

## Written Public Comments received during the 2011 State of the Hanford Site

### Concerning Fiscal Year 2013 Budget

1. Under compliance category, clarify/identify what date actions are to begin and what milestone if any drives the action.
2. Group PBSs for the same facility or workscope together.
3. Provide total dollar request for each PBS.
4. Define whether request is for current budget request or out-year request.
5. Better explain that all projected budget requests are subject to affects of 2011 work efficiencies (and how much dollars are anticipated) and affects of 2012 budget.
6. Forget taking down all the buildings around the contaminated buildings! I don't care if there are hundreds of derelict buildings left after the cleanup is finished. The wildlife won't care either!! Put the most money into cleaning up the transuranic waste burials, and the plumes closest to the river. Also, emptying the single wall liquid waste tanks. Forget spending money on the vitrification plant. It is taking too long and I understand that the glass begins to break up after not too long of time, anyway. Then what? Finish cleaning up the chromium! Withdraw the decision making Hanford a nuclear waste dump for the Nation! NEVER!
7. I am grateful that the leaking of chromium from groundwater into the Columbia River will be ended as of 2012. And I would hope that all radioactive and chemical pollutants at Hanford that are imperiling groundwater can be similarly controlled and that this be priorities. The second priority is making extant waste inert and providing for safe disposal of it. The vitrification process seems promising. I would say it makes no sense as regards completion of cleanup to bring more waste on-site until all extant waste is made inert and provided for permanent disposal. I wonder if, along with ending of leaking of chromium into the river, there is a standard by which that statement – the ending of the leaking – can be evaluated? Will it be stopped to the point that direct contact with juvenile salmon will mean that the juvenile salmon will not be harmed?
8. Would Hanford DOE commit to proactively interact with the greater than class c EIS people to make sure they understand the incredible level of contamination that's in the subsurface of Hanford and all the money and focus that's going to try and clean it up? There seems to be a disconnect between what's going on at Hanford and this effort to look at bringing huge amounts of highly contaminated waste to the site and burying it at Hanford.
9. Making good on the unfulfilled promise to clean-up all damage done at the entire Hanford site. No more nuclear waste shipped there. No more lies on efficacy and/or safety of nuclear power. We'd like to be able to vote on our common future in my homeland. RE-STORE our faith AND quit lying! CLEAN UP HANFORD, completely NOW.
10. When will the vitrification plant be decommissioned? How will you keep the glassified waste cool? Do evaporators send radioactive waste into the air? Thank you for keeping the workers safe. Shrub stepp should be the final goal. No land should be used by industry. The Manhattan Project was enough industry for many lifetimes and it will never end.

11. More public education on the true costs of nuclear energy from the beginning. Anyone profiting from nuclear development should put money into clean up. The history of uranium refinement, the connection with fluoride, the political infighting, the sums of money involved should all be exposed to public view again and again.
12. I think the unlined trenches should be cleaned up not covered and soon. I don't think we should truck in waste from somewhere else – seems an incredible danger to the public. Why are you demolishing buildings that aren't radioactive before we clean up the trenches?
13. I live in Seattle and have spent a great deal of time hiking and camping in the Hanford Reach. This is a beautiful area of our state and the Columbia River is vital to Washington, and our country as a whole. It's unconscionable to me that Hanford would accept more waste, especially when there is so much work that needs to be done. The single-lined tanks and unburred trenches should be top priorities. Eliminating ANY chance of contamination further reaching the Columbia is vital. Soil and groundwater contamination should be budget priorities and funds should not be diverted from these clean-up activities.
14. I am unsatisfied with the extent of all of the clean-up options in the TC & WM EIS. Only going 3m below the surface is unacceptable if the waste continues to seep further. Capping the trenches is also totally ludicrous. Hanford has very few qualities which make it a good candidate for a permanent waste disposal facility beyond the fact that it is already publicly owned and waste already exists there. Geologically, it is a horrible site and bringing more waste there would be absolutely irresponsible. The development of new technology applied to the cleanup is applaud able, and an important issue moving forward will be to continue revising upward our standards of cleanup as those technologies develop. If we set our standards (and stick to them) by the limits of our current abilities we will be foolish.
15. We have this issue w/nuke waste all over in reactors for power, medicine and research. The waste is \_\_\_\_ for thousands of years – that makes nuke waste management worthy of a dept. at UW for research and study to support this effort. Patent licence and lease technology to do this stuff and make some money. Develop very long barrel guns to shoot the glass into orbit then send them into the sun – really.
16. I am a first year graduate student in the UW Toxicology Program, and a new WA resident. I came here to get a flavor for the history and contemporary issues surrounding the Hanford Site. I appreciated the diversity and thoughtfulness of the meeting. It served all of my needs.
17. I'm very concerned that the river be cleaned up to a level that our government is meeting the treaty obligations to the Tribes. I urge that the 40 miles of unlined trenches of contaminated waste be dealt with in a much more comprehensive manner than being covered with soil. The possibility of using Mox fuel in the Columbia Generating Station should be a deep concern of DOE-Richland, ORP, EPA and WA Ecology. Please become informed and elicit public input. Public input is extremely important to the clean-up process. Please take this seriously, urge its continuation, and funding. I agree that this clean-up is not discretionary. The proposal to bring more radioactive waste to Hanford, given the struggle to clean up this most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere, I think is totally irresponsible. In addition, transportation of the waste is a public health hazard all along the route.

18. Please reconsider the funding for the vit. Plant if that funding could otherwise be used to clean up the burial ditches, rather than covering them. Also if it takes longer to build the plant, that would be fine if it would be done more safely if there wasn't a rush for a deadline. If the budget is the reason for covering them and not cleaning them up then the budget priorities should change.
19. The fuel statement said that the clean-up had to be "addressed" – it did not say it had to be "cleaned-up." So I'm not as excited by the "not discretionary" phrase like you would like us to be. It has wiggle room.
20. As a concerned citizen with 3 young kids I am thankful for your meeting. I would like to emphasize protection of groundwater and protection of the Columbia River. Cleanup of single wall tanks, pumping & treatment of ground water, and further protection of infiltration of contamination deep into the ground. Any additional outreach to school age kids is essential both for radiation awareness and education of how many different science disciplines are employed. Vitrification sounds promising, but also long range in solution. I wish you luck there. Thank you.
21. What can be guaranteed in the way of publications and dissemination of risk assessments? Will there be public meetings specifically dedicated to bringing attention to the continued and future risks of contamination at Hanford to human health? Will the DOE publish an acknowledgement of concern for human health and well being with regards to the contamination at the Hanford Site?
22. Not enough risk and cost info was presented to provide a well-informed opinion. Perhaps an online study course could be provided on Hanford technologies and the costs and risks of various courses of action. DOE & EPA presented "optimistic" views, which were in stark contrast to local "pessimistic" views. These discrepancies should be explained clearly to the point of consensus. Need an action plan to fund faster cleanup and/or budget scrubbing to support priorities. "Temporary" storage of imported waste seems to be a lie, since "temporary" is not defined specifically and power plant waste storage on their sites has indeed become de facto permanent. Highest DOE priority should be on deactivating and processing decommissioned nuclear warheads so they are not re-activated by reactionaries.
23. Don't stop cleaning up the unlined trenches and removing the plutonium waste transuranic from the trenches as step one. That is not an acceptable budget choice. Hold meetings in Spokane too – they have different view from being downwind and using river more than us in Seattle. Forum worked well believe facilitator allowed follow-ups and alternate views to follow up to questions. But, what will you do with our comments?
24. Tribal Issues: teach tribes about naturally-occurring soil contaminants? What about Hanford – induced contaminants? Emergency procedure for Benton & Franklin counties? Why don't public sectors (families in Benton) know these procedures? What becomes of the Central Plateau after all was is put there? After the crises in the Middle East recently, an increase in oil prices is imminent. It would seem that a move to alternative energy would be desirable and also more popular. But then the Japan earthquake happened and the nuclear reactor leaks have spawned a fear in nuclear energy. What are the alternatives now? Solar and wind don't seem

strong enough to power cities. What is the future of energy? Is Hanford done as a site of energy creation/production?

25. I found your presentation very informative and the questions from the public were all answered to my satisfaction.
26. The video "Hanford Story" was exceptional. I will be looking forward to subsequent chapters. There seemed to be an extraordinary fear of any type and level of radiation. There was a massive misunderstanding about MOX fuel from the Columbia Generating Station representing a grossly more dangerous form of spent fuel.
27. The comments extended past Hanford cleanup as one might expect, and were well tolerated. I felt encouraged at positive direction of Tri agencies & the clean-up accomplishments thus far. This is the first such meeting I have attended, and found it to be quite worthwhile and educational. I have no complaints or suggestions for improvements of these (this) meetings, but will attend the next. I certainly hope Hanford waste processing plant does not upon completion become a national repository for waste. There really is no waste disposal for the duration of radioactivity, so a reasonable expectation would be to phase out nuclear in favor of renewable.
28. Please make this event annual. There should be increased public announcements about the event.
29. Does anyone follow the health & genetic defects found in animals who live on the Hanford site?
30. I appreciate this opportunity for our input & a discussion about these issues. I do have a problem w/ the cleanup priority descriptions. I read it several times looking for a mention of the unlined burial grounds. Finally someone at my table told me that's what transuranic means. You need to write the descriptions for lay people. I also don't know what vadose means. What do the colors on the description sheet mean? Next time please show it to someone who doesn't know anything and see if they can understand it. I have a graduate degree but I do not really understand what you wrote – certainly not well enough to complete the exercise.
31. Absolutely NO NEW WASTE brought to Hanford. NONE. Cleanup soil and ground water. Why are you considering use of plutonium fuel? Is it for weapons? There must be transparency – not withholding of information! The law demands that, but so does your responsibility as 'watchdogs'. Are we crazy to keep producing waste that we have NO PLACE TO PUT? What kind of a world are we creating? Don't we care? No relicensing of the Wash. Nuclear plant! WPPSS must retire!