

Seattle State of the Site Meeting
November 27, 2007

**These are the comments the Tri-Party Agreement agency
decision makers heard in Seattle**

1. Insufficient notification of the meeting.
2. Language in the notification lacking specifics.
3. Full funding is necessary. Cleanup delays are unacceptable and believe there is funding available to cleanup Hanford.
4. Why can't USDOE come-up with enough funding to cleanup Hanford? The Global Nuclear Energy Project (GNEP) requires a government subsidy; instead government should give the \$5B shortage to Hanford now for cleanup and to meet milestones. Why start a whole new problem with GNEP?
5. Groundwater protection is the more important. Grave concerns of groundwater contamination. Little is known about how fast contaminants are migrating toward the river.
6. Need to understand the migration of contaminations from tank farms to the groundwater and eventually to the Columbia River. Lack of groundwater integration but acknowledge and applaud recent groundwater integration efforts.
7. Disappointed with the S-102 single-shell tank spill and the response to the spill. Why did it take so long for the spill to be reported? Why weren't the workers provided protective equipment?
8. Keep rigor on employee protection.
9. Appalled that a simple check valve would have prevented the waste (spill) to come out of the water line.
10. These tanks are well beyond their design life and we do not have the luxury of time. Need to remediate and take care of those tanks.
11. Concerned about worker exposure and worker protection. Need to keep workers safe with proper equipment.
12. Cleanup apace – increase in scope. Look at alternative technologies for the Waste Treatment Plant, not just glass – other technologies that might enable efficiencies.
13. Concerned with fires at Hanford and would like to see more studies done in soil contamination and wind speed spread of contaminations.
14. Delays are unacceptable when we have the funds to cleanup. Spend the money. America owes us back to help us clean it up.
15. Concerned and want to know why Ecology would support the proposed Black Rock Reservoir which would accelerate movement of groundwater beneath Hanford and threaten the Columbia River. Governor should know better.
16. How much volume is in each tank?
17. Concerned with the length of time it will take to retrieve the waste from the tanks. What will happen with the tanks when they are emptied? On average, how much waste is left in each tank? How are the Russians dealing with their legacy waste? Are we doing better?
18. USDOE needs to step up and put pen to paper and commit to building more double-shell tanks. The only thing stopping USDOE is funding. Also need a 3rd

melter and a second Low-Activity Waste facility which would take cleanup to 2035 meeting your cleanup goals. The public should be skeptical that USDOE did not propose that after 2018, when WTP is operating, tank retrievals would increase from one tank a year to five or six (since there is no commitment)

19. Is there room at Yucca Mountain? Is there a back-up plan for Yucca Mountain? Double-Shell Tanks are a necessary investment and are needed.

20. These meetings (Hanford State of the Site) are a complete waste of time. Need to have an independent audit of cleanup because “people” can’t write contracts that can get the cleanup done.

21. Why should the State agree to delays not associated with the Waste Treatment Plant? No more waste should be added to Hanford from off-site locations. State has gone to court and USDOE can not bring more waste to Hanford. Concerned about the 22 year delay on tanks

22. Cleanup schedules and worker safety at Hanford need to be balanced.

23. How does USDOE hold previous contractors accountable for their past performance? How does USDOE ensure timelines are realistic in contracts and that schedules are accurate and not to put workers in danger?

24. USDOE is in default with its contracts with the public. D = perennial delinquent and should be hauled into court. D = delay. DOE is just getting sanction for future delays. D = default. Implicit and explicit. USDOE needs an attitude change; this is failure. USDOE receives a “D” grade.

25. Just because few showed up tonight doesn’t mean Hanford isn’t on peoples mind. Not o.k. to slow Hanford cleanup, but then say that it is o.k. to bring more waste to Hanford. People are upset – don’t bring more waste to Hanford. Want to see cleanup done properly, don’t want people hurt. Do believe work is getting done, but also believe if Bush decides to bring more waste onsite to Hanford it will come, but it will be a bad decision.

26. With so few of us here tonight this doesn’t seem to push political will. Do any of the politicians even care?

27. Need general glossary of acronyms.

28. Concern with the lack of attention on dealing with the High-Level Waste solution. Concerned about how well the Waste Treatment Plant will truly work. Concerned that the tanks are leaking and getting into the vadose zone and groundwater.

Concerned that the Columbia River contractor is a performance based contract and that they make more money by reducing their costs towards cleanup.

29. The waste import moratorium expires in 2008. That is why USDOE wants to issue the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement because USDOE has already decided that waste will come to Hanford.

30. The Hanford cleanup problem seems so enormous and nothing anyone can do.

31. EPA and Ecology need to put pressure on USDOE for lack of timely notices for public meeting, the newly proposed delays for Hanford cleanup and no new waste shipped to Hanford

32. Would like to see elected officials get more money to help with the cleanup of Hanford – Hanford helped during WWII

33. The longer it takes for cleanup, the more it will cost and the more consequences there will be. Can not understand why there would be delays because it will cost

more money

34. How do the workers feel about bringing new waste to Hanford?

35. Concerned that over 100 gallons of toxic waste was spilled and why did it take ½ day to notify public? Why was the wrong pipe in the pump? What changes does USDOE want to see based on the information that came from the investigations?

36. Concerned that worker self-contained breathing apparatus wasn't available to workers at S Farm – it was in a locked cabinet and workers couldn't get to it if they wanted to. Concerned that single-shell tanks are past their design life and would not withstand a "5" earthquake. Believe we are playing with fire

37. Concerned that people can not comment on Global Nuclear Energy Project (GNEP) initiative because USDOE Headquarters will not conduct meetings in Seattle, Portland or Spokane for public input. Concerned that Greater than Class C public meeting notice went out to only 20 people – that is inadequate.

38. Hanford clean up is very technical and very involved. There is not enough money and have been leaks to the river and that is unacceptable. Concerned these meetings are not meaningful and nothing I or we can do.

39. This comes down to politics and money. This is an election year and may be a good time to get one candidate above the other.

40. Concerned that USDOE is here trying to explain why we are not meeting schedules but haven't heard why we want to bring more waste to Hanford

41. Are other sites facing the same problems as Hanford?

42. Keep an eye on the ball and building new double-shell tanks is an investment now.

43. Do the tank retrievals usually happen that late at night? What was the fine to the contractor – is it punitive or not?

44. Contractor accountability. How is USDOE holding contractors accountable? Do you review past performance, safety records and call references?