

Public Comments on FY 2002 IPL

No.	Actual Public Comments Paraphrased
1.	Problems with FY01 budget leads to problems with FY 02. DOE should reconsider upgrading 105KE for FRS and use 105KW instead. Means transporting fuel from KE to KW to utilize the existing FRS at KW. This reduces cost, schedule and exposure and allows KE to accelerate sludge and debris removal.
2.	As a lifetime resident of Washington state, have listened to bureaucratic Government studies about the Hanford cleanup. Tax payer money wasted and people tired of this. The Columbia River is becoming contaminated with radiation. Communities on the river; irrigation; salmon all suffer. As a sportsman know the value of the Reach and importance of salmon spawns. I work at a cancer research center and know risks and disaster (at Hanford). Do people have to die before Government and State wake up? In Europe they store waste safely. What is U.S. problem? Stop the waste and cleanup the mess.
3.	Not able to attend meetings but provide comments. In general concerned over the danger the Hanford site represents even to Portland. All communities along the Columbia River from Hanford to Ocean are in danger. In 2001, over \$100M of cleanup work not done due to inadequate funding. DOE must ask for all money for cleanup (TPA) and not fund non-cleanup activities. DOE's request includes money for weapons, defense and nuclear security - stop this. Shut FFTF down. Do not fund or accept more off-site waste. Years of Pu processing has caused worker health problems and DOE should fund medical monitoring and compensation for workers and families. Fund cleanup of contamination around burial grounds. Reduce indirect overhead cost and give the true costs of these to public vs shifting money from account to account to cover up. Focus on cleanup not production.
4.	Do not restart FFTF using cleanup funds and generating more waste. Use cleanup money to fund activities that support the TPA. Do not let more waste from other sites be stored at Hanford. Stop the existing waste contaminating groundwater from moving further toward the river. Please let me know how you'll handle these issues.
5.	Has provided attachments which are his previously submitted comments on Plan for ER Program for 200 Area solid waste, responses he received from Brian Foley and those comments marked up. Primary concern is the unrealistic approach to cleanup at Hanford. This includes cost, scope, schedule, and safety concerns. He has provided the outline for a more "realistic site cleanup plan". He believes that the stakeholders should be allowed to consider this plan which may allow reconsideration of some of the "locked in thinking" that appears to be going on. Lots of money spent on cleanup and very little accomplished. DOE/Foley responded to each comment some of the more unusual suggestions are as follows: -Review 1940's waste disposal and safety philosophy – apply to existing waste establish risk with same. -reevaluate government requirements and form more realistic risk, cost and schedules for cleanup (challenge current thinking). - Perform minimal surveillance testing and oversight. - in some instances the act of exposing waste during characterization and remediation will increase risk and cost and extend schedule and generates more waste.
6.	Where is FFTF in budget? Will RL also make FFTF suffer?

Public Comments on FY 2002 IPL

No.	Actual Public Comments Paraphrased
7.	<p>Cannot attend meeting but wants to comment on DOE 's failure to be responsible for the cleanup of toxic waste at Hanford and not shutting FFTF down which could produce more waste.</p> <p>Provides the last two letters written to Secretary of Energy in 1999 – also expressing anger and frustration that the mandate to cleanup by local citizens is ignored in favor of producing more weapons under the smokescreen of medical isotopes. Also outraged that Hanford would be considered as a national radioactive waste dump site making one of the most contaminated even more so.</p> <p>Answer these questions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Why does DOE continue to push its agenda? 2) What legal authority does the DOE have to override the mandate for cleanup, thereby threatening the safety of the citizens in the Pacific NW? <p>3/13/99 – To Secretary Richardson, I attended 3/10/00 Bud meeting. Surprised that the DOE will override the wishes of the citizens who voted some years ago to cleanup the mess at Hanford.</p> <p>Although we were asked to help set priorities, it appears that no one listens to citizens or EPA & Ecology that they want cleanup. Nor is anyone listening to the Governor of Oregon and Washington, nor doctors or scientists or ordinary citizens who are deeply concerned about the toxic waste that is leaking into the groundwater and then Columbia river. We continue to see \$100M given for cleanup going to FFTF which will only produce more waste. Even when DOE's own scientists have verified safety risks. The \$100M must be paid back to cleanup.</p> <p>7/7/99 to Secretary Richardson, I urge you to shutdown FFTF and pay back the \$100M to cleanup. No research or amount of medical isotopes can justify ignoring the cleanup mandate from the people. Both the EPA & Ecology want Hanford cleaned up why does DOE ignore this? As a citizen of this area, I have the right to live in a safe environment. Government agencies should be committed to the voice of the people.</p>
8.	<p>105 B reactor is a World Treasure. In the 80's DOE was willing to allow UNC, with limited funds, to collect and preserve historical items for a museum in the future. Even the Smithsonian Institute was interested and took D control room instead of B because of the idea of a museum here at Hanford.</p> <p>Due to lack of funding the Reactor complex keeps losing things in the name of cleanup (D&D). Now may be the last chance to preserve this treasure. The B museum will be a great asset for DOE, D.C., Wa. State and the Tri-Cities. The US government should fund this and involve interested groups in the B Museum.</p>
9.	<p>The current DOE plans for funding of B reactor conversion into a public museum are inadequate. Past and current Secretaries of Energy have supported this action where is RL's support (see letter for project phase comments).</p>
10.	<p>Open letter to Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson.</p> <p>The approach that the Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility takes toward Hanford is to advocate for policies that will keep the dangerous waste at Hanford out of the realm of public health. We have failed many times to keep hazards at Hanford out of this realm, we need to all work harder not slack off. As I review the new funding request I see the numbers are inadequate and the entire ATTITUDE behind the numbers is inadequate.</p> <p>Historically since the Manhattan Project we have spent over 5 trillion taxpayer dollars on making nuclear weapons (and waste). Never thinking how to dispose of the waste products in an earth friendly way. Wa. State is bearing the brunt of this oversight with a lack of funding. Considering the half life of Pu being 24, 000 years there is a real need to make this waste safe and keep it out of the realm of public health. Considering the length of time Pu represents a danger against the timeframe of Congressional Representatives, 2 yrs, Senators 6 yrs, and Gov 4 years no wonder adequate funding cannot be attained. Citizens must express our needs. Secretary Richardson must stop getting inadequate funding for Hanford. Given the \$300B budget for military, we need to look at cleanup as an important security issue as well.</p>

Public Comments on FY 2002 IPL

No.	Actual Public Comments Paraphrased
11.	<p>Comments I had planned to give at the Seattle meeting.</p> <p>Our lives are busy and complex which is why there is so little awareness of the important issue of nuclear waste containment. The Hanford Public Interest Network continues to try making more people aware so it can become a potent political level that changes policy and influences votes. Too much procrastination from the Government about the handling of nuclear waste and people have misplaced faith in this.</p> <p>How can a "sane" group of policy makers continue to allow further waste leaks - knowing the disaster that can come. Hanford is the most contaminated site in the US. Even a small amount of leakage into the river could cause t medical and ecologic catastrophe of unprecedented size. As a physician I recognize this as a health problem of immense proportions. Does a disaster have to happen before DOE acts? The waste that has already leaked could make it's way to the river in 20 years and continue for 5, 000. DOE cannot continue to fail to act they must cleanup waste.</p> <p>Cites two incidents quoted from Oregon Department of Energy: Hanford worker had higher dosimeter readings than fellow workers – turned out to be oysters from Willipa Bay. This shows the environmental disaster that is waiting to happen with a major leak. There is genetic altering from nuclides, and they could be moving throughout the entire ecologic basin of the Columbia affecting all species of life. Tritium is already leaking in small amounts from Hanford into the river. We know that causes of cancer include recognition of the multiple gene alterations that occur prior to clinical cancer. Radiation particularly if ingested or inhaled has been shown to have gene altering ability. We know that there are other even more dangerous substances such as technetium and strontium moving more slowly toward the river. Yet the DOE only studies. You have a moral obligation to your employers the American people to convince Congress of how serious this cleanup work is.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) DOE must ask for adequate funds to cleanup before there is a disaster. 2) Proposals for further nuclear production must include cost for containment of new waste material. 3) Stop all new waste shipment from other sites to Hanford until the leaking tank problem resolved.
12.	<p>Cleanup funds should not be diverted to other projects. FFTF is a misuse of money. Medical isotopes are available elsewhere – there is no shortage. Any studies on FFTF should not be done by a company which could benefit from a recommendation. Why use such a company to begin with when results will be suspect. Do not use cleanup funds to do these studies.</p> <p>Follow the advice of GAP on how the funding should be spent for cleanup. DOE should be audited by an external source like GAP.</p> <p>I'm glad the EPA & Ecology has stepped in after the disgraceful public hearing in Seattle. The DOE official's behavior is indicative of the disregard of public opinion that DOE has. Contractors should not be able to be planted in the audience to speak in favor of DOE. If so they should be fined.</p> <p>If it's true that DOE loses public comments, that's why I'm sending these to elected officials. DOE must hold itself accountable.</p>
13.	<p>Admit that a plume of radioactive tritium is heading towards the Columbia River and that DOE must act decisively and immediately to avoid disaster. Do not waste cleanup funds on non-cleanup projects (FFTF). The \$44M for FFTF restart would only add more waste. If we use Hanford as a national waste site, it would double the Low Level Waste and Mixed Waste at Hanford. Refuse this waste and use the money to cleanup Hanford.</p> <p>Tell the public the true cost of overhead not just move from account to account.</p> <p>The lives of present and future generations depend on us acting responsibly, effectively and morally now. Do not turn the NW into a wasteland.</p>
14.	<p>I have attended many meetings in the past 2 years in the NW about Hanford. " All nuclear production must stop in Hanford and a speedy and extensive program for removal of nuclear waste must be adopted and started NOW." We get little support from elected officials for cleanup. Locke is hesitant because Hanford is both a federal and military territory and he doesn't believe he has responsibility for the health of the state residents from the deadly fallout. We don't need medical isotopes from FFTF. We cannot trust the government to tell us the truth. Some workers exposed were not told the truth at first but 2nd exams showed exposure was higher.</p> <p>We have spent \$5 Trillion on weapons but only \$40Billion on cleanup. Now of the 177 tanks, there are 70 leaking and going to the river. Government mixed up; making the mess with lots of dollars but not same for cleanup. Weapons not solution to conflict. With our knowledge we should sustain humans instead of destroying them.</p>

Public Comments on FY 2002 IPL

No.	Actual Public Comments Paraphrased
15.	25 years ago we lost our son (age 22) from cancer. We lived downwind of Hanford and are disappointed at how slow cleanup is. We demand the DOE cleanup and protect the worker and public health. Shutdown FFTF -- do not create more waste. And do medical monitoring of the workers and families. Do not use unlined low level waste burial grounds. Use funds to investigate the contamination around the burial ground, and do not use cleanup funds for off site waste.
16.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) if we could have all the \$ we need for total cleanup of the site how fast could we cleanup? 2) Would it change end dates? 3) How much money would it save in the long run? 4) Would seeing this help congress see the need for more funding?
17.	Sad that people have to write the Government to keep us safe from trash created by Pu processing. Some day the Government will represent people not interest groups. Do your best to think of public safety, funding medical monitoring and not doing activities that make more waste. Follow through with funding and cleanup of site.
18.	Concern about Hanford and the water quality of the Columbia River. We encourage the DOE to stop using the unlined, leaking dumping grounds and to fund investigation of the contamination around the grounds. Use cleanup funds for cleanup instead of supporting off-site waste. We want to enjoy the river for many future generations.
19.	<p>Will citizens eventually be reimbursed for health problems caused by Hanford? It's one thing to have expenditures for the environments protection, and other projects: rivers, earth and etc. What about the people and not only those who choose to work there?</p> <p>I have written to the Hanford archives and received information and a form that talks about health but does not discuss respiratory system. I have rewritten several times trying to find out about the respiratory health but have never been answered -- so I am reluctant to send in the form they sent me.</p> <p>I was born in SW Montana in 1945 and almost every person my age had to wear glasses before they were 12 (near sightedness). I believe this health problem comes from the poisons from Hanford.</p>
20.	Government would like you to oppose the DOE plan to import more off-site waste to Hanford. The dumpsites are unlined, unregulated and effectively unmonitored. There is serious risk of pollution to the Columbia River eminently. Please do all you can to protect Wa. State from this risk to the river, fish and the health of the residents that live, work and play in the area. We need to cleanup now. Nuclear waste is long lived and we cannot afford more contamination and must stop the importation of waste.
21.	<p>a) Of general concern from workshop:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the schedule to complete cleanup is still 50 years and \$50M (2048) -- same as time or original start of cleanup. Surely the \$50 M has grown due to 10 years of study and development costs 2) ORP... 3) I have been told that if present approaches are unsuccessful, simpler approaches will be used -- using more realistic application of regulatory requirements. Develop a simple realistic approach that can be redirected if problems arise. 4) Hanford not quickly built for national defense by developing new technology testing. Impossible regulatory requirements and limited funding. Hanford cleanup is a NW emergency -- as is river protection. Is DOE going overboard by taking too much time (even more risk) and high cost to bankrupt the country. 5) Lets do it (cleanup) using proven technology, quick & cost effective. Use Hanford & other site experiences. Will be work at Hanford until 3000 and risk could be resolved in say 15 years and \$15B 6) We need a proposal for alternate approach, with scope risk and safety, cost and schedule - would not be difficult since all simpler methods are known and problems and requirements are identified.
21.	Cleanup of Hanford should be most important environmental project in the country. Funding must be met for all Hanford projects.
22.	Leak earlier this year at Hanford that workers caught and took precautions to contain it. These occurrences will continue until the funding is given. The federal government has a moral and financial responsibility to cleanup the legacy of the cold war and protect the environment. Don't waste any more time.

Public Comments on FY 2002 IPL

No.	Actual Public Comments Paraphrased
23.	<p>Same issues each year at budget hearing. FFTF (production) and lack of progress on cleanup and new revelations about contamination of the Columbia River. I am growing increasingly frustrated with DOE's handling of the Hanford Site. The only priority should be cleanup.</p> <p>Hanford threatens the public health of the people of WA and OR. Enough damage has been done and the government needs to follow through on it's commitment to cleanup.</p>
24.	<p>The 2001 budget request for cleanup is \$100M short because the DOE wants to fund FFTF and increase the waste at Hanford. The site needs to be cleaned up as soon as possible, but it appears that cleanup is NOT DOE's priority. They ignore the public interest and health. No reason for the inflated military nuclear spending (at Hanford). The DOE needs to get priorities straight and give the Hanford cleanup budget all the funding it needs. FFTF should be shutdown – we don't need more waste.</p> <p>Prevent future disasters. DOE has plenty of money for cleanup if it re-prioritizes it's funding.</p>
25.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Do not take money from cleanup for downwinder litigation. 2) Do not use cleanup money on FFTF. Shut FFTF down. 3) Contractor overhead is rising. The money has just been shifted around which is unacceptable. This money should go back toward cleanup.
26.	<p>Have come to Budget hearings last 3-4 years. Each time we tell you we do not want FFTF restarted and that cleanup of leaking waste the highest priority. Again we get a budget that is not sufficient for cleanup (-\$100M) but have money for FFTF standby.</p> <p>You break the law and risk safety of people in Wa. State with your "Alice in Wonderland" budget proposals. How can the EPA let you violate TPA milestones at the same time you want to bring more waste into the state from offsite.</p> <p>The Reach is the last salmon spawning ground on the Columbia River and they are close to extinction. Even with a tritium plume moving toward the river you want to add more waste. You want to spend \$104.2 M on weapons called defense and nuclear security. Where will we be with problems at the tanks.</p> <p>You have moved \$265M from EM and ORP to cover contractor overhead, such as BNFL.</p> <p>I am cynical about trying to influence decisions since you ignore the hundreds of citizens who come here each year. Cleanup is the highest priority before a tragedy forces you to clean up a greater disaster.</p> <p>Compensate the workers who were harmed</p>
27.	<p>Never got an answer from last Hanford hearing. What IAEA oversight or reports on Hanford are available? On Cogema contract, BNFL fiscal liabilities (ORP), this information should be in the draft budget data at all public meetings. DOE's efforts to give FFTF funding for more weapons creates a conflict and destroys confidence in government (fed and state) IAEA should be involved in oversight objectively.</p> <p>Ref to news articles on nuclear waste, in Russia and political dissent and Put in pressing treason charges against environmentalists who report waste problems. Honesty and openness in contracts, budgets and operations reports are required and should be proportional to the integrity of the science that will help us cleanup.</p>
28.	<p>I was unable to attend the meeting in Portland but wanted to give comments. I am opposed to the "pork" projects like FFTF restart and any funds spent on weapons development. I am against any more waste at Hanford. Cleanup what is already there. The Wa EPA must ban adding more waste to the high level nuclear waste tank system. DOE must reveal the true overhead costs and stop just shifting the money from one account to another.</p>
29.	<p>Don't want more waste to come to Hanford from FFTF. PCBs.</p> <p>Cleanup should be quicker – what prevents this? Oppose money for FFTF restart – shut it down. No new waste – hazard to workers, Fully fund TPA and not non-cleanup activities.</p>
30.	<p>I want to make you aware of an alternate approach for cleaning up the Hanford site. I have work history at Hanford. I recently talked to DOE – RL & ORP, as well as EPA and was advised to also contact you. The alternate cleanup will save the government money and protect the river and public. I am awaiting responses from my comments to DOE and etc.</p> <p>The alternate approach assures river and public are protected but the entire site would not be remediated back to use for the public. We will use proven technology, equipment and methods to accomplish the work. Eliminating cost and time and may cost ¼ the amount of \$ and time with less risk to the river. Urges Locke and Hastings to review the approach and generate a time-line and cost and risk information related. All stakeholder parties should have the opportunity to perform a thorough comparison on how to cleanup. Please give this matter your attention as only minimal progress has been done in the past 12 years. We must act to protect the river.</p>

Public Comments on FY 2002 IPL

No.	Actual Public Comments Paraphrased
31.	<p>On behalf of the Hanford Public Interest Network. Concerned not only for myself but for my great, great, great, grandchildren and how they will be affected by Hanford cleanup. Cleanup is going too slowly. Don't like that cleanup money is going to FFTF. The 2002 budget has a shortfall and this money is needed to meet the TPA. You must demand the money that cleanup needs. Don't agree with recent ROD about more low level mixed waste coming to Hanford which will only spend more cleanup money. Also, cleanup money is being put toward security, and downwinder litigation when it should be put toward cleanup.</p>
32.	<p>Need to keep focused on TPA. The money is there and we have to stick to the agreement and not divert money or priorities to FFTF. Cleanup is something we owe our kids and there hasn't been anything said that should change that focus. Also the cleanup terminology is a bit misleading in that this will never be cleaned up in anyone's lifetime – more like consolidation. Don't enlarge this with waste from other parts of the country.</p>
33.	<p>If the budget is not sufficient to keep the cleanup in compliance with legal requirements – isn't someone breaking the law? - is it DOE who aren't asking and demanding more? - Is it congress who are breaking the law by not passing the budget sufficiently?</p>
34.	<p>With Physicians for social responsibility: Cleanup is not a very good word. Safe containment is probably more accurate. TPA wimpy but only agreement we have. DOE needs to be stronger when they ask for funding – lobby if they have to. Or Congress will turn away and say they aren't in mood, they have other priorities. We once had Manhattan project and the need for national security but waste is not seen as that type of budget priority. So instead have national insecurity because this waste mess is a treat to the environment and to the health of generations to come. DOE needs to talk to Congress about waste as a national security problem not some of the other silly priorities. We should view like Manhattan, i.e. containment of waste to prevent disaster. If we had a big disaster we would get FEMA to help – say a tank explosion</p>
35.	<p>There is a resistance to cleanup. The world court decision of 1996 states that the nuclear power must work to abolish nuclear weapons immediately. A treaty can bring this about. So we the public must look at public health as a human rights issue – internationally. We need to help the policy makers start this treaty and I think that by focusing on public health and environment and the cleanup and resisting weapons we can do this.</p>
	<p>From the raging grannies: Same message as the written submission from meeting in #26 above.</p>
36.	<p>From Peace Action of Washington. Work at Hanford is evil because corporate priorities are being met while literally people are dying and while we are running the risk of a horrendous disaster that will kill thousands of millions of people. Need to do good work at Hanford. There is no funding for the protection of whistleblowers. They are the ones who stand up against the evil of Hanford. The DOE continues to play the game of making more nuclear weapons and build up stockpiles. This is a deliberate violation of U.S. national policy. We need to get Hanford compliant and can do this by listening to the whistleblowers.</p>
37.	<p>With all the money missing from the cleanup program budget how can you justify spending money to restart FFTF?</p>
38.	<p>FFTF is proof of the waste at Hanford and proves that (waste) goes on at Hanford. It's essential that you stop avoiding the question (of cleanup funding going to FFTF.)</p>
39.	<p>From University of Washington. I am concerned when I hear about reducing base operations and the risk associated with that as it pertains to health and safety.</p>
40.	<p>Raised at Hanford – not trying to be sarcastic. Lots of money spent on prisons in Wa State. To save money why not build a prison in the 200 area and assign all the death-row prisoners and lifers to help with cleanup. They would eventually die from various kinds of cancers.</p>

Public Comments on FY 2002 IPL

No.	Actual Public Comments Paraphrased
41.	Will there be a recording of this process made so there is a history of this meeting? I am concerned that our comments will be filtered and the higher ups won't get the actual comment.
42.	Inspired by gentleman who said to step back and if we do as a species we notice we are soiling our nest not once but twice. What does this say for our future? We hear about whale problems from polluted ocean. Now we will pollute the algae the base of human life and again soil our nest. It smells like greed on someone's part. The public isn't paid to come here but others are.
43.	From Hanford Information network We all need to be better educated about Hanford. Come down and tour the site and see the progress that has been made.
44.	I have been to Hanford and it scared me. How can we talk about compliance gaps and not enough money to do what is legally necessary but we have \$44M in budget for FFTF. And this will only add waste. Plus DOE is also wanting to ship this huge amount of waste from other places in US. We have leaking tanks and now tritium reported in the groundwater. DOE can't contain the waste it has but wants to bring more - this makes no sense.
45.	From Physicians for Social Responsibility The real problem is that there are national priorities driving the cleanup issue at Hanford. Lots of money to cleanup but it's being used in other places. When congress thinks something is necessary they fund it - like gulf war. We need national leadership commitment to ER after the Cold War ended. The fear from cold war can still raise the military production issue and the ability to fund. The U.S. is not making cleanup it's priority we have to make this a national priority.
46.	Cleanup is behind schedule and we need more money. Still DOE wants to restart FFTF and spend more money and add more waste. The loss of money to FFTF means no river cleanup. Also we have a tritium plume that is only 3.5 miles from the River and has lots of bad contamination. DOE also wants to bring more waste from elsewhere here. DOE has mismanaged the burial grounds. DOE also fails to properly record and document waste coming into the site but spend more time recording the waste they will send to WIPP. DOE must make cleanup it's first priority.
47.	Need a more direct response to this about the priorities and gaps. There seems to be a gap between this tritium plume that is 3 years from river and the gap between your 7-18 year cleanup plan.
48.	This all started in the action theater in WWII with the beginning of arms race and the two bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The physicians - Carl Sagan wrote a letter to Soviet Union and stopped cold war. Now we have people like Norm Chomski (sp?) who talks about how the public is hoodwinked into believing stuff like the arms race and the new bad buy Saddam. Only promoting arms race. The main problem is they affect n world health.
	Phy for Social Responsibility. He also submitted written comments that are the same see #10 above.
49.	Hanford officials come to these hearing s and brag about what good work they are doing. So appreciate (Steve Wiegman) backing down and saying that the SY101 not clean. FFTF not in EM budget yet they get the benefit of site services. Every one should pay their fair share. Tape 3 - In some instances you have narratives without data in them so we don't have anyway to know why they are prioritized above something else.
50.	It appears that the request for full funding is a moving target. Who really is involved ? and will you ask for more money? Since it is a legal requirement. Also there is a perception that DOE has met all the TPA requirements?
51.	All the money you get is taxpayer money and I am telling you for myself and others that we want you to shut down and dismantle the FFTF and do cleanup as fast as you can.

Public Comments on FY 2002 IPL

No.	Actual Public Comments Paraphrased
52.	<p>From University of Wa. Studies Hanford workers over the last several years and we find that what is not being accounted for in the budgets over the next several years is the bow wave of illness that exists in the Hanford workforce. Our preliminary results from the 1,000 workers is exposure to things that will cause health effects e.g. radiation, noise, asbestos, solvents, irritant gases, beryllium. 50% of workers say have been involved in hazards related to radiation 40% noise, asbestos, corrosives, 30% of our workers in an accident and 77% felt they had been exposed to a hazard during the accident.</p> <p>This means that at the end of next year after our first year of surveillance we'll have more data. Now see 20% have abnormal lung function, 42% specific abnormal lung functions. 50% of those studied have abnormal x-rays. 5% positive for Beryllium and almost 80% of the population has significant hearing loss. This translates into money when you begin talking about claims.</p>
53.	<p>Problem here is groundwater and the need to model and complaints that not enough money budgeted for that work. Need good data to do that work.</p> <p>Problem with the security money going away and never coming back no matter what the security requirements.</p>
54.	<p>Many people have said the same thing but we really need to get more funding on the cleanup issue. We need to have a paradigm shift in the way we look at how to get this funding. If we need \$934M to cleanup up to meet legal requirements we need to get it. I want to encourage managers to work with your policy people and get those above you to ask for more money from OMB and Congress. We need money for what is unexpected as well.</p>
55.	<p>Showed length of ribbon that represents the \$5.5 Trillion spent on developing weapons and another ribbon that represents the \$40B spent on cleanup. And the money toward weapons research continues to be spent.</p>
56.	<p>Wants figures on PNNL's contract. How much is for the cleanup and how is the rest figured into Hanford's annual allotment.</p> <p>Have the agencies (Tri-Party?) done any financial analysis of how much discreet cleanup items will cost if delayed. How much of a risk increase will occur if specific cleanup actions are delayed? If congress were presented with the amount of \$ increase delays would cause would it get us more funding?</p> <p>Flat budgets are dead on arrival. We need enough money to cleanup what is required by TPA.</p> <p>Congratulate RL for acknowledging in writing that Gable Mountain is a sacred site.</p> <p>Other missions must not detract but rather support Cleanup. Cleanup to the state of unrestricted use.</p> <p>Get SNF out of basins and into safe stable dry storage until we find final disposal site.</p> <p>Process the Pu in PFP into stable form for long term storage and decontaminate and decommission facility</p> <p>Remove and process waste in the 1800 burial grounds on site into stable waste form ready for permanent disposal</p> <p>Continue to excavate and decontaminate earth and source points along the Columbia River. Protect worker, public and leave a clean legacy to our children.</p>
57.	<p>2001 budget has shortfalls; tanks, ER and PFP as well as characterization for burial grounds and waste sites and wells for compliance.</p> <p>The budget has no slack to deal with the newly identified problems that arise each year such as the high tritium in the 618-11 and the need to characterize expeditiously.</p> <p>In 2002 we expect DOE to forcefully request a budget which will fully fund all compliance work. The federal government should not request or expect leeway on compliance —that would not be given private industry.</p>
58.	<p>Taking a look at the overall budget, I think I can safely say that it does not reflect the greater public interest – 20% will not go to cleanup.</p> <p>Hazel O'Leary had taken position that cleanup was #1 priority. Now DOE is promoting other missions that are weapons-related. [does not see the 3rd site outcome as cleanup focused] Believes that #3 supports FFTF as new mission (re-start). Shortfall yet \$44M to support FFTF. Oregon has passed a bill that opposes new waste producing missions at Hanford until the site is compliant – until it's cleaned up actually.</p>

Public Comments on FY 2002 IPL

No.	Actual Public Comments Paraphrased
59.	<p>Knows Hanford and have worked at Good Samaritan Hospital with people who have ailments – he calls them human debris – that were exposed to radiation workers or downwinders and have thyroid and brain tumors. He wants to know how Congress can allocate for nuclear weapons development when there is a World Court Ruling of 1996 that defines public health and environmental humanitarian conduct. Discusses how dangerous that they can conduct environmentally safe nuclear war without destruction of environment and we must protect the civilian populations. Now paying claims on the Irradiation Compensation Act of 1990. You ask for cleanup money for weapons – FFTF. Believes we have laws that should prevent this new weapons work.</p> <p>Says that the DOE complex is working on some new weapons designs or new warheads designs that they intend to try to carry out with money in this new budget (FY 02). The health impact to communities is also a medical impact and economic impact.</p>
60.	<p>Gives statement for Charlie Hales who is Portland City commissioner. Hanford represents threat to Portland and it's citizens. I feel strongly about the need for funding cleanup.</p> <p>Federal government has clear obligation to cleanup, and DOE should fully characterize cleanup and hold to highest regulatory standards. This is overdue. Full funding must happen. DOE cannot begin any new waste-producing missions at Hanford and must focus all funding on cleanup. Do not restart FFTF for this is a dangerous abandonment of common sense and the obligation DOE has to the NW. The Portland city council voted unanimously last year to oppose any restart of the FFTF and urged DOE to make full funding a priority as well as cleanup and cleanup be the only mission.</p>
61.	<p>We keep coming to hearings and saying same thing over and over and I feel ignored but DOE needs to cleanup site.</p> <p>In addition to the song: we want to breathe our air and drink our water. Cleanup is supreme and yet you only have hair-brained schemes What don't you understand? Don't start FFTF up, shut it down like you promised 5 years ago. We don't want tritium or Plutonium (Pu). Shut down FFTF and cleanup the land, no more nicely, now demand.</p>
62.	<p>Problem that I see is that we have a lot of people that are well intentioned, but we have tunnel vision. We don't see what's really happening. The costs of Hanford is not a Department of Energy cost, it is a military problem. The Hanford Nuclear Reservation is a war project. I don't want to see plutonium being produced anymore. I know it's been rough on the river. I know that the radiation and the chemicals are getting into the groundwater and may migrate to the Oregon side of the river affecting salmon and maybe drinking water. Cleanup must be first priority.</p>
63.	<p>I think there's some good people at Richland who really want to clean the place up, but DOE Secretary Bill Richardson is paying absolutely no attention to us. Only people in Oregon who have any power to change anything as far as Hanford cleanup goes is our congressional delegation, and I think mostly they're sitting on their b____s. You need to give a congressional delegation the impression that there are a lot of voters out here who actually care about cleaning up Hanford and that they need to move this up on their priority scale. Some legal obligation on the part of DOE and the administration to submit a budget to Congress that is in compliance with the Tri-Party Agreement and other legal requirements in cleaning up Hanford. Compliance gap is increasing into the future. Again, it seems that the only people who have any power to change this is our congressional delegation. They've got to start raising these questions in Congress—why aren't you in compliance with these legal requirements?</p> <p>Also, Norm Busche of the GAP out along the banks of the Columbia and clipping mulberry leaves and measuring the radioactivity in them because he's trying to find out indirectly how much radioactive strontium-90 is getting into the salmon spawning beds in the river. We need to know whether Hanford is actually in some significant way, poisoning the river right now.</p> <p>Whistleblowers. Filing lawsuits against DOE because DOE's contractors are constantly firing whistleblowers, usually it's over safety issues. DOE should ride herd over contractors better.</p> <p>DOE's credibility was brought up earlier by one of our panelists, and rightly so, because it's one of the federal government's most dysfunctional bureaucracies. I mean, it's famous for being dysfunctional</p> <p>No more importing waste to Hanford. – regardless of Gov Locke's inability to do something. Enforce the TPA</p>
64.	<p>DOE is leading people to believe that WA St Ecology thinks Cleanup is most important – may not be so.</p>
65.	<p>DOE is placing the emphasis on citizens to get to our Congressional delegation to make it happen. DOE needs to ask for the funding they need.</p>
66.	<p>The agencies have power not people. Why don't we tax the corporations who make lots of money to help fund Hanford.</p>
67.	<p>Need to establish mutual trust between the DOE and the people of NW. Do not fund FFTF which is stealing money from Cleanup budget. And do not import more waste. What you are doing could have devastating consequence for the River and the Basin and its' inhabitants.</p>

Public Comments on FY 2002 IPL

No.	Actual Public Comments Paraphrased
68.	What part of the cleanup money goes for insurance and assurance that the engineering contractors are proficient. Money should not be issue. The safety of people of Washington and Oregon is issue.
69.	I am a victim of Hanford and the toxic waste. Lots of people who live around Hanford affected. 28 families dying, 200 have birth defects, kids born with no brains and eyes and etc. Find a solution to the problem. I have cancer and continue to need help. You keep trying to cover up the health problems. Lets make it a win-win situation and do something about it, not just sit here and play politics.
70.	Hanford Information Network: In 99, I visited Hanford and was struck by the beauty of it and the need to act with urgency and save it. Many tank are leaking NOW and we can study to death or do something. Move forward. First a safety issue and next funding. If we put off the tank project it will only get more costly. More pollutants will leak and there will be a bigger problem.
71.	Why was PUREX shut down? Wouldn't it have helped the situation by dealing with the worst waste?
72.	How can we get the funding issue to congress and ask for legislation that directs the Doe to pursue less cost of projects Note: could not tell if this was ORP focused or not.
73.	I have just finished my 6 th tour of Hanford and it is very disturbing. Gable Mountain now a sacred site for the Native Americans - done by Keith Klein. Stood on the 618-11 burial ground and know that the waste there is leaking. The budget is flat and that is not acceptable because we can't do Cleanup with that funding. There has been progress made since my last visit last summer. I am worried that we won't find a solution and Congress will not have the will to fund Cleanup. People have to get on Congress' case and tell them we want Cleanup now. What is estimated for Cleanup is a drop in the big government funding budget. We have to call our congressional people every day and send letters. Tell them we want full funding for compliance. We want unrestricted use. Move waste from tanks and make into glass logs. Get fuel out and safely store until final disposal site identified. Process Pu and get plant stable, move contaminated soil from river shore.
74.	Believes Paige's compassion catching and could be great movement of people. Leaking from tanks is going on. Need to convey problem is national defense. The Columbia River is the Northwest's life blood. Cleanup up whole Reach for uninhibited playground. Want my children to enjoy the beauty of Reach. We have to cleanup area quickly. Get a ground swell going and work congressmen and etc to fund Cleanup.
75.	Hanford Information Network Concerned about Cleanup on site and want full funding. Cleanup problem bigger than one president (administration). We people have to be part of making it happen. DOE has to submit to Congress a fully loaded budget or Cleanup won't happen. Cleanup one of nation's worst problems.
76.	How can we help get full budget - put pressure on Congress to establish Cleanup priority. Need to revisit flat funding issue and tell them it's not working. Needs to be a public comment part of the budget determination process. Do we need to take an enforcement action to make them listen?
77.	If we don't have enough funding for Cleanup how can we think of restarting FFTF? Why aren't the people who can answer questions at these meetings (this after a question about \$100M for defense spending?)