

Tri-Cities State of the Site Meeting
November 29, 2007

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

1. Workers (USDOE) are doing the wrong thing by encapsulating waste and sending it to Yucca Mountain. Why not mine the fuel and use it in reactors around the world?
2. The total risk to a family near the Central Plateau is quite low. The idea of retrieving 99% of the tank waste seems excessive. Vitrifying low-activity waste turns my stomach because so many children could be saved (with the dollars). Being way behind in retrieval should not matter; it is probably not necessary. The risk assessment is going the wrong way. Who looks at the results of risk assessments? What happens with the risk assessments besides being buried in Environmental Impact Statements?
3. What threat does the proposed Black Rock Reservoir pose to groundwater contamination at Hanford? If built, how will it be monitored? If it did pose a threat, what would you do about it?
4. Beryllium disease is still an issue for Hanford workers. The number of workers with Chronic Beryllium Disease is increasing. DOE is required (10 CFR 50) to establish a single, sitewide beryllium program. Six years after that compliance date, Hanford has six different programs. USDOE is not requiring proper enforcement or compliance with this requirement. The current prevention program is not working. DOE needs to conduct an investigation to find out the reason beryllium numbers are increasing.
5. There are issues with Chronic Beryllium Disease. Workers have been bringing these issues to the awareness of the contractors. Only 30% of people at Hanford have been tested. A lot of USDOE facilities have Beryllium (Oak Ridge, Hanford, etc.). Beryllium is everywhere. It was used to make steel stronger, even used in dental fillings. There is a Beryllium Awareness Group working to reduce the exposures to workers.
6. Regarding extending deadlines, how long is it going to take until this stuff ends up in the River and causes a major environmental issue? Is there enough time? Perhaps you need to re-tank the stuff. Is there any scientific evidence on how long it will take the stuff from ending up in the River?
7. The agencies want to renegotiate start up of the Waste Treatment Plant. There is a (proposed) eight-year delay on starting up the Waste Treatment Plant. The end date for completing treatment is extended another 10-12 years which makes a total of 20 years beyond current milestone dates. Ecology's position should be an eight-year delay in start up; an eight-year for all other related activities.
8. Low-Activity Waste start-up is now proposed for 2014, five years after start-up. Ecology, do not extend the operating mission.
9. Had agreement for health insurance. The agreement was originally with (Secretary of Energy) Hazel O'Leary. The insurance keeps deteriorating. It now pays only 5%; it is suppose to be paying more. Would DOE's new manager be

willing to meet and listen to me to get this health insurance issue resolved?

10. Past several years have been pushing USDOE – Office of River Protection to do study on Iron Phosphate Glass, but no response. There is a significant advantage over borosilicate glass. Frustrated because no one will talk about it.

11. We support USDOE and putting safety first. But we still expect you to get the work done. The dilemma with the complete shutdown of tank retrieval because of the spill at Tank S-102 was not necessary. It is expensive having to shutdown and keep the crews on standby. Understand the delays because of limited funding, but yet you eat-up dollars with long delays in retrievals because of this stoppage.

12. You talked about the Hanford Advisory Board providing values-based advice? What do you mean by this? Do you look at groundwater? Are you interested in the Tri-Cities economy, the workforce, the Yakama Indian Nation?

13. The site budget is shrinking. The focus is on doing work more efficiently. Currently USDOE is recompeting three major contracts. Believe this is going to create new inefficiencies. Causing a lot of uncertainty with jobs on site. How long will this process take? What is the driver for recompeting contracts now?

14. Making a mess takes a long time to clean up. Hanford workers have done a tremendous jobs cleaning up Hanford safely. Have concerns starting over with new contractors. It takes time to develop working relationships. Currently have a contractor who listens to the workers. (Agencies) are asking to extend the retrieval process. Is there an extension available to delay Performance Based Incentives if there are safety issues?

15. Have the greatest gratitude and admiration for those who fought the (recent) fire. Heard that the way the fire was fought was a victory. The burning of 80,000 acres is not a victory but a loss. Native habitats, plants, and animals will not survive. Need more equipment, aircraft. Grass fires need to be stopped immediately. Need more aircraft and need an aggressive campaign to remove noxious weeds (fuel). Re-establish native grasses (They burn slower and cooler.). USFWS and DOE need to work together to make the decision on the adequacy of resources needed to fight a fire.

16. In 20 years (1943 to 1963) they built the Hanford Site and filled all of the tanks. In 1989 (20 years ago) the Tri-Party Agreement was created. Since then some progress was made along the River; Central Plateau progress has not been so good, Cleanup is taking far too long. The Waste Treatment Plant is a 20 year design and construction project - a schedule unheard of in industry. Heard USDOE and BNI say they could not efficiently spend more money. Contribute most of this to budget restraints, fixed funding profiles which means it is going to take longer. Need to be increasing funding levels for the next several years by 20%. Fund this project as if you are serious about it.

17. Didn't realize retrieval could be dangerous. Continued (tank) retrieval may be unnecessary . Need to identify which tanks are a threat and which tanks can have concrete dumped into them. The threat of waste affecting the river and downriver communities is ridiculous. Hood River will never be impacted by Hanford.

18. Want to preserve the B Reactor, a historical treasure. Have gained a lot of support but we are not there yet. Hearings are being held next week (December 3-7) in D.C. by Doc Hastings. Want assurance (from DOE) that you support

preserving the B Reactor.

19. Anytime you talk about extensions look at the age around the room. We are losing senior technical expertise. Cannot understand geological standards resulting in such delays. (WTP) should have been designed to the same standards as the nuclear facilities. Billions of dollars being accrued with all of these delays to the Waste Treatment Plant. How can a new building not be safe enough when you look at tanks that have been in the ground for years? Don't believe your delays were really seismic related. Believe you had another reason for the delays.

20. Look at the grout vaults (built and never used). B-Whip started and filled it in. Spent a lot of money at Hanford; studied a lot of things out there. Let's go do something while you still have the people smart enough to do it!

21. Need to look at a way to meet those tank retrieval requirements. Let's optimize the cleanup effort and re-look at cleanup. Need to leave some cleanup monuments for the public to see; cap some things. Need to be able to explain the good work that happened at Hanford. Need a Hanford Nuclear Park. Could save a lot of money; River Corridor could have been cleaned up ten years ago. I've made these suggestions several times, but can't seem to get anyone to address this.

22. WTP construction locked into a specific design. Can make no improvements to that design. Why is that the case? How can we get some improvements designed and implemented?