank has been leaking, similar to what the gentleman spoke about earlier tonight. It is a relatively small hole. We have dug the whole ground up, dug up the tank, done an incredible amount of environmental remediation, both in the front of the house and the back of the house, which has a slope towards the back. We had to pay for this out of our own pocket. The remediation is still going on. People came to my house today and actually poured these microbes in the ground that supposedly eat the contamination.

The question is, how can we possibly be forced to pay for this kind of stuff, which I am happy to do, because we need to clean it in my yard, but something the size of this, what is going on in Hanford, has there even been any thought as to whether we would clean it or put ground in it, and talk about not digging all the way down to the bottom of the ground to where the contamination is and removing it. Ultimately it has got to be removed. The only way to do it is to do it right the first time. That's my main comment.

My second point is I would like to point out,

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

344-1

344-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. This closure includes the tank system, along with the vadose zone as impacted by the tank farms (i.e., past leaks). Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

However, as discussed in the Summary, Section S.1.3.2, and Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2, of this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE will not make decisions on groundwater remediation, including the remediation of groundwater contamination resulting from non-tank-farm areas in the 200 Areas, because that is being addressed under the CERCLA (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) process. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford under the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

46

or like to ask, we have got, on one hand, this long convoluted question about what to do about this stuff and there is other conversations somewhere that DOE and Ecology are involved in about licensing additional open nuclear -- putting in nuclear power plants. I don't see how you can have such a complicated issue as what is going on with Hanford remediation, and none of us being able to agree on how you are going to solve that problem, and still consider the possibility that you are going to produce more of this stuff.... by the way, no commercial enterprise will fund. So my second comment is I wish that DOE and Ecology would make comments from whatever department you are in to whatever department issued those licenses and share some of this information with them, because the consequences of this and the cost of this need to be taken into account. Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Lex? Carol Isaac? Is Carol Isaac here?

MS. ISAAC: I am Carol Isaac, I have spent 25 years in the Department of Surgery doing research and a couple of years working with earthquake remediation.

First of all, our Department of Ecology, I would like to address that. I would have been appreciative had you done more to bring up your own

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

344-2 **344-2** Nuclear energy production is beyond the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* and DOE does not license nuclear power plants. Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

345-1 **345-1** Ecology's foreword, located in the front section of the *Draft TC & WM EIS*, provides information on Ecology's role as a cooperating agency and also includes Ecology's insights on the development of the draft EIS. The foreword presented in this final EIS provides additional insights from Ecology as a result of DOE's responses to Ecology's comments on the draft EIS and on DOE's decisions to be made. The alternatives presented in this *TC & WM EIS* were developed under NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to address the essential components of DOE's three sets of proposed actions (tank closure, FFTF decommissioning, and waste management) and to provide an understanding of the differences between the potential environmental impacts of the range of reasonable alternatives. Ecology was consulted and provided guidance

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

47

1 alternatives rather than only accept what the feds
2 have given us.
3 (Audience applause.)
4 MS. ISAAC: One alternative that really
5 stands out and that is the cap. That cap is cosmetic.
6 There is no other way around this. If you were in my
7 Department of Surgery at the University of Washington
8 and you walked up to a patient and say yes, you have a
9 horrible mess there, that is a boil, huge infection
10 under there, one of the worst in the country, as we
11 have, we are going to put a Band-Aid on it, don't
12 worry about it, you won't see it. It might go through
13 your bloodstream, don't worry about it, it has a
14 beautiful Band-Aid. We can't do that to Hanford. We
15 can't do that to the worst place in the country. We
16 have to be the model for cleaning this up.
17 Now, when you have this situation -- also I
18 am also one of the people who had the oil tank with
19 the nickel hole in the bottom of it. In the Summer of
20 2008, under that whole routine, I could look down, I
21 swear I saw China on the other side. We had to do
22 that, 250 feet. If there was oil under there or coal
23 under there, we have the technology to get it out in
24 no time and certain people would get the money for
25 that.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

345-1 cont'd

345-2

concerning the nature and content of all of the alternatives. These alternatives describe the appropriate actions to be considered for SEPA requirements. Ecology agrees that the information provided in this *TC & WM EIS* regarding the alternatives will provide the data needed to continue its permitting process.

The alternatives presented in this *TC & WM EIS* were developed under NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to address the essential components of DOE's three sets of proposed actions (tank closure, FFTF decommissioning, and waste management) and to provide an understanding of the differences between the potential environmental impacts of the range of reasonable alternatives. Consistent with CEQ guidance, this EIS analyzes the range of reasonable alternatives that covers the full spectrum of potential combinations. The alternatives considered by DOE in this EIS are "reasonable" in the sense that they are practical or feasible from a technical and economic standpoint and meet the agency's purposes and needs. Potential conflicts with laws and regulations do not necessarily cause an alternative to be unreasonable, but additional mitigation commitments may be required if it is selected for implementation. For a more comprehensive discussion on compliance with regulatory requirements, see Section 2.7 of this CRD.

345-2 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. This closure includes the tank system, along with the vadose zone as impacted by the tank farms (i.e., past leaks). However, as discussed in the Summary, Section S.1.3.2, and Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2, of this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE will not make decisions on groundwater remediation, including the remediation of groundwater contamination resulting from non-tank-farm areas in the 200 Areas, because that is being addressed under the CERCLA (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) process. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

48

By the way, I think the military owes us this and a lot more, and this cleanup delay is cleanup denied by the military.

(Audience applause.)

MS. ISAAC: We have this problem sitting there. It isn't just materials going down into possibly the groundwater, spreading out like crazy. This is a 40-mile trench of absolutely toxic radioactive material. We don't know how much, where it is going, we aren't following this stuff to where it is really going. What we do in the Department of Surgery, we have monthly morbidity and mortality reports so we track what our record is, what we are doing, who is being harmed. Even if you can't clean it up, we should have somebody out here telling us, or giving us a protocol for surveying what is going on with the human population in the area and the fish, of course, and all of the other ecological problems with the species. This is wrong.

Even if you are not going to put the money right now into cleaning up, you should be there monitoring, and we should be asking -- we should be telling, we should be telling the military come here, look at our collateral damage while you're making it over there. We need this taken care of here first.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

345-3

345-4

345-3 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks.

345-4 Surveying, monitoring, and tracking of potential impacts of the Hanford waste on humans and the environment are necessary and DOE has such a program in place. The results are reported annually in the Hanford Site environmental reports (Poston, Duncan, and Dirkes 2011).

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

49

345-4 cont'd

We are the taxpayer.

I think I will let it go there. Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Phoebe Warren. After Phoebe would be Ken or Merry Ann Peterson, whichever would like to go.

MS. WARREN: Thank you for coming to gather our comments today, and thank you, my fellow citizens, who have the energy and intelligence to study this topic for decades and decades. I am a mechanical engineer, I work in Seattle, my name is Phoebe Warren, and I went into mechanical engineering 30 years ago to look at alternatives for nuclear power because it was clear 30 years ago, as it is today, that we aren't up to the task.

346-1

In simple terms that are being proposed to us today, I would recommend prohibition of off-site waste entering Hanford and I recommend vitrification of all high level waste, clean closure. But I don't really think these are the proper terms, so stepping back for a moment, as far as I understand it, and this is not after a huge study, there are people in the room who know a lot more than I do, what we have at Hanford is numerous outcomes of previous cleanup efforts. After a lot of work and many decades, we have got contamination that is pretty befuddled from previous

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

346-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

50

1 efforts.
2 So if we proceed now, ignoring secondary
3 waste and GTCC waste, in coming up with proposals and
4 recommendations, we are likely to come up with another
5 muddle that will produce another solution that will
6 create another generation of contamination. These
7 things don't just go away. They get mixed, they get
8 displaced, they get contained to various degrees.
9 As an engineer, all I can say is that we
10 don't want the best possible technology. What we want
11 is to figure out what the hell we are going to do and
12 not piecemeal. And if as a society we have any sense
13 of ethics, we should be coming up with minimum
14 standards that need to be met, by whatever is being
15 proposed.
16 So, for example, if we are not meeting
17 drinking standards, why aren't we spending more money?
18 The military in the United States is probably the
19 richest organization in the world. If any
20 organization could make these costs, the military
21 could. It's a deliberate decision to permit such
22 conditions.
23 I think part of the problem with these
24 dialogues is that a lot of the real basics aren't
25 brought to the table. You know, if we have a

346-2

346-3

346-2 cont'd

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

346-2 Regarding the development of a solution for all waste, including secondary and GTCC wastes, management of secondary waste is included in the alternatives evaluated in this *TC & WM EIS*. Regarding the commentor's concern about the inclusion of GTCC LLW in this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE has included information from the *Draft GTCC EIS* in the *Final TC & WM EIS* cumulative impacts analysis. For a more comprehensive discussion on GTCC LLW, see Sections 2.1 and 2.12 of this CRD.

Additional sensitivity analyses have been added to this EIS to evaluate the potential impacts if certain remediation activities were conducted at some of the more prominent waste sites on the Central Plateau and along the river corridor. Furthermore, other sensitivity analyses have been included that evaluate the effect of restricting the receipt of offsite waste containing target COPCs. The results of these analyses are presented in Chapter 7, Section 7.5. As referenced in the Section 7.5.2.8 discussion, DOE has drafted a roadmap that implements a strategy for the development of better-performing secondary-waste forms.

346-3 Chapter 7, Sections 7.1 and 7.5, discuss potential mitigation measures that may be needed and are feasible for DOE to implement to offset the potential impacts that might result from implementing an alternative. While DOE's Preferred Alternatives for tank closure, FFTF decommissioning, and waste management in this *TC & WM EIS* may not necessarily represent the most environmentally preferred alternatives, the ROD issued by DOE will identify any additional mitigation and monitoring commitments adopted by DOE and specify other factors considered by DOE in reaching its decision, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. In announcing its decision in the ROD based on the EIS analyses, DOE will be obligated to carry out the decision consistent with the requirements identified in this EIS. These requirements will be interpreted and applied by Federal, state, and local regulatory agencies through their independent authorities. These agencies may also impose additional mitigation measures through future permitting processes or remedial actions under the scope of the TPA, which include additional opportunities for public comment. DOE has every intention of completing Hanford cleanup efforts consistent with the standards that are determined to be legally applicable or relevant and appropriate under the CERCLA and TPA process.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

51

346-2 cont'd

vitrification plant that is being built without a design and we are looking at levels of future pollution without considering GTCC waste and secondary waste, we are not really thinking clearly, and I am sure no one in the room is individually responsible, but as a society, it is reprehensible. Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Merry Ann Peterson.

MS. PETERSON: I am Merry Ann Peterson, M-e-r-r-y, A-n-n. Please, let's clean it up 100 percent, no excuses. Thank you.

347-1

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Roxy Giddings followed by Ryan Jarvis.

MS. GIDDINGS: Hi, I am Roxy Giddings. It's fun to see all of my buddies and friends who have been coming to these things forever and a day. I am a downwinder, went through fourth grade through high school, that is your growing up and maturing years. I pray everyday that I won't do what my sister did, get breast cancer, and dad died of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, which is cancer of the lymph system, and he and mom grew up on Whidbey Island and that was a good thing, because it seemed to be kind of clean out there, so they got a good start.

I've got these things that have been coming out in the paper lately, very interesting. Hanford

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

347-1 Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

might become a national park, January the 25th this year. Boy, the National Parks really knows how to take care of stuff. How far behind are they in their cleanup?

A new era for nuclear industry, this is from the Tacoma paper. I live in Tacoma now. February 17, "The federal guarantees authorized by Congress in 2005 were seen as an essential for construction of any new reactor because of the huge expense involved." I am sure it doesn't take any energy to make one of those plants, I mean, really, we are saving energy by having the new plants.

Nuclear waste politics trumps science, sense, that is certainly something I would agree with. That is an opinion from the editors at the News Tribune. Mixing politics with radioactive waste is never a good idea. Boy, you have got that. Everything that has to do with radioactive waste is mixed with politics.

Hanford to restart shipments of nuclear waste to the southwest. Okay. So they are going to cleanup contractors, CH2M Hill Plateau Remediation Company has hired 60 more employees to help dig up waste and determine if it is suitable for shipment. Well, we will see.

Oh, my favorite one, where is my favorite

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

53

one? That is the one where we are going to build a new plant -- no, my favorite one is where the Vermont Yankee plant is leaking tritium out now and they said it wasn't, they said they didn't have the kind of pipes that would do that, and then in the same article it says something about there's a whole bunch of other plants that are leaking tridium too.

And today, I just got this from the AAA magazine, Hanford tours reveals atomic age secrets. Don't you believe, don't you believe what they tell you, because they lie, the people that work at Hanford lie to us all the time, and so do all the people that build the nuclear plants. We have been lied to for 50 -- how long has it been? 50 years? Let's see, I am a great-grandma now.

Two botanists find rare life on an old nuclear reservation. This article is so full of errors, I can't believe it, but it is a result of simply the distance between my grandparents, my parents, and my generation. There is, you know, some more generations beyond me now.

Are we out? Oh, that is too bad, because I wanted to tell you that we need to follow the state law, we need to have cleaner than the clean closure, no more waste dump, no more stuff brought in, and that

348-1

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

348-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

54

348-1 cont'd

tridium can't be removed from the groundwater.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Ryan Jarvis. After Ryan, will be Karin Engstrom.

MR. JARVIS: Hi, my name is Ryan Jarvis, I am a law student here in Seattle. I would just like to address a couple of things. First of all, I learned about Hanford just last year for the first time, and I was really amazed that it is the most contaminated site in the western hemisphere, and I was actually more amazed to learn about the befuddled cleanup attempts that have been going on longer than I've been alive. I'm only 23 and as I understand, not much has happened, and some attempts that went down in flames to cleanup. So I urge the Department of Energy and Ecology to really make the effort to do what is right here. Empty the tanks to 99.9 percent of what is in there, use state waste management laws to really -- to avoid landfill closure and clean closure, and also no off-site waste.

349-1

It seems a little absurd to me to consider accepting more waste to Hanford, considering it is already the most contaminated site in the western hemisphere. And then finally, I would like to address Mr. Lyon. I was a little disappointed that as you stood up here and discussed what the Department of

349-2

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

349-1 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

349-2 Ecology supports the principles and provisions of the Washington State statutes. One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to provide information to help the State of Washington make informed decisions that would be protective of the people of the state and its resources. Ecology and Mr. Lyon wanted public input on these alternatives and the analysis before a decision is made.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

55

Energy has put in their EIS and you have considered it, but you haven't really taken a stance as of yet, and I would just like to read to you a provision from your organic statute, the statute that created the Department of Ecology. It says, "The legislature recognizes and declares it to be the policy of this state that it is a fundamental and inalienable right of the people of the State of Washington to live in a healthful and pleasant environment, and to benefit from the proper development and use benefit of its natural resources."

I don't understand how the Department of Ecology could -- this could be their guiding statute, and yet at the same time not take a stand on what is right at Hanford and really insuring that our strong state laws are enforced there to do what is right. Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Karin Engstrom? Sylvia Haven? Sylvia?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She left.

MR. PARHAM: She left, okay. Anne Jess? Anne? Helga Kahr. After Helga will be Brian Bessembinders.

MS. KAHR: Helga Kahr, Seattle, three minutes is inadequate to address this draft EIS, so I am going

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

349-2 cont'd

The alternatives presented in this *TC & WM EIS* were developed under NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to address the essential components of DOE's three sets of proposed actions (tank closure, FFTF decommissioning, and waste management) and to provide an understanding of the differences between the potential environmental impacts of the range of reasonable alternatives. Consistent with CEQ guidance, this EIS analyzes the range of reasonable alternatives that covers the full spectrum of potential combinations. The alternatives considered by DOE in this EIS are "reasonable" in the sense that they are practical or feasible from a technical and economic standpoint and meet the agency's purposes and needs. Potential conflicts with laws and regulations do not necessarily cause an alternative to be unreasonable, but additional mitigation commitments may be required if it is selected for implementation. For a more comprehensive discussion on compliance with regulatory requirements, see Section 2.7 of this CRD.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

56

to reserve my right to submit extensive written comments.

When I was in the fourth grade, our class was taken on a field trip to the Zion nuclear plant in the state of Illinois, one of the first nuclear plants -- commercial nuclear plants in the United States. I remember standing on a catwalk looking down at the spent fuel pool glowing blue. That was in April. In September, the girl who was standing next to me, my best friend, Leslie Collins, came down with a rare aggressive form of leukemia and died within two months. It was several decades later that I found out what killed her. I was representing atomic workers and medical workers who had radiation injuries. *350-1*

The EIS is entirely inadequate in addressing the biological effects of ionizing radiation. Briefly, there is no safe level of ionizing radiation to which human tissue can be exposed; and second, there is no way to hide from gamma rays. You simply can't.

Plutonium 239 is an isotope that remains dangerously radioactive and toxic for 250,000 years. The draft EIS doesn't begin to look at that time frame. One pound of plutonium in the atmosphere, breathed in by the people, will kill every human being *350-2*

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

350-1 DOE notes that this EIS uses methods, models, and data sources that are widely accepted within the scientific and regulatory communities. It evaluates the potential radiation doses and cancer risks (from both normal operations and potential accidents) to workers and members of the public as a result of actions conducted during the operational phases of the alternatives and over the long term. Potential human health impacts associated with normal operations are presented in Chapter 4; more-detailed data on this topic are presented in Appendix K ("Short-Term Human Health Risk Analysis"). Potential long-term impacts are presented in Chapter 5; additional details regarding potential long-term human health impacts are presented in Appendix Q ("Long-Term Human Health Dose and Risk Analysis"). Both DOE sites and commercial nuclear facilities regulated by NRC or agreement states (states authorized to regulate certain nuclear activities) must comply with regulations designed to protect workers and members of the public from radiation, including ensuring that members of the public who tour nuclear facilities receive no or only extremely small doses. As discussed in Appendix K, Section K.1, cancer is caused by a number of factors, both external and internal. The American Cancer Society reports that about 25 percent of all deaths in the United States are due to cancer.

350-2 The modeling timespan of 10,000 years was based on precedent and NEPA requirements that the flow field must provide a basis for an unbiased evaluation of the *TC & WM EIS* alternatives for the 10,000-year period of analysis. Still, longer-term impacts were considered in the analyses for some contaminants on a case-by-case basis. For example, many of the results from the groundwater transport runs show increases in the concentration of uranium at the end of 10,000 years; as a result, uranium releases from the SX tank farm were analyzed as a test case for 30,000 years to determine peak concentrations occurring beyond the standard analysis period. The results of this analysis are discussed in detail as a part of Appendix O, Section O.6.4. However, the 10,000-year contaminant transport results for the transuranics—including the plutonium isotopes—indicate that these elements are not the most important indicators of long-term groundwater impacts due to their limited mobility and lower half-lives compared to uranium.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

57

on this planet, and yet we are discussing, you know, dealing with this stuff. That is insane.

The draft EIS talks about how many adult men will get cancer in the future from the drinking water from the leaching of radioactive isotopes into the ground. They do not address what ionizing radiation will do to children, and ionizing radiation harms children more because their cells are dividing more quickly. In the state of Belarus, which is where most of the Chernobyl contamination went, the medical doctors there are writing reports about the health of the children there. There is not one healthy child in the entire country of Belarus. They all have thyroid disorders and cancers and childhood leukemias. That is what radiation does.

There is really no ideal solution to this problem of nuclear waste, but we need to do the very best we can do, and that is to vitrify as much as possible and to develop a deep geologic site to put the waste. That is not Hanford, that is not Yucca Mountain. Any other solution is insanity.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Brian, and after Brian will be Ruth Yarrow.

MR. BESSEMBINDERS: Okay. So first, this is a horrible place to put nuclear waste. It is going to

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

350-2 cont'd

350-3

350-4

350-3 DOE acknowledges that the scientific data indicate that health effects of radiation exposure are more pronounced in children than in adults. As discussed in Appendix K, Section K.1.1.6, of this *TC & WM EIS*, a number of authoritative studies provide guidance on risk factors relating health effects to dose. Section K.1.1.6 discusses the scientific evidence relating radiation dose to incidence of cancers, both fatal and nonfatal. The discussion indicates that the fatal cancer risk factor of 0.0006 reflects an age distribution that includes children and is generally regarded as conservative. Appendix Q, Section Q.2.4.2, explains that nuclide-specific risk coefficients, developed using techniques that account for gender and age, were used for the long-term human health impacts analysis.

350-4 As described in the Summary, Section S.1.3, and Chapter 1, Section 1.3, this EIS evaluates vitrification of the tank waste under a number of the Tank Closure alternatives. However, the proposed actions evaluated in this *TC & WM EIS* do not include remediation of nontank waste (e.g., burial grounds, cribs and trenches [ditches]) or groundwater, which will continue to be governed by the TPA process in compliance with CERCLA's legal requirements. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones, and is governed by the requirements of CERCLA. CERCLA and the implementing EPA regulations require that the substantive requirements of all applicable or relevant and appropriate Federal and state laws and regulations be met for each cleanup action taking place at Hanford. CERCLA also requires consideration of detailed decision criteria for each cleanup alternative as part of determining cleanup levels for each operable unit or waste management area.

Regarding the safe disposal of waste generated from nuclear energy production, the current Administration has established a Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future that has issued a report and recommendations for a path forward for managing the country's HLW. DOE's decisions regarding management of Hanford waste will be consistent with Administration policies. For a more comprehensive discussion of this topic, see Section 2.10 of this CRD.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

1 get into the drinking water, it is going to get into
2 farms, agriculture, shipped around the country,
3 bottled water, I don't know, do we take any from this
4 area, we should look at that. And yeah, it is
5 affecting Oregon, Washington, anyone down river, and
6 it is guaranteed to cause cancer. At what amount, you
7 guys can argue.
8 This keeps happening in many places. Where I
9 am from in Omaha, we had a drinking water plant that
10 was going to be put in. There was a former weapons
11 manufacturing plant in the area, and basically they
12 were like, you know, it is not going to leak in until,
13 you know, 30, 40 years, but we are going to put this
14 drinking water plant, which will suck more water out.
15 It is providing water to a city with the richest man
16 in the world, so it is still happening there.
17 Tennessee, I mean, all over the country,
18 gigantic pools of sludge from coal power plants, I
19 mean, no matter what energy you are talking about
20 here, except for renewable resources, which we can
21 actually utilize, are going to cause a negative
22 effect. Natural gas, tracking, putting benzonite into
23 the water.
24 You know, we just can't keep fighting this.
25 We can't keep fighting it forever. We can't have

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

59

these alternatives. We can't have these half efforts at cleaning it up. It has been happening forever, and basically policy is to just keeping having these meetings and saying, well, we will take that opportunity to bury the waste in the areas you care about most.

The federal government is overtaking the state standards, make no mistake. There are state standards that do not allow this to happen and why isn't the federal government taking this into account? **351-1**

Yeah, Governor Gregoire, she has the authority to stop this, why isn't she? She needs to use her abilities to stop the permitting process. It should not happen in the future, it should not happen now. We shouldn't have to keep on fighting this, but it seems we're going to have to.

Environmental impact statements are only supposed to be 300 pages, they are supposed to be understandable to the common layman, the public. These are becoming legal documents, rapidly, and as we've seen earlier, chemistry professionals can't figure this stuff out. I mean, this needs to be on the Seattle channel, this needs to be broadcast to people. We need to get over -- we need to realize it is our own greed that causes this, too, and it has **351-2**

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

351-1 DOE must comply with certain legal requirements to undertake specific activities that are part of the proposed actions and alternatives; these requirements are identified throughout this EIS. For example, Chapter 1, Section 1.2.1, discusses Hanford regulatory compliance requirements; Section 1.2.7 discusses the WAC regulations DOE must meet for the proposed closure of the SSTs. Section 1.9, which describes the alternatives evaluated in this EIS, refers to the RCRA, WAC, and DOE order requirements that must be met for DOE to implement Tank Closure alternatives. The very nature of "environmental impact analysis" requires DOE to analyze and describe in the EIS how proposed processes and technologies would operate; what results they are expected to achieve; what end products or byproducts might result; and how these measure up against the legal requirements that apply. Statutory, regulatory, Executive order, and DOE requirements are discussed in the context of each chapter and are listed in the references at the end of each chapter. Chapter 8 identifies and discusses the laws and legal requirements that are potentially applicable to the proposed actions and alternatives, as well as the permits and approvals DOE must obtain from Federal, state, and local agencies. In Sections 8.1.7 and 8.3, DOE identifies the consultations and coordination that DOE has undertaken with American Indian tribes and would need to continue for the purpose of implementing the proposed actions and alternatives. In addition, Chapter 7, Sections 7.1 and 7.5, discuss potential mitigation measures that may be needed and are feasible for DOE to implement to offset the potential impacts that might result from implementing an alternative.

While DOE's Preferred Alternatives for tank closure, FFTF decommissioning, and waste management in this *TC & WM EIS* may not necessarily represent the most environmentally preferred alternatives, the ROD issued by DOE will identify any additional mitigation and monitoring commitments adopted by DOE and specify other factors considered by DOE in reaching its decision, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. In announcing its decision in the ROD based on the EIS analyses, DOE will be obligated to carry out the decision consistent with the requirements identified in this EIS. These requirements will be interpreted and applied by Federal, state, and local regulatory agencies through their independent authorities. These agencies may also impose additional mitigation measures through future permitting processes or remedial actions under the scope of the TPA, which include additional opportunities for public comment.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

60

351-2 cont'd

caused a lot of the other problems.

Yeah, clean closure, I mean, clean -- we need 98 percent, whatever we can do. We need to switch to clean energy. We need to stop trying to push the nuclear agenda, and we need to consider that -- I mean, is Obama -- hopefully what he is trying to do is offer this ridiculous proposal in the hope that the people around the country will realize that we can't build nuclear power plants, and hopefully, you know, we actually comment and we say this is ridiculous and hopefully that is his plan.

MR. PARHAM: Three minutes.

MR. BESSEMBINDERS: Yeah, water will be more expensive in the future. Go to Portland.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Ruth Yarrow, and after Ruth will be Barbara Zepeda.

MS. YARROW: My name is Ruth Yarrow, I am an ecologist who came here to work with Physicians for Social Responsibility on the Hanford issue 13 years ago. At that time, the Department of Energy said there are 200 feet of soil beneath the tanks, and if any leaks, it would adhere to the soil particles and would not enter the groundwater. Six months later, there were blaring headlines in the newspapers in Seattle saying radioactivity found in the groundwater

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

351-2 For those who may not want to read through this entire EIS, DOE published a Summary. The Summary is intended to provide a brief overview of the material contained in the *Draft TC & WM EIS*. For those interested in reading this entire EIS, DOE has also issued a Reader's Guide to assist the public in navigating through the complex information presented. This guide serves as an introduction and guide to the contents of this EIS, highlights the key features of the reasonable alternatives, and helps readers review the technical analyses presented. Recognizing that many people may not read beyond the EIS Summary, the information presented in both the Summary and the Reader's Guide attempts to strike a balance between those readers interested in the more technical details regarding DOE's proposed actions and alternatives and readers seeking a simpler overview. DOE also held a 1-hour open house prior to each public hearing on the draft EIS to allow the public to meet informally with members of the *TC & WM EIS* team, ask questions, and learn more about this EIS. Informative factsheets also were provided at these open houses.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

61

1 under Hanford.
2 When I read about the amount of radioactivity
3 that is considered acceptable or on the verge of
4 dangerous, if you graph that, it has gone down very
5 steeply over the many decades that we have dealt with
6 radioactivity, to a tiny fraction of what we
7 originally thought was what human beings could take.
8 In other words, given the mistakes that DOE thought
9 that the groundwater was not going to get
10 contaminated, or our original naivete about what
11 radioactivity could do to the human body, I think we
12 need to put a huge chunk of humility into any of these
13 decisions and realize we don't have any idea of the
14 long-term effects, the synergistic effects of what is
15 happening at Hanford. So that is one point I would
16 like to make.
17 The other is the money is there. I made a
18 graph once at one of these hearings with a piece of
19 string, and one represented the billions that have
20 been spent on producing and delivering nuclear and --
21 weaponry and it went all the way around a building, a
22 room this size. At that point, the DOE was saying we
23 don't have enough money to do the cleanup. The amount
24 that was being asked for for cleaning up Hanford was
25 like that much. So we have spent incredible amounts

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

352-1

352-2

352-1 The analyses in this *TC & WM EIS* consider the environmental impacts of a number of tank closure, FFTF decommissioning, and waste management activities for which assumptions had to be made for the sake of comparison. A conservative approach to model selection and parameterization was adopted in the *Draft TC & WM EIS* to allow for these uncertainties. As a result of comments on the draft EIS and DOE's review of those analyses, refinements in both the modeling approach and selected sensitivity analyses have been incorporated into this *Final TC & WM EIS*. These refinements will better frame uncertainties for the decisionmaking process.

352-2 Both DOE and Congress are committed to cleanup efforts at Hanford, and DOE continues to seek funding for these efforts. One of the purposes of this *TC & WM EIS* is to analyze the potential impacts of DOE's proposed actions to retrieve waste from the buried tanks, treat and dispose of this waste, and close the SST farms by landfill closure, selective clean closure, or clean closure. This analysis is also intended to aid DOE in making decisions regarding cleanup of the past leaks, including remediation of the contamination in the vadose zone. DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones. The TPA agencies completed negotiations on several Hanford cleanup projects, including the establishment of 29 additional and/or accelerated groundwater and Columbia River protection milestones and target dates.

in producing this waste. We can find the money to clean it up if the political will is there and if our Department of Ecology will stand up and use the laws that it has at its back to demand what cleanup is needed. Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Barbara, and then after that, will be Blair Anuntson.

MS. ZEPEDA: Yeah, I live in Seattle and I have been coming to these things for years. I was a Bomber, a Richland Bomber, I was -- I went to high school in Richland and my mother died of pancreatic cancer, she worked in a decontamination lab. They were very low paid workers, all of the workers, and so there was one person there that I had to listen to her all through high school come home and complain about how none of the supervisors there would allow them to really follow the safety rules. They'd have safety meetings, but they were never allowed to follow them, except for Russ Knights, and I don't know if you can find any Russ Knights in Hanford anymore, because essentially, the problem with Hanford is the problem with the military industrial complex that Eisenhower talked about, and it is intellectual and economic incest.

It is the worst form of incest, because it

352-2 cont'd

353-1

353-1 Comment noted.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

hides the facts, it hides the dollar facts, and if you can't even get the dollars straight, how in the hell can you get all of the protons, neutrons, and the million chemical formula right? It is deliberate and yet they are brilliant people. I was late to this meeting because I was listening to European Journal on CBTBS, a Tacoma PBS station. A German -- one of the best German engineers was talking about why the new subway train tunnel in Cologne was a catastrophe. It flooded, it undermined a building there and museum, and he said the reason is that they are allowing the contractors to monitor themselves.

You cannot have -- and I would -- if you would take this book and print it in your -- this is Eldon Caldicott's book, a New Nuclear Danger, and talks about George Bush and the military industrial complex, but this goes back to Eisenhower and it is a list of the Dirty Dozen, the ten top contractors that have been involved in the weapons and in so-called cleanup and the so-called peaceful uses of nuclear energy, which our leading politicians, Andrew Jackson and John Adams pushed, and they bought off the environmentalists because they gave them some little parks. They didn't tell them the parks -- that the water running through those parks was all going to be

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

nuclearized with those darling little plants.

And here is the other -- this is the political incest of the military industrial complex, with the documentation of the major corporations that have played this game because they need more money, the more messes they make. When you have got an economic system, like Wall Street, you not only destroy the environment, you destroy the economy, and while you're ruining the world.

And then here I have -- I am going to give you these 20 pages from 159 pages of the latest City Light bond prospectus. In this is a hidden subsidy of City Light through the Northwest Energy that we are subsidizing nuclear plants and this is what allows Obama to come forward with this big plan, because he can hide it in the budget, because in here, they tell you, okay, it's like 50 million but it has gone up to 500 million within ten years of financing within City Light, because we have got all of this wonderful unused bonding capacity, which the municipal ownership lead built the first public utility in the United States at City Light in 1905 and it has been bastardized. Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Blair Anuntson? Jim Kelley.

MR. KELLEY: I am Jim Kelley from Seattle.

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

1 Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment. I
2 wanted to say, first off, I am not a scientist. My
3 training is in communications and the law, and because
4 of that, I am not going to make a scientific argument,
5 but I do want to make a personal appeal and I am going
6 to direct it to you, because you are the two public
7 employees who are here.
8 I am a former state and county employee, and
9 so Jeff and Mary Beth, I just want to say that, you
10 know, I am a citizen of the United States and a
11 lifelong resident of Seattle, Washington, so you both
12 work for me, and you both work for all of the people
13 here, but more importantly, you work for all of these
14 people's children and their children and future
15 generations that will go on, hopefully, for many, many
16 generations, and you might be also pleased to know
17 that I haven't reproduced, but it is important to keep
18 that in mind, because when government deals with big
19 issues, and I mean, really important issues, like the
20 abolition of slavery and the kinds of things that have
21 made this, you know, have made this a great country,
22 when it has always taken heroes to step up from the
23 ranks of everyday workers, and, you know, the thing is
24 that when you work for government, it is so easy to
25 just do things the way it has always been done, and

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

66

this environmental impact statement, I am sorry to say, I have worked on some EISs myself, this environmental impact statement is the perfect example of that.

This is a 6,000-page document that no one can understand, because chemists can't understand it and attorneys can't understand it. What we can do is we can try to boil it down and understand bits and pieces, and yes, I'll make the same points that everybody else here has made, you know, that the -- about the cleaning up to 99.9 percent and all of that, but that is not the important issue here. The important issue here is for someone, and I'm saying this for the record, someone who works on these issues at the US Department of Energy, at the state Department of Ecology, and the governor's office, and the Oval Office, somebody should step up and say enough is enough. This has to change. Our approach to the way we deal with the cleanup of nuclear waste has to change.

This is a critical, critical issue to the health of our future generations and to the health of our environment, you know, our ecosystems and everything else that depend upon clean water, and boy, I am just begging you, please, step out of that --

354-1

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

354-1 For those who may not want to read through this entire EIS, DOE published a Summary. The Summary is intended to provide a brief overview of the material contained in the *Draft TC & WM EIS*. For those interested in reading this entire EIS, DOE has also issued a Reader's Guide to assist the public in navigating through the information presented. This guide serves as an introduction and guide to the contents of this EIS, highlights the key features of the reasonable alternatives, and provides references to specific sections of the document to assist the reader in reviewing the technical analyses presented. Recognizing that many people may not read beyond the EIS Summary, the information presented in both the Summary and the Reader's Guide attempts to strike a balance between those readers interested in the more technical details regarding DOE's proposed actions and alternatives and readers seeking a simpler overview. DOE also held a 1-hour open house prior to each public hearing on the draft EIS to allow the public to meet informally with members of the *TC & WM EIS* team, ask questions, and learn more about the EIS. Informative factsheets also were provided at these open houses.

The impacts of the different levels of tank waste retrieval and types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These levels include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which would retrieve 99.9 percent of the tank waste and clean-close all or part of the SST system. DOE's preferred retrieval option (retrieval of at least 99 percent of the tank waste) is consistent with the TPA goal of not allowing residual waste to exceed 10.2 cubic meters (360 cubic feet) for 100-series tanks or 0.85 cubic meters (30 cubic feet) for the smaller 200-series tanks (these limits would correspond to 99 percent retrieval). DOE has already begun the process of retrieving waste from the tanks, such as tanks located in Waste Management Area C.

Decisions made by DOE on the proposed retrieval actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

354-1 cont'd

that inertia that comes with being a part of a system that does things over and over the same way. Step out of it, be a hero. Thanks.

MR. PARHAM: Fred Miller. After Fred Miller will be Robert MacDonald.

MR. MILLER: My name is Fred Miller, I am the president of Peace Action of Washington and a board member of Peace Action, which is America's largest peace organization.

First, I want to talk a little bit about 90 percent and 99 percent and 99.9 percent. Speaking to someone whose formal education in mathematics ended when I was 15, recently there were headlines about a middle-aged white man who went to the Pentagon and started killing people. I am a middle-aged white man, and his father and mother had reported that he was crazy. My father has been saying I was crazy for years. And he hadn't spoken to his parents for quite a while. I haven't spoken to my parents for about three weeks now. So I want you to think, okay, what are the chances that middle-aged white men in this audience are psycho gun toters? Would you keep your job if you knew that you were going to a place where there was about 50 middle-aged white men and you knew that 90 percent of them were not psychotic gun toters?

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

68

Would you keep your job if that was 99 percent? Would you keep your job if it was 99.9 percent? Which means about, oh, one headline nationwide every 20 hearings. 99.9 percent is not that high.

We had an attorney and a chemist with much more education than me, who couldn't understand the EIS. It only took me a few minutes and I have no college background. One thing I noticed is it doesn't seem to talk about the ecology of the Hanford area in the time we are talking about. I have spoken with atmospheric scientists and I asked them, I was just having fun, okay, how bad could it get? Could we have West Texas weather in Hanford? You know, West Texas, they get thunderstorms that dump an inch of rain in four or five minutes, that dumps a foot of rain, and this not wildly unusual. It happens someplace in -- actually East Texas more or less every year, a foot of rain in 24 hours. He said we have no idea. It is entirely possible that we could make East Texas weather look placid.

Are you planning to have it clean enough for who knows what kind of weather is heading for Hanford in the next hundred years, to say nothing about a thousand years? How clean are you planning on making it? Thank you.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

355-1

355-1 Regarding the possibility of foreseeable natural events at Hanford and the potential for related impacts on waste treatment and disposal facilities, Chapter 3, Section 3.2, of this *TC & WM EIS* depicts and discusses the ecology and climate at the site. DOE Order 420.1B and its implementing standards require that nuclear and nonnuclear facilities be designed, constructed, and operated to safeguard the facility, public, workers, and environment from natural phenomena hazards, including earthquakes and floods. Appendix V of this EIS also provides an analysis that depicts potential impacts at Hanford that could result from climatic changes, which may increase infiltration rates and the rise of the groundwater table.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

69

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Robert MacDonald, it's a late sign-up. Robert? No?

Have I covered everyone who signed up? I believe I have. There are a lot of names here. I would like to turn now to people who have not signed up who want to offer comment.

Is there anyone who would like to provide -- yes, sir. Come on up.

MR. HEGGEN: Hello, my name is Richard Heggen, H-e-g-g-e-n, and I am a former ecology employee who used to work on the single shell tanks, and I will keep this kind of brief. Basically, in reviewing the EIS and my knowledge of other documents and issues on Hanford, there is about four key points I would like to make.

Institutional controls, this is the first point, institutional controls, like covers, liners, fences, et cetera, will fail over time and a shorter time than you probably think. Existing -- the second point is existing contamination has already been shown to show serious human health and environmental effects. Even if you clean it up to 99.9 percent or better, you have already got issues out there. You can't get to some of these amazing amounts of chemistry and radiological inventory from past ditches

356-1

356-2

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

356-1 For analysis purposes only, this EIS assumes that administrative controls or postclosure care and monitoring would continue for 100 years beyond the construction, operations, and deactivation phases of an alternative. As discussed in Appendix M, closure features are assumed to fail after a period of time (e.g., RCRA landfill barriers at 500 years, Hanford landfill barriers at 1,000 years). The failure of these systems is reflected in the impacts analysis presented in this EIS. Chapter 7, Sections 7.1 and 7.5, discuss potential mitigation measures, including development of better-engineered landfill barriers and waste-form performance, among others.

However, it should be noted that, under DOE Policy 454.1 (April 9, 2003), institutional controls are necessary and important to DOE efforts to fulfill its programmatic responsibilities. It is DOE policy to use institutional controls as essential components of a defense-in-depth strategy that uses multiple, relatively independent layers of safety to protect human health and the environment (including natural and cultural resources). DOE would implement institutional controls and other mitigating or preventive measures as necessary to provide a reasonable expectation that, if one control were to fail temporarily, other controls would be in place or other actions would be taken to mitigate significant consequences.

356-2 Regarding the contamination present in the soil from past releases to cribs and trenches (ditches), in general, the scope of this *TC & WM EIS* does not include groundwater remediation activity as part of the proposed actions evaluated. However, DOE is implementing an extensive, ongoing cleanup program at Hanford, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, a legal agreement between DOE, Ecology, and EPA. The TPA identifies cleanup actions and schedules, called milestones, and is governed by the requirements of CERCLA. CERCLA and the implementing EPA regulations require that the substantive requirements of all applicable or relevant and appropriate Federal and state laws and regulations be met for each cleanup action taking place at Hanford. CERCLA also requires consideration of detailed decision criteria for each cleanup alternative as part of determining cleanup levels for each operable unit or waste management area.

NEPA's purpose is different; its focus is to ensure agencies take a "hard look" at the potential environmental impacts associated with a proposed action and the reasonable alternatives to that proposed action. Agencies must conduct a comparative analysis of the alternatives and present the results; consider the cumulative impacts of the alternatives when added to other ongoing actions; and

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

70

and cribs and so forth, which actually kind of thwarts the tank form inventories.

Point No. 3 is that the EIS is incomplete. I covered those points earlier in Gerry's presentation, and the last point is a lack of meaningful characterization out on-site. This has been going on for years, just kind of a real slow paced characterization. There is not enough characterization to actually support the modeling done in the EIS. It is pretty standard methodology is to validate your model characterization, go out and take some field samples, find out if that model is valid or not. I didn't see that in the EIS.

Because of all that and other issues, I would just like to say for the record US DOE needs to conduct the most thorough possible cleanup on-site, and I am talking at least 99.9 percent or better. Dig those tanks out, you know, take a good look at the linings and other containmented areas on-site. And also, the most important point is not to bring any more waste to Hanford whatsoever. Thanks.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you.

MR. DIPESO: Good evening. Jim Dipeso, D-i-p-e-s-o. Good Italian name. Please spell it right.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

356-2 cont'd

356-3

356-4

356-5

identify potential mitigations that could be used to offset the impacts identified by the NEPA analysis. The goal is to consider the best-available information at the time of the agency's decisionmaking process. However, NEPA does not require that an agency ultimately choose the most environmentally preferred alternative based on a "ranking" process.

356-3 Regarding the level of detail in site characterization to support modeling and assessment, the *TC & WM EIS* analyses rely on various modeling approaches to predict the future consequences of the RPP mission activities that DOE may undertake. In the *Draft TC & WM EIS,* Appendix L, Section L.4, field-sampling data from over 5,000 boring logs are used to support lithologic encoding of the regional-scale flow model. In Section L.6, field-sampling data from approximately 1,800 groundwater wells are used to calculate the regional scale flow model. In Appendix N, Section N.1, of the draft EIS, field-sampling data from approximately 140 vadose zone boreholes are used to calibrate the vadose zone model, as well as regional-scale groundwater plume measurements for the BY Cribs, BC Cribs, 216-T-26 Crib, REDOX Facility Area, and PUREX Plant Area. In Appendix U, model results of contaminant plumes are compared against field measurements for the major COPCs. DOE's view is that the overall level of Hanford characterization data supports differentiation among the alternatives, a key feature of NEPA analyses. As part of the closure and permitting processes, additional subregional-scale site-characterization data may be developed to support smaller-scale, more-detailed modeling assessments.

356-4 The impacts of different levels of tank waste retrieval and of different types of SST system closure are addressed in the *TC & WM EIS* analyses. These include Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B, which evaluate 99.9 percent retrieval of the tank waste and clean closure of all or part of the SST system. Decisions made by DOE on the proposed actions will be based on a number of factors, including health and safety, environmental, economic, and technical considerations; agency statutory missions; and national policy considerations. The decisions on the selected course of action and supporting rationale will be documented in a ROD issued no sooner than 30 days after the EPA Notice of Availability for this *Final TC & WM EIS* is published in the *Federal Register*.

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

356-5 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

71

I'm with the Republicans for Environmental Protection. We will have detailed written comments to be submitted later. Very briefly, the primary theme of our letter is there should be no further consideration of importing off-site waste into Hanford. Hanford should not be a nuclear waste repository, or as -- if you will forgive me the humor for the lateness of the hour, a former Nevada senator once said in regard to Yucca Mountain, he called it a nuclear waste suppository.

Anyway, importing off-site waste is at cross purposes with thorough cleanup of the radioactive and chemical wastes that endanger the Columbia River. We support 99.9 percent cleanup standards, a clean closure, not landfill closure, because all landfills leak. Anything else is irresponsible and thank you and we will be in touch.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone who has not provided a comment yet is invited to at this time.

No? We'd like to turn to people who have already commented who would like to provide additional comment.

MR. POLLET: Gerry Pollet with Heart of America Northwest. I have several points I would like to make tonight. First, I would like to

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

357-1

357-1 cont'd

357-1 Regarding the commentor's concern about the transport of LLW and MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal, DOE will be deferring the decision on sending LLW or MLLW from other DOE sites to Hanford for disposal (with some limited specific exceptions), at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. For a more comprehensive discussion on the transport and disposal of offsite waste, see Section 2.1 of this CRD.

The clean closure alternatives considered for the SST system are represented by Tank Closure Alternatives 6A and 6B, Base and Option Cases. For both Base Cases, the assumption is that the SST system would be cleaned to levels that would allow for unrestricted use, which is represented by the removal of the tanks, ancillary equipment, and soils beneath the tanks (contaminated as a result of past leaks) down to the groundwater table. The two Option Cases represent this type of clean closure along with removal of soils beneath the tank farms (contaminated as a result of infiltration from the contiguous cribs and trenches [ditches]). The analysis shows that removal of the contaminants from the vadose zone would not capture those contaminants that may have already reached the groundwater table due to past practices (i.e., past leaks and contiguous cribs and trenches [ditches]).

Regarding the status of groundwater contamination and remediation at Hanford, groundwater remediation activities, as required under RCRA, CERCLA, and/or the TPA, are in various stages of assessment, risk-based end-state development, corrective action, and/or active remediation. For a more comprehensive discussion of remediation at Hanford, see Section 2.3 of this CRD.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

72

start thanking those who have stayed to this late hour. Your participation and your presence makes a big difference, and hopefully someone back on the top floor of the Forestal (ph.) building, Energy Department headquarters, will hear about your comments tomorrow morning, and perhaps someone at the governor's office as well.

First off, in this very room, not so many years ago, several people here remember that there was a hearing on the proposed restart of the FFTF nuclear reactor, and there were probably 3- to 500 people here that evening. There are at least 100 people I counted here tonight talking about the legacy of nuclear weapons and reactor production at Hanford and a need for full cleanup. Luckily, we won a decision after five or six years of hard citizen organizing that that reactor was to be shut down.

What is beyond me and inexplicably is why the Energy Department is even asking the question as to whether or not you fully remove the reactor. There is a standard in state law that for all energy facility sites, we restore the site by removing the reactor. Oregon did this with the Trojan nuclear reactor on the Columbia River. For the other nine nuclear weapons production reactors along the Columbia River, the

358-1

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

358-1 In Washington State, in conformance with Nuclear Energy and Radiation Act (RCW 70.98), the Washington State Department of Health is responsible for administering regulatory, licensing, and radiation control requirements to protect public health and safety. These licensing provisions, as well as those of "Radioactive Material – Licensing Applicability" (WAC 246-232), expressly do not apply to activities conducted within Hanford's boundaries. The Department of Health's general radiation protection provisions ("Radiation Protection – General Provisions" [WAC 246-220]) contain exemptions for DOE or NRC contractors or subcontractors engaged in activities at U.S. Government–owned or –controlled sites, including transportation of radiation sources to or from such sites and use or operation of nuclear reactors and devices ("Exemptions" [WAC 246-220-050]). Under NEPA, agencies identify the laws, regulations, and requirements that may apply to the proposed action and alternatives. Chapter 8 of this *TC & WM EIS* provides both a listing and short description of the laws, regulations, and requirements that may apply to the proposed actions, including decommissioning of FFTF.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

73

1 Energy Department has long agreed that it has to
2 remove them entirely. So what is different about this
3 FFTF reactor? There is no difference. It should be
4 removed entirely, not just to grade level, but remove
5 it entirely so that that portion of the Hanford site
6 can be restored for other uses, including treaty
7 rights to use that portion of the site, which are not
8 compatible with leaving it under account. And this
9 decision is one that is so by bizarrely sensible that
10 I have been listening to presentation after
11 presentation and going, how come the State of
12 Washington ignores its own site closure standard for
13 reactors and energy facilities, when it says in its
14 presentation, we agree there isn't much difference
15 between capping it or taking it apart and removing it
16 entirely.
17 Did the State of Washington Department of
18 Ecology forget about its own site restoration
19 standards? Yes, apparently so. And that's not
20 excusable. The Energy Department should have been
21 reminded of that standard. It wasn't really -- it was
22 up to the contractor and the Energy Department to be
23 knowledgeable about it, but it is certainly logical
24 for them to rely on the State of Washington to say,
25 hey, we are a cooperating agency, you need to know, as

358-1 cont'd

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

74

1 you draft this, that we have such a standard. So what
2 is going on here? I would like to hear from the State
3 of Washington how it missed this. I would really like
4 to hear that answer.
5 It is important that the reactor be entirely
6 dismantled and the site restored to as beneficial use
7 a condition as is possible. As has been stated over
8 and over again tonight and in prior hearings, caps
9 fail. Caps fail and result in exposures to people.
10 Sometimes they fail because of deliberate intrusions,
11 so it's not wise to have isolated spots all over the
12 560 square miles of Hanford where you have got caps as
13 opposed to trying to consolidate as much of the waste
14 as possible on this one small area in the central
15 plateau. That is inevitable, but the landfills that
16 are proposed are also projected to leak without even
17 adding off-site wastes, and let's think about that in
18 a final thought for tonight.
19 The landfills will release far in excessive
20 standards, even without off-site waste being added,
21 and therefore, the reasonable alternative is not only
22 to not add more off-site waste, but this EIS needs to
23 ask the question how much of Hanford's existing waste
24 should be exhumed, dug up, treated, and sent to deep
25 geologic repositories elsewhere in the country? Not

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

358-1 cont'd

358-2

358-2 The alternatives presented in this *TC & WM EIS* were developed under NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to address the essential components of DOE's three sets of proposed actions (tank closure, FFTF decommissioning, and waste management) and to provide an understanding of the differences between the potential environmental impacts of the range of reasonable alternatives. Consistent with CEQ guidance, this EIS analyzes the range of reasonable alternatives that covers the full spectrum of potential combinations. The alternatives considered by DOE in this EIS are "reasonable" in the sense that they are practical or feasible from a technical and economic standpoint and meet the agency's purposes and needs. Potential conflicts with laws and regulations do not necessarily cause an alternative to be unreasonable, but additional mitigation commitments may be required if it is selected for implementation. For a more comprehensive discussion on compliance with regulatory requirements, see Section 2.7 of this CRD.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

above groundwater, not next to rivers, but dug up and removed and sent to deep geologic repositories because it doesn't belong next to a major river, it doesn't belong above potable groundwater. Thank you.

MR. PARHAM: Thank you. Anyone else who would like to provide a comment who has already. Yes, sir.

MR. RASBERRY: No one has brought this up, but I think it is of interest to most people here that the US Department of Energy just had a press release on March 4th, tours of Hanford are available. You usually can't go to Hanford, it is usually closed, but one day a year, they make reservations for the rest of the year. If anyone wants to take a tour, then you have to register on that day. The tour is free, it is information intensive, it is rather exhausting, it is about five hours. You are going around Hanford site.

The date to register is tomorrow. If you want to go on a tour sometime in the next year, you have to go to the web site tomorrow early and register. I have been on the tour, it is a lot of fun, I recommend going if you are interested. You get to meet some of the people there, it is what it is. If anyone would like to talk to me about it, I will be around. Thank you.

358-2 cont'd

DEPONET

Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

Public Hearing March 8, 2010

76

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Does it say when the tour is going to be?

MR. RASBERRY: It is April until September, tours.

MR. PARHAM: Do we have an additional comment?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you give us the web site?

MR. RASBERRY: I will be around. Hanford.gov. Hanford.gov.

MS. ISAAC: I would like to make an additional comment. When we are using these units of 99.9 percent, this is by volume. I would like us to use a different way of talking about it. Instead of by volume, I would like to be talking about this with respect to its toxicity or its radioactivity, heavy metal content, whatever the bad stuff is. I want that to be talked about. What percent of that is being left, not what percent of volume is being left. That is part of the obfuscation of this statement.

And the other thing is, you probably don't know this, but the federal government does have a law concerning consent forms. When people participate in research, which I feel we are all doing right now is research, when people participate in research, the

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

345-5

345-6

345-5 Commentor 345 (comments continued). While a generic parameter that could characterize the residual waste could possibly be defined and provided, it would be difficult because the tank waste constituents include a host of both radioactive and chemical constituents. Therefore, DOE has chosen to provide a number of tables in Appendix D that quantify, by COPC, the radioactive and chemical constituents in curies and grams, respectively. For example, for the 99.9 percent retrieval case, Tables D–18 and D–19 in Appendix D provide the residual radioactive inventory in curies and Tables D–24 and D–25 provide the residual chemical inventory in grams.

345-6 For those who may not want to read through this entire EIS, DOE published a Summary. The Summary is intended to provide a brief overview of the material contained in the *Draft TC & WM EIS*. For those interested in reading this entire EIS, DOE has also issued a Reader's Guide to assist the public in navigating through the complex information presented. This guide serves as an introduction and guide to the contents of this EIS, highlights the key features of the reasonable alternatives, and helps readers review the technical analyses presented. Recognizing that many people may not read beyond the EIS Summary, the information presented in both the Summary and the Reader's Guide attempts to strike a balance between those readers interested in the more technical details regarding DOE's proposed actions and alternatives and readers seeking a simpler overview. DOE also held a 1-hour open house prior to each public hearing on the draft EIS to allow the public to meet informally with members of the *TC & WM EIS* team, ask questions, and learn more about the EIS. Informative factsheets also were provided at these open houses.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

1 federal government requires that consent forms be
2 written in language that the average person
3 participating would be able to understand. Now, it is
4 very low for medical research, it is seventh grade.
5 But we have to take those consent forms to people,
6 committees, whatever is set up, boards, review boards,
7 to look at those for us and let us know if we have
8 passed that test. I think that you folks should be
9 submitting your materials and the -- to some board and
10 to let you know if you have passed that test before
11 you come to us. Thank you.
12 MR. PARHAM: We would like to thank you for
13 coming out tonight. That concludes our program. This
14 is No. 8 in the series and thank you very much. You
15 have been a very patient and curious crowd. Thank you
16 very much and see you later.
17
18
19 (The meeting concluded at
20 10:00 p.m.)
21
22
23
24
25

345-6 cont'd

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.

Comments from the Seattle, Washington, Public Hearing (March 8, 2010)

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
) ss.
COUNTY OF KING)

I, Holly Buckmater a Certified Court Reporter and an officer of the Court, under my commission as a Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing deposition transcript of the witness named herein was taken stenographically before me and transcribed under my direction; that the transcript is a full, true and complete transcript of the proceedings, including all questions, objections, motions and exceptions of counsel, make and taken at the time of the foregoing proceedings, to the best of my abilities;

That I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any party to this action or relative or employee of any such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in the said action or the outcome thereof;

That the witness, before examination, was by me duly sworn, and the transcript was made available to the witness for reading and signing upon completion of transcription, unless indicated herein the waiving of signature.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand on this 15th day of March, 2010, at Shoreline, Washington.

/s/ Holly Buckmaster
Holly Buckmaster
Notary Public in and for
the State of Washington
residing in Seattle.
My commission expires:
November 9, 2010.

DEPONET
Nationwide Scheduling
Toll Free: 1.800.337.6638
Facsimile: 1.973.355.3094
www.deponet.com

Response side of this page intentionally left blank.