

Received
JAN 11 1993

**ADDENDUM
(FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT)**

**Decommissioning of Eight
Surplus Production Reactors
at the Hanford Site,
Richland, Washington**



December 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20585

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency Thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

DOE/EIS--0119F

DE93 005749

ADDENDUM (FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT)

DECOMMISSIONING OF EIGHT SURPLUS PRODUCTION
REACTORS AT THE HANFORD SITE,
RICHLAND, WASHINGTON

December 1992

U.S. Department of Energy.
Washington, D.C. 20585

MASTER

COVER SHEET

RESPONSIBLE AGENCY. U.S. Department of Energy

TITLE: Addendum (Final Environmental Impact Statement), Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mr. Michael Talbot, Acting Director
Office of Communications, Richland Field Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland, Washington 99352
Telephone: (509) 376-7501

Ms. Carol Borgstrom, Director
Office of NEPA Oversight
EH-25, Office of the Assistant Secretary
for Environment, Safety and Health
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue S.W.
Washington, D C 20585
Telephone: (202) 586-4600 or 800-472-2756

To request copies of the Addendum (Final Environmental Impact Statement), contact Mr. Talbot at the above address

ABSTRACT. The purpose of this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is to provide environmental information to assist the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) in the selection of a decommissioning alternative for the eight surplus production reactors at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington

Five alternatives are considered in this EIS: 1) No Action, in which the reactors are left in place and the present maintenance and surveillance programs are continued, 2) Immediate One-Piece Removal, in which the reactor buildings are demolished and the reactor blocks are transported in one piece on a tractor-transporter across the Site along a predetermined route to an onsite low-level waste-burial area, 3) Safe Storage Followed by Deferred One-Piece Removal, in which the reactors are temporarily stored in a safe, secure status for up to 75 years, after which the reactor buildings are demolished and the reactor blocks are transported in one piece on a tractor-transporter across the Site along a predetermined route to an onsite low-level waste-burial area, 4) Safe Storage Followed by Deferred Dismantlement, in which the reactors are temporarily stored in a safe, secure status for up to 75 years, after which they are fully dismantled and any remaining radioactive waste is transported to a low-level waste-burial area on the Hanford Site, and 5) In Situ Decommissioning, in which the reactors remain at their present locations, contamination is immobilized, major voids are filled, potential pathways (openings such as large pipes, air ducts and doors) are sealed, and an engineered mound of building rubble, earth, and gravel is constructed over each decommissioned reactor to act as a long-term protective barrier against human intrusion and water and wind erosion. In each alternative other than no action, an engineered barrier is placed over the waste form in order to limit water infiltration. A second No Action alternative of closing the facilities and doing nothing further is neither responsible nor acceptable and is not considered.

The DOE has selected safe storage followed by deferred one-piece removal as its preferred decommissioning alternative.

FOREWORD

This environmental impact statement (EIS) presents analyses of potential environmental impacts of decommissioning the eight surplus production reactors at the Hanford Site near Richland, Washington.

In 1980, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) issued an Environmental Assessment (EA) of the F-Area Decommissioning Program (DOE/EA-0120), which addressed the dismantlement of the F Reactor and disposal of radioactive materials in burial grounds in the 200 Areas of the Hanford Site. Four alternatives were considered at that time: layaway, protective storage, entombment, and dismantlement. Based on the EA, a finding of no significant impact for the dismantlement alternative was published in the Federal Register on August 22, 1980 (45 FR 56125).

Subsequent to that action, the DOE concluded that it would be more appropriate to consider and implement a consolidated decommissioning program for all eight of the surplus production reactors located at Hanford, and decided to examine all reasonable decommissioning alternatives in greater depth. Accordingly, on May 16, 1985, the DOE published in the Federal Register (50 FR 20489) a "Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement on Decommissioning the Eight Shutdown Production Reactors Located at the Hanford Site Near Richland, Washington." The notice of intent presented pertinent background information on the proposed scope and content of the EIS. The scope of the EIS includes only the disposition of the eight reactors, associated fuel storage basins, and the buildings used to house these systems. Decommissioning of the N Reactor is not within the scope of this EIS. Thirty-five comment letters were received in response to the notice of intent; all comments were considered in preparing the draft EIS.

The draft EIS was published in March 1989 and announced in the Federal Register on April 28, 1989 (54 FR 18325). Copies were made available to appropriate federal, state, and local officials and units of government, environmental organizations, and the general public in order to provide all interested parties the opportunity to review and comment on the draft EIS. During the 90-day comment period, public hearings on the draft EIS were held

in Richland, Washington; Spokane, Washington; Portland, Oregon; and Seattle, Washington. Fifty-four persons or organizations sent letters to the DOE containing comments on the draft EIS, and 29 persons or organizations presented comments on the draft EIS at public hearings. These comments were considered by the DOE in the preparation of the final EIS. Comments on the draft EIS did not require DOE to modify any alternatives presented in the draft EIS, to evaluate any new alternatives, or to supplement, improve, or modify its analyses in the draft EIS (40 CFR 1503.4); therefore, the final EIS consists of two volumes. The first volume is the draft EIS as written. The second volume (Addendum) consists of a summary; five appendixes containing additional health effects information, costs of decommissioning in 1990 dollars, additional graphite leaching data, a discussion of accident scenarios, and errata; a chapter containing responses to individual comments; and an appendix containing reproductions of the letters, transcripts, and exhibits that constitute the record of the public comment period.

The EIS was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, the implementing regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) in 40 CFR 1500-1508, and DOE's NEPA regulations in 10 CFR 1021 (57 FR 15122, April 24, 1992). The EIS was written early in the decision-making process to ensure that environmental values and alternatives could be fully considered before any decisions were made that might lead to unacceptable environmental impacts or that might limit the choice of reasonable alternatives. To comply with the NEPA requirement for early preparation of environmental documentation, the EIS was prepared before detailed engineering plans for decommissioning the reactors were prepared. As with any major action, it is expected that once a decommissioning alternative is selected, detailed engineering design will be carried out that may improve upon the conceptual engineering plans presented here. However, the engineering design will be such as to result in environmental impacts not significantly greater than those described here.

Decommissioning is dependent on future federal funding actions, and the actual start date cannot be predicted at this time. However, in the interim,

the DOE is conducting a comprehensive program of surveillance, maintenance, and monitoring to ensure the safety of the reactors.

The Addendum will be sent to those who received the draft EIS, will be made available to members of the public, and will be filed with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). A notice of availability of the Addendum will be published by the DOE in the Federal Register. The DOE will make a decision on the proposed action not earlier than 30 days after the EPA's notice of filing of the Addendum is published in the Federal Register. The DOE will record its decision in a Record of Decision published in the Federal Register.



CONTENTS

FOREWORD	iii
1.0 SUMMARY	1.1
1.1 INTRODUCTION	1.1
1.2 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION	1.2
1.3 DESCRIPTION AND COMPARISON OF DECOMMISSIONING ALTERNATIVES	1.3
1.3.1 No Action Alternative	1.8
1.3.2 Immediate One-Piece Removal Alternative	1.9
1.3.3 Safe Storage Followed by Deferred One-Piece Removal Alternative	1.10
1.3.4 Safe Storage Followed by Deferred Dismantlement Alternative	1.11
1.3.5 In Situ Decommissioning Alternative	1.12
1.3.6 Alternatives Considered but Not Analyzed in Detail	1.14
1.3.7 Evaluation of Alternatives	1.14
1.3.8 Preferred Alternative	1.14
1.4 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	1.18
1.4.1 Description of Impacted Portions of the 100 and 200 Areas	1.18
1.4.2 Geology and Hydrology of the Site	1.19
1.4.3 Climate, Meteorology, and Seismology of the Site	1.21
1.4.4 Air Quality, Water Quality, and Environmental Monitoring of the Site	1.21
1.4.5 Ecology	1.23
1.4.6 Socioeconomics of the Area Surrounding the Site	1.23

1.4.7	Transportation	1.24
1.5	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	1.24
1.5.1 - 1.5.6	Radiological Consequences	1.24
1.5.7	Impacts from Hazardous Wastes	1.26
1.5.8	Socioeconomic Impacts	1.26
1.5.9	Commitment of Resources	1.26
1.5.10	Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	1.26
1.5.11	Short-Term Versus Long-Term Use of the Environment	1.27
1.5.12	Means to Mitigate Adverse Environmental Impacts	1.27
1.5.13	Cumulative Impacts	1.28
1.6	STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS	1.28
9.0	RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT	9.1
9.1	PERSONS AND AGENCIES PRESENTING COMMENTS	9.1
9.1.1	Letters	9.2
9.1.2	Transcripts	9.5
9.1.3	Exhibits	9.6
9.1.4	Alphabetical List of Commenters	9.7
9.2	DECOMMISSIONING AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION PREFERENCES	9.12
9.2.1	Decommissioning Alternatives	9.12
9.2.2	Historic Preservation of B Reactor	9.12
9.3	COMMENTS AND RESPONSES	9.12
APPENDIX F:	ADDENDUM TO SECTION F.3 OF APPENDIX F: BIOLOGICALLY RELATED HEALTH EFFECTS	F.1

APPENDIX K: DECOMMISSIONING COSTS	K.1
K.1 COST COMPARISON OF THE ALTERNATIVES	K.2
K.2 NO ACTION	K.2
K.2.1 No Further Action	K.2
K.2.2 Continue Present Action	K.4
K.3 IMMEDIATE ONE-PIECE REMOVAL	K.4
K.3.1 Costs of Immediate One-Piece Removal	K.4
K.3.2 Waste-Site Costs	K.7
K.3.3 Transporter Shipment of the Reactor Blocks	K.7
K.4 SAFE STORAGE FOLLOWED BY DEFERRED ONE-PIECE REMOVAL	K.11
K.4.1 Costs of Safe Storage Followed by Deferred One-Piece Removal	K.11
K.4.2 Waste-Site Costs	K.13
K.5 SAFE STORAGE FOLLOWED BY DEFERRED DISMANTLEMENT	K.14
K.5.1 Costs of Safe Storage Followed by Deferred Dismantlement	K.14
K.5.2 Waste-Site Costs	K.17
K.6 IN SITU DECOMMISSIONING	K.17
K.6.1 Costs of In Situ Decommissioning	K.17
K.6.2 Waste-Site Costs	K.18
K.7 REFERENCES	K.20
APPENDIX L: SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION ON THE RELEASE RATES OF RADIONUCLIDES FROM THE GRAPHITE MODERATOR BLOCKS	L.1
L.1 RESULTS OF SUBSEQUENT STUDIES	L.1
L.2 IMPLICATIONS OF NEW RESULTS	L.3
L.3 REFERENCES	L.4

APPENDIX M: ACCIDENT SCENARIOS	M.1
APPENDIX N: ERRATA	N.1
APPENDIX O: LETTERS, TRANSCRIPTS, EXHIBITS	O.1

FIGURES

1.1 The Hanford Site and Surrounding Region 1.2
1.2 Reactor-Block Construction 1.5
1.3 Barrier Configuration for In Situ Decommissioning 1.13

TABLES

1.1	Costs of Decommissioning Alternatives	1.15
1.2	Comparison of Alternatives	1.16
F.5	Comparison of Cancer Fatalities for the Disposal Alternatives . .	F.2
K.1	Costs of Decommissioning Alternatives	K.3
K.2	Summary of Estimated Costs for Immediate One-Piece Removal of the Eight Surplus Production Reactors	K.5
K.3	Estimated Costs for Immediate One-Piece Removal of a Typical Reactor	K.8
K.4	Estimated Construction Costs for Burial of Reactor Blocks with Liner/Leachate Collection System in the 200-West Area	K.9
K.5	Summary of Costs for Transporters and Removal of Eight Surplus Production Reactors	K.10
K.6	Summary of Estimated Costs for Safe Storage Followed by Deferred One-Piece Removal of the Eight Surplus Production Reactors	K.12
K.7	Summary of Costs for Safe Storage Followed by Deferred Dismantlement for Eight Surplus Production Reactors	K.15
K.8	Estimated Costs for Deferred Dismantlement of a Surplus Production Reactor	K.16
K.9	Estimated 200-West Area Burial-Site Costs Associated with Burial of the Dismantled Reactor Blocks	K.18
K.10	Estimated Costs for In Situ Decommissioning of an "Average" Surplus Production Reactor	K.19
K.11	Estimated Burial-Site Costs for the In Situ Decommissioning Alternative	K.20

ADDENDUM (FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT)

DECOMMISSIONING OF EIGHT SURPLUS PRODUCTION REACTORS AT THE HANFORD SITE, RICHLAND, WASHINGTON

1.0 SUMMARY

This section summarizes the content of the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) and this Addendum, which together constitute the final environmental impact statement (FEIS) prepared by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) on the decommissioning of eight surplus plutonium production reactors located at the Hanford Site near Richland, Washington (see Figure 1.1). The FEIS consists of two volumes. The first volume is the DEIS as written. The second volume (this Addendum) consists of a summary; Chapter 9, which contains comments on the DEIS and provides DOE's responses to the comments; Appendix F, which provides additional health effects information; Appendix K, which contains costs of decommissioning in 1990 dollars; Appendix L, which contains additional graphite leaching data; Appendix M, which contains a discussion of accident scenarios; Appendix N, which contains errata; and Appendix O, which contains reproductions of the letters, transcripts, and exhibits that constitute the record for the public comment period. The objectives of the summary are to state the major results of the environmental analyses and to serve as a guide to the body of the DEIS. Section numbers and headings in this summary correspond to section numbers in the DEIS (e.g., Section 1.3.4 of the summary corresponds to Section 3.4 of the DEIS).

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Nine water-cooled, graphite-moderated plutonium production reactors were constructed along the Columbia River by the U.S. government at the Hanford Site near Richland, Washington, between the years 1943 and 1963. All are now retired from service. Eight of these reactors (B, C, D, DR, F, H, KE, and KW) have been declared surplus by the DOE, and are available for decommissioning. Decommissioning of the N Reactor is not within the scope of this EIS.

Summary; Purpose of and Need for Action




FIGURE 1.1. The Hanford Site and Surrounding Region

1.2 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

The proposed action is to decommission the eight surplus production reactors. Facilities included within the scope of the proposed action are

Summary; Decommissioning Alternatives

the eight surplus reactors, their associated nuclear fuel storage basins, and the buildings that house these systems. The purpose of decommissioning is to isolate any remaining radioactive or hazardous wastes in a manner that will minimize environmental impacts, especially potential health and safety impacts on the public. No future long-term use of any of the eight surplus production reactors has been identified by the DOE with the exception of B Reactor, which has been placed on the National Register of Historic Places. Because the reactors contain irradiated reactor components and because the buildings that house the reactors are contaminated with low levels of radioactivity, the DOE has determined that there is a need for action and that some form of decommissioning or continued surveillance and maintenance is necessary.

1.3 DESCRIPTION AND COMPARISON OF DECOMMISSIONING ALTERNATIVES

The alternatives considered in this DEIS are no action, immediate one-piece removal, safe storage followed by deferred one-piece removal, safe storage followed by deferred dismantlement, and in situ decommissioning. Evaluation of the alternatives has been carried out on the basis of several conditions and assumptions, the more important of which are listed below:

- The reactors are similar in design, construction, and radiological condition. Major differences are noted in the DEIS, but these are not significant for decommissioning purposes.
- The residual radioactive materials within the surplus facilities are low-level radioactive wastes (Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act and DOE 5820.2A), which are suitable for disposal at Hanford by shallow-land burial. Waste disposal would be in the Hanford 200-West Area for the removal and dismantlement alternatives, and in the Hanford 100 Areas for the in situ decommissioning alternative.
- Each disposal site, whether located in the 100 Areas or 200-West Area, will have a protective barrier, a ground-water monitoring system, and a marker system. The 200-West Area disposal site may be provided with a liner/leachate collection system. The protective barrier is designed to limit the infiltration of water and is assumed to limit infiltration to 0.1 centimeter per year.
- Costs are estimated on the basis of efficient, overlapping work schedules and are given in 1990 dollars.

Summary; Decommissioning Alternatives

The reactors and their associated fuel storage basins are briefly described in the following paragraphs (see Appendix A in the DEIS for a detailed description).

The eight surplus production reactors were constructed during the period 1943 to 1955 in the Hanford 100 Areas adjacent to the Columbia River, where the large volume of water necessary for reactor cooling was available. All of the surplus production reactors have been inactive since 1971. The reactors are similar in design, except that the newer KE and KW Reactors differ from the others in the number, size, and types of process tubes; the size of the moderator (graphite) stack; and the type of reactor-block shielding employed. While noted in the EIS, these differences are not significant for decommissioning purposes.

Each reactor building, designated as a 105 building, contains a reactor block, a reactor control room, a spent-fuel discharge area, a fuel storage basin, fans and ducts for ventilation and recirculating inert gas systems, water cooling systems, and supporting offices, shops, and laboratories. A typical reactor facility is a reinforced concrete and concrete-block structure approximately 76 meters long, by 70 meters wide, by 29 meters high. Outside the reactor block, the building has massive reinforced concrete walls (0.9 meter to 1.5 meters thick) that extend upward to the height of the reactor block to provide shielding, with lighter construction above. Roof construction is primarily precast concrete slab or poured insulating concrete. The reactor block is located near the center of the building. Horizontal control-rod penetrations are on the left side of the reactor block (when facing the reactor front face), and vertical safety-rod penetrations are on top of the reactor. Process tubes, which held the uranium fuel and carried the cooling water, penetrate the block from front to rear. Fuel discharge and storage areas are located adjacent to the rear face of the reactor. Experimental test penetrations are located on the right side of most of the reactors.

A typical reactor block (Figure 1.2) consists of a moderator stack consisting of graphite bars encased in a thermal shield surrounded by a biological shield. The entire block rests on a massive concrete base and

1.5




FIGURE 1.2. Reactor-Block Construction (base not shown)

Summary; Decommissioning Alternatives

foundation. Each older reactor-block assembly (graphite stack, thermal shield, biological shield, and base) weighs approximately 8,100 tonnes, and has overall dimensions of 14 meters wide, 12.2 meters deep, and 14 meters high. The K Reactor blocks are larger than the older reactor blocks and weigh approximately 11,000 tonnes each.

The graphite moderator stack consists of individual graphite blocks 10.6 centimeters square by 121.9 centimeters in length. The 105-F Reactor contains approximately 80,000 graphite blocks. The full, six-sided thermal shield is composed of a single layer of approximately 3,300 cast-iron blocks. The biological shield (outside of the thermal shield) is 132 centimeters thick and forms an integral casement on the top and four sides. In the older reactors, the biological shield is constructed of alternating layers of steel and masonite, and in the K Reactors, the biological shield is composed mainly of high-density concrete.

The fuel storage basins are concrete structures 6 meters deep, varying in area from 650 to 929 square meters. The top of each basin is at ground level. The typical fuel storage basin has a fuel discharge area adjacent to the reactor rear face, a large storage area, and a transfer area. The fuel storage basins at 105-KE and 105-KW are currently being used to store N Reactor fuel, which will be removed before decommissioning begins. The basins at 105-F and 105-H contain residual sludge and are filled with rubble and dirt. The transfer pits at 105-B and 105-C also contain some residual sludge from a previous clean-up operation. This sludge is low-level waste and will be removed or left in place, depending on the decommissioning alternative finally selected.

Radioactive inventories have been estimated for all of the surplus production reactors. The C Reactor has the largest inventory of the older reactors, and the KE Reactor has the larger inventory of the K Reactors. Radionuclides of primary interest (described in terms of their half-lives and total curie amounts in all eight reactors as of March 1985) include tritium (12.3 years, 98,100 curies), carbon-14 (5,730 years, 37,400 curies), chlorine-36 (300,000 years, 270 curies), cobalt-60 (5.3 years, 74,400 curies), cesium-137 (30.2 years, 267 curies), and uranium-238 (4.5 billion years,

Summary; Decommissioning Alternatives

0.013 curies). Cobalt-60 and cesium-137 are of importance because they contribute to the radiation dose received by decommissioning workers. Carbon-14, chlorine-36, and uranium-238 are of importance because of their long half-lives and because of their contribution to long-term individual and population public radiation doses. Tritium is not of particular importance either with respect to worker doses or to public doses, but it is mentioned here because it is present in large amounts.

On November 3, 1989, the Hanford Site was placed on the National Priorities List (NPL) by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for cleanup under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). On May 15, 1989, in anticipation of this designation, the DOE, the EPA, and the Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE) entered into the Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (Tri-Party Agreement). The Tri-Party Agreement addresses all of the active and inactive waste sites at Hanford under either the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) or CERCLA, but not the reactors themselves, except for hazardous wastes that might be generated during decommissioning. The Tri-Party Agreement provides for the cleanup of inactive waste sites under CERCLA and for the permitting of active waste sites under RCRA. If in situ decommissioning is chosen, the barriers covering the reactors and fuel storage basins may cover 16 inactive waste-disposal sites. These sites are being evaluated by the DOE within the scope of the DOE's responsibilities under the Tri-Party Agreement. If the in situ decommissioning alternative is selected, any evaluation and remedial action required for any of these 16 sites beyond the actions proposed for in situ decommissioning will be completed before decommissioning of the reactors begins. These actions are outside the scope of this EIS.

Several materials that may be considered to be hazardous materials under RCRA, the Toxic Substances Control Act (TOSCA), or the Clean Air Act (CAA) are or have been present in the facilities. These materials include mercury (RCRA), friable asbestos (CAA), polychlorinated biphenyls (TOSCA), cadmium (RCRA), and nonirradiated lead (RCRA). These materials are being recycled, stored, or disposed of according to applicable regulations. Lead (RCRA, 653 tonnes) used as an integral component in the reactor structure in the

Summary; Decommissioning Alternatives

thermal shields has been irradiated and will either be left in place under the in situ decommissioning alternative, or moved to a 200-West Area low-level waste burial ground under the dismantlement or removal alternatives. The impacts of the irradiated lead are evaluated in the DEIS.

Decommissioning alternatives are discussed in the following sections.

1.3.1 No Action Alternative

For the purpose of this EIS, no action means to continue present actions indefinitely. A second no action alternative of doing nothing further is not reasonable and is not considered in detail.

1.3.1.1 Continue Present Action Alternative

Continue present action means to continue routine surveillance, monitoring, and maintenance. These activities are the same as those required during the safe-storage period of deferred decommissioning, and the annual (or unit) costs and radiation doses are similar. Over the 100-year period assumed for active institutional control (and over any successive 100-year period), the cost to continue present action is estimated to be \$44 million in 1990 dollars for all eight reactors. The occupational radiation dose over the same 100-year period for surveillance, monitoring, and maintenance is estimated to be 24 person-rem. At the end of the 100-year period of active institutional control, problems similar to those faced in the no further action alternative would be present with respect to the isolation of remaining radioactive materials from the environment and with respect to the protection of human health and safety, even though 100 years of radioactive decay would have taken place. The presence of long-lived isotopes and other safety hazards within the facilities would require further action.

Continue present action is subsequently referred to as the no action alternative because the no further action case was not evaluated as a feasible alternative.

1.3.1.2 No Further Action Alternative

No further action means to close the facility and to discontinue all activities related to the facility. Although no decommissioning cost would be

Summary; Decommissioning Alternatives

incurred and there would be no further occupational radiation dose, this alternative is not reasonable and is not acceptable to the DOE because it would not properly isolate the remaining radioactivity in the facility from the environment, would not provide for any maintenance or repair of the structures, and would not make any other provision for the protection of human health and safety. No further action would eventually result in deterioration of the reactor buildings, potential release of radionuclides to the environment, and potential human exposure to radioactivity and to other safety hazards by intrusion. This alternative is not considered further.

1.3.2 Immediate One-Piece Removal Alternative

Immediate one-piece removal means to transport each reactor block, intact on a tractor-transporter, from its present location in the 100 Areas to the 200-West Area for disposal, a distance of about 5 to 14 miles, depending on the reactor. The reactor block includes the graphite core, the thermal and biological shields, and the concrete base. Contaminated areas of the associated fuel storage basins would be removed for disposal in the 200-West Area, along with other contaminated equipment and components in the buildings that house the reactors and the fuel storage basins. The uncontaminated portion of the fuel storage basins would also be removed to provide access for the tractor-transporter. Each reactor building would then be demolished and an excavation prepared under the reactor block through the former location of the fuel storage basin. Before excavation, the weight of the reactor block would be transferred to I-beams that would be inserted through holes drilled in the concrete base and grouted in place. If contaminated soil was identified during the excavation, it would be removed and transported to the 200-West Area for disposal. A tractor-transporter would then be driven under the block, and the block would be lifted from its remaining foundation by hydraulic apparatus on the transporter and carried intact on a specially constructed haul road to the 200-West Area for disposal. The complete immediate one-piece removal process would take about 2.5 years for each reactor and about 12 years for all eight reactors. Following reactor removal, the site formerly occupied by the

Summary; Decommissioning Alternatives

reactor would be backfilled, graded, seeded, and released for other DOE use. (The term "other DOE use" means that a new or alternative use is not precluded by the presence of radioactivity.)

The estimated total cost for immediate one-piece removal of all eight reactors is about \$228 million in 1990 dollars. This includes \$13 million for purchase of the two tractor units and fabrication of the transporter, and about \$22 million for haul-road construction.

Public radiation doses during the decommissioning period are estimated to be zero, and occupational radiation doses are estimated to be 159 person-rem for immediate one-piece removal of all eight reactors.

1.3.3 Safe Storage Followed by Deferred One-Piece Removal Alternative

Safe storage followed by deferred one-piece removal means a multidecade safe-storage period during which surveillance, monitoring, and maintenance are continued, followed by the transport of each reactor block intact on a tractor-transporter from its present location in the 100 Areas to the 200-West Area for disposal.

During preparation for safe storage, building components and structures are repaired as needed to ensure the security of the facility during the safe-storage period. Building security, radiation monitoring, and fire detection systems are upgraded to provide safety, security, and surveillance as long as required.

The safe-storage period used as a basis for this EIS is 75 years, which is an adequate time for decay of cobalt-60, a radionuclide that contributes significantly to occupational dose. This period permits the reactors to be decommissioned with less occupational radiation dose than in the case of immediate one-piece removal. The safe-storage period for all but the first reactor is actually longer than 75 years because the reactors would be decommissioned in sequence at estimated 1- to 2-year intervals. During the safe-storage period, surveillance, site and facility inspections, radiological and environmental surveys, and site and facility maintenance would be carried out. Major building maintenance would be performed at estimated 5-year and 20-year intervals.

Summary; Decommissioning Alternatives

At the end of the safe-storage period, deferred one-piece removal would take place. The sequence of events is the same as for immediate one-piece removal. Deferred one-piece removal is estimated to take about 2.5 years for each reactor and about 12 years for all eight reactors. The entire safe storage followed by deferred one-piece removal alternative would take about 87 years for all eight reactors.

The estimated total cost for safe storage followed by deferred one-piece removal of all eight reactors is about \$235 million in 1990 dollars. This includes about \$36 million for safe storage and preparation for safe storage, and about \$199 million for deferred one-piece removal.

Public radiation doses are estimated to be zero, and occupational radiation doses are estimated to be 51 person-rem, including 23 person-rem during the safe-storage period and 28 person-rem during deferred one-piece removal, for all eight reactors.

1.3.4 Safe Storage Followed by Deferred Dismantlement Alternative

Safe storage followed by deferred dismantlement means a multidecade safe-storage period (75 years), during which surveillance, monitoring, and maintenance are continued, followed by piece-by-piece dismantlement of each reactor, and transport of radioactive waste to the 200-West Area for burial. Piece-by-piece dismantlement is a reasonable alternative to consider at a delayed point in time because radioactive decay, primarily of cobalt-60, will significantly reduce occupational radiation exposure compared to immediate piece-by-piece dismantlement. Activities during preparation for safe storage and during the safe-storage period are the same as for the safe storage followed by deferred one-piece removal alternative, except for slightly longer storage periods for all but the first reactor in the deferred dismantlement case.

At the end of the safe-storage period, deferred dismantlement takes place. Each reactor block would be disassembled piece by piece, and all contaminated equipment and components would be packaged and transported to the 200-West Area for disposal. Contaminated structural surfaces, including contaminated surfaces of the fuel storage basins, would also be removed,

Summary; Decommissioning Alternatives

packaged, and transported to the 200-West Area for disposal. Noncontaminated material and equipment would be released for salvage or disposed of in place or in an ordinary landfill. Remaining noncontaminated structures would be demolished and the site backfilled, graded, seeded, and released for other DOE use. An estimated 6.5 years would be required for deferred dismantlement of each reactor. The entire safe storage followed by deferred dismantlement process would take about 103 years for all eight reactors.

The estimated total cost for safe storage followed by deferred dismantlement of all eight reactors is about \$311 million in 1990 dollars. This includes about \$38 million for safe storage and preparation for safe storage, and about \$273 million for deferred dismantlement.

Public radiation doses during the decommissioning period are estimated to be zero, and occupational radiation doses are estimated to be 532 person-rem, including 23 person-rem during the safe-storage period and 509 person-rem during deferred dismantlement, for all eight reactors. The occupational radiation dose for deferred dismantlement is higher than the occupational radiation doses for immediate or deferred one-piece removal because of the need to work at the interior of the carbon block where dose rates are higher than in the work areas utilized for one-piece removal. Even after 75 years of decay, the occupational dose (i.e., the product of worker hours times dose rates, summed over all tasks), would exceed that for immediate one-piece removal. It is possible, however, that in 75 years advances in robotics would reduce the occupational radiation dose.

1.3.5 In Situ Decommissioning Alternative

In situ decommissioning means to prepare the reactor block for covering with a protective mound (barrier) and to construct the mound. Surfaces within the facility that are potentially contaminated would be painted with a fixative to ensure retention of contamination during subsequent activities. The voids beneath and around the reactor block would be filled with grout and/or gravel as a further sealant and to prevent subsidence of the final overburden. Roofs, superstructures, and concrete shield walls would be removed down to the level of the top of the reactor block. Structures surrounding the reactor shield walls would be demolished. Piping and other channels of access into

Summary; Decommissioning Alternatives

the reactor building would be backfilled with grout or similar material to ensure isolation of the reactor from the surrounding environment. Finally, the reactor block, its adjacent shield walls, and the spent-fuel storage basin, together with the contained radioactivity, gravel, and grout, would be covered to a depth of at least 5 meters with a mound containing earth and gravel. The mound would include an engineered barrier designed to limit water infiltration through the barrier to 0.1 centimeter per year. Riprap on the sides of the mounds would ensure structural stability of the mounds and mitigate the impacts of any flood that might reach the reactors. An artist's conception of the barrier configuration for one of the reactors is shown in Figure 1.3. The mounds may cover the existing locations of 16 inactive waste-disposal sites. Necessary remedial actions for these sites will be taken prior to or in conjunction with in situ decommissioning.

In situ decommissioning of one reactor is estimated to take about 2 years, and in situ decommissioning of all eight reactors is estimated to take about 5 to 6 years. The estimated total cost for in situ decommissioning of all eight reactors is about \$193 million in 1990 dollars.

Public radiation doses during the decommissioning period are estimated to be zero, and occupational radiation doses are estimated to be 33 person-rem for in situ decommissioning of all eight reactors.




FIGURE 1.3. Barrier Configuration for In Situ Decommissioning

Summary; Decommissioning Alternatives

1.3.6 Alternatives Considered but Not Analyzed in Detail

One major alternative, immediate dismantlement, was identified but not analyzed in detail because of its high cost (in the same range as safe storage followed by deferred dismantlement) and high occupational dose (higher than safe storage followed by deferred dismantlement because of the shorter radioactive isotope decay time). Minor variations within each decommissioning alternative also were not analyzed in detail because they offered no apparent advantages. Alternative disposal sites (i.e., other than Hanford) also were not analyzed in detail because they would result in increased costs, the possibility of increased radiation exposures to the public from cross-country transport of radioactive waste, and the possibility of transportation accidents with no compensating benefit.

1.3.7 Evaluation of Alternatives

Estimated costs of the alternatives are shown in Table 1.1, segregated to show the costs of safe storage, construction of monitoring wells, well monitoring, waste disposal, and other decommissioning costs.

The total costs and principal environmental impacts of the alternatives considered are summarized in Table 1.2. The impacts include short-term occupational radiation doses and long-term public radiation doses as a result of releases of radioactivity from the 100-Area or 200-West Area disposal sites (from Section 1.5). (A distinction is made in the DEIS between short-term impacts that occur during decommissioning operations and long-term impacts that occur following the completion of decommissioning operations to 10,000 years.) Other impacts afford little or no basis for choice among alternatives.

1.3.8 Preferred Alternative

The DOE has analyzed the environmental impacts of decommissioning the eight surplus production reactors at the Hanford Site and has analyzed public and agency comments received on the DEIS during the public comment period.

The environmental impacts of the alternatives do not offer a strong basis for selection among the alternatives (see Table 1.2). For example, the difference in worker dose between immediate one-piece removal and deferred

TABLE 1.1. Costs of Decommissioning Alternatives^(a)

<u>Activity</u>	<u>No Action</u>	<u>Immediate One-Piece Removal</u>	<u>Safe Storage Followed by Deferred One-Piece Removal</u>	<u>Safe Storage Followed by Deferred Dismantlement</u>	<u>In Situ Decommissioning</u>
Safe storage	43.5	--	35.9	38.0	--
Mound/barrier	--	--	--	--	61.9
Burial site/barrier	--	46.6	46.6	15.9	--
Construct ground-water monitoring wells	--	1.6	1.6	1.6	2.1
Ground-water monitoring	--	38.1	8.8	10.3	101.6
Other decommissioning costs	<u>--</u>	<u>142.0</u>	<u>142.0</u>	<u>245.5</u>	<u>27.4</u>
TOTALS	43.5	228.3	234.9	311.3	193.0

(a) Costs are for 100 years, in millions of 1990 dollars.

Summary; Decommissioning Alternatives

TABLE 1.2. Comparison of Alternatives^(a)

Alternative	Occupational Radiation Dose (person-rem)	Occupational Cancer Fatalities	Total Cost (millions of 1990 \$)	Population Dose over 10,000 yr ^(b) (person-rem)	Population Cancer Fatalities	Maximum ^(c) Well Dose (rem/yr)
No action (continue present action)	24	0	44	50,000	20	1.2
Immediate one-piece removal	159	0	228	1,900	1	0.04
Safe storage followed by deferred one-piece removal	51	0	235	1,900	1	0.04
Safe storage followed by deferred dismantlement	532	0	311	1,900	1	0.04
In situ decommissioning	33	0	193	4,700	2	0.03

(a) Quantities are for all eight reactors. Costs are for 100 years.

(b) The same population would receive 9 billion person-rem over 10,000 years and 900,000 to 9 million health effects from natural radiation.

(c) This is the maximum dose rate to a person drinking water from a well drilled near the waste form at any time up to 10,000 years.

one-piece removal is not significant. But based on its review of environmental impacts, total project costs, and the results of the public hearing process, the DOE selects safe storage followed by deferred one-piece removal as the agency's preferred alternative for decommissioning the Hanford surplus production reactors.

In May 1989, subsequent to issuing the DEIS, the DOE entered into the Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (Tri-Party Agreement). This agreement includes the management of hazardous wastes at the Hanford Site and the administration of remedial and corrective actions (cleanup) for hazardous wastes, hazardous substances, and other pollutants and contaminants at the Hanford Site under RCRA and CERCLA. While this agreement does not explicitly include decommissioning of the eight surplus reactors, it does recognize that certain activities related to decommissioning may be subject to RCRA. The agreement provides that whenever decommissioning activities "result in the generation of hazardous wastes, the treatment, storage, and disposal of those wastes shall be subject to this Agreement." The Tri-Party Agreement

Summary; Decommissioning Alternatives

further provides that "in the event a contaminated structure is found to be the source of a release (or presents a substantial threat of a release) of hazardous substances, hazardous wastes, or hazardous constituents to the environment, the investigation and remediation of such a release (to include remediation of structures, as necessary), where subject to CERCLA or RCRA, shall also be subject to this Agreement." The Tri-Party Agreement also contemplates completion of remedial and corrective action at Hanford in 30 years.

The DOE proposes to complete this decommissioning action consistent with the proposed 30-year Hanford clean-up schedule for those Hanford remedial actions included in the Tri-Party Agreement Action Plan. Therefore, the safe-storage period would be for less than 30 years versus the 75 years assumed in the DEIS for the deferred one-piece removal alternative. (This shortened safe-storage period results in costs and environmental impacts that are bounded by the immediate and the deferred one-piece removal alternatives discussed in the DEIS.) The DOE also intends to evaluate the priority of this decommissioning action relative to the priority of RCRA/CERCLA remediation of the 100-Area past-practice units being conducted under the Tri-Party Agreement. Should the selection of this alternative eventually be shown to be inconsistent with subsequent RCRA and CERCLA remediation decisions, the DOE will reevaluate the appropriateness of proceeding with this alternative on an area-by-area basis. DOE will continue to conduct routine maintenance, surveillance, and radiological monitoring activities in order to ensure continued protection of the public and the environment during the safe-storage period.

The DOE nominated the B Reactor for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places in accordance with the opinion of the Washington State Historic Preservation Officer and the provisions of 36 CFR 800, "Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties." On April 3, 1992, the National Park Service entered the B Reactor in the National Register. Specific actions to mitigate the impact of decommissioning on the historic preservation of B Reactor will be determined later in accordance with 36 CFR 800. Actions to preserve this historic resource may include extensive recordation by photographs, drawings, models, exhibits, and written histories, and may also

Summary; Affected Environment

include preservation of some portions of the B Reactor for display on or near its present location or at some other selected location.

1.4 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The affected environment includes areas both on the Hanford Site and external to the Hanford Site that might be impacted by decommissioning (see Figure 1.1). These areas are briefly described in the following sections.

1.4.1 Description of Impacted Portions of the 100 and 200 Areas

In early 1943, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers selected the Hanford Site as the location for reactor and chemical separation facilities for the production and purification of plutonium for possible use in nuclear weapons. Areas of the Site that may be impacted by the decommissioning of the eight surplus production reactors are described in the following sections.

1.4.1.1 100 Areas

The 100 Areas are all on relatively flat terraces and bars near the Columbia River with elevations generally between 120 meters and 150 meters above mean sea level, and from about 11 meters to 30 meters above normal river level. The topography is characterized by low relief and gentle slopes. Small gravel mounds to 10 meters in height are found between the 100-K and 100-D Areas.

The 100-B/C Area occupies about 263 hectares, and is the farthest upstream of the 100 Areas, at river mile 384. Essentially all facilities in the area are surplus, with the principal exception of the 100-B/C water system, which supplies water for the 200 Areas. The 100-K Area occupies about 55 hectares at river mile 381.5. The KE and KW fuel storage basins are in operation for the purpose of storing irradiated fuel from the N Reactor. The 100-N Area occupies about 36 hectares at river mile 380. Its facilities are now retired. The 100-D/DR Area occupies about 389 hectares at river mile 377.5. While the reactor and fuel storage basins are surplus, other facilities remain in operation at the 100-D/DR Area. Sanitary and fire-protection water is transported by pipeline from the 100-D/DR Area to the 100-H and 100-F Areas, and back-up water is supplied to the 200 Areas in support of the

Summary; Affected Environment

100-B/C water system. The 100-H Area occupies 130 hectares at river mile 372.5. All major buildings have been removed from the 100-H Area except the 105 building. The 100-F Area occupies 219 hectares at river mile 369. All facilities except the 105, 108, and 1608 buildings have been removed from the 100-F Area.

Contaminated solid and liquid wastes from the 100 Areas are buried in approximately 110 inactive waste-disposal sites in the 100 Areas. These sites are currently being reviewed by the DOE pursuant to its responsibilities under CERCLA, RCRA, and the Tri-Party Agreement.

1.4.1.2 200 Areas

The 200 Areas are located near the middle of the Hanford Site, about 11 kilometers from the Columbia River. The topography is nearly flat and varies in elevation from about 190 to 245 meters above mean sea level. Facilities and sites exist in the 200 Areas for nuclear fuel processing, plutonium separation, plutonium fabrication, high-level and transuranic radioactive waste handling and storage, and low-level radioactive waste handling and disposal.

Contaminated solids and liquids from the entire Hanford Site are buried in both inactive and active low-level waste burial grounds in the 200 Areas. Low-level wastes from the removal and dismantlement decommissioning alternatives would be buried in the 200-West Area.

1.4.2 Geology and Hydrology of the Site

The Hanford Site is located in the semiarid Pasco Basin, a structural and topographic depression within the Columbia Plateau in southeastern Washington State. The 100 Areas are located adjacent to the Columbia River on the lowest of several levels of alluvial terraces on the Site. The normal elevation of the river is 116 meters above mean sea level, and the elevations of the reactor ground-floor levels range from 125.7 to 150.6 meters. The 200 Areas are located near the center of the Site on a large bar of sand and gravel known as the 200-Area Plateau. The 200-Area Plateau ranges in elevation from 190 to 245 meters above mean sea level.

Summary; Affected Environment

1.4.2.1 Geology of the Site

The principal stratigraphic units at the Hanford Site are the Columbia River Basalt Group with interbedded sediments of the Ellensburg Formation, which forms the bedrock beneath the Site; the Ringold Formation, consisting of semiconsolidated clays, silts, sands, and gravels lying directly over the bedrock; and the Hanford Formation, composed of a thin surface mantle of sands, gravels, and wind-blown silts overlying the Ringold Formation. The basalt is as much as 5,000 meters thick, and the Ringold and Hanford Formations are up to 360 meters and 100 meters thick, respectively.

1.4.2.2 Hydrology of the Site

The primary surface water features of the Hanford Site are the Columbia and Yakima Rivers. Surface run-off from the site to these two rivers is extremely low. The average annual flow of the Columbia River at Hanford is about 3,400 cubic meters per second, and the average annual flow of the Yakima River at Kiona (see Figure 1.1) is about 104 cubic meters per second. Normal Columbia River elevations range from 120 meters above mean sea level at Vernita, where the river enters the Site, to 104 meters at the 300 Area, where it leaves the Site. The dam-regulated probable maximum flood would produce a flow of about 40,800 cubic meters per second in the Columbia River and would reach the elevation of the bottom of the fuel storage basins at 100-F and 100-H, but would not reach the floor of any reactor building. A 50% failure of Grand Coulee Dam would create a maximum flow of about 226,500 cubic meters per second and flood elevations of 143 to 148 meters in the 100 Areas. Parts of the 100 and 300 Areas and most downstream cities would be flooded. The 200 Areas would not be reached by this flood.

Ground water occurs under the Site in both unconfined and confined aquifers. The unconfined (upper) aquifer is contained within the glaciofluvial sands and gravels in the Ringold Formation. The bottom of the unconfined aquifer is the basalt surface of the Columbia River Basalt Group or the clay zones of the lower member of the Ringold Formation. The confined aquifer consists of sedimentary interbeds and/or interflow zones that occur between dense basalt flows in the Columbia River Basalt Group. Direct interconnections occur between the unconfined and uppermost confined aquifers. Natural

Summary; Affected Environment

recharge to the unconfined aquifer may occur in small amounts from precipitation and surface run-off. Artificial recharge to the unconfined aquifer in the 200 Areas results from the disposal of waste cooling and process water to the ground. Depth to the water table averages about 12 meters in the 100 Areas and from 55 to 95 meters in the 200 Areas.

1.4.3 Climate, Meteorology, and Seismology of the Site

The Hanford climate can be described as arid, hot in summer and cool in winter. Rainfall averages 16 centimeters per year, and average temperatures range from 1.5°C in January to 24.7°C in July. The prevailing wind is from the northwest with a secondary maximum from the southwest. Summer winds frequently reach velocities of 50 kilometers per hour. The 100-year extreme wind is estimated to have a velocity of 137 kilometers per hour. Tornado probabilities are small.

The Columbia Plateau is in an area of moderate seismicity. Swarms of small, shallow earthquakes are the predominant seismic events, with magnitudes of 1.0 to 3.5 on the Richter scale.

1.4.4 Air Quality, Water Quality, and Environmental Monitoring of the Site

Air quality in the vicinity of the Hanford Site is good except for occasional episodes of wind-blown dust from dry plowed fields and construction areas. The major nonradioactive industrial air pollutant release is from the PUREX and Uranium Oxide Plants, which discharge oxides of nitrogen under a Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit issued by the EPA. Average annual NO₂ concentrations at all Hanford Site and nearby monitoring locations were well below federal and state ambient air standards in 1987.

The WDOE classifies the Columbia River as Class A (excellent) between Grand Coulee Dam and the mouth of the river. The DOE holds a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the EPA for eight point source discharges into the Columbia River.

Radiological monitoring of the atmosphere, ground water, Columbia River water, foodstuffs, plants, animals, and soil is conducted routinely by the Pacific Northwest Laboratory (PNL). Measurements made in 1987 showed slight elevations of krypton-85, uranium, polonium, and iodine-129 concentrations in

Summary; Affected Environment

air at site perimeter monitoring stations relative to background concentrations measured at more distant monitoring stations. Only iodine-129 showed a statistically significant difference. Water measurements made in 1987 showed that radionuclides have entered ground water in the 200 Areas and migrated easterly to the Columbia River. Samples collected from the Columbia River upstream and downstream from the Hanford Site indicate that tritium, iodine-129, gross alpha, and uranium concentrations were measurable at higher concentrations downstream from Hanford than upstream, but that all offsite concentrations are well within EPA drinking water standards. The major sources of radionuclides entering the river are from N Reactor liquid-disposal facilities (no longer in service) and from 200-Area ground water moving below the Hanford Site and into the river. Foodstuffs from the area, including those irrigated with Columbia River water, were sampled, and the concentrations of radionuclides were shown to be similar to the low concentrations in foodstuffs grown in other adjacent areas. Some waterfowl, fish, and rabbits showed low levels of cesium-137 attributable to Hanford operations. Dose rates from external penetrating radiation measured in the vicinity of local residential areas were similar to those obtained in previous years, and no contribution from Hanford activities could be identified. Nonradiological monitoring for chemical constituents included routine sampling and a special effort involving hazardous materials. Some elevated levels of nitrate, chromium, fluoride, and carbon tetrachloride were found in ground-water samples. Columbia River waters were within State of Washington water quality standards, with the exception of pH and fecal coliform bacteria. These latter contaminants are not attributable to Hanford Site activities.

Measured and calculated radiation doses to the general public from Hanford operations during 1987 were well below applicable regulatory limits. The calculated effective dose potentially received by a hypothetical maximally exposed individual for 1987 was about 0.05 millirem, compared with a dose of 0.09 millirem estimated for 1986. The collective effective dose to the population living within 80 kilometers of the Site estimated for 1987 was 4 person-rem, compared with 9 person-rem estimated for 1986.

Summary; Affected Environment

These doses can be compared with the 300 millirem and 100,000 person-rem received annually by an average individual and by the surrounding population, respectively, as a result of naturally occurring radiation.

1.4.5 Ecology

The ecology of the Hanford Site is that of a cool desert or shrub steppe. Because of the arid climate, the productivity of both plants and animals is relatively low compared with that of other natural communities with higher rainfall.

1.4.5.1 Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology

The dominant plants on the Hanford Site are large sagebrush, rabbit-brush, cheatgrass, and Sandberg bluegrass. Cottonwoods, willows, cattails, and bulrushes grow along ponds and ditches. Cheatgrass and Russian thistle invade areas where the ground surface has been disturbed. More than 300 species of insects, 11 species of reptiles and amphibians, more than 125 species of birds, and 27 species of mammals are found on the Site. Coyote, elk, and mule deer are the largest mammals observed on the Site. The Columbia River supports the most important aquatic ecosystem on the Site. Forty-five species of fish have been identified in the Hanford Reach.

1.4.5.2 Threatened and Endangered Species

None of the plant species occurring on the Site are federally listed as threatened or endangered. The bald eagle and peregrine falcon are animal species federally listed as threatened and endangered, respectively. While the bald eagle is a regular winter resident and the peregrine falcon is a casual migrant, neither species nests on the Site.

1.4.6 Socioeconomics of the Area Surrounding the Site

The Tri-Cities (Kennewick, Pasco, and Richland, Washington) and the surrounding area have been designated a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. About 376,000 people live within an 80-kilometer radius of the center of the Site according to the 1990 census. About 16,000 persons are employed on DOE-related projects at Hanford.

Summary; Environmental Consequences

Service amenities in the Tri-Cities are provided by various agencies and units of government and by private organizations in the MSA (e.g., schools, fire and police protection, utilities, medical facilities, parks, and shopping facilities).

Major land use in the area includes the Hanford Site, urban and industrial development in and around incorporated cities, irrigated farming, and dry farming.

Nine archaeological properties located on the Hanford Site have been identified and listed in the National Register of Historic Places, but none are within the 100 or 200 Areas. Preoperational surveys at proposed borrow-pit sites and around the reactors will be conducted in advance of any decommissioning operations to ensure that no cultural resource or archaeological site is inadvertently impacted or disturbed.

The DOE nominated the B Reactor for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places in accordance with the opinion of the Washington State Historic Preservation Officer. On April 3, 1992, the National Park Services entered the B Reactor into the National Register.

The Hanford Site is located on lands ceded to the U.S. government by the Yakima and Umatilla Indians and is near lands ceded by the Nez Perce Indians.

1.4.7 Transportation

The area is served by major interstate, U.S., and state highways; by commercial airlines; by two railroads; and by barge service on the Columbia River. DOE-owned railway and highway systems serve the Hanford Site.

1.5 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Environmental consequences other than those discussed in Section 1.3 are discussed in this section.

1.5.1 - 1.5.6 Radiological Consequences

Radiological consequences may occur as part of decommissioning operations, as a result of accidents during decommissioning, and as a result of long-term, postdecommissioning releases of radionuclides from the disposed

Summary; Environmental Consequences

low-level radioactive wastes. In all three cases, the radionuclide inventory described in Section 1.3 provides the basis for the calculated potential radiological impact. Occupational radiation doses are discussed in Section 1.3 (Table 1.2) and result from external exposure to gamma radiation. Accidental and long-term radiation doses are discussed below.

During decommissioning operations, the most probable source of radiation exposure to the public is inhalation of airborne radionuclides released by accidents. Several postulated accidents were analyzed. The one of largest radiological consequence was determined to be a railroad-crossing collision of a gasoline tanker with a boxcar carrying reactor graphite; this postulated accident occurred under the safe storage followed by deferred dismantlement alternative. Although the graphite would not burn, the resulting 30-minute fire would release radioactive particulates to the atmosphere sufficient to cause a lifetime dose of 0.2 rem to the maximally exposed individual member of the public.

The radiological consequences of long-term releases of radionuclides to the ground water over 10,000 years from the 200-Area disposal site and from the 100-Area in situ sites were also calculated, based on calculated release rates from the solid wastes and on estimated travel times to the Columbia River. Population doses from these releases were calculated to be about 50,000 person-rem (5 to 50 health effects) for no action (continued present action), 1,900 person-rem (0.2 to 2 health effects) for the removal and dismantlement alternatives, and 4,700 person-rem (0.5 to 5 health effects) for in situ decommissioning. During the same time period (10,000 years), the same population (410 million affected individuals) would receive 9 billion person-rem (900 thousand to 9 million health effects) from natural radiation sources.

Maximum annual individual doses over 10,000 years were also calculated for persons drinking water from wells drilled near the waste-disposal sites. These calculated doses are 1.2 rem per year for no action, 0.04 rem per year for the removal and dismantlement alternatives, and 0.03 rem per year for in situ decommissioning.

Summary; Environmental Consequences

1.5.7 Impacts from Hazardous Wastes

Based on known release rates and on estimated travel times, estimates were made of the maximum concentration of lead in well water near the waste-disposal sites over 10,000 years. For the no action alternative, the maximum concentration of lead is estimated to be 6×10^{-4} milligrams per liter; for the removal and dismantlement alternatives, the concentration of lead is estimated to be 4.9×10^{-4} milligrams per liter; and for the in situ decommissioning alternative, the concentration of lead is estimated to be 1.2×10^{-4} milligrams per liter.

1.5.8 Socioeconomic Impacts

Socioeconomic impacts are caused primarily by the influx (or egress) of workers required by the project. The maximum number of workers required onsite at any one time for any decommissioning alternative is 100. This number is less than 1% of the workers presently on the Site and would produce negligible socioeconomic impacts.

1.5.9 Commitment of Resources

Resources committed to the decommissioning of the Hanford surplus reactors would include the land on which the reactors now stand and the necessary grout and fill material for in situ decommissioning, the land required for low-level waste disposal for either the one-piece removal or dismantlement alternatives, and the energy necessary to carry out the alternative for any of the alternatives. Land commitments are discussed in the next section.

It is estimated that approximately 98,000 cubic meters of grout and 1,600,000 cubic meters of fill material would be required for in situ decommissioning of all eight reactors.

Approximately 6 million, 2 million, and 5 million liters of fuel would be consumed for one-piece removal, dismantlement, and in situ decommissioning, respectively.

1.5.10 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Unavoidable adverse impacts would result from each decommissioning alternative. The most important of these is occupational radiation dose,

Summary; Environmental Consequences

which is greatest for safe storage followed by deferred dismantlement (532 person-rem), less for immediate one-piece removal (159 person-rem) and safe storage followed by deferred one-piece removal (51 person-rem), and least for in situ decommissioning (33 person-rem). The occupational radiation dose is least for in situ decommissioning because the reactor block is neither handled nor disassembled.

Another adverse impact is the dedication of land to the disposal of radioactive waste. The land required for radioactive-waste disposal in the 200 Areas is about 6 hectares, which is offset by the 5 hectares that would become available for other DOE use in the 100 Areas following removal or dismantlement of all eight reactors. For in situ decommissioning, however, about 20 hectares of land would be occupied in the 100 Areas by the eight reactor mounds, although no additional land would be required in the 200 Areas for radioactive-waste disposal.

Approximately 16 hectares of land could be disrupted for excavation of earth and gravel for in situ decommissioning (depending on the depth of the excavation), but this land can be reclaimed and would remain available for other use.

1.5.11 Short-Term Versus Long-Term Use of the Environment

Each decommissioning alternative will require the use of some land for disposal of radioactive wastes and will restrict that land from other beneficial uses for long periods of time because of the presence of long-lived radionuclides, principally carbon-14 and chlorine-36. The amount of land thus restricted was discussed in Section 1.5.10.

1.5.12 Means to Mitigate Adverse Environmental Impacts

Adverse environmental impacts that can be mitigated include occupational radiation doses, disruption to land areas, and migration of chemicals and radionuclides caused by water infiltration through waste-disposal sites.

Decommissioning workers will wear dosimeters, and radiation zones will be monitored before workers are allowed to enter. Protective shields, remotely operated tools, and contamination control envelopes will be employed when appropriate. Standard contamination monitoring devices will be used.

Summary; Statutory and Regulatory Requirements

ALARA (as low as reasonably achievable) principles will be applied in every phase of engineering planning that deals with radioactive material to reduce worker exposure.

Sites used for the acquisition of dirt and gravel will be surveyed for archaeological resources and endangered species, and will be rehabilitated when no more material need be acquired from the site.

Water migration through the waste-disposal sites (both the 200-West Area and the 100-Area sites) will be mitigated by the installation of a multilayer, engineered barrier consisting of a capillary layer of fine-textured soil underlain by an impervious layer of soil/bentonite clay. Calculations in the DEIS are based on a water infiltration rate through the barrier of 0.1 centimeter per year.

1.5.13 Cumulative Impacts

No significant additional cumulative impact from decommissioning the surplus production reactors is expected in conjunction with existing or reasonably foreseeable future actions at the Hanford Site.

1.6 STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Decommissioning will be carried out in accordance with DOE's environmental policy, which is "to conduct its operations in an environmentally safe and sound manner . . . in compliance with the letter and spirit of applicable environmental statutes, regulations, and standards."

Environmental regulations and standards of potential relevance to decommissioning are those promulgated by the EPA under the Atomic Energy Act (AEA), the CAA, Clean Water Act (CWA), Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), RCRA, and CERCLA. State environmental regulations, including dangerous waste regulations, have also been promulgated under the authority of some of these federal statutes. Other relevant environmental statutes include the National Historic Preservation Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the American Antiquities Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Public Law 100-605, the Hanford Reach Study Act. The DOE will

Summary; Statutory and Regulatory Requirements

consult with affected Indian tribes during decommissioning to ensure that Indian treaty and statutory rights are not abridged and that Indian historic sites are protected. Regulations of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission do not apply to the decommissioning of the surplus production reactors.

No EPA or state-issued permit is expected to be required for decommissioning purposes, with the possible exception of a RCRA permit for permanent disposal of the reactor blocks. No existing EPA or state standard is expected to be exceeded either by decommissioning operations or by disposal actions.

9.0 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Specific comments, included in letters received by DOE and in oral testimony at the public hearings, are presented in this chapter along with DOE's responses. Persons and agencies who provided comments are listed in Section 9.1. Preferences for one decommissioning alternative over another and preferences for or against historic preservation of the B Reactor are recorded in Section 9.2. Comments and responses are presented in Section 9.3.

Letters were reviewed first, followed by the exhibits and then the transcripts. In those cases where an individual or organization made the same comment in more than one format, an attempt was made to respond (or record a preference) only once. Comments were edited by the reviewers for brevity, consistency of style, and focus; however, a conscious effort was made in all cases to capture the intent of the commenter. In some cases (most often in transcript comments), the reviewers were unable to discern the meaning of the comment, and these comments are not presented here.

Letters, transcripts, and exhibits are reproduced in their entirety in Appendix 0.

9.1 PERSONS AND AGENCIES PRESENTING COMMENTS

Section 9.1.1 lists the letters, 9.1.2 the transcript pages, and 9.1.3 the exhibits containing comments on the DEIS. The letters and exhibits are numbered according to the order in which they were received; the transcripts are identified according to the city in which each hearing was held. Section 9.1.4 contains an alphabetical list of all groups and individuals who provided comment, along with the corresponding letter, transcript, or exhibit number(s) for each.

Responses to Comments; Persons and Agencies

The following notations are used:

C = Comment	Tr-P = Portland transcript
Ex = Exhibit	Tr-R = Richland transcript
L = Letter	Tr-Se = Seattle transcript ^(a)
R = Response	Tr-Sp = Spokane transcript

9.1.1 Letters

L001A	D'Arcy P. Banister U.S. Department of the Interior
L001B	Alton Haymaker
L002	Dennis R. Arter
L003	J. R. Young
L004	Roger C. Gibson
L005	Jacob E. Thomas Washington Historic Preservation Officer
L006	Lourdes Fuentes-Williams Coalition Organizing Hanford Opposition
L007	June A. Sawyer
L008	Richard L. Larson Washington Department of Transportation
L009	John T. Greeves U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
L010	Dr. and Mrs. Michael Berg
L011	H. Dale Hellewell
L012	Ora Mae and Floyd Orton
L013	Dennis D. Skeate Benton County Management Team
L014, L015	M. J. Szulinski

(a) All of the comments in the Spokane transcripts are contained in the exhibits and were addressed in that way.

Responses to Comments; Persons and Agencies

L016	Beulah L. Sumner
L017	Beth D. Marsau
L018	Jim Thomas Hanford Education Action League
L019	J. Ross and Lois H. Adams
L020	Stephen J. Doyle
L021	Bonnie Tucker Doyle
L022	The Honorable John Poynor Richland City Council
L023	Johnson
L024	Mr. and Mrs. M. W. Bradshaw
L025	The Honorable Max E. Benitz Washington State Senate
L026	Barbara Richardson
L027	Theresa Potts
L028	Alan Richards
L029	Barbara Harrah
L030	Lantz Rowland
L031	Thomas M. Clement
L032	Colleen Bennett and Adele Newton League of Women Voters of Oregon
L033	The Honorable Brad Fisher Kennewick City Council
L034	The Honorable Ed Hendler Pasco City Council
L035	Hans C. F. Ripfel Tri-Cities Technical Council
L036	Tom Lande

Responses to Comments; Persons and Agencies

L037 David E. Clapp
Washington Department of Health and
Human Services

L038 The Honorable Robert Drake
Benton County Board of Commissioners

L039 Richard J. Leumont
Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society

L040 Richard J. Leumont
Columbia River Conservation League

L041 T. H. McGreer

L042 Christine O. Gregoire
Washington Department of Ecology

L043 J. Ernesto Baldi

L044 Michael R. Cummings

L045 Ray Olney
Yakima Indian Nation

L046 [duplicate of L045]

L047 Tom Wynn
Trail and District Environmental Network

L048 Michael Gilfillan
Kootenay Nuclear Study Group

L049 Ronald A. Lee
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,
Region 10

L050 Rex Buck, Jr.
Wanapum Tribe

L051 Laurel Kay Grove

L052 The Honorable Dean Sutherland
Washington State Senate

L053 C. M. Conselman
Columbia Section, American Society of
Civil Engineers

Responses to Comments; Persons and Agencies

9.1.2 Transcripts

Richland

Tr-R17	Alton Haymaker
Tr-R20	John Burnham Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council
Tr-R24	Gordon Rogers
Tr-R27	Jim Stoffels
Tr-R29	The Honorable Claude Oliver Benton County Treasurer
Tr-R38	Harry Brown Columbia Basin Section American Society of Mechanical Engineers
Tr-R43	Dick Hammond
Tr-R45	Milton Lewis
Tr-R49	Eleanor Finkbeiner
Tr-R53	The Honorable Raymond Isaacson Benton County Commissioner

Spokane

Tr-Sp16	Jim Thomas Hanford Education Action League
Tr-Sp22	Mary Wieman

Portland

Tr-P16	Eugene Rosalie Northwest Environmental Advocates
Tr-P20	T. H. McGreer
Tr-P22	Ruth McGreer
Tr-P24	David Stewart-Smith Oregon Department of Energy

Responses to Comments; Persons and Agencies

Tr-P36	JoAnn Oleksiak
Tr-P39	Martha Odom
Tr-P47	Bill Jones
Tr-P50	Eugene Rosalie Northwest Environmental Advocates
Tr-P52	Kathleen Maloney

Seattle

Tr-Se15 ^(a)	Dan Silver Washington State Governor's Office
Tr-Se24	Barbara Zepeda Washington Democratic Council
Tr-Se48	Sharon Gann
Tr-Se48	Frank Hammond Sierra Club, Cascade Chapter
Tr-Se52	Mark Bloome Heart of America Northwest
Tr-Se55	Brendon Mahaffey
Tr-Se60	Donna Bernstein Heart of America Northwest
Tr-Se65	Russ Childers
Tr-Se68	Mark Bloome Heart of America Northwest

9.1.3 Exhibits

Ex01	CEQ Guidelines
Ex02	Notice of Intent
Ex03	Notice of Availability
Ex04	Schedule of Public Involvement Activities
Ex05	Ivan M. A. Garcia

(a) These comments repeat those of L042, and are recorded under L042.

Responses to Comments; Persons and Agencies

Ex06	Alton Haymaker
Ex07	John Burnham Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council
Ex08	Jim Stoffel(s)
Ex09	The Honorable Claude Oliver Benton County Treasurer
Ex10	Harry Brown Columbia Basin Section American Society of Mechanical Engineers
Ex11	The Honorable Raymond E. Isaacson Benton County Commissioner
Ex11	Jim Thomas Hanford Education Action League (Exhibit 11 was misnumbered by the hearing reporter. The comments are recorded in the FEIS under L018.)
Ex12	Mary R. Wieman
Ex12, Ex13	David Stewart-Smith Oregon Department of Energy (Exhibit 12 was misnumbered by the hearing reporter. All of the State of Oregon's comments are recorded in the FEIS under Exhibit 13.)
Ex14	Hale Weitzman
Ex15	Barbara Zepeda Washington Democratic Council
Ex16	Frank Hammond Sierra Club, Cascade Chapter
Ex17	Donna Bernstein Heart of America Northwest

9.1.4 Alphabetical List of Commenters

Adams, J. Ross and Lois H.	L019
Arter, Dennis R.	L002
Baldi, J. Ernesto	L043
Banister, D'Arcy P. U.S. Department of Interior	L001A

Responses to Comments; Persons and Agencies

Benitz, The Honorable Max E. Washington State Senate	L025
Bennett, Colleen League of Women Voters	L032
Berg, Dr. and Mrs Michael	L010
Bernstein, Donna Heart of America Northwest	Ex17, Tr-Se60
Bloome, Mark Heart of America Northwest	TrSe52, Tr-Se68
Bradshaw, Mr. and Mrs. M. W.	L024
Brown, Harry Columbia Basin Section, American Society of Mechanical Engineers	Ex10, Tr-R38
Buck Jr., Rex Wanapum Tribe	L050
Burnham, John Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council	Ex07, Tr-R20
Childers, Russ	Tr-Se65
Clapp, David E. Washington Department of Health and Human Services	L037
Clement, Thomas M.	L031
Conselman, C. M. Columbia Section, American Society of Civil Engineers	L053
Cummings, Michael R.	L044
Doyle, Bonnie Tucker	L021
Doyle, Stephen J.	L020
Drake, The Honorable Robert Benton County Board of Commissioners	L038
Finkbeiner, Eleanor	Tr-R49

Responses to Comments; Persons and Agencies

Fisher, The Honorable Brad Kennewick City Council	L033
Fuentes-Williams, Lourdes Coalition Organizing Hanford Opposition	L006
Garcia, Ivan M. A.	Ex05
Gibson, Roger C.	L004
Gilfillan, Michael Kootenay Nuclear Study Group	L048
Greeves, John T. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission	L009
Gregoire, Christine O. Washington Department of Ecology	L042
Grove, Laurel Kay	L051
Hammond, Dick	Tr-R43
Hammond, Frank Sierra Club, Cascade Chapter	Ex16, Tr-Se48
Harrah, Barbara	L029
Haymaker, Alton	L001B, Ex06, Tr-R17
Hellewell, H. Dale	L011
Hendler, The Honorable Ed Pasco City Council	L034
Isaacson, The Honorable Raymond E. Benton County Commissioner	Ex11, Tr-R53
Johnson	L023
Jones, Bill	Tr-P47
Lande, Tom	L036
Larson, Richard L. Washington Department of Transportation	L008

Responses to Comments; Persons and Agencies

Leaumont, Richard J. Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society	L039
Leaumont, Richard J. Columbia River Conservation League	L040
Lee, Ronald A. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10	L049
Lewis, Milton	Tr-R45
Mahaffey, Brendon	Tr-Se55
Maloney, Kathleen	Tr-P52
Marsau, Beth D.	L017
McGreer, Ruth	Tr-P22
McGreer, T. H.	L041, Tr-P20
Newton, Adele League of Women Voters of Oregon	L032
Odom, Martha	Tr-P39
Oleksiak, JoAnn	Tr-P36
Oliver, The Honorable Claude Benton County Treasurer	Ex09, Tr-R29
Olney, Ray Yakima Indian Nation	L045
Orton, Ora Mae and Floyd	L012
Potts, Theresa	L027
Poynor, The Honorable John Richland City Council	L022
Richards, Alan	L028
Richardson, Barbara	L026
Ripfel, Hans C. F. Tri-Cities Technical Council	L035

Responses to Comments; Persons and Agencies

Rogers, Gordon	Tr-R24
Rosalie, Eugene Northwest Environmental Advocates	Tr-P16
Rowland, Lantz	L030
Sawyer, June A.	L007
Silver, Dan Washington State Governor's Office	Tr-Se15
Skeate, Dennis D. Benton County Management Team	L013
Stewart-Smith, David Oregon Department of Energy	Ex12, Ex13, Tr-P24
Stoffel(s), Jim	Ex08, Tr-R27
Sumner, Beulah L.	L016
Sutherland, The Honorable Dean Washington State Senate	L052
Szulinski, M. J.	L014, L015
Thomas, Jacob E. Washington Historic Preservation Officer	L005
Thomas, Jim Hanford Education Action League	L018, Ex11, Tr-Sp16
Weitzman, Hale	Ex14
Wieman, Mary R.	Ex12, Tr-Sp22
Wynn, Tom Trail and District Environmental Network	L047
Young, J. R.	L003
Zepeda, Barbara Washington Democratic Council	Ex15, Tr-Se24

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

9.2 DECOMMISSIONING AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION PREFERENCES

Comments expressing a preference for one decommissioning alternative over another and comments expressing a preference for historic preservation of the B Reactor are listed in Sections 9.2.1 and 9.2.2 by letter number, exhibit number, or transcript page number.

9.2.1 Decommissioning Alternatives

No Action: L015, Ex05, Ex06, Tr-R44.

Immediate One-Piece Removal: L006, L010, L012, L018, L019, L020, L021, L026, L027, L028, L029, L030, L032, L036, L037, L039, L040, L042, L043, L044, L045, L047, L048, L053, Ex12, Ex13, Ex16, Tr-P16, Tr-P37, Tr-Se52, Tr-Se56, Tr-Se63, Tr-Se65.

Safe Storage Followed by Deferred One-Piece Removal: L041.

Safe Storage Followed by Deferred Dismantlement: None.

In Situ Decommissioning: L007, L011, L017, L031, L035, Tr-R25.

Other: Ex14.

9.2.2 Historic Preservation of B Reactor

Do not preserve B Reactor as an historic site: L019, L020, L021, L028, L036, Ex12, Tr-P17, Tr-P37, Tr-P46.

Preserve B Reactor in place: L005, L014, L022, L025, L033, L034, L035, L038, L053, Ex05, Ex07, Ex08.

Preserve B Reactor by recordation: L007, L030, L031, L042, Ex10, Tr-R26.

9.3 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

References in this section to page numbers, sections, and chapters are to pages, sections, and chapters in the DEIS.

L001A-C01. The EIS should address mineral and energy resources, such as petroleum and methane, that may exist at the Site and the environmental effects that may result from their exploration or extraction.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

R. The existence of large-scale mineral, petroleum, or methane resources beneath the Hanford Site has not yet been demonstrated. Large-scale exploration or extraction of resources discovered in the future would be the subject of another EIS.

L001A-C02. The EIS should discuss ground-water contamination resulting from deep drilling in search of hydrocarbon (primarily methane) resources.

R. Potential ground-water contamination resulting from deep drilling for hydrocarbons would be the subject of another EIS. Potential ground-water contamination resulting from the presence of surplus reactor decommissioning wastes is discussed in Section 5.7.

L003-C01. The estimated natural background dose in the DEIS of 300 millirem/year per person is too large.

R. As stated in Section 4.4.3 of the DEIS, the source of this information is the report entitled Environmental Monitoring at Hanford for 1987, PNL-6464, which relied on the 1987 National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements report, Ionizing Radiation Exposure of the Population of the United States. The latter report includes an exposure of 200 millirem/year per person from radon gas and its daughters, in addition to the approximately 100 millirem/year from other natural sources.

L003-C02. The flood damage caused by a break in Grand Coulee Dam would not be as catastrophic as a break in Mica Dam, which would release much more water and result in higher flood elevations and longer flood time.

R. The impact of immersion of a single reactor in the Columbia River resulting from a severe flood is discussed in Section 5.7.3 of the DEIS. The impact of immersion of all eight reactors would be approximately eight times the impact of immersion of a single reactor. This is the maximum impact from flooding related to decommissioning. The maximum impact is independent of flood times and elevations.

L003-C03. Cost tables in Chapter 3 contain too many significant figures.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

R. As explained in the DEIS, costs are deliberately not rounded for computational accuracy. Costs are re-estimated in Appendix K of the FEIS in 1990 dollars.

L003-C04. Was a cost estimate made for each reactor, or was an estimate made for a typical reactor and adjustments made for gross differences among the reactors?

R. Cost estimates were made for a typical reactor and adjustments were made for differences among reactors. As stated in Chapter 3 of the DEIS, these differences are not very significant for decommissioning purposes.

L003-C05. No mention is made in the DEIS of the need to decontaminate ground contaminated by leaks in effluent lines and retention basins and by deliberate releases of up to 20,000 gpm of reactor effluent for long periods of time into cribs near the retention basins and into a natural sump south of C Reactor.

R. These releases are outside the scope of this EIS, but are within the scope of the Tri-Party Agreement among the DOE, the EPA, and the WDOE. This Agreement covers the management of hazardous wastes at the Hanford Site and the cleanup of hazardous wastes, hazardous substances, and other pollutants and contaminants at the Hanford Site.

L003-C06. Appendix E, "Methods for Calculating Radiation Dose," is superfluous; a source document could be cited instead.

R. The decision to reproduce the material in Appendix E rather than simply cite a source document was made because of the importance of this material and because the methodology continues to change and evolve.

L003-C07. Appendix F, "Radiologically Related Health Effects," is a rehash of extensive literature on radiological health effects. DOE should prepare a document stating health-risk factors to be used in EISs and then incorporate the document by reference.

R. Appendix F is included for the same reasons that Appendix E is included.

L003-C08. It is ridiculous to assume that the Hanford Site would be abandoned after 100 years.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

R. This assumption was made in order to terminate costs at some point and in order to be consistent with DOE Order 5820.2A and with EPA guidance in 40 CFR 191.14. These documents contemplate loss of institutional control after 100 years following disposal of the waste (see Chapter 3). As noted in the DEIS, the DOE does not intend to abandon the Site and will maintain institutional controls as long as they are necessary. Also see response to L010-C01.

L003-C09. It would be helpful to know if the actual doses would be less or greater than those shown in Table 1.2.

R. The dose calculations are meant to be conservative (Appendix G). Therefore, the actual doses should not exceed the calculated doses shown in Table 1.2.

L003-C10. (1) Does the population dose in Table 1.2 include the maximum well dose and any accident doses? (2) What is the significance of the well dose? Why single out the well dose and not talk about the other, much larger doses shown in Table 1.2? (3) How many wells would be drilled?

R. (1) No. The accident and well doses are doses to individuals rather than to populations. (2) The well dose is an individual dose from one well and would be delivered to very few persons. The "much larger" doses shown in Table 1.2 are population doses and represent small individual doses summed over large populations. (3) The number of wells is immaterial because the dose calculation is based on all of the contaminated water being withdrawn by a single well (Section G.1.3.1).

L003-C11. DOE should let each commenter know what the response was to each comment.

R. In this FEIS, DOE is responding to each comment on the DEIS. DOE will send a copy of the FEIS to each commenter.

L004-C01. Nuclear waste should be broken up into particles that will sink to great depths when dispersed over large areas of the ocean.

R. While ocean disposal of radioactive wastes is permitted under certain conditions under the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act, the United

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

States adheres to a resolution of the London Dumping Convention calling for a moratorium on ocean disposal of radioactive wastes. Ocean disposal would increase the probability of processing and transportation accidents relative to disposal at Hanford.

L005-C01. The EIS should treat the B Reactor separately from the other reactors in view of its eligibility for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. The issue of historic preservation should be explored in more detail in the FEIS. For example, the EIS should evaluate the feasibility of removing only the most hazardous portions of the reactor and retaining in situ as much as possible of the reactor building, control room, mechanical and electrical systems, and any other features that are not a long-term health risk.

R. The DOE nominated the B Reactor for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places in accordance with the opinion of the Washington State Historic Preservation Officer and the provisions of 36 CFR 800, "Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties." On April 3, 1992, the National Park Service entered the B Reactor in the National Register. Specific actions to mitigate the impact of decommissioning on the historic preservation of B Reactor will be determined later in accordance with 36 CFR 800. Actions to preserve this historic resource may include extensive recordation by photographs, drawings, models, exhibits, and written histories, and may also include preservation of some portions of the B Reactor for display on or near its present location or at some other selected location.

L006-C01. The impacts of floods more severe than floods from a 50% break of Grand Coulee Dam should be evaluated.

R. See response to L003-C02.

L006-C02. What assurance can DOE give that decisions made today will be carried out in 75 years and that money for decommissioning will be available?

R. Authorization and funding to carry out decommissioning at any time depend on congressional action. DOE's record of decision will be essentially a recommendation to Congress to authorize the necessary funding.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

L006-C03. What is the basis for the cost estimate?

R. The cost estimates were made by different persons and firms familiar with the tasks involved, as explained in Chapter 3.

L008-C01. The transport and hauling of all materials on state highways must comply with regulations and guidelines pertaining to safe transportation of those materials.

R. DOE does not contemplate the offsite shipment of any decommissioning wastes on public highways. However, should this occur, transportation regulations will be met, as noted in Section 6.5 of the DEIS.

L009-C01. The definition of decommissioning used in the DEIS, Section 2.0, "to isolate securely any remaining radioactivity in a manner that will reduce environmental impacts to an acceptable level," is different from NRC's in 10 CFR 50.2, in which it is indicated that decommissioning means to "reduce residual radioactivity to a level that permits release of the property for unrestricted use and termination of license." No definition is given as to what constitutes acceptable radioactive levels.

R. The definition in Section 2.0 should have been the same as the definition in Section 1.2, specifically: "The purpose of decommissioning is to isolate any remaining radioactive or hazardous wastes in a manner that will minimize environmental impacts, especially potential health and safety impacts on the public." At the present time, DOE does not intend to release the Site for unrestricted use, only for other DOE use as noted in Section 1.5.10. Procedures for determining "acceptable" residual radioactivity levels for release of properties are defined in DOE 5400.5, should they be required. The DOE reactors are not licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). The EPA is proceeding with a rulemaking (40 CFR 194) that is intended to establish guidelines for "Radiation Protection Criteria for Cleanup of Land and Facilities Contaminated with Residual Radioactive Materials." DOE will revise its procedures as appropriate and implement the EPA regulations as guidelines, when they are promulgated. Also see response to L010-C01.

L009-C02. Information is not given in the EIS as to the basis for the use of 75 years for the safe-storage period. Note that the NRC limits the

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

safe-storage period in 10 CFR 50.82(b)(1) to 60 years unless a longer period is needed to protect public health and safety. Factors to be considered in extending the safe-storage period include the unavailability of waste disposal capacity and other site-specific factors such as the presence of other nuclear facilities at the Site.

R. The 75-year safe-storage period is intended to allow decay of cobalt-60 and cesium-137 in order to reduce worker dose. A different storage period could be chosen. Unavailability of disposal capacity and the presence of other onsite nuclear facilities are not factors in the choice. See also response to L010-C01.

L009-C03. On page 3.2 it is indicated that the reactor is put into safe storage by securing all "smearable" radioactive contamination in the facilities. However, information is not given as to what type of smearable contamination is present in the reactors at this time.

R. This statement was intended to indicate that each reactor would be surveyed again for surface contamination from spills and releases in order to seal the contamination from possible air suspension during the safe-storage period. Specific information on existing smearable contamination is given in the letter report by R. A. Winship, "Radiation and Smear Survey Data," referenced in Appendix A.

L009-C04. NRC regulations do not permit "no action."

R. "No action" is included in the EIS as an alternative in order to satisfy the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) implementing the National Environmental Policy Act in 40 CFR 1502.14(c) that require the inclusion of the no action alternative.

L009-C05. A detailed characterization of remaining radionuclides would be necessary for in situ decommissioning.

R. A detailed characterization of the radioactive inventory is given in the Miller and Steffes (1987) report and is summarized in Appendix A.

L009-C06. No information is given on costs, activities, or radiation doses after 100 years.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

R. The analyses of activities and costs do not extend past 100 years in order to be consistent with EPA guidance in 40 CFR 191 (Section 3.0). The analyses could be extended to any desired time. Long-term doses from radionuclide migration are given to 10,000 years.

L010-C01. Hanford should be cleaned up in 30 years. The site should be released to the public.

R. Thirty years presumably refers to the milestone in the Tri-Party Agreement among the DOE, the EPA, and the WDOE for the cleanup of the Hanford Site under CERCLA and RCRA. The Tri-Party Agreement specifically recognizes that certain activities related to decontamination and decommissioning may be subject to RCRA, and when those activities result in the generation of hazardous wastes, the treatment, storage, and disposal of those wastes will be subject to the Agreement. The safe-storage period of 75 years is based on an adequate time for decay of cobalt-60 (and partial decay of cesium-137), in order to reduce occupational radiation dose. For either of the safe-storage alternatives, the safe-storage period could be shortened or modified in order to make decommissioning consistent with time frames in the Tri-Party Agreement.

The broader issues of shoreline and land use planning are outside the scope of this EIS, except to note that Public Law 100-605, the Hanford Reach Study Act, provides for a study of the Hanford Reach of the Columbia River that will result in recommendations as to the future use and designation of the Hanford Reach. The reactor buildings are only a very small part of the 100 Areas. The 100 Areas, which include approximately 27 "operable units," will require extensive investigation and remediation pursuant to the Tri-Party Agreement. Shoreline and land use planning will be a consideration in performing these investigations and remedial and corrective actions.

However, even though DOE has stated in the past that it intends to maintain institutional control of the Hanford Site in perpetuity and intends to do so for areas where radioactive materials are disposed of or where they are left in place above unrestricted release limits, it is possible that some other portions of the Site could be released for public or private use. This possibility is being considered by DOE as part of its responsibilities under CERCLA. DOE has formed the Hanford Future Site Use Working Group (organizing

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

committee) to assist in developing Hanford future site use alternatives. This organizing committee consists of representatives from the DOE Richland Field Office (RL), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, States of Washington and Oregon, National Park Service, Yakima Indian Nation, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, and Benton, Franklin, and Grant Counties. The organizing committee is considering six major steps in developing future Hanford use scenarios: 1) agree to charter and ground rules; 2) identify issues to be addressed; 3) identify individual "visions" of future site use; 4) gather information and examine issues and visions; 5) identify cleanup strategies to implement those visions; and 6) identify a list of alternatives for the Hanford Remedial Action Environmental Impact Statement that encompasses the visions of all participants. Final remediation and decommissioning decisions will be made through NEPA or CERCLA processes.

L012-C01. The Hanford Site should be cleaned up in 30 years and restored to public use.

R. See response to L010-C01.

L013-C01. Land use planning should be included in the EIS. Specifically, return of land to productive agriculture should be considered.

R. See response to L010-C01.

L014-C01. B Reactor should be developed as a visitor center and Hanford museum either separately or as a part of the decommissioning plan.

R. See response to L005-C01.

L016-C01. The remaining hazardous substances should be neutralized.

R. The remaining hazardous substances are lead and radionuclides. While organic materials can often be broken down into more simple and more benign forms such as carbon dioxide and water, the same is not true of an elemental inorganic substance such as lead, which is already in its simplest form. The lead might be converted into a less soluble compound, but this would involve isolating and processing the lead, which alone would increase worker exposure

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

and hazardous waste volumes. Similarly, some radionuclides can be transmuted into stable nuclides by neutron irradiation, but not without worker exposure to radiation and further generation of waste.

L017-C01. The reactors should be decommissioned by in situ decommissioning following a 75-year safe-storage period.

R. While not evaluated specifically in the DEIS, the costs and impacts of this alternative can be easily derived from the costs and impacts of safe storage (no action) for 75 years and in situ decommissioning. This alternative was not considered in the DEIS since the safe-storage period would result in increased costs without significantly simplifying in situ decommissioning.

L018-C01. Leaving the reactors in their present location and burying them under a mound of dirt and gravel (and under an engineered barrier) is not a demonstrated technology. The EIS does not offer an estimate of how long the "engineered barrier" might last.

R. As stated in Appendix H of the DEIS, the engineered barrier is not yet proven for the Hanford Site and will require at least 5 years of experimental work to demonstrate barrier performance. However, the design of the barrier is intended to provide long-term (10,000-year) protection from water infiltration and from inadvertent intrusion. In the event of failure of the engineered barrier in either the 100 or 200 Areas, the long-term impacts are no greater than those of no action.

L018-C02. Hanford should be cleaned up within 30 years and the land restored to public use.

R. See response to L010-C01.

L018-C03. Immediate one-piece removal requires the least amount of land to be barred from public access (see page 5.34).

R. As stated in Section 1.5.10 of the DEIS, DOE would restore the land to other DOE use, not to public access (see also response to L010-C01).

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

L018-C04. DOE, EPA, and the State of Washington should develop a land use plan for the Hanford Site. The future use (and ownership) of the Hanford Site should be decided by the citizens of Washington and by the affected native American Indian tribes.

R. See response to L010-C01.

L018-C05. Decommissioning should start with the reactor that has the lowest radiological inventory and proceed in order of increasing inventory.

R. The order of decommissioning will be decided on the basis of detailed engineering studies, which will include consideration of the inventories.

L018-C06. On page 3.27, there is an error in Table 3.7. The third "Deferred Removal" total for the DR Reactor is an error and should read \$7,485.82.

R. The error is in the D Reactor column and should read \$7,448.82 instead of \$74,485.82. In any event, the costs have been re-estimated in 1990 dollars in Appendix K.

L018-C07. There should be an explanation that the removal costs for deferred one-piece removal will probably be higher than those same costs for immediate one-piece removal due to inflation.

R. Costs were given in the DEIS in 1986 dollars for all alternatives without regard to the time period during which each activity might take place. This was done for comparison purposes. Future costs may vary with inflation, deflation, and changing technology. Costs are presented in Appendix K in 1990 dollars.

L018-C08. The EIS does not provide an estimate of how long the engineered barrier will withstand erosion.

R. See response to L018-C01.

L018-C09. On page 5.3, DOE does not consider the possible breach of a contamination control envelope as an accident scenario.

R. The second accident (second bullet) on page 5.4 includes loss of the contamination control envelope (see Section 5.5.1.1).

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

L018-C10. Accident calculations on page 5.6 should have been done using the KE Reactor rather than the F Reactor (which was chosen because it is closer to the population center); the KE Reactor inventory is larger than the F Reactor inventory.

R. The KE Reactor inventory (in the F Reactor location) actually was used for these calculations in order to provide the most conservative (highest impact) accident evaluation.

L018-C11. The accident calculations on pages 5.9-10 do not contain enough detail. There should be a description of the basic assumptions used in calculating the dose estimates, as well as a numerical expression of the range of uncertainty associated with the estimates.

R. The KE Reactor inventory in the F Reactor location was used for these calculations. Equations are presented in Appendix E. Uncertainties in the dose calculations arise from uncertainties in the source terms, meteorological conditions, transport models, and other assumptions. Note, for example, that the season in which the accident occurs makes a 40-fold difference in the dose to the maximally exposed individual and a 30-fold difference in the population dose in Table 5.1. These differences alone overshadow a difference in source terms between, say, KE Reactor and F Reactor.

L018-C12. DOE should consider the possibility that future users of the Hanford Site might not be able to comprehend warnings against intrusion.

R. Radiological impacts from both deliberate (ignoring the warnings) and inadvertent intrusion are discussed in Appendix G.

L018-C13. The DEIS does not state from which date the 100-year period of institutional control will be calculated.

R. For cost and dose calculations, the 100-year period begins in 1990.

L019-C01. The N Reactor should be included in the decommissioning plans.

R. As stated in the notice of intent to prepare this EIS, the N Reactor is outside the scope of this EIS. The N Reactor is not now available for decommissioning. However, at an appropriate time, the N Reactor will be decommissioned and appropriate NEPA documentation will be prepared.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

L020-C01. The N Reactor should be included in the decommissioning plans.

R. See response to L019-C01.

L021-C01. The N Reactor should be included in the decommissioning plans.

R. See response to L019-C01.

L022-C01. B Reactor should be preserved intact at its present location and made accessible to the public.

R. See response to L005-C01.

L026-C01. The Hanford Site should be returned to public use, including to individuals and Native American tribes who originally surrendered the land.

R. See responses to L010-C01 and to L045-C01.

L027-C01. The Hanford Site should be cleaned up within 30 years and as much land as possible returned to public access.

R. See response to L010-C01.

L028-C01. N Reactor should also be decommissioned.

R. See response to L019-C01.

L030-C01. DOE should establish an irrevocable trust fund for the safe storage and extensive recordation of B Reactor for 75 years followed by one-piece removal.

R. See response to L005-C01 and L006-C02.

L031-C01. B Reactor should be preserved as a model, including the water treatment plant, in the Hanford Science Center.

R. See response to L005-C01.

L032-C01. What about the possibility of old radioactive fuel (storage basin) leaks under reactors other than KE?

R. The water level in these storage basins was always carefully monitored. While the possibility of a leak exists in any system containing water, the

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

observed water loss in the other fuel storage basins was consistent with calculated evaporation losses. Cleanup studies under the Tri-Party Agreement should identify contaminants that may have been released from other basins.

L032-C02. What about the possibility of erosion?

R. The impact of immersion of a reactor in the Columbia River caused by erosion under the reactor is discussed in Section 5.7.3 of the DEIS.

L032-C03. Insufficient data are presented on the movement of Hanford ground water toward the water table and toward the Columbia River.

R. There is a very active effort to better characterize and understand ground-water movement, both vertical and horizontal, at the Hanford Site. Some of this work is ongoing through the site-wide ground-water monitoring program conducted by the Pacific Northwest Laboratory. This work will be expanded in order to carry out the terms of the Tri-Party Agreement. For the DEIS, the best available ground-water movement data were used in calculating impacts.

L033-C01. The B Reactor should be preserved intact at its present location and made accessible to the public.

R. See response to L005-C01.

L034-C01. The B Reactor should be preserved intact at its present location and made accessible to the public.

R. See response to L005-C01.

L035-C01. The B Reactor should be treated separately from the other reactors. Specifically, "continue present action" could be applied to B Reactor with the objective that public access and tours could be assured, consistent with safety requirements. If this option could not be allowed, alternative means should be provided for commemorating the reactor such as extensive recordation of written and photographic materials, a kiosk with displays of visual aids at the Vernita Rest Area, an obelisk at a point along Highway 240 from which the reactor site is visible, or a reconstruction of at least the reactor control room.

R. See response to L005-C01.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

L036-C01. The 100 Areas should be returned to the public domain. If that is not possible, then a nonnuclear use of the Site should be established such as power generation utilizing solar energy, wind, and/or fermented agricultural waste.

R. See response to L010-C01.

L038-C01. The B Reactor should be preserved intact at its present location and made accessible to the public.

R. See response to L005-C01.

L041-C01. The FEIS should show the number of people involved versus estimated illnesses within the site and external to it for each of the five alternatives for the first 100 years, estimated illnesses for the same people for the same time period if Hanford did not exist, and the estimated illnesses for the remaining 9,900 years.

R. These numbers either appear in the DEIS or may be calculated from information presented in the DEIS, as follows. The number of persons within 80 km of Hanford is 340,000 (page 4.34). These persons receive approximately 100,000 person-rem annually from natural background radiation (page 5.39), or 10,000,000 person-rem over 100 years. This 100-year population dose corresponds to 1,000 to 10,000 health effects (page F.13). The maximum dose from decommissioning in the first 100 years to the same group is the worker dose of 532 person-rem for the safe storage followed by deferred dismantlement alternative (there are no other population doses in the first 100 years). This population dose corresponds to a range of 0.05 to 0.5 health effects. Long-term health effects over 10,000 years are presented in Section 5.7.1.3.

L041-C02. Use of the term "no action" is confusing.

R. Evaluation of "no action" is required by the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality. No action usually means not to carry out the proposed action. The proposed action in this case is decommissioning. No action, therefore, means either to do nothing further or to continue what is now being done. Both "no action" scenarios are discussed in this EIS.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

L041-C03. Future costs should take into account inflation and the future value of money.

R. Inflation and the future value of money were not included in order to avoid unnecessary confusion and speculation.

L041-C04. Why is no ground-water monitoring included under "continue present action" in Table 1.2?

R. "Continue present action" is the no action alternative required by the Council on Environmental Quality regulations. No action does not include any monitoring wells drilled especially for this alternative. There are, however, existing monitoring wells in the vicinity of each reactor that are and will continue to be sampled and tested regularly under the Hanford Site Monitoring Program. Also, DOE has an active surveillance and maintenance program to ensure the physical integrity of the reactors. These monitoring, surveillance, and maintenance programs are part of the continue present action alternative.

L041-C05. People outside the scientific realm may be confused by "rem/yr," whereas in later chapters dosage is given in "mrem/yr." Consistency is recommended.

R. Definitions of the numerical prefixes are given in Chapter 8. One rem is equal to 1,000 mrem.

L041-C06. The use of the word "conservative" in Table 5.3 is unfortunate. Such usage is not covered in most dictionaries and certainly not in politics.

R. "Conservative" is defined in Chapter 8. For the purpose of the EIS, it refers to assumptions or choices that tend to overestimate rather than underestimate impacts.

L041-C07. Add the definition of "smear" or "smearable." Add the definitions of "stochastic" and "stochastic dose equivalent" as used in Section E.1.4.

R. Smearable means removable by wiping. In Section E.1.4, the phrases "stochastic dose limit" and "stochastic effective dose equivalent" are used. The first phrase should read "dose limit for stochastic effects," and the second should read "(stochastic) dose equivalent limit." "Stochastic" means

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

that the probability of occurrence is proportional to dose. "Stochastic effects" are malignant and hereditary diseases for which the probability of an effect occurring, rather than its severity, is regarded as a function of dose without threshold.

L041-C08. Intruder scenarios in Section E.3.4.1 defy the imagination.

R. Intruder scenarios are included in order to show impacts on unsuspecting individuals if institutional control is somehow lost. Although these are not high-probability events, the scenarios are consistent with those used by the NRC to estimate doses to intruders.

L041-C09. The flow rate of the Columbia River of 1×10^4 liters per year on page E.38 is an obvious error.

R. The flow rate should be 1×10^{14} liters per year.

L041-C10. A note of explanation should be added to Table 1.2 showing the population dose for the first 100 years.

R. The population dose (with the exception of worker dose) for the first 100 years for all alternatives is zero.

L042-C01. The in situ decommissioning and safe-storage alternatives may be severely impacted by RCRA regulations and the Washington State Dangerous Waste Regulations. The FEIS should more clearly identify and evaluate the potential regulatory requirements for these alternatives.

R. It is not yet clear that RCRA (or CERCLA) specifically applies to the decommissioning of the surplus production reactors or that a RCRA permit will be required. In order to fall under the purview of RCRA or the Washington State Hazardous Waste Management Act (HWMA), a substance must either be a listed waste or exhibit one of four hazardous characteristics (ignitable, corrosive, reactive, or toxic). The only substance in the reactors that might qualify as hazardous under RCRA is lead. Lead is not a listed waste, but would be a characteristic waste if it fails the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP). The TCLP measures the concentration of hazardous constituents in solution following dissolution of particles of the waste sample in a low pH extraction fluid. There is no low pH source at or near the

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

reactors, the pH of the soils is approximately 8.0, and the lead in the reactors is in large pieces (not small particles). Thus, even if it is determined that RCRA applies to the lead in the surplus production reactors, the lead may qualify for delisting.

EPA's land disposal restrictions (40 CFR 268) permit the land disposal of radioactive lead following encapsulation of the lead in a protective material that is intended to substantially reduce the surface exposure to potential leaching media.

It is not clear that while the reactors are being maintained in a safe-storage condition, the reactor materials would be classified as waste. The lead is firmly held in the thermal shields, inside the reactor block, above ground, dry, and not subject to dissolution or other release. The irradiated lead is part of the reactor block structure. Also, the enclosed buildings have never been used for the treatment, storage, or disposal of hazardous waste. The circumstances are unique in considering the applicability of RCRA and the Washington State Dangerous Waste Regulations. (Lead could be considered an extremely hazardous waste under the State's regulations.) For these reasons, the DEIS does not include any RCRA enhancements during the safe-storage period, and none are added in the FEIS.

For all decommissioning alternatives, the DEIS includes conceptual designs and cost estimates for ground-water monitoring, liner/leachate collection systems (except for in situ decommissioning), intruder warning markers, and engineered barriers (Chapter 3). The liner/leachate collection system is omitted from the in situ alternative because of the difficulty of constructing such a barrier under the reactors, and also because of the lack of efficacy of such a system. This lack of efficacy arises because release of the lead is expected to occur over a much longer period of time than is contemplated in the RCRA regulations for the liner/leachate collection system to function. The other systems are intended to meet the requirements of RCRA or CERCLA to mitigate the short-term and long-term potential for contamination migration into the ground water or the Columbia River.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

The Tri-Party Agreement recognizes that certain activities related to decommissioning of structures may be subject to RCRA. Whenever such activities result in the generation of hazardous wastes, the treatment, storage, and disposal of those wastes are subject to the Agreement.

Thus, while the specific applicability of RCRA is uncertain, enhancements have been added to the decommissioning alternatives that would essentially meet the technical requirements of RCRA. As stated in the DEIS, the DOE intends to continue discussions with the EPA and the WDOE to resolve the specific applicability of the particular requirements of RCRA or CERCLA to decommissioning.

L042-C02. The 1984 Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) to RCRA contain provisions for corrective actions at permitted facilities. Consideration must be given in the EIS to the applicability of these provisions.

R. As a condition of any RCRA permit, HSWA require corrective action for any release of hazardous wastes and constituents. HSWA will not affect any decommissioning alternative because no release of lead has been observed. To the extent that hazardous substances from past reactor operations may have been released to surrounding soils, the clean-up studies to be performed under the Tri-Party Agreement will address the presence of such substances and any necessary remedial actions.

L042-C03. The Washington State Dangerous Waste Regulations (WAC-173-303) are more stringent than the federal RCRA regulations. For example, the state toxicity designation procedure in WAC-173-303-101 may designate the reactor cores as dangerous or extremely hazardous waste. The EIS should note that this may restrict alternatives.

R. Under the state's regulations, lead removed from the reactors as a waste would be classified as an extremely hazardous waste. Nothing else in the reactor blocks is known to be subject to this designation. Such material would be disposed of in a facility meeting the requirements of RCW 70.105.050. See also response to L042-C01.

L042-C04. The safe-storage alternatives appear either to totally lack the appropriate ground-water monitoring or to severely underestimate what would be

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

required. These alternatives should be reanalyzed to ensure that the appropriate ground-water monitoring programs are planned for and implemented over the possible 96-year safe-storage period.

R. See response to L042-C01. At the present time, DOE has an extensive program of monitoring, surveillance, and maintenance of the reactor facilities to ensure that there are no radiological or chemical releases to the environment. There are ground-water monitoring wells located in each of the 100 Areas as well as throughout the Hanford Site. Also, the lead in the reactors is dry, above ground, and not subject to leaching. Therefore, addition of a special ground-water monitoring system for safe storage would be both costly and redundant.

L042-C05. Should the B Reactor be nominated and eventually listed on the National Register of Historic Places, the EIS would need to evaluate a combination of alternatives, such as removal of the remaining seven reactors while decontaminating B Reactor. These discussions should be included in the FEIS.

R. See response to L005-C01.

L042-C06. The text on page 1.7 should clarify that irradiated lead is a mixed radioactive waste subject to regulation.

R. Irradiated lead, as a waste, would be a mixed hazardous radioactive waste if it fails the TCLP. The lead would be subject to regulation under RCRA and the radioactive impurities would be subject to regulation under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (see response to L042-C01).

L042-C07. Thermal expansion and contraction plus past removal of metal channel liners resulted in powdered graphite (pages 1.22 and 5.4). Would graphite powders support combustion?

R. No. See Section 5.1.2.2 of the DEIS.

L042-C08. Columbia River flow alteration could be caused by factors in addition to climatic changes (page 3.57). The FEIS should describe erosion and accretion processes that could change the river channel and lead to immersion of the reactors.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

R. The processes of erosion and accretion are not relevant to the selection of the preferred alternative. Only the impacts of immersion of one (or more) of the reactors as a result of erosion are relevant. These impacts were evaluated in Section 5.7.3.

L042-C09. It would be helpful to have figures showing the extent of a probable flood resulting if 25% and 50% of Grand Coulee Dam were destroyed.

R. These floods will not reach the 200 Area. Elevations of the flood caused by a 50% failure of Grand Coulee Dam relative to the reactor elevations are given in Appendix B. The impacts of these floods with respect to decommissioning are evaluated in terms of immersion of one (or all) of the reactors in Section 5.7.3.

L042-C10. The text should include a comparison of recharge coming from artificial sources with recharge coming from natural sources and discuss how this pattern is expected to change over time (page 4.17).

R. Artificial recharge will not occur over the reactor disposal areas and therefore will not affect the rate at which substances from the decommissioned reactors enter or move vertically downward through the vadose zone. Artificial recharge will affect the level of the water table (mostly at the point of recharge), the rate of horizontal movement of ground water, and the rate of horizontal movement of substances in the ground water to the Columbia River. Changes in artificial recharge will have little effect on long-term decommissioning impacts because the rate-controlling steps are the rates of downward movement of water, lead, and radionuclides and the rates of dissolution of the lead and radionuclides.

L042-C11. A review of University of Washington seismic data and reactor siting data indicates that deep seismic data are associated with known and inferred geologic structures (page 4.21).

R. The statement on page 4.21 refers to known geologic structures and does not include inferred structures. The authors of the DEIS are familiar with data from the University of Washington and believe that the pattern and

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

distribution of earthquakes deeper than 8 km do not exhibit an obvious relationship to known folds or faults. See Section 5.7.3 for impacts of seismic events.

L042-C12. Current monitoring programs for leaking tanks are not refined enough to determine, with any degree of certainty, that leaks from waste tanks have or have not resulted in radiation exposure to the public (page 4.23).

R. Radiation monitoring programs at Hanford are not designed to establish a direct connection between any specific source and members of the public. Annual doses to members of the public are determined on the basis of measured releases, measured concentrations in air, soil, and water, measured dose rates at selected onsite and offsite locations, and on pathway analyses.

L042-C13. Have any of the well systems on the Hanford Site used for drinking water ever exceeded radiological drinking-water standards? If so, how did they come into compliance (page 4.25)?

R. Radiological drinking water standards apply, strictly from a regulatory standpoint, to water supplied by "community" drinking water systems. No community drinking water systems exist on the Hanford Site. However, in 1985, the average concentration of tritium in ground water used for drinking water at the FFTF was 22,000 picocuries per liter. The drinking water standard is 4 millirem per year; and an annual average drinking water concentration of 20,000 picocuries per liter of tritium is assumed to produce a total body dose of 4 millirem per yer (40 CFR 141.16). The average concentrations of tritium in 1986, 1987, and 1988 in a new, deeper replacement well drilled for drinking water purposes were 8,500, 4,100, and 8,500 picocuries per liter, respectively (R. E. Jaquish and R. W. Bryce, editors, Hanford Site Environmental Report for Calendar Year 1988, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, PNL-6825, May 1989).

L042-C14. The FEIS should explain how decisions could be influenced because RCRA applies to the hazardous component of radioactive mixed waste but not to the radioactive component of radioactive mixed waste (page 6.4).

R. This distinction does not affect the selection of the preferred alternative; it only affects the actions that the agency must take after an alternative is selected.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

L042-C15. Because masonite and transite are no longer in today's lexicon, the text should give a brief description of each product (page A.16).

R. Masonite is a Masonite Corporation trademark. Masonite is produced from byproduct wood chips that are reduced to fibers by high-pressure steam, which are then pressed into board without the use of chemicals. Transite is a Johns Manville Company tradename. Transite is a construction or insulating material made of asbestos fibers and Portland cement molded under hydraulic pressure. These definitions are added to the glossary as errata.

L042-C16. The FEIS should explain why certain facilities listed in Table A.12 do not contain cadmium, while the text on page 3.4 states that cadmium is alloyed with lead.

R. Only B, F, and H Reactors are known to contain cadmium. All of the cadmium inventory in these reactors (shown in Table A.12) is removable (see Miller and Steffes 1987). The cadmium in B Reactor is alloyed with lead. The cadmium in F and H Reactors is not alloyed with lead.

L042-C17. The DEIS understates the impact of RCRA and WAC 173-303 on in situ decommissioning and safe storage. The FEIS should more clearly describe the potential regulatory requirements for these alternatives.

R. See response to L042-C01.

L042-C18. The FEIS should indicate that decommissioning will be done in accordance with the terms of the Tri-Party Agreement recently signed by the state and federal governments.

R. The Tri-Party Agreement, which was signed on May 15, 1989, recognizes that certain activities related to decommissioning may be subject to RCRA, and that whenever decommissioning activities result in the generation of hazardous wastes, the treatment, storage, and disposal of those wastes will be subject to the Agreement. None of the surplus production reactors are currently considered to be treatment, storage, or disposal facilities as defined by RCRA.

L042-C19. The B Reactor has an exceptionally strong association with the history of the U.S. atomic energy program and the development of the atomic

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

bomb at the end of World War II. In view of its historic significance, the future interpretive value of the B Reactor should be preserved, if it is technically, environmentally, and economically feasible. Varying degrees of interpretive value could be preserved by maintaining part of the facility in its present condition, construction of a replica at the site, displaying the control room at the Hanford Science Center or the Smithsonian Institution, or by providing extensive photographs and records at one of the sites. The FEIS should evaluate the environmental, cost, scientific heritage, and cultural impacts of each option listed above. Evaluations should address public accessibility and the ability to illustrate unique construction and operational achievements. Incremental costs associated with maintaining and monitoring the B Reactor in place while the other seven reactor blocks are moved to the 200-West Area should be included in the FEIS. Of course, the historic register decision must not compromise protection of public health, safety, and the environment.

R. See response to L005-C01.

L042-C20. The Washington State Shoreline Management Act (RCW 90.58) states that it is the policy of the state to provide for management of its shorelines by planning for and fostering all reasonable and appropriate uses. Although the DEIS assumes a time period of 100 years for active institutional control--with an intention to maintain institutional control of the site in perpetuity--there is no discussion about allowing reasonable and appropriate public use of the shoreline. Decommissioning of the reactors will remove a significant roadblock to opening major sections of the Hanford Reach shoreline to the public. If the reach is designated as a part of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, that portion of the river will remain open for boating and fishing but not for shoreline uses. Protection of historic, archaeological, and cultural properties together with yet-to-be-decommissioned sites would preclude opening of the entire Hanford Reach. However, the FEIS should articulate a federal policy of shoreline use during the period of institutional control. A phased approach would allow the public reasonable and appropriate use of the shoreline.

R. See response to L010-C01.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

L045-C01. The Yakima Indian Nation requests that the Department of Energy consult with the Nation during planning, site characterization, cultural resource and archaeological site survey work, and implementation of the selected alternative to ensure the protection of numerous Indian cultural resource sites in the area (36 CFR 800, "Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties"). Such consultation must include onsite inspection by the Yakima Indian Nation.

R. It is DOE's intent to consult with Indian tribes during all phases of the planning, site characterization, cultural resource and archaeological site survey work, and implementation of the selected alternative as required under the law and as is necessary to ensure protection of Indian rights under applicable treaties and other statutory and regulatory requirements. In addition, DOE will, on a regular basis, consult with Indian tribes with respect to potential impacts to Indian burial sites and cultural resources. Such consultation will include invitations for onsite visits by representatives of the affected Indian tribes.

L045-C02. The DEIS inadequately describes the treaty between the Yakima Indians and the U.S. government. Although mention is made of ceded land areas, no description is made of the legal status of this land. No mention is made of the DOE's trust responsibility to Indian tribes, as described in federal law and policy.

R. Section 4.6.5 of the DEIS specifically acknowledges the treaty rights of the Yakima and Umatilla Indians. Also, Chapter 6 of the DEIS contains specific references to the National Historic Preservation Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act. Describing the terms of the treaty between the U.S. government and the Yakima Indian Nation is outside the scope of this EIS.

L045-C03. Description of cultural resource management of the Hanford Site in the DEIS, consistent with the National Historic Preservation Act and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, is lacking. The DEIS makes mention of the fact that the 100 Areas have not been surveyed for cultural resources, but does not describe how the Yakima Indian Nation will be consulted during such surveys.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

R. DOE has a cultural resources plan in place (Hanford Cultural Resources Management Plan, PNL-6942, June 1989) that was established to preserve and protect cultural resources. The plan applies to all new construction, decontamination and decommissioning, and CERCLA remediation. It is DOE's policy to ensure that tribal participation takes place during cultural resource survey work. This policy is carried out by the Site Management Division of the DOE-Richland Operations Office.

L045-C04. The Hanford Reach of the Columbia River is exceptionally significant to the Yakima Nation, in terms of the fishery, cultural and natural resource sites, and religious areas. The DOE must fully consider the impacts of its proposed actions on these resources when developing the FEIS.

R. See response to L045-C03.

L045-C05. The Yakima Indian Nation supports the goals of restoring the Hanford land.

R. See response to L010-C01.

L045-C06. There is no doubt that the B Reactor is a significant historic site, but consideration of its protection should be weighed in the context of preservation of a record of thousands of years of human habitation and development in the same area. The DOE should place greater emphasis on preserving Indian cultural resources in the development of the FEIS.

R. See responses to L050-C01, L010-C01, and L045-C03.

L045-C07. As the environmental restoration of the land along the Columbia River goes forward, the federal government should consider means of returning access and use of this area to the Yakima Indian Nation, which maintains property rights at Hanford.

R. See responses to L010-C01 and L045-C03.

L045-C08. Many of the major federal environmental laws, including the Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, and CERCLA, have been amended by Congress to specifically recognize the authority of Indian tribes to regulate the environment on tribal lands. This authority may extend off-reservation to ceded lands. The DOE should recognize in the FEIS that treaty rights and

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

tribal jurisdiction are included in the statutory and regulatory requirements that apply to decommissioning the surplus production reactors.

R. The DOE is fully committed to meeting all tribal legal rights during the planning, engineering, and decommissioning of the Hanford surplus reactors. See response to L010-C01.

L045-C09. Section 1.6 of the summary should list the National Historic Preservation Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act.

R. These acts are discussed briefly in Chapter 6. They were omitted from the DEIS summary for brevity, but have now been added to Section 1.6 of the Addendum.

L045-C10. The FEIS should explain how designation of the 100 Areas on the CERCLA National Priorities List and the Tri-Party Agreement among DOE, EPA, and Washington State will affect consideration of the DEIS alternatives and implementation of the chosen alternative.

R. The effect, if any, of these factors on final selection of the alternatives to be implemented will be discussed in DOE's record of decision. Implementation of the selected alternative ultimately will depend upon timely funding from Congress. See response to L042-C18.

L045-C11. Section 4.6.5, "Indian Tribes," should be placed under Section 6.0, "Statutory and Regulatory Requirements," with an equivalent change in the summary. Three specific changes should be made in this section. (1) Perhaps one-third of the enrolled Yakima Indian Nation members live off the Yakima Reservation. Thus the phrase on page 4.39, "who now live on nearby reservations," is incorrect and should be amended. (2) The sentence beginning at the top of page 4.41, "As part of their treaty agreements...", should be replaced (for the Yakima Indian Nation) with the following language from the Treaty of 1855 between the Yakima Indian Nation and the U.S. government: "The exclusive right of taking fish in all streams, where running through or bordering said reservation, is further secured to said confederated tribes and bands of Indians, as also the right of taking fish at all usual and accustomed places, in common with citizens of the Territory, and of erecting temporary

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

buildings for curing them; together with the privilege of hunting, gathering roots and berries, and pasturing their horses and cattle upon open and unclaimed land." (3) The sentence on page 4.41 beginning "Consultation with Indian religious leaders may be necessary..." should be replaced by "Consultation with Indian religious leaders is required by law if the potential exists for abridgement of religious freedom, as set forth in the American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978."

R. The factual changes are made in the Errata (Appendix N of the FEIS). Historic preservation acts and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act are added to the summary in Section 1.6 of the FEIS.

L048-C01. Any costs and health impacts that have already been incurred by the mothballed reactors should be included in the FEIS.

R. The purpose of the EIS is to evaluate the proposed action and its alternatives. Therefore, cost and health impacts are estimated for proposed future actions, not for past actions.

L048-C02. One-piece removal would permit releasing the 100 Areas to public use.

R. See response to L010-C01.

L048-C03. The reactors should be removed in order of increasing radioactive inventory.

R. The order of decommissioning will be decided on the basis of detailed engineering studies, which will include consideration of inventories.

L049-C01. The regulatory discussions on pages 1.7, 6.5, and 6.6 relating to CERCLA and RCRA need to be revised. The FEIS needs to be consistent with and reference the Tri-Party Agreement signed May 15, 1989.

R. See response to L042-C18.

L049-C02. On page 1.17, references need to be cited for all the information under the "Geology of the Site" and "Hydrology of the Site" headings.

R. References were purposely omitted from the summary for brevity. They appear in the corresponding sections in Chapter 6.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

L049-C03. On page 5.3, "routine release" needs to be defined. Does this include infiltration and migration of contaminants to ground water? If so, will there be a routine release of radionuclides to the ground water as a result of natural recharge?

R. "Routine release" means releases during decommissioning operations. The expression does not include long-term infiltration of water and migration of contaminants to ground water. The long-term release of contaminants caused by infiltration of rainwater through the engineered barrier is discussed in Chapter 5 and Appendix G of the DEIS.

L049-C04. What are the "analyses" referred to in the first paragraph on page 5.18, and what is the "analysis" referred to in the second paragraph on page 5.18? What is meant by "infiltration rate" and by "recharge rate"?

R. The analysis/analyses refer to the calculation of the long-term impacts of the release of radionuclides and lead into the environment through the ground-water pathway. As stated in the text, infiltration rate refers to the downward movement of precipitation (net amount) through the engineered barrier, into the waste form, and downward to the ground water. Recharge rate refers to the downward movement of precipitation (the net amount outside of the engineered barrier) through the soil that supplies the ground water.

L049-C05. The last sentence in the third paragraph on page 5.18 implies that recharge from precipitation on the reservation (Hanford Site) is the sole source of water for the ground-water system under the Hanford Reservation. The ground-water system under the Hanford Reservation is not an isolated, closed system surrounded by ground-water divides. Water enters the area from outside the boundaries of the reservation and flows to the Columbia River. The ground-water model is constructed to simulate such flux; general statements made in other parts of the document should reflect this concept.

R. The language in paragraph 3 on page 5.18 was not meant to imply that the Hanford Site is a closed system. The discussion in Section 4.2.2 indicates that the Hanford Site aquifer system interacts with the Columbia and Yakima Rivers and receives water from sources such as the Cold Creek drainage system

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

and from higher bordering elevations. Basalt ridges west and south of the Site do provide ground-water divides that act as site boundary conditions for water movement.

L049-C06. Estimates of human health effects of radionuclides in the Columbia River are very small (page 5.23). Would these same estimates apply to fish and aquatic life and to those who consume them?

R. The estimates of human health effects include the effects of eating contaminated fish. No estimate of the effects of these low levels of radiation on aquatic life was made for the purposes of this EIS, although concentrations of radionuclides in fish are routinely measured (Section 4.4.3).

L049-C07. In the last paragraph on page 6.5, it is unclear why the in situ decommissioning alternative would not need to include conceptual designs for the disposal site barriers.

R. The in situ decommissioning alternative includes conceptual designs for disposal site barriers, marker systems, and ground-water monitoring systems but does not include liner/leachate collection systems (Appendix H).

L049-C08. In the second paragraph on page C.1, the phrase "years per meter" should be "meters per year."

R. The phrase "years per meter" was deliberately chosen to reflect the very slow rate of downward movement of water through the vadose zone in the natural Hanford environment.

L049-C09. The discussion of ground-water movement on page C.1 needs to be expanded to include vertical movement of water upward into the Columbia River.

R. Hydrologic modeling is discussed in Section C.3 and is more fully discussed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement, Disposal of Hanford Defense High-Level, Transuranic, and Tank Wastes, U.S. Department of Energy, DOE/EIS-0113, December 1987.

L049-C10. Page C.7, paragraph 3. Additional explanations of the water levels used for calibrating the model are needed here. What "computer routine"? This is a steady-state model, so specifically, what water levels were calibrated to? pre-liquid waste disposal? time-averaged? present day? If they

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

were time-averaged, what are the time boundaries? This all makes a difference in light of the statement that the water levels were dropped to the pre-1945 levels.

R. The computer routine is a routine used by Cearlock et al. to calibrate the Variable Thickness Transient (VTT) Model on the basis of conditions in 1975. This calibrated model then provided the basis for two postdisposal climatic conditions described in Section C.3.1 that also include no further liquid waste disposal.

L049-C11. Figure C.1 (ground-water contour map) should include Site boundaries and labels for the waste burial sites. If the map illustrates contour levels for the unconfined aquifer, this needs to be stated.

R. Boundaries and labels should be clear from other maps in the DEIS. The contours represent the top of the unconfined aquifer.

L049-C12. Ground-water effects should be clarified considering other water recharge rate estimates (page G.5). See H. H. Bauer and J. J. Vaccaro, Estimates of Ground-Water Recharge to the Columbia Plateau Regional Aquifer System for Pre-Development and Current Land-Use Conditions, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, U.S. Geological Survey, 88-4108.

R. The basis for selection of the recharge rates (0.5 and 5.0 centimeters per year) is provided in Section 0.3.2 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement, Disposal of Hanford Defense High-Level, Transuranic, and Tank Wastes, U.S. Department of Energy, DOE/EIS-0113, December 1987.

L049-C13. The description of the ground-water monitoring system on pages H.4 and H.5 should be more complete, including location of the piezometers, a monitoring schedule, and a quality assurance plan for sampling and analysis procedures.

R. The ground-water monitoring system will be designed and operated in consultation with the WDOE and EPA. Further details in the FEIS would be premature.

L049-C14. The following statement at the top of page H.5 needs clarification: "The 100- and 200-Area wells have different locations because the ground-water

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

hydrology gradients are better known in the 200 Areas than in the 100 Areas due to the influence of the Columbia River on the 100-Area hydrology."

R. This sentence refers to other material in the same paragraph and is intended to explain why wells are arranged in a circular pattern around the waste form in the 100 Areas and why more wells are placed downgradient than upgradient of the waste form in the 200 Areas.

L050-C01. The Wanapum Band of Indians wishes to be informed about the method of decommissioning selected by DOE because the Band has burial sites, religious sites, medicines, herbs, and roots on the Hanford Site.

R. The DOE intends to honor this request.

L051-C01. The discussion of historic preservation of B Reactor should be clarified to explain exactly what inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places means and to distinguish among the different names assigned to different preservation statuses.

R. The National Register of Historic Places provides an authoritative list or guide to identify the nation's cultural resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment. It is designed to be administered as a planning tool. Federal agencies undertaking a project that may affect a listed or eligible property must provide the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation a reasonable opportunity to comment, pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Procedures are outlined in 39 CFR 800.

Ex05-C01. A comparison table should be included of the five alternatives versus the impacts of natural disasters such as flooding and earthquakes.

R. These impacts are covered in Section 5.7.3. A table was not thought necessary by the authors.

Ex05-C02. The estimate of employees on DOE-related work, given in Section 4.6.1, should be revised downward.

R. The number of employees on DOE-related projects in September 1989 was approximately 12,600.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

Ex05-C03. Section 3.2.5 recognizes that a major structural upgrade of the reactor foundation would be required for one-piece removal. It should also consider banding or otherwise securing the upper structure to prevent fissures during removal and transit.

R. While not mentioned in Section 3.2.5, the Kaiser Engineers Hanford report referenced in Section 3.2.5 contains a statement with respect to reinforcing the reactor block during transit.

Ex05-C04. Section 5.3.1 addresses the block-drop accident. Two other accident scenarios, not as dramatic as the block drop but more probable, are the loss of synchronism of the four transporter drives while in transit and the jamming of the hydraulic mechanism, necessitating the sacrifice of the transporter in the pit at the 200 Areas.

R. These two accidents would increase the cost of one-piece removal, but would not likely increase accidental radiation doses, which is the subject of Section 5.3.1.

Ex07-C01. Preservation of B Reactor will require consideration of public health and safety.

R. See response to L005-C01.

Ex08-C01. B Reactor should be preserved intact onsite and should be upgraded to provide relevant historical and educational displays and to provide public access.

R. See response to L005-C01.

Ex09-C01. What was the original congressional intent of taking and establishing the Hanford land area in carrying out the World War II secret Manhattan Project?

R. A discussion of the original congressional intent for Hanford is outside the scope of this EIS.

Ex09-C02. Did the 1942-1943 Congress and the Army Corps of Engineers evaluate their actions with knowledge that some portion or all of the Hanford Federal Reservation land taken for this project would be contaminated and unsuitable

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

for return to its previous use? In their deliberations, did they offer consideration to assess the ultimate plan for future generations?

R. A discussion of the original planning for use of all or part of the Hanford Site is outside the scope of this EIS.

Ex09-C03. What was the determination used in the amount of lands originally condemned for the Hanford Reservation in Benton, Franklin, and Grant counties? Is it planned by the federal government or yet to be determined that this portion of land will be kept off of the tax rolls of Benton, Franklin, and Grant counties indefinitely? What land set aside is necessary to address the environmental impact containment of the eight surplus reactors?

R. Discussions of the amount of land originally condemned for the Hanford Reservation and of the impact of retaining this land (thus kept off the tax rolls) are outside the scope of this EIS. The land required for decommissioning purposes is discussed in Section 5.9.4.

Ex09-C04. Water allocation from the Columbia River for irrigation purposes has been conducted for a number of years. The resource of water combined with land grows crops in ready abundance throughout the world. Recognizing that the Hanford Reservation was created in the middle of a vast agricultural plain, has the DOE considered the need to reserve water rights for future irrigation needs of the Hanford lands now held in its trust? If not, why not?

R. A discussion of consideration given to the need to reserve water rights for future irrigation of Hanford lands is outside the scope of this EIS.

Ex09-C05. With the original Hanford national mission now significantly declining, is DOE considering a future community impact plan? Does the DOE have any comparable environmental impact consideration plans for deactivation of any comparable facilities?

R. A discussion of future community impact planning, except for the action proposed in this EIS, is outside the scope of this EIS. See response to L010-C01.

Ex09-C06. Land-use planning and socioeconomic impact need much more attention and emphasis than given in the DEIS.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

R. See response to L010-C01. Socioeconomic impact of the action proposed in this EIS is covered in Section 5.8.

Ex10-C01. Alternative proposals should be considered in support of the nomination of B Reactor as a National Historic Landmark. Specific items that should be considered include an obelisk or information kiosks located at the Vernita Bridge rest area, enhancement of the B Reactor display currently located at the Hanford Science Center with a videotape, and access to the existing control room, either at the existing site or elsewhere.

R. See response to L005-C01.

Ex11-C01. Land-use planning in the DEIS is inadequate and requires further consideration. Specifically, land that has not been adversely affected by radioactivity should be evaluated for return to productive agricultural use, including provisions for irrigation water systems that will deliver water to areas such as Cold Creek Valley adjacent to Highway 240. Reconsideration of the economic value of the Arid Lands Ecology Reserve should be included. If there is justification for keeping this land out of productive agriculture, consideration must be given to providing payment in lieu of taxes to units of local government, so that the adverse economic impact that now exists can be rectified.

R. See response to L010-C01.

Ex12-C01. N Reactor should be decommissioned along with the eight surplus production reactors.

R. Decommissioning of N Reactor is outside the scope of this EIS. At an appropriate time, N Reactor will be decommissioned and appropriate NEPA documentation will be prepared.

Ex12-C02. There should be some way in which the radionuclide tritium can be salvaged to preserve the usefulness of existing nuclear weapons.

R. While tritium exists within the carbon blocks, its removal would entail opening the reactors and performing an extraction procedure that could result in a greater worker radiation dose, a larger volume of radioactive waste, and a greater cost than estimated for any of the decommissioning alternatives.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

Ex13-C01. Concerning the leak under the KE fuel storage basin described in Chapter 3: 1) When did the leak occur? 2) How large was the leak? What is the radioactive inventory contained in the leak? 3) Is there a radioactive plume? 4) Could there be other undiscovered leaks? 5) Has liquid waste moved to the water table? 6) Could this liquid move to the water table in less than 260 to 880 years? 7) How much soil has been contaminated? 8) Is the river in danger? 9) When will DOE finish its characterization studies?

R. 1) The leak was first observed in 1974. 2) The leak is estimated to have been about 15 to 57 million gallons. The inventory of radioactivity contained in the leak is estimated to include cobalt-60, 3.6 curies; strontium-90, 1470 curies; cesium-137, 1050 curies; plutonium-238, 0.21 curies; and plutonium 239/240, 1.3 curies. 3) The extent of the radioactive plume has been partially characterized, and, as stated in Chapter 3, will be fully characterized before decommissioning begins. 4) The possibility of an undiscovered leak always exists. However, the water level in the storage basins was always carefully monitored, and any losses (other than from the KE basin) were consistent with calculated evaporation rates. 5) Radionuclides and hazardous materials have been observed in the monitoring wells in the 100 Areas. Although the sources of these contaminants are not certain, characterization of the sources, their underground pathways, and the extent of contamination will be carried out as part of the Hanford Site RCRA/CERCLA cleanup under the Tri-Party Agreement. 6) Yes. 7) See item 3 above. 8) No. This response is based on the annual Hanford environmental monitoring reports. 9) Completion of these studies will depend on Congressional funding of activities to be carried out under the Tri-Party Agreement.

Ex13-C02. More information is needed on how DOE reached its conclusion on page 3.57, "Climatic changes that alter the flow of the Columbia River could result in long-term erosion under a reactor in the 100 Areas and eventual immersion of that reactor in the river."

R. This is not a conclusion. It is merely a supposition which allowed presentation of the impacts of immersion of one of the reactors in the DEIS.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

Ex13-C03. Different recharge rates (0.5 and 5.0 centimeters per year) produce different dose rates in the 200 Areas (page 5.19) due to dilution factors, but not in the 100 Areas. This requires clarification.

R. This is explained in Appendix C. Because the hydrology at the river is dominated by fluctuations of the river and not by recharge, different recharge rates do not matter.

Ex13-C04. On page C.1, the units "years per meter" should be replaced by "meters per year" in the sentence, "Water travels downward at rates measured in years per meter in the Hanford environment."

R. The phrase "years per meter" was deliberately chosen to reflect the very slow rate of downward movement of water through the vadose zone in the natural Hanford environment.

Ex13-C05. The DEIS on page C.6 discusses travel times downward through the vadose zone based on a water infiltration rate through the protective barrier of 0.1 centimeters per year. The 1987 Hanford Defense Waste EIS (DOE/EIS-0113) also presents information based on infiltration rates of 0.0, 5.0, and 15.0 centimeters per year. The DEIS should include all available data.

R. The calculations for no action in Appendix G include an infiltration rate of 5.0 centimeters per year. This infiltration rate bounds the long-term impacts for all alternatives at that rate (Section G.1.2). For no action, the impacts are the same at 5.0 and 15.0 centimeters per year (Section 5.7.1.1).

Ex13-C06. On page A.1, the DEIS states that a "liner/leachate collection system and leak detection system are omitted from in situ decommissioning because of the impracticality of installing these systems under the reactor blocks." Why is a detection system important away from the river (in the 200-West Area) and not essential near the river?

R. The liner/leachate collection system and leak detection system were included in the DEIS for disposal alternatives in the 200-West Area solely to meet the requirements of RCRA based on the presence of lead in the reactors. A well-monitoring system was included to meet RCRA requirements for all disposal alternatives. In addition to the practical impossibility of installing

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

such a system for in situ decommissioning, the liner/leachate collection system was omitted because of the lack of efficacy of such a system. This lack of efficacy arises because release of the lead is expected to occur over a much longer period of time than is contemplated by the RCRA regulations for the liner/leachate collection system to function (see L042-C01).

Ex13-C07. 1) The DEIS (in Appendix H) does not outline the long-term goals of well monitoring after decommissioning is complete. 2) What level of lead or radioactivity will require action? 3) Is there some plan to deal with elevated levels? 4) How long does monitoring continue? 5) Will failed seals in the monitoring wells be replaced? 6) Will the eventual deterioration of monitoring well seals allow an avenue of faster travel time to ground water?

R. 1) The goals of well monitoring are to determine whether or not lead or radionuclides from the decommissioned reactors have reached ground water. 2) The presence of lead or radioactivity, in wells downgradient of the monitored facilities, in concentrations that are statistically different from the historical record or statistically different from upgradient wells, will initiate an assessment of the nature, cause, and extent of the contamination. The result of the assessment will determine the response action. 3) Elevated levels will be handled in the same fashion as other Hanford ground-water cleanup. 4) Monitoring will continue until no longer required by the appropriate regulatory agency or until institutional control is lost. 5) The integrity of the monitoring well seal will be assessed by a continual review of the data from the well. If data indicate that the well seal is not functioning as designed and as required by the applicable laws, regulations, and DOE Orders, the well will be either remediated or abandoned in a manner to prevent contaminant movement through the well, including the well seal. 6) As stated in answer 5, the wells will be periodically monitored and the data assessed. Part of the data assessment will be an evaluation of well seal integrity. If data indicate that the well seal is not functioning as designed and as required by the applicable laws, regulations, and DOE Orders, the well will be either remediated or abandoned in a manner to prevent contaminant movement through the well, including the well seal. If DOE institutional control is transferred to another entity, either the new land administrator

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

will assume responsibility for maintaining the wells and eventual well abandonment, or DOE will abandon the wells in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and DOE Orders. Existing Washington State Law (WAC-173-160) requires well abandonment to prevent water and contaminant migration.

Ex16-C01. The DEIS does not discuss the case where failure of Grand Coulee Dam has occurred at the same time severe seismic activity has weakened the outer protective layer of riprap on the in situ mounds.

R. This case is equivalent to (or no worse than) complete immersion of one (or more) of the reactors, which is discussed in Section 5.7.3.

Ex17-C01. The DEIS fails to acknowledge that the cleanup of the reactors must be done in accordance with federal and state environmental laws.

R. The following statement appears in Chapter 6 of the DEIS: "Decommissioning [of the surplus production reactors] will be carried out in accordance with DOE's environmental policy, which is 'to conduct its operations in an environmentally safe and sound manner...in compliance with the letter and spirit of applicable environmental statutes, regulations, and standards.'"

Ex17-C02. Federal and state environmental laws do not give the DOE the authority to make the fundamental decision as to the fate of the reactors. The State of Washington, the WDOE, and the EPA should be the fundamental decision-makers regarding these eight reactors, rather than DOE.

R. DOE is the responsible federal agency for decommissioning the reactors. As stated in the response to Ex17-C01, DOE will comply with applicable environmental statutes, regulations, and standards.

Ex17-C03. The policies, procedures, and standards of RCRA and CERCLA are ignored by DOE in the DEIS.

R. The applicability of RCRA and CERCLA is discussed in Section 6.4. See also responses to L042-C01 and L042-C18.

Ex17-C04. The DOE failed to consider the immediate dismantlement alternative, due to cost.

R. This alternative was considered and rejected in Section 3.6.1 because of the following disadvantages: a significant increase in occupational radiation

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

exposure; increased costs of design and fabrication of special remote handling and viewing equipment; the necessity to use special contamination control equipment, water and other shielding, and water cleanup techniques; and the potential for increased public exposures from any transportation accident. The immediate one-piece removal alternative produces the same result with far less impact.

Tr-R26. B Reactor should be preserved in the form of a model that includes the front and rear faces and the horizontal and vertical control rods and safety systems.

R. See response to L005-C01.

Tr-R47. The potential future value of the irradiated materials in the reactor cores might be such that a method of access to the cores should be provided.

R. The very high costs involved in removing and processing irradiated materials in the reactor blocks make this possibility highly unlikely and too speculative to consider in this EIS.

Tr-P17. Why is N Reactor not included in the DEIS?

R. N Reactor is not available for decommissioning at the present time. DOE will prepare appropriate environmental documentation when N Reactor does become available for decommissioning.

Tr-P19. If B Reactor is preserved as an exhibit, the exhibit should include a visual display of the effects of the bombing of Nagasaki.

R. See response to L005-C01.

Tr-P20. How was the population dose of 50,000 person-rem for no action arrived at?

R. Population doses were calculated by means of radionuclide pathway analyses, which include calculations based on experimental data on the release of radionuclides (over 10,000 years) from the decommissioned reactors into water, on the movement of water and radionuclides through the ground to the Columbia River, and on the ingestion of water and foodstuffs containing radionuclides by persons living downstream from Hanford.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

Tr-P21. Will persons in eastern Oregon or downstream from Hanford be affected by the 50,000 person-rem population dose from no action?

R. Yes. The 50,000 person-rem population dose is projected to result in 5 to 50 health effects over 10,000 years to persons downstream from Hanford. Natural background radiation will produce 900,000 to 9 million health effects in the same population over the same time period.

Tr-P22. Where do the cost estimates come from?

R. Decommissioning cost estimates were made by various firms and individuals experienced both in decommissioning and in cost estimating.

Tr-P22. How safe is Hanford?

R. Radiological conditions at Hanford are monitored routinely. The results for 1987 are summarized in Section 4.4.3. These results show very small public radiation doses (much below background) that can be attributed to Hanford.

Tr-P37. Decommissioning of N Reactor should be included in the EIS.

R. See response to Tr-P17.

Tr-P39. Why is it essential to decommission the surplus production reactors?

R. As stated in Chapter 2, "Because the reactors contain irradiated reactor components and because the buildings that house the reactors are contaminated with low levels of radioactivity, the DOE has determined that there is a need for additional action to ensure protection of the public health and safety, and that decommissioning or continued surveillance and maintenance is necessary."

Tr-P41. Is there a technology for cleanup of ground water?

R. There are several technologies for cleanup of ground water, including technologies similar to those used to treat drinking water and domestic sewage. However, not all technologies are technically and economically viable for a given ground-water problem.

Tr-P42. Impacts from sludge in the storage basins seem to be omitted from the DEIS.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

R. Both short-term impacts to workers and long-term impacts to the public from sludge in the storage basins are included in Appendix G, Chapter 3, and Chapter 5 of the DEIS.

Tr-P43 and 44. The text discussing radiation dose calculations seems to contain many qualifying adjectives and adverbs, such as "possibly indicating," "quite probable," "approximately," "equivalent to about," etc.

R. This is true. To the extent possible, the dose calculations are based on experimental measurements. However, because the processes are so slow, the pathways so varied, and the time scales so long, experimental data must be extrapolated and often summed or averaged. Hence the qualifications.

Tr-Se57. EPA should have a strong involvement in decommissioning the surplus production reactors.

R. EPA's involvement in decommissioning is described in Chapter 6. EPA also participates (along with the WDOE) in the Hanford cleanup under the terms of the Tri-Party Agreement. See response to L042-C18.

Tr-Se58. Would radioactive material in the surplus production reactors be classified as high-level or low-level waste?

R. All of the radioactive material that might be generated as waste in any of the decommissioning alternatives would be classified as low-level radioactive waste under the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act and under DOE 5820.2A.

Tr-Se59. EPA has jurisdiction over decommissioning. If EPA chooses not to exercise its jurisdiction, then the WDOE has jurisdiction.

R. DOE is responsible for decommissioning the eight surplus production reactors. The authority of the EPA and the State of Washington is discussed in Chapter 6 (see also response to Tr-Se57).

Tr-Se65. DOE does not have the right to decide what happens with respect to decommissioning. EPA, or whoever is in charge, must make the decisions.

R. See response to Tr-Se57.

Responses to Comments; Comments and Responses

Tr-Se66. DOE claims that the waste involved is low level, but if it must be left alone for 75 years before anybody can touch it, it must actually be very high level.

R. The terms "high-level radioactive waste" and "low-level radioactive waste" have specific meanings based on federal law and regulations. The material in the reactors would be characterized as low-level waste under the applicable laws and regulations. As noted in the DEIS, decommissioning can be conducted without waiting for 75 years, but worker radiation doses are lower if the radionuclides in the reactors are allowed to decay with time.

APPENDIX F

ADDENDUM TO SECTION F.3 OF APPENDIX F: BIOLOGICALLY RELATED HEALTH EFFECTS

APPENDIX F

ADDENDUM TO SECTION F.3 OF APPENDIX F: BIOLOGICALLY RELATED HEALTH EFFECTS

Since the completion of the DEIS in early 1989, additional documentation on the potential effects of radiation on human health has become available. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, in development of the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPs) for radionuclides, presented currently available information and adopted a fatal cancer risk factor associated with exposure to 1 Sv (sievert; 1 Sv = 100 rem) of $39,000/10^6$ persons, or for 1 rem of about 4×10^{-4} (EPA 1989). This evaluation was revisited in 1991 for the evaluation of National Primary Drinking Water Regulations for radionuclides, and retained (Federal Register 1991). Between these two evaluations, the Committee on the Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation (BEIR) of the U.S. National Research Council published its recommendations in a report known as BEIR V (1990). On the basis of available evidence, this committee recommended use of a population-weighted average lifetime excess risk of death from cancer following an acute dose to the whole body of 0.08/Sv ($8 \times 10^{-4}/\text{rem}$). However, they qualified this, in that extension of exposures "over weeks or months, however, is expected to reduce the lifetime risk appreciably, possibly by a factor of 2 or more." If a conservative value of only two is used as a "dose rate reduction factor" applicable to the BEIR V estimates, then the EPA and BEIR V results are essentially the same. Both of these results are within the range estimated in Table F.4 of the DEIS.

If the EPA and BEIR V estimates of fatal cancer are used, comparisons of the five alternatives of the DEIS in terms of cancer fatalities may be made. These are summarized in Table F.5.

Addendum to Section F.3

TABLE F.5. Comparison of Cancer Fatalities for the Disposal Alternatives

<u>Alternative</u>	<u>Occupational Doses (person-rem)</u>	<u>Occupational Cancer Fatalities</u>	<u>Population Doses (person-rem)</u>	<u>Population Cancer Fatalities</u>
No Action	24	0	50,000	20
Immediate One-Piece Removal	159	0	1,900	1
Safe Storage Deferred One Piece Removal	51	0	1,900	1
Safe Storage Deferred Dismantlement	532	0	1,900	1
In-Situ Decommissioning	33	0	4,700	2

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1989. "Risk Assessment Methodology," Environmental Impact Statement on NESHAPS for Radionuclides, Background Information Document, Volume 1. EPA/520/1-89-005, Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

56 FR 33050-33127. July 18, 1991. "National Primary Drinking Water Standards; Radionuclides." Federal Register. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

National Academy of Sciences Advisory Committee on the Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation (BEIR). 1990. Health Effects of Exposure to Low Levels of Ionizing Radiation, BEIR V. Commission on Life Sciences, National Academy of Sciences--National Research Council, Washington, D.C.2222

APPENDIX K

DECOMMISSIONING COSTS

APPENDIX K

DECOMMISSIONING COSTS

Updated estimates (in 1990 dollars) for the cost of decommissioning the eight surplus production reactors at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington, are presented in this appendix (see Chapter 3.0 for previously described costs). Appropriate factors for adjusting costs from the 1986 base to the 1990 base were used to facilitate this update. These factors are based on an analysis of cost indices and other measures of projected cost escalations over the period of interest (Konzek 1989). The purpose of these cost estimates, to provide a basis of comparative analysis among the decommissioning alternatives, remains unchanged by this update.

The general conditions and assumptions applied during this re-evaluation are unchanged from those given in Chapter 3.0, except that estimated costs are given in constant 1990 dollars. The order of decommissioning will be determined on the basis of detailed engineering studies. However, for cost estimation purposes, it was assumed that F Reactor would be decommissioned first. The contingency allowances contained in various reports by others (individuals and firms) that were used to develop the decommissioning cost estimates in Chapter 3.0 were reviewed for reasonableness. This review of contingency allowances determined that 1) they were in compliance with DOE guidelines contained in DOE-RL 5700.3, and 2) they covered only the scope of decommissioning work as it was originally conceived in the parent document(s). DOE-RL 5700.3 delineates the contingency requirements for Hanford projects, primarily construction projects; however, for the purpose of this cost update, these contingency requirements are assumed to be equally applicable to "deconstruction"/decommissioning projects as well. As a result of this review, no adjustments were necessary in the various contingency allowances previously provided by others.

The estimated costs of decommissioning the eight surplus production reactors using each of the five postulated alternatives are summarized in

Decommissioning Costs; No Action

Section K.1. The detailed cost estimates supporting the summary information are contained in Section K.2 for no action, Section K.3 for immediate one-piece removal, Section K.4 for safe storage followed by deferred one-piece removal, Section K.5 for safe storage followed by deferred dismantlement, and Section K.6 for in situ decommissioning.

K.1 COST COMPARISON OF THE ALTERNATIVES

A cost comparison of the alternatives is presented in Table K.1 to show the separate costs of safe storage, active decommissioning, barrier construction and waste site modifications, and subsequent monitoring. An overall evaluation of the five alternatives is presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.7, and is not repeated here.

K.2 NO ACTION

Consideration of no action is required by the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality that implement the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). No action has two possible meanings: either to discontinue present actions and do nothing further, or to continue present actions indefinitely.

K.2.1 No Further Action

With no further action, the facility would be closed and all related activities would be discontinued. Although this alternative has no cost, it is not reasonable because it does not properly isolate the facility's remaining radioactivity from the environment, does not provide for any maintenance or repair of the structures, and does not make any other provision for protection of human health and safety. No further action would result in deterioration of the reactor buildings, potential release of radionuclides to the environment, potential human exposure to radioactivity by intrusion, and potential safety hazards to intruders. No further action is not the DOE's interpretation of no action. Therefore, this alternative is not analyzed in greater detail.

TABLE K.1. Costs of Decommissioning Alternatives(a)

Activity	No Action	Immediate One-Piece Removal	Safe Storage Followed by Deferred One-Piece Removal	Safe Storage Followed by Deferred Dismantlement	In Situ Decommissioning
Safe storage	43.5	--	35.9	38.0	--
Mound/barrier	--	--	--	--	61.9
Burial site/barrier	--	46.6	46.6	15.9	--
Construct ground-water monitoring wells	--	1.6	1.6	1.6	2.1
Ground-water monitoring	--	38.1	8.8	10.3	101.6
Other decommissioning costs	<u>--</u>	<u>142.0</u>	<u>142.0</u>	<u>245.5</u>	<u>27.4</u>
TOTALS	43.5	228.3	234.9	311.3	193.0

(a) Costs are for 100 years, in millions of 1990 dollars.

Decommissioning Costs; Immediate One-Piece Removal

K.2.2 Continue Present Action

The **continue present action** alternative consists of comprehensive surveillance, monitoring, and maintenance. These activities are the same as those required during the safe-storage period of the **safe storage followed by deferred decommissioning** alternative. The annual (or unit) costs and radiation doses are similar. Initial repairs are estimated to cost about \$975,200 per reactor; major building repairs are estimated to cost about \$248,500 per reactor every 20 years; minor repairs are estimated to cost about \$78,000 per reactor every 5 years; and routine surveillance, monitoring, and maintenance activities are estimated to cost about \$23,200 per reactor annually. For 100 years of **continued present action**, the cost is estimated to be \$43.5 million in 1990 dollars, including a 20% contingency.

Throughout this EIS, **continue present action** is subsequently referred to as the **no action** alternative.

K.3 IMMEDIATE ONE-PIECE REMOVAL

The **immediate one-piece removal** alternative involves the removal of the surplus production reactors (in one piece) from their existing sites, along with their respective spent-fuel storage basins. This would include all piping, equipment, components, structures, and wastes having radioactivity levels greater than those permitted for the sites to be available for other DOE use. **Immediate one-piece removal** entails the following activities: 1) removing each reactor block (graphite core, surrounding shielding, and support base) in one piece and transporting it on a tractor-transporter over specially constructed haul roads to a DOE-owned burial location in the 200-West Area; 2) dismantling and removing the remaining contaminated materials, equipment, and soils; and 3) reuse or disposal of all noncontaminated equipment and structures.

K.3.1 Costs of Immediate One-Piece Removal

A summary of estimated costs for **immediate one-piece removal** is given in Table K.2. The costs shown are for movement of the eight intact reactor blocks by tractor-transporter overland to the 200-West Area burial ground and

TABLE K.2. Summary of Estimated Costs for Immediate One-Piece Removal of the Eight Surplus Production Reactors (thousands of 1990 \$)^(a)

Cost Category	Reactor								Totals
	105-F	105-H	105-D	105-DR	105-B	105-C	105-KE	105-KW	
Labor	3,462 20	2,764 66	2,764 66	2,764 66	2,809 03	2,809 03	2,764 66	2,764 66	22,903 56
Equipment/materials	692 44	692 44	692 44	692 44	700 80	700 80	692 44	692 44	5,556 24
Service charge (25%)	1,038 66	864 28	864 28	864 28	877 46	877 46	864 28	864 28	7,114 98
Subtotal	5,193 30	4,321 38	4,321 38	4,321 38	4,387 29	4,387 29	4,321 38	4,321 38	35,574 78
One piece removal	17,095 04 ^(b)	4,567 35	4,556 83	4,368 65	4,488 22	4,304 30	4,542 78	4,361 64	48,284 81
Subtotal	22,288 34	8,888 73	8,878 21	8,690 03	8,875 51	8,691 59	8,864 16	8,683 02	83,859 59
Contingency (20%)	4,457 67	1,796 75	1,794 64	1,757 01	1,794 10	1,757 32	1,791 83	1,755 61	16,904 93
Subtotal	26,746 01	10,685 48	10,672 85	10,447 04	10,669 61	10,448 91	10,655 99	10,438 63	100,764 52
Building removal ^(c)	2,934 12	2,360 50	2,360 50	2,360 50	2,360 50	2,360 50	2,360 50	2,360 50	19,457 62
Road construction ^(d)	16,771 75	2,172 50	564 88	564 88	434 50	434 50	434 50	434 50	21,812 01
Ground-water monitoring system and operation ^(e)	4,961 94	4,961 94	4,961 94	4,961 94	4,961 94	4,961 94	4,961 94	4,961 94	39,695 52
Burial ground ^(f)	5,821 87	5,821 87	5,821 87	5,821 87	5,821 87	5,821 87	5,821 87	5,821 87	46,574 96
TOTAL COSTS	57,235 69	26,002 29	24,382 04	24,156 23	24,248 42	24,027 72	24,234 80	24,017 44	228,304 63

(a) Notes 1) shipping and burial costs are based on disposal at Hanford, 2) no salvage credit is taken, and 3) water flushes, high-pressure water lance, concrete scarfing, and selected manual techniques are the decontamination methods assumed to be used. Costs are deliberately not rounded for computational accuracy.

(b) Includes total cost of transporter.

(c) Adapted from Kaiser (1983) report, and includes 30% contingency as well as selected adjustment factors for a fixed-price contractor.

(d) Includes 25% contingency.

(e) Includes 20% contingency.

(f) Includes 12% contingency.

Decommissioning Costs; Immediate One-Piece Removal

for the dismantlement and removal of the remaining components and structures. In all cases, shipping and burial costs are based on disposal at Hanford in the low-level burial site in the 200-West Area. The estimated costs do not include any additional allowance for inflation to account for either the work not beginning immediately or for the work extending over several years. This method of presenting the cost estimate permits useful comparisons to be made among the costs of all alternatives.

The total estimated cost for immediate one-piece removal of all eight surplus production reactors is about \$228 million in 1990 dollars. This estimate includes a 25% service charge on labor, equipment, and materials; a 20% contingency allowance on dismantlement costs and construction of monitoring wells; a 30% contingency allowance on building removal; a 25% contingency allowance on road construction; and a 12% contingency on burial-ground costs. The 25% service charge on labor, equipment, and materials is standard practice at Hanford for obtaining these services internally. The 20% contingency on dismantlement costs is based on the Kaiser (1985) report. The 20% contingency on monitoring wells is based on the Smith (1987) report. The 25% contingency on road construction activities is based on and consistent with the Kaiser (1986) report. The 30% contingency on building removal is based on the Kaiser (1983) report. The 12% contingency on burial-ground costs is based on conceptual designs developed for this EIS.

Reductions in planning and preparation costs are estimated for the second and subsequent reactors to account for the elimination of some planning activities that do not need to be repeated and for reduced site-preparation costs when two reactors are located at the same site. Haul-road construction costs are greatest for the F Reactor because it was assumed for cost estimation purposes that F Reactor would be decommissioned first and because it is farthest from the 200-West burial ground. Short haul-road extensions that tie into the main haul road would be constructed for subsequent reactor-block transport operations as required, resulting in significantly lower haul-road construction costs for these latter reactors. Fuel storage basin decontamination

Decommissioning Costs; Immediate One-Piece Removal

costs are higher for the B and C Reactors than for the other six reactors because contaminated sludge must be removed from the fuel-storage transfer pits of these two reactors.

Estimated costs (in 1990 dollars) for **immediate one-piece removal** of a "typical" reactor are shown in Table K.3. Average costs per reactor are used when estimating costs of radioactive waste packaging and disposal, building removal, engineering, and road construction. However, other costs such as the tractor-transporter are one-time costs starting with the first reactor and cannot be accurately represented by averaging. Still other costs, such as satisfying regulatory requirements and developing work plans and procedures, are greatest for the first reactor and are substantially less for subsequent reactors.

The estimated costs for the planning and preparation activities that precede actual decommissioning operations are included in Table K.3. In addition, costs are included in the table to account for such functions as supervision, radiation monitoring, and engineering support.

The Kaiser estimate (Kaiser 1986) for the tractor-transporter (see Chapter 3 and Section K.3.3 for details) has been revised to reflect 1990 cost base values. In 1990 dollars, two transporter units are estimated to be purchased for \$12.53 million.

K.3.2 Waste-Site Costs

The 200-West Area waste-site costs for the reactor blocks are presented in Table K.4. The table summarizes the costs associated with using protective barrier and warning marker systems and a liner/leachate collection system, but does not include the costs of road construction to the 200-West Area burial site from the individual reactor sites.

K.3.3 Transporter Shipment of the Reactor Blocks

As discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.5, the following two studies were conducted to determine the feasibility of moving a reactor block in one piece:

- a study by Rockwell (1985) to develop preliminary cost estimates of route preparation and burial of the surplus production reactors

Decommissioning Costs; Immediate One-Piece Removal

TABLE K.3. Estimated Costs for Immediate One-Piece Removal of a Typical Reactor

Activity	Cost (thousands of 1990 \$)(a)
Predecommissioning	
Satisfy regulatory requirements	76.70(b)
Gather and analyze data	47.75(b)
Develop work plans and procedures	115.54(b)
Engineering support	253.67
Prepare site	300.40(b)
Prepare reactor building	424.78
Perform detailed radiation survey	3.90
Building/Storage Basin Dismantlement	
Decontaminate fuel storage basin	251.90
Remove transfer area equipment	35.93
Set up decon facility/repair shop	152.45
Remove valve pit equipment	51.89
Decontaminate/remove ICR rooms equipment	332.01
Remove downcomer and effluent line	229.14
Decontaminate instrument and sample room	245.70
Remove process piping	708.11
Decontaminate fan room	265.08
Remove/dispose of vertical safety rods	338.74
Remove front and rear elevators	342.90
Remove helium ducts	29.58
Remove miscellaneous contaminated equipment	675.52
Remove miscellaneous noncontaminated equipment	34.10
Decontaminate/deactivate repair shop	77.96
Package radioactive waste	565.68(b)
Remove building	2,432.20(b,c)
Reactor Block Removal, Disposal, and Monitoring	
Engineering	79.60(b)
Acquire tractor-transporter	1,565.80(b)
Construct road	2,181.20(b)
Construct reactor model	19.55
Excavate foundation	1,278.63(b)
Package reactor block (5 sides)	22.25
Load/tile down reactor block	71.83
Transport reactor block	35.15(b)
Burial ground (200-West Area), including protective barrier	5,198.10(b)
Construct ground-water monitoring system (200-West Area)	164.26(b,d)
97.5-yr ground-water monitoring system operating cost	3,970.69(b,d)
Reactor Site Restoration	
Restore reactor site	27.18
Prepare final report	46.83
Conduct radiation monitoring	307.07
Quality assurance/quality control	108.05
Supervision and secretarial	526.03
Services (25% of labor, material, and equipment costs)(b,e)	889.37
Contingency (25%)	545.26
Contingency (20%)(b,c)	2,940.11
Contingency (12%)(c)	623.77
TOTAL	28,592.36

- (a) Includes labor, equipment, waste disposal, and contractor costs for each activity.
- (b) This cost is a calculated fractional allocation of about one-eighth the total cost of this task for all eight reactors.
- (c) The 20% contingency applies to all activity costs in the table except building removal, road construction, and burial-ground work. The first of these three activities utilizes a 30% contingency as well as other adjustment factors adapted from KEH-R-83-14 (Kaiser 1983), and these costs are included in the activity cost presented in the table. Based on the Rockwell Hanford Operations (1985) report, a 25% contingency is utilized for road construction. Burial-ground work activity utilizes a 12% contingency, based on the Adams (1987) report. The costs estimated in these reports were escalated to a 1990 cost base.
- (d) Based on a cost estimate by Smith (1987) escalated to a 1990 cost base.
- (e) Services include items obtained from other onsite contractors, such as laundry, utilities, fire protection and patrol, transportation, medical aid, etc.

Decommissioning Costs; Immediate One-Piece Removal

TABLE K.4. Estimated Construction Costs for Burial of Reactor Blocks with Liner/Leachate Collection System in the 200-West Area^(a)

Item	Costs (thousands of 1990 \$)	
	Per Block	Total for 8 Blocks
Direct Costs:		
Excavation	491.3	3,930
Foundations ^(b)	363.8	2,910
Hauling of soils/sand/gravel	301.8	2,414
Installation of soil/clay mix	911.2	7,289
Installation of geotextile	223.0	1,784
Installation of geomembrane	194.0	1,552
Backfilling	783.4	6,267
Revegetation	6.1	49
Installation of subsurface markers	50.0	400
Installation of surface markers	325.8	2,606
Contractor overhead and markup	<u>517.1</u>	<u>4,137</u>
Total construction	4,167.5	33,338
Construction management	317.1	2,537
Contract management	317.1	2,537
Engineering design and inspection	396.4	3,171
Escalation	0	0
Contingency (12%)	<u>623.8</u>	<u>4,990</u>
TOTALS	5,831.9	46,573

(a) From Adams (1987), except as noted otherwise; escalated to 1990 cost base.

(b) Adapted from Rockwell (1985), Table 2; escalated to 1990 cost base.

- a study by Kaiser (1986) to determine the structural feasibility of moving the surplus production reactor blocks intact from their present locations in the 100 Areas to permanent, low-level burial grounds in the 200-West Area.

For the purpose of determining the total decommissioning costs associated with the various decommissioning alternatives described in this EIS, costs in both of these studies have been escalated to 1990 dollars.

The transport of each of the eight surplus production reactors at Hanford from their present locations near the Columbia River to the 200-West Area burial grounds is estimated to cost an average of about \$2.8 million

Decommissioning Costs; Immediate One-Piece Removal

(see Table K.5), not including demolition of surrounding building structures, construction of roadways for transporting the reactor blocks, cost for transport to the burial site, or preparation of the 200-West Area burial site.

K.4 SAFE STORAGE FOLLOWED BY DEFERRED ONE-PIECE REMOVAL

The safe storage followed by deferred one-piece removal alternative includes three distinct operational phases: preparation for safe storage, the safe-storage period, and deferred one-piece removal. Additional details associated with this decommissioning alternative are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.3.

K.4.1 Costs of Safe Storage Followed by Deferred One-Piece Removal

A summary of estimated costs for safe storage followed by deferred one-piece removal is given in Table K.6. The storage costs shown are corrected for the safe-storage period that varies from 75 to 84 years. The deferred removal costs shown in the table are for removal of the eight intact reactor blocks by tractor-transporter overland to the 200-West Area burial ground and the dismantlement and removal of the remaining components and structures. In all cases, shipping and burial costs are based on disposal at Hanford in the low-level burial site in the 200-West Area. The total estimated cost for safe storage followed by deferred one-piece removal is about \$235 million in 1990 dollars.

The application of a 25% contingency on road construction costs is based on the Kaiser (1986) report. The 12% contingency on burial-ground construction costs is based on the Adams (1987) report. The 30% contingency applied to building removal costs is based on the Kaiser (1983) report. The estimated costs do not include any additional allowance for inflation, either to account for the work not beginning immediately or to account for the work extending over several years. This method of presenting the cost estimate allows useful comparisons to be made among the costs of all alternatives.

Reductions in planning and preparation costs are estimated for the second and subsequent reactors to account for the elimination of some planning activities that do not need to be repeated and for reduced site-preparation

Decommissioning Costs; Immediate One-Piece Removal

TABLE K.5. Summary of Costs for Transporters and Removal of Eight Surplus Production Reactors^(a)

<u>Cost Category</u>	<u>Estimated Costs (1990 \$)</u>
Transporters, two (2)	11,620,000
Tax at 7.8%	<u>906,360</u>
Total Transporter Cost	12,526,360
CPAF ^(b) construction:	
Direct construction cost	
- Excavation and concrete removal	7,857,440
- Pressure grout holes	158,900
- Steel supports	<u>890,100</u>
Total Direct Construction Cost	8,906,440
Indirect Costs:	
General overhead ^(c)	
- Small tools at 2.5% labor	3,860
- Contractor indirects and fees at 18% of labor	27,830
- Radiation and health protection at 3% of labor	4,640
Technical services	41,830
General requirements	35,730
Subcontractor administration	1,172,770
Bid package plus badging	15,400
Constructability review	<u>20,540</u>
Subtotal Indirect Cost	<u>1,322,600</u>
TOTAL	22,755,000 ^(d)

(a) Based on Kaiser (1986), Appendix A, and escalated to 1990 cost base. The cost estimate is for construction only and does not include engineering or contingency.

(b) Cost plus award fee.

(c) The estimated cost of each subcategory is the product of the total labor cost (\$155,000 in 1990 dollars) times the percentage given for that item (Kaiser 1986).

(d) Total cost is rounded to the nearest \$1,000.

TABLE K.6. Summary of Estimated Costs for Safe Storage Followed by Deferred One-Piece Removal of the Eight Surplus Production Reactors (thousands of 1990 \$)^(a)

Cost Category	Reactor								Totals
	105-F	105-H	105-C	105-B	105-DR	105-D	105-KE	105-KW	
Safe Storage									
Initial repairs	1,550.70	1,642.30	859.90	435.30	1,085.40	372.30	277.60	277.60	6,501.10
Annual maintenance and surveillance ^(b)	1,462.50	1,482.00	1,501.50	1,540.50	1,560.00	1,579.50	1,599.00	1,638.00	12,363.00
5-yr maintenance	863.50	887.70	568.70	831.60	1,396.80	1,164.00	206.40	206.40	6,125.10
20-yr roof repairs	602.70	629.40	800.40	564.60	783.30	702.30	443.70	443.70	4,970.10
Subtotal	4,479.40	4,641.40	3,730.50	3,372.00	4,825.50	3,818.10	2,526.70	2,565.70	29,959.30
Contingency (20%)	895.88	928.28	746.10	674.40	965.10	763.62	505.34	513.14	5,991.86
Total Safe Storage Costs	5,375.28	5,569.68	4,476.60	4,046.40	5,790.60	4,581.72	3,032.04	3,078.84	35,951.16
Deferred Removal									
Labor	3,462.20	2,764.66	2,809.03	2,809.03	2,764.66	2,764.66	2,764.66	2,764.66	22,903.56
Equipment/materials	692.44	692.44	700.80	700.80	692.44	692.44	692.44	692.44	5,556.24
Service charge (25%)	1,038.66	864.28	877.46	877.46	864.28	864.28	864.28	864.28	7,114.98
Subtotal	5,193.30	4,321.38	4,387.29	4,387.29	4,321.38	4,321.38	4,321.38	4,321.38	35,574.78
One-piece removal ^(c)	17,095.04	4,567.35	4,304.30	4,488.22	4,368.65	4,556.83	4,542.78	4,361.64	48,284.81
Subtotal	22,288.34	8,888.73	8,691.59	8,875.51	8,690.03	8,878.21	8,864.16	8,683.02	83,859.59
Contingency (20%)	4,457.67	1,796.75	1,757.32	1,794.10	1,757.01	1,794.64	1,791.83	1,755.61	16,904.93
Subtotal	26,746.01	10,685.48	10,448.91	10,669.61	10,447.04	10,672.85	10,655.99	10,438.63	100,764.52
Building removal ^(d)	2,934.12	2,360.50	2,360.50	2,360.50	2,360.50	2,360.50	2,360.50	2,360.50	19,457.62
Road construction ^(e)	16,771.75	2,172.50	434.50	434.50	564.87	564.87	434.50	434.50	21,811.99
Ground-water monitoring system installation & operation ^(f)	1,296.68	1,296.68	1,296.68	1,296.68	1,296.68	1,296.68	1,296.68	1,296.68	10,373.44
Burial ground ^(g)	5,821.87	5,821.87	5,821.87	5,821.87	5,821.87	5,821.87	5,821.87	5,821.87	46,574.96
Total Deferred Removal Costs	53,570.43	22,337.03	20,362.46	20,583.16	20,490.96	20,716.77	20,569.54	20,352.18	198,982.53
TOTAL COSTS	58,945.71	27,906.71	24,839.06	24,629.56	26,281.56	25,298.49	23,601.58	23,431.02	234,933.69

(a) Notes: 1) shipping and burial costs are based on disposal at Hanford; 2) no salvage credit is taken; and 3) water flushes, high-pressure water lance, concrete scarifying, and selected manual techniques are the decontamination methods assumed to be used. Costs are deliberately not rounded for computational accuracy.

(b) Based on letter report by Hughes (1986).

(c) Includes total cost of tractor-transporter.

(d) Adapted from Kaiser (1983) report and includes 30% contingency as well as selected adjustment factors for a fixed-price contract, escalated to 1990 cost base. The higher removal cost for the 105-F Reactor includes the cost of a mobile crane that would also be used for demolition of the other seven reactors.

(e) Includes 25% contingency.

(f) Includes 20% contingency.

(g) Includes 12% contingency.

Decommissioning Costs; Safe Storage Followed by Deferred One-Piece Removal

costs when two reactors are located at the same site. Haul-road costs would be greatest for the F Reactor because it was assumed for cost estimation purposes that it would be decommissioned first and because it is farthest from the 200-West Area burial ground. Short haul-road extensions that connect with the main haul road would be constructed for subsequent reactor-block transport operations as required, resulting in significantly lower haul-road construction costs for these latter reactors. In addition, fuel storage basin decontamination costs would be higher for the B and C Reactors than for the other six reactors because contaminated sludge must be removed from the fuel storage transfer pits of these two reactors.

Estimated costs (in 1990 dollars) for deferred removal of a "typical" reactor are the same as those shown previously in Table K.3 for immediate one-piece reactor block removal. Average costs per reactor are used when estimating costs of radioactive-waste packaging and disposal, building removal, engineering, and road construction. However, other costs, such as the tractor-transporter, are one-time costs starting with the first reactor and cannot be accurately represented by averaging. Based on the estimate by Kaiser (1986), the tractor-transporter (see Section K.3.3 for details on escalation of the Kaiser cost estimate to 1990 cost base) could be purchased for \$12.53 million. Still other costs, such as satisfying regulatory requirements and developing work plans and procedures, are greatest for the first reactor and are substantially less for subsequent reactors. Nevertheless, the total cost given in Table K.3 is intended to be representative of decommissioning a typical reactor by deferred one-piece removal.

The estimated costs for planning and preparation activities that precede actual decommissioning operations are also included in Table K.3. Work requirements are included in the table to account for such functions as supervision, radiation monitoring, and engineering support.

K.4.2 Waste-Site Costs

The 200-West Area waste-site costs for safe storage followed by deferred one-piece removal are the same as for immediate one-piece removal (Table K.4).

Decommissioning Costs; Safe Storage Followed by Deferred Dismantlement

K.5 SAFE STORAGE FOLLOWED BY DEFERRED DISMANTLEMENT

The **safe storage followed by deferred dismantlement** alternative comprises three distinct operational phases: preparation for safe storage, the safe-storage period, and deferred dismantlement. Routine surveillance operations are postulated for safe-storage periods that vary from 75 to 96 years for the eight reactors. Piece-by-piece dismantlement of the first reactor would begin after 75 years of safe storage, but dismantlement of the eighth reactor would not begin until 21 years after the start of dismantlement of the first reactor. This results in a 96-year safe-storage period for the eighth reactor. Deferred dismantlement of a single reactor is postulated to require approximately 6.5 years for completion. When dismantlement of one reactor has progressed to the stage that piece-by-piece dismantlement of the reactor block can begin (approximately 3 years into the dismantlement schedule), work on a second reactor would begin. This staggered dismantling would result in efficient use of personnel and equipment resources. Additional details associated with this decommissioning alternative are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.4.

K.5.1 Costs of Safe Storage Followed by Deferred Dismantlement

Estimated costs for **safe storage followed by deferred dismantlement** of the eight surplus production reactors, corrected for the safe-storage period that varies from 75 to 96 years, are summarized in Table K.7. The total cost for all eight reactors is about \$311 million. Estimated costs for deferred dismantlement of the first reactor, shown in Table K.8, are assumed to be typical of the remaining seven reactors.

Reductions in planning and preparation costs are assumed for the second and subsequent reactors to account for the elimination of some planning activities that do not need to be repeated and for reduced site-preparation costs when two reactors are located at the same site. Fuel storage basin decontamination costs are higher for B and C Reactors than for the other reactors because the contaminated sludge must be removed from the fuel storage transfer pits of these reactors. Waste-disposal costs are higher for KE and KW Reactors than for the other reactors because their reactor blocks are

TABLE K.7. Summary of Costs for Safe Storage Followed by Deferred Dismantlement for Eight Surplus Production Reactors (thousands of 1990 \$)

Cost Category	Reactor								Totals
	105-F	105-H	105-C	105-B	105-DR	105-D	105-KE	105-KW	
Safe Storage									
Initial repairs	1,550.7	1,642.3	859.9	435.3	1,085.4	372.3	277.6	277.6	6,501.1
Annual maintenance and surveillance ^(a)	1,462.5	1,521.0	1,579.5	1,638.0	1,696.5	1,755.0	1,813.5	1,872.0	13,338.0
5-yr maintenance	863.5	887.7	620.4	831.6	1,513.2	1,164.0	223.6	223.6	6,327.6
20-yr roof repairs	602.7	629.4	800.4	564.6	783.3	936.4	591.6	591.6	5,500.0
Subtotals	4,479.4	4,680.4	3,860.2	3,469.5	5,078.4	4,227.7	2,906.3	2,964.8	31,666.7
Contingency (20%)	895.9	936.1	772.0	693.9	1,015.7	845.5	581.3	593.0	6,333.4
Total Safe-Storage Costs	5,375.3	5,616.5	4,632.2	4,163.4	6,094.1	5,073.2	3,487.6	3,557.8	38,000.1
Deferred Dismantlement									
Preparation	3,011.2	1,980.2	1,980.2	1,795.4	1,980.2	1,795.4	1,980.2	1,795.4	16,318.2
Dismantlement	21,191.1	21,191.1	21,519.5	21,473.4	21,191.1	21,144.9	22,141.2	22,141.2	171,993.5
Subtotals	24,202.3	23,171.3	23,499.7	23,268.8	23,171.3	22,940.3	24,121.4	23,936.6	188,311.7
Contingency (20%)	4,840.5	4,634.3	4,699.9	4,653.8	4,634.3	4,588.1	4,824.3	4,787.3	37,662.5
Building removal costs ^(b)	2,934.1	2,360.5	2,360.5	2,360.5	2,360.5	2,360.5	2,360.5	2,360.5	19,457.6
Ground-water monitoring system installation and monitoring ^(c)	1,492.2	1,492.2	1,492.2	1,492.2	1,492.2	1,492.2	1,492.2	1,492.2	11,937.6
Burial-ground costs, including liner/leachate collection system ^(d)	1,986.5	1,986.5	1,986.5	1,986.5	1,986.5	1,986.5	1,986.5	1,986.5	15,892.0
Total Deferred Dismantlement Costs	35,455.6	33,644.8	34,038.8	33,761.8	33,644.8	33,367.6	34,784.9	34,563.1	273,261.4
TOTAL COSTS	40,830.9	39,261.3	38,671.0	37,925.2	39,738.9	38,440.8	38,272.5	38,120.9	311,261.5

(a) Based on letter report by Hughes (1986); escalated to 1990 cost base.

(b) Adapted from Kaiser (1983) report and includes 30% contingency as well as selected adjustment factors for a fixed price contract; escalated to 1990 cost base. The higher removal cost for the F Reactor includes the cost of a mobile crane that is subsequently utilized for demolition of the other seven reactors as well.

(c) Includes 20% contingency based on a 1987 cost estimate supplied by Smith (1987); escalated to 1990 cost base.

(d) Includes 12% contingency; see Adams (1987) for details; escalated to 1990 cost base.

Decommissioning Costs; Safe Storage Followed by Deferred Dismantlement

TABLE K.8. Estimated Costs for Deferred Dismantlement of a Surplus Production Reactor

Activity	Cost (thousands of 1990 \$)(a)
<u>Predecommissioning</u>	
Satisfy regulatory requirements	76.7
Gather and analyze data	139.0
Develop work plans and procedures	336.2
Design/procure/test special equipment	468.5
Prepare site	369.7
Prepare reactor building	424.7
Repair rail spur	668.1
Decontaminate fuel storage basin	201.6
Establish decon/repair shop	154.6
<u>Building Equipment Removal</u>	
Remove valve pit equipment	54.0
Decontaminate HCR rooms	332.4
Decontaminate sample and instrument rooms	229.6
Decontaminate fan rooms	262.3
Remove miscellaneous contaminated equipment	461.6
Remove miscellaneous noncontaminated equipment	38.6
Construct railcar confinement structure	643.3
Establish railcar loading facility	175.8
Decontaminate downcomers	244.3
Remove and dispose of process piping	1,228.6
Remove and dispose of VSR equipment	313.3
Remove front and rear elevators	343.0
<u>Reactor Block Dismantlement, Disposal, and Monitoring</u>	
Install and inspect bridge crane	438.5
Construct reactor block confinement structure	54.2
Install and inspect arc saw	534.0
Remove top biological shield	738.7
Remove top thermal shield	116.7
Remove graphite block	3,615.3
Remove remaining thermal shields	356.0
Remove confinement control structures	187.6
Decontaminate and deactivate repair shop	78.0
Package radioactive waste	1,223.2
Burial ground (200-West Area), including protective barrier and liner/leachate collection system	1,986.5(b)
Construct ground-water monitoring system (200-West Area)	164.3
26.5-yr ground-water monitoring system operating cost	1,079.2
<u>Building Demolition/Restoration</u>	
Demolish reactor base	667.2
Demolish building and building foundation(c)	2,432.2
Restore site	34.0
<u>Generic Activities</u>	
Engineering support	1,263.2
Radiation monitoring	767.7
Quality assurance/quality control	270.1
Supervision and secretarial	1,315.1
Services(d) (25% of labor, material, and equipment costs)	2,613.9
Final report	46.8
Subtotals	29,864.5
Contingency (20%)(e)	<u>5,089.2</u>
TOTAL COST FOR DEFERRED DISMANTLEMENT	34,953.7

(a) Includes labor, equipment, waste disposal, and contractor costs for each activity.

(b) This activity includes a 12% contingency (Adams 1987), and the contingency is included in the activity cost presented in the table.

(c) The activity utilizes a 30% contingency as well as other adjustment factors adapted from KEH R-83-14 (Kaiser 1983); these costs are included in the activity cost presented in the table.

(d) Services include items obtained from other onsite contractors such as laundry, utilities, fire protection and patrol, transportation, medical aid, etc.

(e) The 20% contingency applies to all activity costs in the table except building demolishing and removal and burial-ground costs; see also footnotes (b) and (c).

Decommissioning Costs; In Situ Decommissioning

larger (see Chapter 3, Tables 3.10 and 3.11 for details); thus, deferred dismantlement costs are higher for the KE and KW Reactors.

K.5.2 Waste-Site Costs

The 200-West Area waste-site costs for the dismantled reactor blocks are presented in Table K.9. The table summarizes the costs associated with constructing a protective barrier, a warning marker system, and a liner/leachate collection system.

K.6 IN SITU DECOMMISSIONING

Decommissioning of a surplus production reactor by in situ decommissioning is the least complex of the proposed decommissioning alternatives. The specific activities associated with the in situ decommissioning alternative are discussed in detail in Chapter 3, Section 3.5, and are not repeated here.

The original analyses presented in Section 3.5 were based on three separate estimates, adjusted to a 1986 cost base: 1) the Kaiser (1985) report; 2) the Adams (1987) report; and 3) a report by Smith (1987). The detailed estimates developed by Kaiser and Westinghouse Hanford (Adams 1987) were averaged over all reactors to obtain values for each task for the "average" reactor.

K.6.1 Costs of In Situ Decommissioning

The estimated costs of in situ decommissioning are summarized in Table K.10. The costs shown in the table are based on the three separate costs estimates mentioned previously, escalated to a 1990 cost base. The total cost at the bottom of the table includes site support services (25% of staff labor, materials, and equipment) and contingencies (20% of all costs, except 12% on placement of earth, gravel, and seeding). The total cost for in situ decommissioning of all eight reactors is estimated to be \$193 million.

Individual and collective reactor burial mound costs (in 1990 dollars) are presented in Table K.11. The table summarizes the costs associated with

Decommissioning Costs; In Situ Decommissioning

TABLE K.9. Estimated 200-West Area Burial-Site Costs Associated with Burial of the Dismantled Reactor Blocks^(a)

Item	Costs (thousands of 1990 \$)	
	Per Block	Total for 8 Blocks
Direct Costs:		
Excavation	125.3	1,002.4
Hauling of soils/sand/gravel	137.3	1,098.4
Installation of soil/clay mix	391.3	3,130.4
Installation of geotextile	107.8	862.4
Installation of geomembrane	77.1	616.8
Backfilling	164.6	1,316.8
Revegetation	2.5	20.0
Installation of subsurface markers	22.8	182.4
Installation of surface markers	217.2	1,737.6
Contractor overhead and markup	<u>175.7</u>	<u>1,405.6</u>
Total construction	1,421.6	11,372.8
Construction management	108.3	866.4
Contract management	108.3	866.4
Engineering design and inspection	135.5	1,084.0
Escalation	0	0
Contingency (12%)	<u>212.8</u>	<u>1,702.4</u>
TOTALS	1,986.5	15,892.0

(a) From the Adams (1987) report; escalated to 1990 cost base.

using a protective barrier and warning marker system but without using a liner/leachate collection system.

K.6.2 Waste-Site Costs

With in situ decommissioning, each reactor facility would be left in place. No wastes would be removed and transferred to another disposal location; therefore, no separate costs would be incurred for activities at another waste site.

Decommissioning Costs; In Situ Decommissioning

TABLE K.10. Estimated Costs for In Situ Decommissioning of an "Average" Surplus Production Reactor

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Cost (thousands of 1990 \$)</u>
<u>Predecommissioning</u>	
Satisfy regulatory requirements	76.7
Perform detailed radiation survey	5.2
Develop drawings for demonstration, etc. (1/8 share)	135.1
Prepare work plans and procedures	51.7
Procure concrete batch plant, etc. (1/8 share)	73.9
Assemble mobilization/training team	27.8
Construct ground-water monitoring system	<u>217.2</u> ^(a)
Subtotal	587.6
<u>Decommissioning</u>	
Fix contamination	568.5
Fill below-grade voids	174.5
Fill above-grade voids	207.4
Remove roofs and superstructures	536.0
Demolish shielding walls	13.1
Remove concrete block	127.6
Mound/gravel/seed	6,910.9
Engineering surveillance and closeout (1/8 share)	43.2
Radiation monitoring	75.8
Supervision	98.8
QA	54.1
Support services (25% of staff labor, materials, equipment cost)	<u>474.8</u>
Subtotal	9,284.7
<u>Postdecommissioning</u>	
97.5-yr monitoring system operating cost	<u>10,584.4</u> ^(a)
Subtotal	20,456.7
State sales tax (at 7.8% on purchased materials/equipment usage, etc.)	106.2
Contingency (20%)	2,730.4
Contingency (12%) ^(b)	<u>829.3</u>
TOTAL AVERAGE COST FOR IN SITU DECOMMISSIONING	24,122.6

(a) Based on a cost estimate by Smith (1987);
escalated to 1990 cost base.

(b) This contingency applies only to the mound/
gravel/seed activity.

Decommissioning Alternatives; References

TABLE K.11. Estimated Burial-Site Costs for the In Situ Decommissioning Alternative^(a)

Item	Costs (thousands of 1990 \$)	
	Per Block	Total for 8 Blocks
Direct Costs:		
Hauling of soils/sand/gravel	1,115.2	8,922
Installation of riprap	659.3	5,274
Installation of soil/clay mix	972.8	7,782
Installation of geotextile	357.7	2,862
Revegetation	0.9	7
Installation of subsurface markers	7.6	61
Installation of surface markers	1,737.6	13,901
Contractor overhead and markup	<u>688.1</u>	<u>5,505</u>
Total construction	5,539.2	44,314
Construction management	422.1	3,377
Contract management	422.1	3,377
Engineering design and inspection	527.5	4,220
Escalation	0	0
Contingency (12%)	<u>829.3</u>	<u>6,634</u>
TOTALS	7,740.2	61,922

(a) Estimates made specifically for this EIS; escalated to 1990 cost base.

(b) Totals have been rounded to the nearest thousand.

K.7 REFERENCES

Adams, M. R. 1987. Conceptual Designs and Cost Estimates for Reactor Disposal Alternatives (Letter Report). 8752228, Westinghouse Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.

DOE-RL 5700.3. March 1985. Cost Estimating, Analysis, and Cost Standardization. U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington.

Hughes, M. C. 1986. Cost Estimate for Annual Surveillance and Maintenance of the Eight Shutdown Hanford 100 Area Reactors (Letter Report). UNC Nuclear Industries, Richland, Washington.

Decommissioning Alternatives; References

Kaiser Engineers Hanford Company (Kaiser). 1983. Preliminary Engineering Study, Cocooning of 105 F Reactor. KEH R-83-14, Kaiser Engineers Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.

Kaiser Engineers Hanford Company (Kaiser). 1985. Decommissioning Conceptual Study for In Situ Decommissioning of Eight 105 Reactor Buildings in the 100 Areas. KEH R-84-9, Kaiser Engineers Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.

Kaiser Engineers Hanford Company (Kaiser). 1986. Reactor Block Removal Study (Letter Report). KEH-86-22, Kaiser Engineers Hanford Company, Richland, Washington.

Konzek, G. J. 1989. Development of Cost Escalation Factors for Updating 1986 Decommissioning Costs of Eight Surplus Production Reactors at Hanford to a 1990 Base (Letter Report). Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington.

Rockwell Hanford Operations (Rockwell). 1985. Preliminary Cost Estimates of Route Preparation and Burial of 100 Area Reactors and Listing of Applicable Environmental Regulations (Letter Report). R85-4910, Rockwell Hanford Operations, Richland, Washington.

Smith, R. M. 1987. RCRA Compliance--Ground-Water Monitoring for the SPRD EIS and Revision to RCRA Ground-Water Monitoring Design, SPRD EIS (Letter Reports). PNL-6562 and PNL-6562 Rev. 1, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington.

APPENDIX L

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION ON THE RELEASE RATES OF
RADIONUCLIDES FROM THE GRAPHITE MODERATOR BLOCKS

APPENDIX L

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION ON THE RELEASE RATES OF RADIONUCLIDES FROM THE GRAPHITE MODERATOR BLOCKS

As noted in Appendix D, very little data were available on which to base the estimates of release rates of radionuclides from the reactor-block materials. Subsequent investigations have provided additional information on the release (leaching) rates of carbon-14 and chlorine-36 from irradiated graphite, including graphite retrieved from one of the surplus production reactors at the Hanford Site. The purpose of this Appendix is to discuss the supplemental information and the implications of that information in regard to the estimated release rates of carbon-14 and chlorine-36 from the graphite moderator blocks of the surplus reactors.

L.1 RESULTS OF SUBSEQUENT STUDIES

Gray and Morgan (1988) measured the leach rates of carbon-14 and chlorine-36 from samples cut from a graphite bar that had been irradiated in the Y Test Hole in the Hanford C Reactor during the entire time that C Reactor was in operation. For various reasons (Gray and Morgan 1988), the radionuclide inventory in this bar is not considered to be typical of that in the graphite moderator bars of C Reactor, or in the moderator bars of other Hanford reactors. The relative leach rates, however, are thought to be independent of the radionuclide concentrations. Moreover, because this graphite bar was manufactured for use in construction of one of the Hanford reactors and was irradiated in one of the Hanford reactors, the leach rate data should be more directly applicable than should data obtained from graphites manufactured under other conditions and irradiated in other reactors.

The following general observations can be noted in regard to the data presented by Gray and Morgan (1988):

- The ratios of the initial release rate of chlorine-36 over the initial release rate of carbon-14 from the same sample were consistently higher than the ratio predicted for long-term leaching.

Supplemental Information; Results of Subsequent Studies

- The initial release rate of carbon-14 from the samples leached at 20°C was about 20% of the rate predicted using Equation (D.2); however, the decrease in leach rate with time was less pronounced than that reported by White et al. (1984).
- The initial release rate of chlorine-36 from the samples leached at 20°C was higher than predicted; however, the measured leach rate rapidly decreased to less than the predicted long-term rate.
- At the end of 8 weeks, the leach rates at 20°C were in reasonable agreement with the predicted rates for both isotopes.
- At higher temperatures (50°C and 90°C), both initial and final leach rates for both isotopes were lower than the predicted rates.

In a subsequent study, Gray and Morgan (1989) measured the release rates of carbon-14 and chlorine-36 from three irradiated graphite samples obtained from the moderator block of the G-2 Reactor at Marcoule, France. The source of the raw materials used to manufacture this graphite, the process used to purify the moderator bars, and the environmental conditions to which the graphite was exposed during operation of the reactor represent major differences between these samples and those obtained from C Reactor at Hanford. Because of these differences, the leach rate results from the French graphite should not be assumed to apply, a priori, to the Hanford moderator graphites.

The results obtained by Gray and Morgan (1989) from their leach rate studies (at 20°C) using irradiated graphite from the G-2 Reactor can be summarized as follows:

- The ratios of the initial release rate of chlorine-36 over the initial release rate of carbon-14 from the same sample varied by two orders of magnitude (one order of magnitude higher and one order of magnitude lower, for different samples, compared to the ratios measured for the samples from C Reactor).
- The initial release rates of carbon-14 from the three samples were higher than predicted using Equation (D.2); moreover, the release rates decreased very slowly as a function of time, averaging about two orders of magnitude higher than the predicted rate at the end of the 13-week study.

Supplemental Information; Implications of New Results

- In contrast to carbon-14, the release rates of chlorine-36 decreased rapidly with time. However, at the end of the 13-week study, the release rates were still about one order of magnitude higher than the predicted long-term release rate.

L.2 IMPLICATIONS OF NEW RESULTS

As discussed in previous publications (Morgan 1985; Gray and Morgan 1988), the carbon-14 and chlorine-36 may exist in more than one chemical (and physical) state in irradiated graphite. Furthermore, one can expect that each chemical state would exhibit a unique leach rate, with the measured (gross) removal rate being the sum of the individual rates times the relative concentrations of the isotope in each state. By postulating the existence of only two chemical states for each isotope, one can explain the general features and the differences in leaching behavior that have been reported to date. A more comprehensive analysis of the data will be required to determine if more than two chemical states are needed to adequately describe the details of the observed leaching behavior. Additional studies will also be required to characterize the different chemical states, the concentrations of radioisotopes in each state, and their relative distributions within the moderator graphite.

At the present time, however, a "best estimate" for the long-term release rates of carbon-14 and chlorine-36 from the graphite in the moderators of the surplus Hanford reactors is that they will not exceed the predicted release rates given in Appendix D. Therefore, there is no need to alter previous estimates of long-term leach rates for either isotope based on these new data concerning leach rates. Doses calculated for leaching of graphite are unchanged with inclusion of the new data.

Supplemental Information; References

L.3 REFERENCES

Gray, W. J., and W. C. Morgan. 1988. Leaching of ^{14}C and ^{36}Cl from Hanford Reactor Graphite. PNL-6769, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington.

Gray, W. J., and W. C. Morgan. 1989. Leaching of ^{14}C and ^{36}Cl from Irradiated French Graphite. PNL-6989, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington.

Morgan, W. C. 1985. "Migration and Availability of Carbon-14 from Irradiated Graphite." In A Compilation of Carbon-14 Data, R. A. Paasch, ed., UNI-3499, pp. 1-18. UNC Nuclear Industries, Inc., Richland, Washington.

White, I. F., G. M. Smith, L. J. Saunders, C. J. Kaye, T. J. Martin, G. H. Clarke, and M. W. Wakerley. 1984. Assessment of Management Modes for Graphite from Reactor Decommissioning. EUR-9232, Commission of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

APPENDIX M

ACCIDENT SCENARIOS

APPENDIX M

ACCIDENT SCENARIOS

The DOE has continued to review the accident scenarios presented in the DEIS. The following information is provided to supplement the discussions in Chapter 5 of the DEIS.

1. Regarding the dose calculations for the bounding accident scenario for the two one-piece removal alternatives, the assumption was made that less than 8 hours would be required to immobilize a small pile of cold, broken-up graphite, because work crews (emergency response crews) would accompany the reactor at all times during its transport (see Section 5.1.2.1). The reason why the reactor would fall off the tractor was not discussed, but it was assumed in the DEIS that this event would not immobilize the work crews.

While it could be argued that a release period greater than 8 hours should have been used, the application of the 8-hour release was particularly conservative. The analysis assumed that the "maximally exposed individual" remained in the plume of radioactively contaminated air emanating from the accident site for the full 8 hours. The atmospheric dispersion model used to calculate the resulting dose to the individual (see Section E.3.3.4) is based on providing a 1-hour average airborne contaminant concentration that will not be exceeded 95 percent of the time. Using an 8-hour exposure period in the model is conservative because there is a high probability that the wind direction and turbulence would change in that length of time. Thus the calculated dose conservatively assumes an 8-hour release, a stable wind pattern for the entire release period, and that the individual remains in the air path for the entire release.

2. Regarding a potential transport accident scenario involving a flammable liquid (e.g., gasoline) and the reactor graphite in the two one-piece removal alternatives, such a potential scenario was not considered for four reasons. First, the haul road would be a special, single-use road that avoids high traffic areas of the Hanford Site. Second, the rate of travel of the tractors that carry the reactor blocks would be slow enough that ample time would be available for establishing suitable roadblocks at road crossings. Third, the graphite would still be encased in the heavy biological shield and would not be affected by the fire. Fourth, even if the fire were to breach the shield, significant quantities of the graphite within would not burn (see Section 5.1.2.2).

Accident Scenarios

3. Regarding a potential railcar accident scenario involving a collision at a railroad crossing between a railcar containing 3 percent of the total reactor graphite and a vehicle carrying a flammable liquid (e.g., gasoline) that could occur during the deferred dismantlement alternative, the following assumptions were made in the analysis:
 - i. The 30-minute fire would bound the radiological impacts.
 - ii. The fire would be limited to 30 minutes.
 - iii. The impact forces would crush only 1 percent of the graphite shipment into fine powder.
 - iv. Only 1 percent of the powder (i.e., 0.01 percent of the graphite shipment) during the fire would result in resuspensions that would determine the source term (atmospheric release) from this accident.

These assumptions are conservative for the following reasons:

i and ii. As discussed in the above analysis of potential accidents for the one-piece removal alternatives, the reactor graphite is not combustible under this accident condition and therefore the duration of the fire is not a significant factor. The fire was utilized in this scenario to provide a means for resuspending the graphite powder in the accident. The important factors used to define how much graphite powder is assumed to be resuspended are discussed below.

iii. The assumption that the impact forces would crush only 1 percent of the graphite to a fine powder is an engineering estimate. Based on past experience at Hanford with handling reactor graphite, very minor amounts of dust are generated when the graphite is fractured. One percent is considered conservative but no formal study was used to develop the value. Although 1 percent is considered conservative, an increase in the release fraction by a factor of five would still not result in a likelihood of a health effect.

iv. The assumption that 1 percent of the graphite powder would be resuspended is derived from two documents referenced in the DEIS (see Sections 5.3.1 and 5.5.1.2) and other sources in the literature. A review of these sources reveals that resuspension rates can vary from as high as 10 percent to less than 0.00001 percent depending on the resuspension mechanism and particulate. One percent was selected as a reasonable yet conservative value.

4. Regarding the in situ decommissioning alternative, DOE concluded that there are no credible accidents that would result in the release of radioactive materials. DOE believes that this conclusion is valid after considering the potential impacts of adverse weather conditions and the

Accident Scenarios

loss of integrity of temporary structures during the demolishing and burial stages of this decommissioning alternative. As indicated in the DEIS (see Section 5.3.1), the bulk (a 10-to-1 peak-to-average ratio was assumed) of the radioactive inventory is in the interior part of the reactor block, which remains sealed in the in situ alternative. The graphite would never be exposed and is therefore not available for resuspension. Potential areas of contamination on the outside would be immobilized with surface coatings before any exterior structure would be removed. Therefore, the quantity of radioactive material potentially available for resuspension would be insignificant.

APPENDIX N

ERRATA

APPENDIX N

ERRATA

This section contains errata for the DEIS. Errata are listed by page number (p.) and line number (L) or by page number, table number (T), and line number, as appropriate.

<u>Location</u>	<u>Change</u>
p. 1.6, L 6	Change "8,240" to "approximately 80,000"
p. 1.7, L 24	Change "(653 tonnes)" to "(RCRA, 653 tonnes)"
p. 1.13, L 7	Change "\$181 million" to "\$179 million"
p. 1.14, T 1.1, L 7	Change "\$27.7 M" to "\$25.4 M"
p. 1.14, T 1.1, L 12	Change "\$181.2 M" to "\$178.9 M"
p. 1.15, T 1.2, L 11	Change "deffered" to "deferred"
p. 1.15, T 1.2, L 16	Change "181" to "179"
p. 2.1, L 12	Change the purpose of decommissioning to read: "The purpose of decommissioning is to isolate any remaining radioactive or hazardous wastes in a manner that will minimize environmental impacts, especially potential health and safety impacts on the public."
p. 3.8 through 3.22	Change header from "Immediate-One Piece Removal" to "Immediate One-Piece Removal"
p. 3.11, T 3.2, L 6	Remove line below "Subtotal" row, add line below "Service charge" row (L 5)
p. 3.13, T 3.3, L 38	Change "24.75" to "31.84"
p. 3.13, T 3.3, L 48	Change "(g)" to "(c,g)" and change "985.49" to "846.35"
p. 3.13, T 3.3, L 49	Change "593.36" to "474.75"

Errata

<u>Location</u>	<u>Change</u>
p. 3.13, T 3.3, L 52	Change "22,606.18" to "23,877.38"
p. 3.13, T 3.3, L 61	Between "(Kaiser 1983)" and the period, insert "and these costs are included in the activity cost presented in the table"
p. 3.18, T 3.6, L 20	Change "2,900" to "32,900"
p. 3.27, T 3.7, L 14	Change "Equipment materials" to "Equipment/materials"
p. 3.27, T 3.7, L 17	Change "12,855.50" to "12,856.50"
p. 3.27, T 3.7, L 18	Change "17,815.36" to "17,815.35"
p. 3.27, T 3.7, L 20	Change "74,485.82" to "7,448.82"
p. 3.27, T 3.7, L 28	Change "6,722.74" to "16,722.74"
p. 3.34, L 24	Delete sentence beginning "Safe-storage costs..."
p. 3.38, T 3.8, L 32	Change citation from "Westinghouse 1987" to "Adams 1987"
p. 3.46, L 1	Change "Kaiser (1987)" to "Kaiser (1985)"
p. 3.46, L 6	Change "\$181 million" to "\$179 million"
p. 3.47, T 3.13, L 39	Change "2,800.2" to "2,519.6"
p. 3.47, T 3.13, L 42	Change "22,647.3" to "22,366.7"
p. 3.47, T 3.13, L 50	Add footnote (d) as follows: "(d) This contingency applies only to the mound/gravel/seed activity."
p. 3.52, T 3.15, L 16	Change "181" to "179"
p. 3.55, T 3.18, L 10	Change "27.7" to "25.4"
p. 3.55, T 3.18, L 11	Change "181.2" to "178.9"
p. 3.57	Add the underlined word to the last sentence in the first paragraph: "No significant <u>short-term</u> adverse ecological, socioeconomic, or resource impacts were identified for any alternative." Add the following sentence at the end of the second paragraph: "No significant long-term adverse ecological impacts were identified for any alternative."

Errata

<u>Location</u>	<u>Change</u>
p. 4.33, L 27	Change "About 13,000 persons are" to "In September 1989, about 12,600 persons were"
p. 4.39, L 27	Replace "who" with "many of whom"
p. 4.41, L 3	After "places." insert "For example, the Treaty of 1855 between the Yakima Indian Nation and the U.S. Government states that 'The exclusive right of taking fish in all streams where running through or bordering said reservation, is further secured to said confederated tribes and bands of Indians, as also the right of taking fish at all usual and accustomed places, in common with citizens of the Territory, and of erecting temporary buildings for curing them; together with the privilege of hunting, gathering roots and berries, and pasturing their horses and cattle upon open and unclaimed land.'"
p. 4.41, L 8	Delete sentence beginning "Consultation..." and substitute "Consultation with Indian religious leaders is required if the potential exists for abridgement of religious freedom, as set forth in the American Indian Religious Freedom Act."
p. 5.35	Add the following paragraph to Section 5.10.2: "The use of standard industrial protective work procedures will minimize any impacts to workers from the handling, recycling, storage, or disposal of friable asbestos, mercury, polychlorinated biphenyls, lead, or cadmium."
p. 7.1, L 16	Following J. V. Robinson, insert: "Editorial assistance was provided by V. L. Harrison, K. A. Parnell, and P. L. Novak."
p. 8.1	Add the following definitions: "smearable - removable by wiping; stochastic - probability of occurrence is proportional to dose; stochastic effects - malignant and hereditary disease for which the probability of an effect occurring, rather than its severity, is regarded as a function of dose without threshold"
p. 8.7	Add the following definition: "Masonite - a trademark of the Masonite Corporation that refers to a board produced from byproduct wood chips that are reduced to fibers by high-pressure steam, and then pressed into board without the use of chemicals."

Errata

<u>Location</u>	<u>Change</u>
p. 8.12	Add the following definition: "Transite - a trade-name of the Johns Manville Corporation that refers to a construction or insulating material made of asbestos fibers and Portland cement molded under hydraulic pressure."
p. B.3, T B.2, L 1	Move "Reactor" to Column 2 from Column 3
p. C.5, L 22	Change "3.3" to "C.3"
p. E.7, L 9 and 10	Change "stochastic dose limit" to "dose limit for stochastic effects" and change "stochastic effective dose equivalent" to "(stochastic) dose equivalent"
p. E.32, T E.11, L 20	Change "during 1982 and 1983" to "from 1976 through 1983"
p. E.38, L 21	Change " 1×10^4 " to " 1×10^{14} "
p. F.13, T F.4	No change. The health-effect risk factor range used in the DEIS (100 to 1,000 health effects per million person-rem) encompasses new cancer risk factors published in BEIR V (National Academy of Sciences, Committee on the Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation. 1990. <u>Health Effects of Exposure to Low Levels of Ionizing Radiation</u> , BEIR V.)
Index	Add Index to DEIS (pages N.5 and N.6)

Errata

INDEX

Alternatives	1.3, 3.1
Accidents	5.8, 5.11, 5.12, 5.15
Air quality	1.19, 4.21
Barrier, protective	G.6, H.1
CERCLA	6.5
Climate	1.18, 4.17
Costs	3.10, 3.26, 3.37, 3.45
Cumulative impacts	1.25, 5.37
Deferred dismantlement	1.11, 3.31
Deferred removal	1.10, 3.22, 3.31
Ecology	1.20, 4.26
Flooding	G.35, G.37
Floodplains/wetlands	B.1
Geology	1.17, 4.7
Hazardous materials/wastes	1.23, A.27
Health effects	F.1
Historic preservation	4.38, J.1
Hydrologic modeling	C.5
Hydrology	1.17, 4.11
Immediate removal	1.9, 3.8
Impacts	
long-term	1.22, 5.1, 5.16, G.1
short-term	1.22, 5.1
Indian tribes	4.39
Infiltration	G.1, H.1
In situ decommissioning	1.12, 3.42
Intrusion	5.26, G.27, G.30, G.31
Inventory	A.16, A.29
Land use	5.34, 5.36
Mitigation	5.36
Meteorology	1.18, 4.17
Monitoring	1.19, 4.24
No action	1.7, 3.6
Permits	1.25, 6.1

Errata

INDEX (contd)

Radiation dose	1.22, 3.16, 3.30, 3.40, 3.48, 5.8, 5.11, 5.12, 5.15, 5.16, 5.39
Radiation dose calculations	E.1
Radioactive wastes	3.14, 3.29, 3.37, 3.48
RCRA	6.5
Recharge	G.4
Regulations	1.25, 6.1
Release rates	C.2, D.1
Resource requirements	5.32
Riprap	H.5
Safe storage	1.10, 1.11, 3.22, 3.31
Seismology	1.18, 4.20, G.39
Socioeconomics	1.21, 1.23, 4.33, 5.31, 5.38
Threatened and endangered species	4.29, I.1
Transportation	1.22, 4.41
Transporter	3.17
Water quality	1.19, 4.22

APPENDIX O

LETTERS, TRANSCRIPTS, EXHIBITS

LETTERS

L001A D'Arcy P. Banister
U.S. Department of the Interior

L001B Alton Haymaker

L002 Dennis R. Arter

L003 J. R. Young

L004 Roger C. Gibson

L005 Jacob E. Thomas
Washington Historic Preservation
Officer

L006 Lourdes Fuentes-Williams
Coalition Organizing Hanford Opposition

L007 June A. Sawyer

L008 Richard L. Larson
Washington Department of Transportation

L009 John T. Greeves
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

L010 Dr. and Mrs. Michael Berg

L011 H. Dale Hellewell

L012 Ora Mae and Floyd Orton

L013 Dennis D. Skeate
Benton County Management Team

L014, L015 M. J. Szulinski

L016 Beulah L. Sumner

L017 Beth D. Marsau

L018 Jim Thomas
Hanford Education Action League

L019 J. Ross and Lois H. Adams

L020 Stephen J. Doyle

Letters

L021	Bonnie Tucker Doyle
L022	The Honorable John Poynor Richland City Council
L023	Johnson
L024	Mr. and Mrs. M. W. Bradshaw
L025	The Honorable Max E. Benitz Washington State Senate
L026	Barbara Richardson
L027	Theresa Potts
L028	Alan Richards
L029	Barbara Harrah
L030	Lantz Rowland
L031	Thomas M. Clement
L032	Colleen Bennett and Adele Newton League of Women Voters of Oregon
L033	The Honorable Brad Fisher Kennewick City Council
L034	The Honorable Ed Hendler Pasco City Council
L035	Hans C. F. Ripfel Tri-Cities Technical Council
L036	Tom Lande
L037	David E. Clapp Washington Department of Health and Human Services
L038	The Honorable Robert Drake Benton County Board of Commissioners
L039	Richard J. Leumont Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society
L040	Richard J. Leumont Columbia River Conservation League

Letters

L041 T. H. McGreer

L042 Christine O. Gregoire
Washington Department of Ecology

L043 J. Ernesto Baldi

L044 Michael R. Cummings

L045 Ray Olney
Yakima Indian Nation

L046 [duplicate of L045]

L047 Tom Wynn
Trail and District Environmental

Network

L048 Michael Gilfillan
Kootenay Nuclear Study Group

L049 Ronald A. Lee
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,
Region 10

L050 Rex Buck, Jr.
Wanapum Tribe

L051 Laurel Kay Grove

L052 The Honorable Dean Sutherland
Washington State Senate

L053 C. M. Conselman
Columbia Section, American Society of
Civil Engineers

L001A

TAKE
PRIDE IN
AMERICA



United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF MINES

WESTERN FIELD OPERATIONS CENTER
EAST 360 3RD AVENUE
SPOKANE, WASHINGTON 99202-1413

April 24, 1989

Mr. Tom Bauman
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
RE: SPRD-DRAFT EIS
P.O. Box 550
Richland, Washington 99352

Dear Mr. Bauman:

The draft document on decommissioning eight reactors at the Hanford Site is incomplete as concerns possible distant future mineral or energy resource exploration and development.

The document addresses the possibility of human intrusion as the result of shallow water-well drilling, but does not address mineral or energy resources that may exist at the site or possible environmental consequences of future exploration in search of such resources. No mention is made of the possibility of ground-water contamination resulting from deep drilling in search of hydrocarbon (primarily methane) resources. W. S. Lingley, Jr., and T. J. Walsh, in Issues Relating to Petroleum Drilling Near the Proposed High-Level Waste Repository at Hanford (Washington Geologic Newsletter, Washington State Department of Natural Resources, Olympia, v. 14, No. 3, August, 1986, pp. 10-19), suggest that possible petroleum reserves in the Hanford area range between 40 billion and 1 trillion cubic feet of methane per trap.

It is imperative that the Department of Energy address these possible resources and the environmental effects that may result from exploration or extraction of them.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this draft document.

Sincerely,

D'Arcy P. Banister, Supervisor
Mineral Issue Involvement Section
Branch of Engineering and Economic Analysis

L001B

Speed Letter

To Dept. of Energy
Karen Wheelbas, Dir. of
Recland, Wa.

From Alton Haymaker Tom
1721 Cottonwood DR.
Pasco Wa 99301

Subject De commissioning of eight reactors

MAY 08 1989

MESSAGE

Dear Karen Wheelbas,
Thank you for including my name on receiving
E I S draft. 40 years ago I was much
younger and a laboratory technician at 100F
those were interesting times in my life.

Date

Signed

REPLY

I will make an effort to let the Dept.
know of my concerns.
P.S. Please eat Cherries.

Sincerely,

Date 5-6-89

Signed

Alton Haymaker

Wilson Jones
Carbonless

RECIPIENT—RETAIN WHITE COPY, RETURN PINK COPY
87

Columbia River Cherries

Alton & Joan Haymaker
1721 Cottonwood Drive
Pasco, WA 99301



Sweet & Sassy

(509) 266-4629

MAY 31 1989

L002

Dennis R. Arter, P.E.

TICOMP
116 N. Fifth
Pasco, WA 99301
509/547-1243

May 26, 1989

Tom Bauman
US Dept of Energy
P.O. Box 550
Richland, WA 99352

**Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors
Draft DOE/EIS-0119**

Thank you for providing me with a copy of the draft document for review. I have examined the contents and find it to be well prepared, comprehensive and adequately documented. I have no comments of an adverse nature.

Please request your contractor to change their records to reflect my correct mailing address, as shown above. I moved from the Sylvester Street location three years ago.

Yours truly,



Dennis R. Arter

JUN 16 1989

9021 W. Sagemoor Road
Pasco, WA 99301
June 13, 1989

Ms. Karen J. Wheelless
Office of Communications, Richland Operations Office
U. S. Department of Energy
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Ms. Wheelless:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on DOE/EIS-0119D, the draft EIS on decommissioning of the eight surplus production reactors at the Hanford Site. I have nine comments and suggestions.

1. Grossly Overestimated Background Radiation Dose

Throughout this report the natural background radiation dose received annually by an average individual living near Hanford is stated to be about 300 mr. This is five times as large as the actual background radiation dose of about 60 mr (For example, see pages 4.4 to 4.6 of PNL-6120). Since it is inconceivable that either DCE or the authors of this report do not know the background radiation dose, this gross exaggeration appears to be a deliberate attempt to exaggerate the health effects of the background radiation to make the already trivial effects of the decommissioning appear even more trivial. No wonder the public does not trust DOE to turn out a correct or unbiased analysis!

2. Underestimated Catastrophic Flood Damage

The accident scenarios mention the effects of a catastrophic 50% failure of Grand Coulee Dam and the resultant flood elevations. Because Coulee is a concrete gravity dam, the only reasonable cause for such a failure is an enemy attack. Any enemy capable of such an attack probably wouldn't attack Coulee. They would probably attack Mica Dam and probably near the height of a spring flood. This would release many times as much water and probably would result in higher flood elevations and a much longer flood time.

3. Insignificant Digit Overkill

Cost tables such as Table 3.8 contain as many as 8 significant digits for preliminary order-of-magnitude cost estimates that contain about 25% contingency and such gross assumptions as the K Reactors having about the same costs as the smaller reactors. Such tables showing the breakdowns of costs for the individual reactors should be eliminated because they imply that detailed cost estimates were made for each reactor (which presumably did not occur) or the tables should be simplified by eliminating the details and/or rounding down to no more than 3 significant digits.

It is also suggested that another bullet item be added to section 3.0 that states whether detailed cost estimates were made for each reactor or an estimate was made for a typical reactor and adjustments were made for gross differences among the reactors.

4. Contaminated Ground Decommissioning

Possibly it is considered outside the scope of this EIS, but there is no mention of the need or lack of need for decontaminating the square miles of ground that were contaminated by leaks in the effluent lines and retention basins and by deliberate

releases of up to 20,000 gpm of reactor effluent for long periods of time into cribs near the retention basins and into a natural sump south of 105C.

5. Superfluous APPENDIX E Educational Material

Much of this appendix is simply a description of the methodologies used (for example, Sections E.2 and E.3) and could be covered by a simple statement that the methodologies used are those in the appropriate references. EISs are not supposed to be educational documents loaded up with great quantities of information copied out of the literature to impress the readers with the great technical expertise of the authors.

6. Poor Image Created by APPENDIX F

APPENDIX F is a rehash of the extensive literature on radiological health effects and DOE's conclusions (apparently only for this EIS) as to what method will be used to evaluate those effects. This leaves the reader with the impression that "Ye Gads! DOE and the other government agencies have spent many years and millions of dollars studying this subject and still do not have a standard set of rules or assumptions that should be used for every U.S. Government EIS!"

DOE and the other government agencies could improve their images (and probably save millions of dollars) by issuing a document that states the health-risk factors that should be used and then simply referring to it when they write an EIS.

7. Fantasyland Dose Calculations

The radiation dose estimates are based on the assumption that the Hanford Site would be abandoned after 100 years. First of all, this assumption does not agree with the statement on P. 5.1 that accident conditions chosen describe the most serious incidents that could be reasonably postulated to occur. It is completely ridiculous, based on the current social and legal climate, to assume that the site would be abandoned when we know that it contains a major radioactive waste disposal site.

Then, the radiation dose scenarios contain the "fantasyland" implied assumption that after the site is abandoned, all records and memories of what happened at Hanford would be lost! This would be expected to occur only if there were some global catastrophe that destroyed all written records, and presumably at the same time essentially all human life. Then, majestically, within 10,000 years the human race is rejuvenated and its technology advances so fast that this new human race has well drills that can drill through many inches of steel reactor shield (see page G.28) without even slowing down the drill enough that the operator might notice that it is no longer drilling through sand, gravel, and rock! I again refer you to the statement that accident conditions chosen describe the most serious incidents that could be reasonably postulated to occur. We sure don't have any well or geological drills now that have that amazing drilling capability, and it is unreasonable to expect anybody to ever use such a sophisticated drill when there is no reasonable reason to have one. Anybody with the technology to have well drills can also be reasonably expected to have enough sense to stop drilling and try to figure out what they hit and what the nature of it is before they blithely drill on and spread radioactivity around.

8. Need for Reasonable Long-term Impact Estimate

The most reasonable long-term impact scenario for this EIS is the one based on the assumption that the site will not be abandoned after 100 years. It is not apparent as to whether that alternative was actually evaluated and then described in the summary, particularly in Table 1.2. That table should either contain cost and dose data for the two alternatives for abandonment and non-abandonment or it should have a footnote (or text statement) that states which of those two alternatives is described by that table and what the difference would be (if any) for the other alternative.

Also, section 1.3.7, that refers to Table 1.2 contains no information on the quality of the data in that table. It would be helpful to have a statement in that section stating your belief as to whether the actual doses would be less than shown in that table, or larger.

Also, does the population dose in Table 1.2 include the maximum well dose and any

accident does? What is the significance of the well dose? Why single it out and not talk about the source of the other, much larger, doses shown in that table? How many wells would be drilled? You need more discussion of the contents of that table.

9. Suggested Response Procedure for Comments


DCE should let each commentor know what the response was to each comment.

It is very frustrating to have DCE acknowledge your comments , but not tell you what the response was, particularly if the final impact statement contains major revisions when compared to the draft statement.

It is suggested that DCE number each comment and then state on an attached comment disposal sheet what the response was, including the page numbers where the response occurs or the reason that no change was made in the document.

Thank you, again, for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely yours,



J. R. Young

JUN 16 1989 **L004**

HANFORD SURPLUS PRODUCTION REACTOR DECOMMISSIONING
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

TO: United States Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office

FROM: Maj. Roger C. Gibson(Ret.)
P. O. Box 992
Seattle, WA 98111-0992

Date: June 15, 1989

(Please print/type name, address and zip code clearly)

I would like to make the following comments on the DRAFT Surplus Production Reactor Decommissioning Environmental Impact Statement:

The following is a suggestion for the disposal of nuclear radio-
active waste: Nuclear waste should be broken up into fine
particles that will sink to great depths when dispersed over
large areas of the ocean where there is no or very little aquatic
life, and ocean currents are minimal or non-existent. The crushing,
pulverization, chopping up of the waste most likely could be per-
formed on land more conveniently than at sea, and then be dis-
persed with special machinery that would ensure wide dispersal.
By placing nuclear waste on land in storage depots, these depots
automatically become targets in a war. It is my understanding that
the Soviet government is continuing with nuclear reactor programs
because they would be military targets in war, and thus they act
as a deterrent to war.

Signature/

Roger C. Gibson
Maj. USAFR, Retired

Fold on lines and staple or tape before mailing. Include postage.

L005

CHUCK CLARKE
Director



JUN 16 1989

STATE OF WASHINGTON

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
OFFICE OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION

111 West Twenty-First Avenue, KL-11 • Olympia, Washington 98504-5411 • (206) 753-4011 • SCAN 234-4011

June 14, 1989

Mr. Tom Bauman
U.S. Dept. of Energy
Richland Operations Office
P.O. Box 550
Richland, WA 99352

Log Reference: 1275-F-DOE-09
Re: Decommissioning of Eight
Surplus Production Reactors at
the Hanford Site, Richland,
Washington

Dear Mr. Bauman:

We have reviewed the U.S. Department of Energy draft Environmental Impact Statement, Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS-0119D), March 1989 and would like to offer the following comments.


Appendix J of the EIS, National Historic Preservation Act Requirements, evaluates only two options with respect to the Hanford 105-B Reactor, which has been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The options identified are the no action alternative, which the EIS concludes is unacceptable for health and human safety reasons, and the "recordation" alternative, which would involve the production of measured drawings and written documentation prior to dismantling.

In view of the extraordinary historic significance of the 105-B Reactor, we believe that it should be treated separately from the remaining seven reactors in determining the options for its decommissioning. One additional option that should be carefully considered is the feasibility of removing only the most hazardous portions of 105-B and retaining in situ as much as possible of the reactor building, control room, mechanical and electrical systems and any other features that are not a long term health risk. Although this approach may present technical problems, we believe that the future interpretive value of 100-B should be preserved in the decommissioning process if it is feasible and prudent.

Mr. Tom Bauman
June 14, 1989
Page 2

As the world's first large scale production reactor, 105-B represents a watershed in the history of science and technology. Although access to the site is now restricted, 105-B is still one of the most compelling and thought provoking historic landmarks in the United States. This issue should be explored in greater detail in the EIS.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jacob E. Thomas". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the typed name and title.

Jacob E. Thomas
State Historic Preservation Officer

mr



Coalition
Organizing
Hanford
Opposition

JUN 16 1989

% W2122 Dean · Spokane. WA 99201

June 12, 1989

Lourdes Fuentes-Williams
P.O. Box 422
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814

Tom Bauman
US DOE/Richland Operations
PO Box 550
Richland, WA 99352

On behalf of Coalition Organizing Hanford Opposition (COHO) I request that the following comments be entered into the record for the US Department of Energy's (DOE) Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the "Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Reactors at the Hanford Site."

COHO supports the Immediate One-Piece Removal Alternative for all 8 reactors (including B-Reactor) for the following reasons:

1) The safest thing that can be done with the reactors is to move them away from the Columbia River. Given DOE's worse case scenario of a 50% failure in Grand Coulee Dam the flood waters would not reach the 200-West Area but would reach several of the 100-Area reactors if left on site. More severe scenarios were not examined by DOE because "catastrophic floods, would in themselves have such overwhelming environmental impact as to obliterate or obscure any impact from waste they might release." COHO feels this is an invalid assumption. Imagine if the floods last year in Bangladesh would have taken with them 8 nuclear reactors!

2) Given DOE's estimate that the cost of all the alternatives are comparable, it is unfair to place the financial burden of deferred clean-up on future generations.

3) Even though the 200-West Area has born the brunt of DOE's waste since the start of chemical processing operations, it is preferable to consolidate the waste rather than leaving it spread along the shore of the Columbia River.

4) To defer removal of the reactors for 75 years has numerous other serious problems and leaves many unanswered ethical and technical questions. For example, what assurance can DOE give that a decision made today will be carried out 75 years in the future? DOE projects a \$198 million cleanup. What basis do you have for this estimate? Clearly, the economic conditions and technical capabilities 75 years in the future cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty. Even if DOE is correct about the cost of cleanup, what assurance can you give that the necessary funds will be appropriated when needed?

COHO urges the DOE to initiate the Immediate One-Piece Removal Alternative without delay and, furthermore, to allow the land to heal, that no new DOE projects be permitted on the sites.

For COHO,

Lourdes Fuentes-Williams

0.14 Lourdes Fuentes-Williams

JUN 19 1989

HANFORD SURPLUS PRODUCTION REACTOR DECOMMISSIONING
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

TO: United States Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office

FROM: Jane A Sawyer
311 E. Cedar St.
Grandview, Wa 98930

Date: 6/12/89

(Please print/type name, address and zip code clearly)

I would like to make the following comments on the DRAFT Surplus Production Reactor Decommissioning Environmental Impact Statement:

I favor alternative #2:
in situ decommissioning.

I am strongly apposed to keeping
the B reactor as a National Historical
Site so I favor keeping a pictorial/
historical record instead.

Signature/ Jane Sawyer

Fold on lines and staple or tape before mailing. Include postage.

L008



**Washington State
Department of Transportation**

District 5
2809 Rudkin Road, Union Gap
P.O. Box 12560
Yakima, Washington 98909-2560
(509) 575-2510

Duane Berentson
Secretary of Transportation

June 29, 1989

JUL 11 1989

Mr. Tom Bauman
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550/A7-75
Richland, WA. 99352

Public Hearing DEIS
Reactor Decommissioning
Hanford Reservation

We have reviewed the Notice of Public Hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on the Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors at the Hanford Reservation. We offer the following comments.

We are concerned about the transport and hauling of the decommissioned reactors on State highways. The transport and hauling of all materials on State highways must comply with all regulations and guidelines pertaining to the safe transportation of those materials. If spillage or accident occurs, the developer and/or transporter would be responsible for any cleanup and damage to the State highway caused by the spillage or accident.

We would request advanced notice, two weeks or more, of any transport or hauling of the decommissioned reactors on State highways. Adequate notice should include the proposed routes, dates, and times. Notice should be made to this office.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this proposed project.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. LARSON, P.E.
District Administrator

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Leonard Pittman'.

By: LEONARD PITTMAN, P.E.
Assistant District Project
Development Engineer

GRB:eps

L009



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

JUL 5 1989

JUL 11 1989

Mr. Tom Bauman
Office of Communications
Richland Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550
Richland, Washington 99352
Attn: SPRD Draft EIS

Dear Mr. Bauman:

This letter is in response to the notice in the Federal Register appearing at 54 FR 18325 in which DOE requested comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DOE/EIS-0119D), "Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington." Our comments on the EIS are contained in the Enclosure.

If you have any questions please contact Frank Cardile, of my staff, on (301) 492-0171.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Bell
John T. Greeves, Acting Director
Division of Low-Level Waste Management
and Decommissioning
Office Of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

Enclosure: As stated

NRC/NMSS COMMENTS ON THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S
DOE/EIS-0119D "DECOMMISSIONING OF EIGHT SURPLUS PRODUCTION REACTORS
AT THE HANFORD SITE, RICHLAND WASHINGTON"

1. The definition of decommissioning used in the EIS Section 2.1, "to isolate securely any remaining radioactivity in a manner that will reduce environmental impacts to an acceptable level", is different than NRC's in 10 CFR §50.2 in which it is indicated that decommissioning means to "reduce residual radioactivity to a level that permits release of the property for unrestricted use and termination of license." While this difference may be reasonable because there are different circumstances, nevertheless it means that two Federal agencies are using the same word to mean different things with resulting potential for confusion. Furthermore, information is not given in the EIS as to what criteria are used for establishing acceptable radioactive levels.
2. The EIS indicates that certain of the alternatives will use a 75 year or greater storage period prior to completion of decommissioning. Information is not given in the EIS as to the basis for the use of 75 years for the safe storage period. Note that NRC limits the safe storage period in 10 CFR §50.82(b)(1) to 60 years unless a longer period is needed to protect public health and safety. Factors to be considered in extending the safe storage period would include unavailability of waste disposal capacity and other site specific factors such as the presence of other nuclear facilities at the site.
3. On pg. 3.2 it is indicated that the reactor is put into safe storage by securing all "smearable" radioactive contamination in the facilities. However, information is not given as to what type of smearable contamination is present in the reactors at this time.
4. DOE defines "No Action" as continuing surveillance indefinitely, (i.e., for up to 100 years). NRC's regulations do not permit a surveillance mode involving lengthy delays in the completion of decommissioning without a commitment on the time frame in which the decommissioning would be completed. The NRC requires commercial reactors to submit a decommissioning plan within two years of permanent cessation of operations.
6. DOE defines "in-situ decommissioning" as essentially converting the reactor site to a low-level waste burial site. The analysis of this conversion to a LLW burial site appears insufficient. A detailed

characterization of remaining nuclides would be necessary. Also it is indicated that the monitoring costs are substantial and would continue for 100 years (the time assumed for institutional control), however no information is given as to costs, activities, or radiation doses after that time.

L010

July 11, 1989

Dear Mr. Bauman

We want the Immediate One-Piece Removal of the contaminated reactors away from the Columbia River. Dismantle the buildings and remove the reactor core block in its entirety. Bury the reactor block in Hanford's central plateau.

We want the radioactive reactors away from the Columbia River. We want Hanford cleaned up within 30 years. The citizens of Washington state want the use of Hanford in the future. Mike & Virginia Berg

Dr. & Mrs. Michael Berg
W. 234 Sumner
Spokane, WA 99204



JUL 12 1989

Tom Bauman
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550
Richland, WA. 99352

© USPS 1985

L011
JUL 13 1989

HANFORD SURPLUS PRODUCTION REACTOR DECOMMISSIONING
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

TO: United States Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office

FROM: H. DALE HELLEWELL
70 SE 11 ROAD
OTHELLO WA, 99344


Date: 7-12-89

(Please print/type name, address and zip code clearly)

I would like to make the following comments on the DRAFT Surplus Production Reactor Decommissioning Environmental Impact Statement:

IN SITU DECOMMISSIONING APPEARS TO BE
THE MOST COST EFFECTIVE METHOD & CAN BE
ACCOMPLISHED IN THE LEAST AMOUNT OF
TIME.

Signature



Fold on lines and staple or tape before mailing. Include postage.

L012

July 11, 1980

Tom Bauman
U. S. Dept of Energy
P.O. Box 550
Richland, WA. 99352

JUL 14 1980

We endorse the move of contaminated reactors away from the Columbia River in the One-Piece Removal Option.

We believe this move will favor greater assurance that the reactors will not be forgotten as years pass and Hanford will be cleaned up and the land can be restored for public use. This will make it possible for the entire Hanford mess to be cleaned up within the thirty year agreement.

Sincerely,
Ora Mae and Floyd Orton
W. 3210 Velview Dr
Spokane, Wa. 99208



BENTON COUNTY

P.O. BOX 190 PHONE (509) 786-5600 OR 783-1310 PROSSER, WASHINGTON 99350

L013
JUL 17 1989

July 14, 1989

Ms. Karen J. Wheelless
Office of Communications
Richland, Operations Office
U. S. Department of Energy
Richland, Washington 99352

RE: Draft Environmental Impact Statement -- Decommissioning
of Surplus Production Reactors at the Hanford Site.

Dear Ms. Wheelless:

This letter is being prepared on behalf of the Benton County Management Team, who adopted a motion at yesterday's team meeting. The management team includes all of the Benton County elected officials and appointed directors and their deputies.

The motion, adopted unanimously, requests the Department of Energy to include land use planning as part of the environmental impact statement on the decommissioning of eight surplus production reactors at the Hanford Site.

The land, once required for public safety and isolation, is no longer needed for that purpose. The return of this land to productive agriculture should be considered where practicable and possible. Reasons for not returning the land to agriculture should be identified and justified.

Respectfully submitted,

Chairman, Benton County Management Team

Dennis D. Skeate, P.E.

L013

Benton County Management Team
July 13, 1989
Page Five

Decommissioning of 8 Surplus Production Reactors:

Department Head/Elected Officials: Ray asked if they could get support from the management team, supporting the land use planning. It was suggested a letter of support could come from the management team.

*** Motion was made by Sheriff Kennedy; seconded by Sue Tanska, that a letter be sent, requesting DOE to include land use planning as part of an environmental impact statement on decommissioning of eight surplus production reactors at the Hanford Site, as they may be affected by said decommissioning. Motion passed unanimously.

Team members would like a copy of what is sent to DOE.

Dennis D Skeate
County Engineer

James H McAuliff
Asst. County Engineer

L013

Prosser 786-5611
Tri-Cities 783-1310
Area Code 509

Benton County Engineer

POST OFFICE BOX 110 - COURTHOUSE
PROSSER, WASHINGTON 99350-0110

July 28, 1989

Mr. Emmett Moore
Pacific N. W. Laboratory
P. O. Box 999
Richland, Washington 99352

Dear Mr. Moore:


Replying to your phone call, this morning, concerning the Management Team (I.e. Benton County's) letter concerning the decommissioning of surplus production reactors at the Hanford Site.

I have included a copy of the top of Page Five, of the Management Team Minutes for July 13th, when the motion mentioned in the letter of July 14, was adopted.

It is not very formal, but is a record of how the motion was adopted.

If there are any questions please give me a call. Thanks.

Sincerely,



Dennis D. Skeate, P.E.
Benton County Engineer and
Chairman, Benton County Management Team

JUL 18 1989
L014

JUL 18 1989

July 14, 1989

Tom Bauman
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550
Richland, WA. 99352

COMMENT: Eight Reactors Decommissioning

The Tri-City Herald reports that at a recent meeting discussing the Draft EIS for decommissioning the eight reactors, preservation of B Reactor as a national monument was discussed. Tri-Dec (John Burnham) recommended that the reactor be preserved but not developed as a tourist attraction. He proposed that instead of developing a tourist attraction the money be spent in financing further development studies.

This is a very short-sighted viewpoint and would be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Developing B. reactor as a Hanford showpiece and visitor center could do much to attract visitors to the Tri-Cities.

I feel strongly that B. reactor should be developed as a visitor center and Hanford Museum either separately or as a part of the decommissioning plan.

I would appreciate it if this letter could be made a part of the meeting record.



M. J. Szulinski
1305 Hains Street
Richland, WA. 99352

cc/ J. Burnham
J. Stoffel

JUL 18 1989

L015

JUL 18 1989

July 14, 1989

Tom Bauman
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550
Richland, WA. 99352

COMMENTS: Decommissioning Eight Reactors
Document No. DOE/EIS - 0119D

The facts support no action above the lowest cost.

It is recognized that the objectives of anti-nuclear groups within the State and Environmental Groups may not be rational. The DOE should resist all efforts to expand the action beyond basic requirements.



M. J. Szulinski
1305 Hains Street
Richland, WA. 99352

L016

Jul 14, 1989

JUL 18 1989

Bened L. Sumner
906 Tulip
Coulter Dam, WA 99116

Fox Bauman
Office of Communications
215 Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Sir,

I read of the millions of dollars
proposed to dismantle Hanford
installations to prevent further
radiation, etc. And you'll still have
radioactive reactors to hide
somewhere.

Man, scientists, made these things
when they were needed. Why can't
scientists work on a way to
neutralize any and all of the
offending material, even if it
costs a lot, it would be better than
burying it or disposing of it where
it would have to be dealt with
later.

In all that I've read about this

D.

problem, only once have I read
that a scientist said the material
could be neutralized.

Put some of our best equipped
people on this problem and use
some of that money being used
just thinking about it.

Sincerely,

Barclay L. Sumner

JUL 19 1989

July 15, 1989

Mr. Tom Bauman
U. S. Dept. of Energy
P.O. Box 550
Richland, WA 99352

RE: Draft EIS, decommissioning eight surplus reactors

Dear Mr. Bauman:

I have read the EIS draft regarding decommission of eight nuclear reactors on the Hanford site.

Given the five alternatives, I recommend in situ decommissioning as a first choice, with the safe-storage of 75 years as an added option.

Environmental protection is of primary concern. Once an accident occurs, the safety of our future is threatened. Radioactive equipment and waste should not be dismantled or transported because the risks for contamination are too high. Even a small accident or leak would cause harm to someone.

100 Areas land has already been destroyed by the construction and operation of these nuclear reactors. Please contain this mistake at site. But before you seal and bury the reactors, I recommend the 75-year surveillance and storage for two good reasons:


1) by maintaining surveillance of the site, safety factors such as corrosion and geological changes can be checked and controlled. Valuable research can also be made available.

2) by allowing a 75-year pre-burial state, we allow our future citizens to improve technology and, perhaps revise the EIS options to allow for either a safer decommissioning or a safe recommissioning of the plants.

If you choose one of the 75-year storage and surveillance options, I hope you will allow our future citizens the flexibility of choice.

Sincerely,

Beth D. Marsau
6162 Aquarius
Ferndale, WA 98248



Mrs. Beth D. Marsau



Hanford Education
Action League

July 14, 1989

JUL 19 1989

Tom Bauman
Department of Energy
MS: A7-75
P. O. Box 550
Richland, WA. 99352

Dear Mr. Bauman,

The following are HEAL's written comments on the Draft EIS on the "Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington."

HEAL endorses the Immediate One-Piece Removal option for all eight reactors, including the B reactor.

The main reasons HEAL supports the Immediate One-Piece Removal option are:

1. It moves the reactors, which are still radioactive, away from the Columbia River.

The reactors should be buried away from their present location near the Columbia. By being along the river, the reactors would remain too accessible by the general public. The option of leaving them in their present location and burying them under a mound of dirt and gravel is not a demonstrated technology. The EIS does not even offer an estimate of how long the "engineered barrier" might last before allowing the contaminated reactor blocks to be exposed to the environment.

2. By doing the job immediately, citizens have a greater assurance that the reactors will not be forgotten, that Hanford will be cleaned up, and that the federal government will restore the land to public use. It will also make it possible to keep the entire Hanford mess within the thirty-year cleanup agreement.

In answer to a series of questions by HEAL on the EIS, the Department of Energy responded in part that the "(s)tart of the decommissioning will depend on the availability of funding and on the priorities established by the Department." Again we apparently have a case of the Department not respecting the will of the citizens it is supposed to serve. On numerous occasions over the past several years the citizens of the Northwest have made it abundantly clear that we want Hanford to be cleaned up immediately.

L018

We now have the greatest likelihood of obtaining the necessary funding and skilled workforce to safely dispose of these atomic age relics. If we wait for 75 years as is proposed by two of DOE's options, we run a very high risk of not being able to complete the job of decommissioning.

3. This option requires the least amount of land area to be barred from public access (see p. 5.34--all page references are to those in the draft EIS).

HEAL has repeatedly raised the point that there is no overall government strategy for minimizing the amount of land at Hanford which will have to be off-limits for centuries, and in some cases, millennia. We again call upon the state, EPA and the DOE to develop a plan which will limit (to the greatest extent possible) the amount of land at Hanford which will be fenced off and in effect, turned into a national sacrifice zone. Before such a plan is in place, it is only common sense to pursue those cleanup options which require the least amount of area that will be left contaminated.

There is one other point which should be addressed. At various places throughout the EIS, the DOE states that once the reactor areas are cleaned up, they will be available for "other DOE use." The EIS goes so far as to say that "federal ownership and the presence on the Hanford Site is planned to be continuous." Nowhere does the Energy Department stipulate the basis for its claim to Hanford. HEAL strenuously objects to the Department's regal attitude. The future use of Hanford is a decision which the citizens of Washington and the affected Native American tribes should and must make (refer to pages 3.51 and 5.27).

The following are additional comments which are more technical in character.

The decommissioning of the reactors should start with the reactor which has the lowest radiological inventory (DR) and work on the one with the greatest radiological inventory last (KE). HEAL recommends the following sequence, based on the decay of Cobalt-60 (compare with Figure 3.2 on p. 3.10):

1. DR	2,200 curies in 1990
2. H	2,300
3. F	2,600
4. D	1,960 curies in 1995
5. B	2,300
6. C	2,600
7. KW	1,850 curies in 2001
8. KE	2,900

On page 3.27, there is an error in Table 3.7. The third "Deferred Removal" Subtotal for the DR reactor is an obvious error and should read \$7,485.82.

July 14, 1989

On page 3.27, there should be an explanation that the removal costs for deferred one-piece removal will probably be higher than those same costs for immediate one-piece removal (due to inflation of costs), or at least that there is more certainty with those costs associated with the immediate option.

Concerning the mound designed to withstand erosion without exposing any radioactive material from the reactors (page 3.56), the EIS is deficient in not providing an estimate for how long the engineered barrier will withstand erosion.

On page 5.3, the Department does not consider the possible breach of a "contamination control envelope" as an accident scenario. The other postulated scenarios may not adequately bound the consequences that might result from such a breach of the contamination control envelope under the deferred dismantlement alternative.

On page 5.6, the calculations were done using F reactor. DOE chose F because it is the closest to Richland. However it is more appropriate to use KE reactor in order to have a truly conservative estimate because KE has more than three times the radiological inventory than F and it is only 4 km more distant. The KE reactor should be used in these calculations (including the inverse square law) to accurately bound the estimated consequences of a possible accident.


On pages 5.9-10, there is not enough detail regarding the calculation of the dose estimate. There should be a description of the basic assumptions used in calculating these dose estimates, as well as a numerical expression of the range of uncertainty associated with the estimate.

On page 5.17, the EIS refers to certain people as "those who ignore warnings." DOE should also consider the possibility that future users of Hanford might not be able to comprehend the warnings (no matter how hard we might try to communicate the danger underlying Hanford).

On page 5.27 (and elsewhere), the DEIS does not state from which date the 100-year period of institutional control will be calculated. The Energy Department should stipulate when this 100-year period will begin.

Thank you for considering these comments in the preparation of the final EIS. If you have any questions concerning the above comments, please contact me.

Sincerely,



Jim Thomas
Staff Researcher

L019

JUL 20 1989

1020 Grand Ave.
Astoria, OR 97103
July 18, 1989

Mr. Tom Bauman
Office of Communications
U. S. DCE
Richlands Operations Office
P. O. Box 550
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mr. Bauman


Re: Decommissioning plans for
Hanford reactors


We believe as follows:

1. Option 3, Immediate One-Piece Removal, should be chosen as the preferred decommissioning plan. It is urgent that the reactors be moved away from the Columbia River as soon as possible.
2. The N-Reactor should be included in the decommissioning plans.
3. The B-Reactor should not be made into a National Historical Site.

We also believe that the public hearings on these matters should be held at other places in addition to Portland, Seattle, Richland, and Spokane.

Very truly yours,


J. Ross Adams


Lois H. Adams

L020

~~JUL 21 1989~~

July 17, 1989
2314 SE 24 Avenue
Portland, OR 97214


Tom Bauman
Office of Communications
U.S. DOE
Richland Operations Office
PO Box 550
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mr. Bauman:

It has come to my attention that hearings are being held regarding the decommissioning of Hanford's Nuclear Reactors.

I suggest that the DOE should select option #3, **IMMEDIATE ONE-PIECE REMOVAL**, as the preferred decommissioning plan. These reactors should be moved away from the Columbia River as soon as possible. Additionally, the N-Reactor should also be included in the decommissioning plans and the B-Reactor should not be made into a National Historic Site.

Thank you


Stephen J. Doyle

L021

JUL 21 1989

July 17, 1989
2314 SE 24 Avenue
Portland, OR 97214

Tom Bauman
Office of Communications
U.S. DOE
Richland Operations Office
PO Box 550
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mr. Bauman:

It has come to my attention that hearings are being held regarding the decommissioning of Hanford's Nuclear Reactors.

I suggest that the DOE should select option #3, **IMMEDIATE ONE-PIECE REMOVAL**, as the preferred decommissioning plan. These reactors should be moved away from the Columbia River as soon as possible. Additionally, the N-Reactor should also be included in the decommissioning plans and the B-Reactor should not be made into a National Historic Site.

Thank you,


Bonnie Tucker Doyle



CITY OF RICHLAND WASHINGTON

ma7

July 18, 1989

JUL 24 1989

Mr. Tom Bauman
Office of Communications
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
P.O. Box 550
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mr. Bauman:

Enclosed is a copy of Resolution No. 49-89 which expresses the City of Richland's support of the preservation of the B Reactor as a national historic site.

The Resolution was passed by the Richland City Council on July 17, 1989.

Sincerely,

LESLIE A. SMITH, CMC
CITY CLERK

Encl:

RESOLUTION NO. 49-89

A RESOLUTION supporting the preservation of B Reactor.

WHEREAS, the B Reactor at Hanford was constructed and first operated during World War II as part of the Manhattan Project; and

WHEREAS, the B Reactor produced the plutonium for the first man-made nuclear explosion (the Trinity test) and for the bomb that ended World War II; and

WHEREAS, the U. S. Department of Energy is considering alternatives for decommissioning the B Reactor; and

WHEREAS, the U. S. Department of Energy and the Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation have determined that the B Reactor is eligible for nomination as a National Historic Site; and

WHEREAS, the B Reactor, if publicly accessible, would be a significant asset to the tourism industry of Richland and Benton County.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City of Richland, acting by and through its Council, that the City of Richland supports:

1. The B Reactor at Hanford as a National Historic Site.
2. The preservation of B Reactor intact at its present location.
3. The upgrading and staffing B Reactor as needed to allow tours by the general public.
4. The provision of a public vehicle access road from state highway 240.

PASSED by the City Council of Richland at a regular meeting on the 17th day of July, 1989.

/s/ John Poynor
JOHN POYNOR
Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

/s/ Thomas O. Lampson
THOMAS O. LAMPSON
City Attorney


L023

GET ON WITH IT, USING BEST AVAILABLE TECH
TO REDUCE GENERAL & WORKER RAD DOSE.

(YOU PEOPLE ARE PATHETIC. YOU HOLD PUBLIC
HEARINGS, BUT PROVIDE NO FUNDING SO INTERESTED
PARTIES CAN RESEARCH ISSUE AND ATTEND. NO
WONDER NO ONE SHOWS UP. A SHAM, I SAY.
HOPE YOU'RE ENJOYING YOUR EXPENSE ACCOUNT.)

JUL 24 1989

JOHNSON
POB 451
NORTHPORT, WA. 99157



America the Beautiful USA 15

TOM BAUMAN
DOE
PO Box 550,
RICHLAND, WA. 99352

7-17-89

THE ALPS
Tumwater Canyon
Leavenworth, WA 98826
On Highway 2, 5 miles west of Leavenworth,
nestles the unique ALPS. Famous for home-made
candy, gifts and books. Here you'll find THE JUL
MARLINS, Archie, Esther and Fred and the
Happy Rock Fairies too.



SP-752 Stop by for a friendly interlude.



POST CARD

Address

Sir: - It is imperative
that safety, health &
environment must take
precedence over the
creation of nuclear
wastes - a much greater
threat to our well-being
& that of the planet than
nuclear war. Stop nuclear
production NOW

Tom Bauman
U.S Dept. of Energy
P.O. Box 550
Richland, WA
99352

Mr. & Mrs. M. W. Bradshaw

Photo by: Bob Chamberlin

504 S. 17th St, Coeur d'Alene, ID, 83814

167096

JUL 24 1989

July 24 1989



Washington
State Senate

Senator Max Benitz,
Chairman
Senator Alan Bluechel,
Vice Chairman
Senator Jack Metcalf
Senator Gary Nelson
Senator Brad Owen
Senator Kent Pullen
Senator Lois Stratton
Senator Dean Sutherland
Senator Al Williams

L025

Energy and Utilities Committee

407 John A. Cherberg Building • Olympia, Washington 98504 • QW-41 • (206) 786-7455

July 21, 1989

Tom Bauman
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
RE: SPRD-DRAFT EIS
P.O. Box 550
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mr. Bauman:

I am writing with comments relating to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement on decommissioning the Eight Surplus Production Reactors at Hanford. These reactors have gained a measure of public interest due to their size and proximity to the Columbia River.

My comments fall into two areas: factors to consider in determining the preferred alternative, and the future of the B Reactor.

All five options for the reactors appear to present very low risks to the general public in terms of radiation. Therefore, I would suggest that worker safety is given major consideration when choosing an alternative.

Some people have argued that in the event of a catastrophic flood of the Columbia River, water could reach one or more of the reactors and become contaminated. A close examination of the facts does not substantiate major concern over these fears. In the extremely unlikely event of a major catastrophic flood, people are going to have a lot more to worry about than some water contacting several surplus reactors. In reality, a major flood could wipe out substantial portions of the Tri Cities residential community, as well as major areas in Vancouver, Washington and Portland, Oregon. The reactors will not be a major health hazard in such an event.


SURPLUS REACTORS DEIS/PAGE 2

I would like to be on record as supporting the efforts to place the B Reactor on the National Register of Historic Places. The B Reactor not only has a solid place in history for helping to end a deadly war, it has also been frequently described as an engineering miracle. After touring the structure and knowing the history of its early operators, it is clear that the structure should be saved. The B Reactor can serve as a monument to the need for a strong defense to ensure peace.

It is my understanding that since the B Reactor is located on federal land, USDOE has the initial opportunity to nominate the site for the national register. However, if USDOE decides against nominating the site, I plan on making the nomination.

Thank you for consideration of these comments.

Sincere regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Max E. Benitz" with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Max E. Benitz
Chairman

L026

JUL 24 1989

July 20, 1989

Dear DCE,

I did not testify at the EIS hearing regarding disposal options for the old reactors at Hanford because I heard of the public hearing too late. Having considered the several options, I think the Immediate One-Piece Removal would be wisest as it would move the reactors away from the Columbia River.

I also see, as an eventual plus, the return of these lands to public use. The individuals and Native American tribes who originally surrendered the land understood that this was a temporary agreement for war-time necessity. They should be rewarded for their patriotism by a careful clean-up and return of their lands.

Sincerely,

Barbara Richardson

Barbara Richardson
N. 18,607 Dartford Rd.
Colbert, WA 99005

JUL 24 1989

Dear Mr. Bauman,

I am responding to the EIS regarding the disposal options for the eight old nuclear production reactors at Hanford.

I would like to see the reactors disposed by dismantling the surrounding buildings and removing the reactor core blocks in its entirety.

This would remove the reactors away from the Columbia River and get the job completed right away. It would require the least amount of land area to be barred from public access. It would also make it possible to keep the entire Hanford mess within the 30 year cleanup agreement.

Sincerely,
Theresa Potts
4103 Arrowhead Rd
Coeur d'Alene, Id. 83814

L028

FM: ALAN RICHARDS / HCR 78 BOX 559 / NASELLE WA 98638 206/484-7119
TO: TOM BAUMAN / OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS / US DOE
RICHLAND OPERATIONS OFFICE / PO BOX 550 / RICHLAND WA 99352

RE: HANFORD CLEANUP / REMOVAL OF REACTOR BLOCKS B,C,D,DR,F,H,KE,KW
DT: 07/20/89

Please add my comments to your file. I am unable to attend any of the public hearings, but I would like my opinion to be noted.

I believe that it is VERY important for DOE to select

DRAFT EIS OPTION 3 -- ONE-PIECE REMOVAL

as the decommissioning plan. I feel that the ancient reactors should be moved as far from the Columbia River (or any other body of water) as soon as possible. In addition I hope that you will strongly consider

DECOMMISSION OF THE N-REACTOR VERY SOON

as well. Finally, I feel it is in very poor taste to even consider making a national monument of the B-reactor, a place which made it possible for one group of humans to kill, maim, and horrify hundreds of thousands of other humans. It seems to me that you should

DECOMMISSION THE B-REACTOR IN THE SAME MANNER

as the others.

I am pleased to see some efforts in beginning to clean up the mess at Hanford. I think this is a challenge of which we should all be as fully aware as possible so that we may all work together to achieve safe and reasonable solutions.

The problem belongs to all of us; the solution must come from all of us.

I request that you keep me informed of all events relating to the decommissioning process, as well as to other cleanup components. Please add my name to your mailing list, so that I may be informed in a timely manner of future hearings on these matters. Thank you!

Sincerely,



Alan Richards

CC: NEA, Adams, Gorton, Hadley, Hudson, Unsoeld

JUL 24 1989

L029

~~JUL 24 1989~~

P.O. Box 2119
Gearhart, OR 97138

July 20, 1989

Mr. Tom Bauman
Office of Communications
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
P.O. Box 550
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mr. Bauman:

I would like the DOE to select option 3, the immediate one-piece removal decommissioning plan for Hanford's nuclear reactors. It seems this option would be safest for the population.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,


Barbara Harrah

L030

HANFORD SURPLUS PRODUCTION REACTOR DECOMMISSIONING
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

TO: United States Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office

JUL 24 1989

FROM: Lantz Rowland
9255 Greenwood Ave N, #1
Seattle, WA 98103-3609

Date:

(Please print/type name, address and zip code clearly)

I would like to make the following comments on the DRAFT Surplus Production Reactor Decommissioning Environmental Impact Statement:

- I would like to complement you re both your Summary Draft and the brochure "facts about Hanford", I looked at the Draft at the WofW and went back to the summary & brochure.
 - While your reports were very clear they downplay one factor that I make my living on; the advance in technology. My recommendations modify your proposals in that light.
 - Establish an irrevocable trust fund for safe storage of Hanford's B reactor, with budget for extensive "recordation" over 75 years followed by One-Piece Removal Alternative. I would want the trust fund fixed so that this budget can never be cut? I would add one instruction to the conservative trustee a one million dollar budget over 75 years to find & sell the ^{re technology} public that could keep the reactor in place with population dose @ 1,900 person-rem per 10,000 yrs.
- Regarding reactors C, D, DR, E, H, KE & KW I am in favor of the Immediate one-piece removal plan paid from a trust adding \$600,000 for a 30 day study every 2.5 years re technology to reduce occupational radiation dose within set budget. Thanks!

Signature/ Lantz Rowland

Fold on lines and staple or tape before mailing. Include postage.

Thomas M. Clement
407 Wilson
Richland, Washington
99352

L031

~~58-24-334~~

Karen J. Wheelless, Director
Office of Communications, Richland Operations Office
United States D.C.E.
Richland, Washington 99352

COMMENTS:

WE/EJS - 119 D Summary. Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors at The Hanford Site, Richland, Washington.

My Name is Thomas M. Clement. I live at 407 Wilson Street Richland, W.A. I worked at Hanford as an engineer and a manager in various capacities in the 100 Areas from 1944 until retirement in 1982. I also worked for two summers 1983 and 1984 on the Decommissioning and Demolition Project with Bob Paasch.

I attended the Public Hearing meeting on July 11, 1989 held in the Federal Building, Richland at 10:00 am. I have also read through the Summary of WE/EJS - 0119 D.

I would like to concur with the comments given by Gordon Rogers at the meeting. In other words, I strongly support the In Situ Decommissioning Alternative. I can remember walking around one of the reactor plants in 1983 after reading a report recommending the reactor blocks be moved to 200 Area for burial and thinking that that action would be a tremendous waste of human exposure and money. The reactor shielding is in place at the site and is backed up by three foot thick concrete walls. I wrote a letter at that time recommending In Situ Decommissioning.

The preservation of the "B" reactor as a National Historical Monument would be a nice gesture, but would be costly. I think that a replica of "B" plant in The Science Center would be more to the point and more informative as to how the plant actually worked. The water plant portion of "B" area could be included in the model. Most of the water plant has been demolished in 100-B area.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Thomas M. Clement

**LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF OREGON**

189 Liberty Street N.E., Room 307

Salem, Oregon 97301

(503) 581-5722

July 19, 1989

Karen Wheelles, Director
Office of Communications
Richland Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland, WA 99352

Comments on DEIS: Surplus Reactors

The League of Women Voters of Oregon has taken an active interest in Hanford radioactive waste since 1979. We published a study, Nuclear Update, in 1980. The League of Women Voters of the United States published Nuclear Primer in 1980, which described types and extent of nuclear waste in the U.S. During the last year the LWVUS has held seminars on military nuclear waste in Atlanta, Denver and Seattle.

A number of our members have toured the Hanford Reservation, and we are interested in the deposition of the eight old reactors. We recommend that USDOE selected DEIS Option 2 -- Immediate one-Piece Removal of the old reactors and fuel basins. We make this recommendation because of the significant leak which has contaminated earth under one of the fuel basins. Although we knew of other contaminated earth at Hanford, we did not know of this particular leak until the DEIS.

Our members are very concerned about contamination of the Columbia River. We believe that technical uncertainties must be planned for and publicly recognized. We are not satisfied with the data presented on movement of water under Hanford toward the water table and toward the Columbia River. What about the possibility of old radioactive fuel leaks under the other reactors and the possibility of erosion?

In-site decommissioning would not be acceptable because of weakness in the leak detection system and lack of a specified action system in response. Removal after 75 years cannot be supported because of the lack of information on hydrology and ground water contamination. Option 2, removal to higher ground, would also eliminate flood danger.

The League supports a state consultation and concurrence process and consideration of environmental impacts of military nuclear waste sites. We believe in the effective involvement of state and local governments and citizens in siting proposals for treatment, storage, disposal and transportation of radioactive wastes.

Sincerely,



Colleen Bennett
President



Adele Newton
Energy Chair

JUL 26 1989

L033



CITY OF KENNEWICK WASHINGTON

CIVIC CENTER

(509) 586-4181 / SCAN-526-2237

210 WEST SIXTH AVENUE/P.O. BOX 6108/KENNEWICK, WASHINGTON 99336-0108

July 25, 1989

Mr. Tom Bauman
Office of Communications
Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
P. O. Box 550
Richland, Washington 99352

Dear Mr. Bauman:

Enclosed is a copy of Resolution 89-36, supporting the preservation of B Reactor, which was adopted by the City Council at its meeting of July 18, 1989.

Sincerely,

Margery Price, CMC
City Clerk

cc: CM

CITY OF KENNEWICK
RESOLUTION NO. 89-36

A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE PRESERVATION OF B REACTOR

WHEREAS, The B Reactor at Hanford was constructed and first operated during World War II as part of the Manhattan Project; and

WHEREAS, The B Reactor produced the plutonium for the first man-made nuclear explosion (the Trinity test) and for the bomb that ended World War II; and

WHEREAS, The U. S. Department of Energy is considering alternatives for decommissioning the B Reactor; and


WHEREAS, The U. S. Department of Energy and the Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation have determined that the B Reactor is eligible for nomination as a National Historic Site; and


WHEREAS, The B Reactor, if publicly accessible, would be a significant asset to the tourism industry of Richland and Benton County, NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF KENNEWICK, WASHINGTON, that the City of Kennewick supports the B Reactor at Hanford as a National Historic Site; the preservation of B Reactor intact at its present location; the upgrading and staffing of B Reactor as needed to allow tours by the general public; and the provision of a public vehicle access road from State Highway 240.

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF KENNEWICK, WASHINGTON, this ~~18th~~ day of July, 1989, and signed in authentication of its passage this ~~18th~~ day of July, 1989.

Approved as to form:


WILLIAM L. CAMERON
City Attorney


BRAD FISHER, Mayor

Attest:


M. A. PRICE, City Clerk

JUL 27 1989

RESOLUTION NO. 1880

A RESOLUTION supporting the preservation of B Reactor

WHEREAS, the B Reactor at Hanford was constructed and first operated during World War II as part of the Manhattan Project; and

WHEREAS, the B Reactor produced the plutonium for the first man-made nuclear explosion (the Trinity test) and for the bomb that ended World War II; and

WHEREAS, the U. S. Department of Energy is considering alternatives for decommissioning the B Reactor; and

WHEREAS, the U. S. Department of Energy and the Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation have determined that the B Reactor is eligible for nomination as a National Historic Site; and

WHEREAS, the B Reactor, if publicly accessible, would be a significant asset to the tourism industry of the general Tri-Cities area; NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED by the City of Pasco, acting by and through its Council, that the City of Pasco supports:

1. The B Reactor at Hanford as a National Historic Site.
2. The preservation of B Reactor intact at its present location.
3. The upgrading and staffing B Reactor as needed to allow tours by the general public.
4. The provision of a public vehicle access road from State Highway 240.

PASSED by the City Council of the City of Pasco this 17 day of July, 1989.




 Ed Rendler, Mayor

ATTEST:



 Evelyn Wells, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:



 Greg A. Rubstello, City Attorney

JUL 27 1989

L035

TRI-CITIES TECHNICAL COUNCIL
P.O. Box 1483
Richland, Washington 99352

July 19, 1989

Mr. Tom Bauman
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550 Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mr. Bauman:

The Tri-Cities Technical Council is an organization whose members are the representatives of 21 professional, engineering and technical societies having sections or chapters in this region. As local residents and citizens vitally concerned with assuring the continued healthful environmental features of the area, we wish to offer the following comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for decommissioning the eight surplus production reactors, including possible preservation of the B Reactor as a National Historic Site.

We would support either "Continue present actions" or "In situ decommissioning" on the basis that these are the lowest cost options and they both have negligible environmental impacts. However, we believe the In situ decommissioning is worth the extra cost in that it provides a more permanent solution in the shortest time.

We strongly oppose the options involving removal or dismantlement. The higher costs, longer times to complete, added risk of unpleasant surprises, and the very small reduction in estimated total radiation exposure make any of these options very poor choices.

We strongly recommend that B Reactor be designated as a National Historic Site. As you are aware, B Reactor has been designated as an Historic National Engineering Landmark by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers. The brass plaque signifying this honor is mounted in the Hanford Science Center. Our preference is that the "Continue present actions" option be applied to B Reactor; with the objective that public access and tours could be assured, consistent with current safety requirements. If this option cannot be allowed for any reason, we request that alternative means for commemorating the reactor be provided; for example with extensive recordation of written and photographic materials, a kiosk with displays of visual aids at the Vernita Rest Area, an obelisk at a point along Highway 240 at a point where the reactor site is visible, or a reconstruction of at least the reactor control room.

We appreciate the opportunity to offer our views on this subject. The above comments have been approved by the Council's Executive Board. We would welcome the opportunity to provide information or assistance to DOE in the course of your preparation of the final EIS.

Very truly yours,



Hans C.F. Ripfel, Chairman

25 July, 1969

L036

JUL 27 1969

Tom Bauman
Office of Communications
US DOE

Dear Mr. Bauman,

I attended the meeting in Spokane on the draft EIS for the decommissioning of 8 surplus reactors at the Hanford site. I read the materials provided, listened to one person testify, and spoke for a time with a fellow from the Battelle Corp. It became clear ^{that} the immediate one-piece removal of the 200 area is preferable. The time factor may indeed mean that there is more Cesium 137 and Cobalt 60 present during removal. However, the overriding factor is that these reactors need to be removed from the immediate vicinity of the Columbia River before the current generation of workers and supervisors dies of old age. Anything can happen in 75 or 100 years time; that includes economic collapse, political change, great climatic changes, and, at very least, retirement and death of all the people who began the process. The possibilities for great change, in 75 or 100 years time, is frightening. Also, in situ decommissioning is unacceptable because the reactor buildings will remain too close to the river; given slight changes in the course of the Columbia river and other climatic changes over many centuries - radiologically active fission by-products and some heavy metals may become part of the Columbia.

The "B" reactor is a symbol of death and destruction to most of the world: ~~But~~ Certain people who consider themselves patriots want to retain that building for its historical value; but I, and indeed, most other people worldwide are repulsed at the idea of celebrating the wartime use of nuclear weapons. If nuclear weapons ~~were~~ were forever banned from use, it would be a different story; but that is far from being the case.

Once the reactor buildings are removed I'd like you to consider returning the "100" sites to the public domain. Barring that, a non-nuclear use of the area (especially utilizing solar and wind power and fermented agricultural waste)

would be appreciated by all - except, perhaps, Tri-Cities residents and employees of DOE and their contractors.

Thank you for the opportunity to share these views with you. The draft EIS and your sparsely attended hearing seemed quite open. However, I still remain sceptical as to the intent of the DOE - that it might well do what it wants to do no matter what views are expressed that run counter to it. The history of the DOE, unfortunately, is of low regard for human life and well-being in the face of "National Security" needs. In fact, that seems to be all the more reason to proceed with dismantlement as soon as possible before some distant future leadership can decide to do something else with those reactor buildings.

yours,

Tom Lande

W. 1415 8th Av. #5
Spokane ~~Spokane~~, WA 99204
P



JUL 27 1989

Public Health Service

L037

Centers for Disease Control
Atlanta GA 30333

July 21, 1989

Tom Bauman
Office of Communications
Richland Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550
Richland, Washington 99352

Attention: "SPRD Draft EIS"

Dear Mr. Bauman:

We have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for "Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington." We are responding on behalf of the U.S. Public Health Service. Since this EIS contains significant radiological health considerations, we have requested review assistance from the Office of Health Physics, Food and Drug Administration (within the Public Health Service).

Our major concern in this DEIS is the selection of the alternative which provides the highest level of protection of worker safety and health. Toward this end, two of the alternatives are preferred: 1) immediate one-piece removal, and 2) safe storage followed by one-piece removal. These two alternatives appear close in cost while minimizing impacts on air and water quality, ecology, socioeconomics, and resource commitments. From a radiological health standpoint, we strongly recommend immediate one-piece removal as the preferred removal method.

Thank you for sending this document for our review. Please insure that we are included on your mailing list for future documents with potential public health impacts which are developed under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Sincerely yours,

David E. Clapp, Ph.D., P.E., CIH
Environmental Health Scientist
Center for Environmental Health
and Injury Control

RESOLUTION

89 249

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF BENTON COUNTY, WASHINGTON:

IN THE MATTER OF SUPPORTING THE PRESERVATION OF B REACTOR

WHEREAS, the B Reactor at Hanford was constructed and first operated during World War II as part of the Manhattan Project, and

WHEREAS, the B Reactor produced the plutonium for the first man-made nuclear explosion (the Trinity test) and for the bomb that ended World War II, and

WHEREAS, the U. S. Department of Energy is considering alternatives for decommissioning the B Reactor, and

WHEREAS, the U. S. Department of Energy and the Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation have determined that the B Reactor is eligible for nomination as a National Historic Site, and

WHEREAS, the B Reactor, if publicly accessible, would be a significant asset to the tourism industry of Benton County,


NOW, THEREFORE, Be it resolved that the Board of Benton County Commissioners supports


- 1) The designation of the B Reactor at Hanford as a National Historic Site;
- 2) The preservation of B Reactor intact at its present location;
- 3) The upgrading and staffing of B Reactor as needed to allow tours by the general public; and
- 4) The provision of a public vehicle access road from State Highway 240.

Dated this 24th day of July, 1989.

Board of County Commissioners
 Benton County Courthouse
 P. O. Box 190
 Prosser, Washington 99350


 Chairman of the Board.



 Member.


 Member.

Attest: 
 Clerk of the Board

Constituting the Board of County
 Commissioners of Benton County,
 Washington.

Heintz



JUL 27 1989

Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society

A BRANCH OF THE NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY
9517 W. Richardson
Pasco, Wa. 99301

July 27, 1989

Karen J. Wheelless, Director
Office of Communications, Richland Operation Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland, Washington 99352

Dear Ms. Wheelless:

I am writing to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement concerning Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington.

We recommend adoption of the Immediate One-Piece Removal Alternative. This alternative would not only provide for decommissioning the reactors but would also do a great deal towards restoring the shoreline of the Columbia to its natural state. This alternative would enhance the scenic values of the Columbia's Hanford Reach which are currently under study by the National Park Service.

Adoption of this alternative would provide an immediate positive impact on the local economy which has grievously suffered from cutbacks at the Hanford site.

The costs of this alternative at \$190.8 million is exactly in the middle of the five alternatives. The No Action alternative would cost only \$41.0 million and is the cheapest yet least desirable. The other four alternatives range from \$181.1 million to \$216.6 million. Immediate One-Piece Removal appears to be a cost effective solution.

Again we encourage your adoption of the Immediate One-Piece Removal Alternative as a wise, cost-effective method for decommissioning these reactors while enhancing the environment and scenic and wildlife resources of the Columbia River. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Richard J. Leumont
Chairman,
Conservation Committee

Columbia River Conservation League

9517 W. Richardson
Pasco, WA 99301

July 27, 1989

Karen J. Wheelless, Director
Office of Communications, Richland Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland, Washington 99352

Dear Ms. Wheelless:

I am writing to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement concerning Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington.

We recommend adoption of the Immediate One-Piece Removal Alternative. This alternative would not only provide for decommissioning the reactors but would also do a great deal towards restoring the shoreline of the Columbia to its natural state. This alternative would enhance the scenic values of the Columbia's Hanford Reach which are currently under study by the National Park Service.

Adoption of this alternative would provide an immediate positive impact on the local economy which has grievously suffered from cutbacks at the Hanford Site.

The costs of this alternative at \$190.8 million is exactly in the middle of the five alternatives. The No Action alternative would cost only \$41.0 million and is the cheapest yet least desirable. The other four alternatives range from \$181.1 million to \$216.6 million. Immediate One-Piece Removal appears to be a cost effective solution.

Again we encourage your adoption of the Immediate One-Piece Removal Alternative as a wise, cost-effective method for decommissioning these reactors while enhancing the environment and scenic and wildlife resources of the Columbia River. Thank you!

Sincerely,



Richard J. Leaumont
Director

Permanently protect the last free-flowing stretch of the Columbia River -- known as the Hanford Reach -- as a means to enhance the image, economy and quality of life of the region in harmony with the Hanford site operations and private property owners.

L041

JUL 31 1989

T. H. McGreer
3389 Cherry Drive
Hood River, Oregon 97031

Karen J. Wheelless, Director
Office of Communications, Richland Operations Office
U. S Department of Energy
Richland, Washington 99352

Subject: DOE/EIS 0119D

Dear Ms Wheelless:

I commented orally at the recent meeting in Portland with regard to the above Environmental Impact Statement. I am adding further comments in the attached report

I am a retired engineer with dormant registrations as a professional engineer in Illinois, California and Oregon. I served as an electrical engineer for six years during the construction and initial operation of the ZGS accelerator at Argonne National Laboratory at Argonne, Illinois and a total of eight years during the design, construction at the Fermi National Laboratory at Batavia, Illinois.

Please add my name to your mailing list of interested persons receiving copies of reports and comments on this subject.

Very truly yours,
T. H. McGreer
T. H. McGreer

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
DOE/EIS-0119D DECOMMISSIONING OF EIGHT SURPLUS PRODUCTION
REACTORS AT THE HANFORD SITE, RICHLAND, WASHINGTON.

--
Introductory Comments

The draft report is quite complete and should suffice for a final decision by DOE and EPA with only a few corrections or changes. It is inevitable that a report on a situation such as the Hanford reactors will contain much scientific jargon. When reviewing the summary chapter of the draft report the authors should make every effort to write each sentence with the lay persons in mind. Many of the decision-makers are laymen in the matter of nuclear reactors.

In particular a two or three page discussion in the simplest possible language should be included in the summary chapter to show the number of people involved versus illnesses within the site and external to it for each of the five alternatives. The time period of 100 years would be most useful. Estimated illnesses for the same people for the same time period that would be suffered if Hanford did not exist. An explanation that the figures are at best educated guesses would be helpful.

If necessary a similar discussion of health effects for the remaining 9900 years could be included.

General Comments from a Taxpayers Standpoint

Taxpayers are, at this time, adamant that tax rates shall not be increased. Both the Executive and the Legislative branches of Federal and State governments are quite aware of this. Just as evident are the demands made on governmental agencies.

Every project is, therefore in competition for taxpayer money, Unfortunately, every locality is also demanding equal treatment so that a total budget is 50 to 100 times that for the Hanford decommissioning. Hopefully we taxpayers will engage

in the process so that our priorities are met.

As a minimum Hanford must be kept safe. Beyond the saving of lives and protection of health there is no incentive for spending money on the obsolete reactors in area 100. We urge those in the Department of Energy who participate in budget decisions to select an alternate that gives us the most for our money. Once that selection is made, place it in relative priority with other DOE activities that have to do with the common welfare.

Beyond the DOE budget the demands upon the Federal budget are much greater than the ceiling we taxpayers have and will establish. Therefore the Hanford decommissioning must and should ^{compete} with a host of other concerns. Of course we will want to be good stewards and provide a safe and decent Hanford area. Further than that, the time and method of decommissioning should be competitive with other uses of our money.

The competition is great. The minimum annual reactor budget item for safe storage is about \$500,000. Immediate decommissioning would cost about \$15,000,000. for 12 years. The difference is \$14.5 million per year. A conscientious Congressman will ask whether that amount of money might be better spent on some other concern such as the following:

- Repair or replacement of bridges that are becoming dangerous.

- Repair or replacement of dams that show signs of breaking.

- Reduction of air pollution estimated as causing 50,000 deaths per year.

- Salvaging people who face death because of addiction to drugs, alcohol or tobacco.

- The list could be continued for pages.

In comparison, delayed decommissioning is guessed to cause less than a thousand deaths in 10,000 years!

Soecific Comments on the EIS

Page v, Line 5 "No action alternative"

Using this term for the title of the alternative is confusing and misleading and has required explanation in several places in succeeding pages. A much better title is shown in parenthesis under 1.3.1, "Continue Present Action". If "Safe Storage" means the same as "No Action", why not use "Safe Storage for 75 Years" as the title for the first alternative?

Page 1.14, 1.3.7, Evaluation of Alternatives.

When evaluating cost of a project to be done far in the future versus one to be completed immediately, both should be present-valued. Certainly a program delayed 75 years is much less costly to the taxpayers than one completed and paid for in 12 years.

Since no specific cost of money or inflation rates are predictable, it is common practice to assume a difference between inflation rate and interest rate. The difference tends to be more stable. Presently this would be about 4% per year. Another way of looking at the cost comparison is to compute the amount of money placed at 4% interest, compounded annually to equal 1 million dollars in 75 years; \$52,784.

If present-valued, all costs shown in Table 1.2 would be reduced. In order to accomplish this an annual budget estimate for each alternative for 100 years using 1986 dollars is required. Even if not present-valued, such a tabulation would be of great value to decision makers.

Page 1.22, 1.5.1 Environmental Consequences

The truck driver would not much care whether the box car was filled with plutonium or potatoes.

Page 3.1

"Continue Present Action" is not "No Action".

Page 3.3.

A discussion of Present-valuing should be added.

Table 3.1

Why is no monitoring required under continued present action?

Table 1.2

People outside the scientist realm may be confused by "rem/yr" whereas in later chapters dosage is given in mrem/year. Consistency is recommended.

Table 5.2

Same as for Table 1.2 above.

5.7 Assessment of Long Term Impacts

Even after 10 years in this democracy the rules may change. To assume that our descendents will be careless about their health is rather insulting to them. Actually they will know where we guess about low level radiation effects. Probably some genius will find a way to decontaminate radionuclides that we do not even entertain in our dreams. Private enterprise will probably find a way to profit from such materials as carbon 14.

The use of the word "conservative" is unfortunate. Such usage is not covered in most dictionaries and certainly not in politics.

Table 5.3

Same comment as above

Section 5.7.2 EPA's Philosophy Page 5.27

If the EPA philosophy really is "that active institutional controls are not to be relied upon.....for more than 100 years after disposal." Then EPA assumes that we will learn nothing more in the next 100 years, safety laws and practices will be relaxed and that stupid people will abound. As to the utter nonsense of such a philosophy look back 100 years and imagine what rules we would be following now that were promulgated in 1889. Even Thomas Edison less than 100 years ago thought that high voltage alternating current power distribution should be outlawed because of public danger.

6.6 Standards for Protection of the Public

Since these standards use millirem, the EIS should use millirems where dosing is tabulated throughout.

8.10 Glossary

Add the definition of smear, smearable as it applies in the EIS. Add the definition of stochastic and "stochastic dose equivalent" as used Page E.7, E 1.4.

Page E.35, E.3.4.1 Intruder Scenario

That the regulating agencies representing the populace would abandon all responsibility and permit an individual to foolishly dig a basement and live in a house in the worst possible location, using all of the contaminated water from the worst reactor for drinking and irrigating his own food supply, defies imagination.

However, one hundred years from now, after all data is in on Chernobyl and other pertinent information becomes available, there is a possibility that many controls can be sensibly relaxed. Trust our descendants!

Page E.38

An obvious error in Columbia River flow rate.

Table F.2 Appendix F

Referring back to Table 1.2 The 50000 person-rem for the so-called "No Action" apparently assumes that the site will be abandoned in 100 years and left willy-nilly to the following 9900 years.

A note of explanation should be added to Table 1.2 showing the exposure for the first 100 years. This would put the alternative into better perspective.

RECOMMENDATION

1. Since the EIS is written to show technical comparisons of various ways of decommissioning for those who must make the final decision it has been free of actual recommendations. The authors have done this in a commendable fashion and deserve our congratulations. On the basis of the facts as presented, I recommend that the third alternate "Safe Storage Followed by One Piece Removal" be adopted for the following reasons.

a. The radiation dosage is far below the maximum considered to be safe.

b. It allows future administrators and budget makers freedom of choice as additional monitoring makes present estimated radiological effects either confirmed or altered.

c. It allows state of the art of people protection to be utilized as new facts and new methods develop.

d. The timing of removal, dismantlement or in situ decommissioning to be chosen at any time in the next 10, 50, 100, or 1000 years according to the judgment of people living at that time.

e. Our money can be spent on projects more effective for the promotion our health and welfare or even to reduce the budget deficit.

f. It is the least expensive since the removal expense is deferred for many years. The expectation that the removal of the reactors in 75 years is reasonable for cost estimating purposes.

2. Even though neither DOE nor EPA include it in their instructions for the preparation of the EIS, I recommend that additional cost estimates include the effect on annual budgets and an evaluation of present worth of deferred costs.

Respectfully submitted.

T. H. McGreer
T. H. McGreer

CHRISTINE O GREGOIRE
Director



JUL 31 1989

L042

STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY

Mail Stop PV-11 • Olympia, Washington 98504-8711 • (206) 459-6000
July 27, 1989

Ms. Karen J. Wheelless, Director
United States Department of Energy
Office of Communications
Richland Operations Office
Richland, Washington 99352


Dear Ms. Wheelless:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement on Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington. The Department of Ecology is responsible for coordinating the state agencies' review of federal documents issued under the National Environmental Policy Act.

Consistent with this responsibility, we circulated information on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement to other state agencies, and received responses from the office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. Their comments, along with Governor Gardner's July 20 hearing testimony and comments from Ecology are enclosed, and represent the comments and concerns of the state of Washington.

We strongly support the United States Department of Energy's effort to move ahead with this key element of Hanford cleanup and we look forward to working with you on this most important project.

Sincerely,


Christine O. Gregoire
Director

COG:dp/tgj

Enclosures

cc: Terry Husseman
Mike Palko

**STATE OF WASHINGTON, DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY, COMMENTS ON
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT,
DECOMMISSIONING OF EIGHT SURPLUS PRODUCTION REACTORS
AT THE HANFORD SITE, RICHLAND, WASHINGTON**

July 27, 1989

The following comments refer specifically to RCRA and state Dangerous Waste Regulations.

1. Section 6 discusses the various regulatory authorities which may need to be considered during D&D activities. Section 6.4 is specific to RCRA and CERCLA requirements. In part, this section states that the EIS is not intended to resolve specific regulatory requirements. This is proper, however the EIS does need to discuss the impacts of these regulations on the proposed alternatives. Specifically, in situ decommissioning and safe storage alternatives may be severely impacted by RCRA regulations and the state Dangerous Waste Regulations (WAC 173-303). The final EIS should more clearly identify and evaluate the potential regulatory requirements for these alternatives.
2. The 1984 amendments to RCRA, commonly known as Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA), contain provisions which allow for corrective actions at permitted facilities. As the Hanford Site will be permitted under provisions of WAC 173-303, consideration must be given to the applicability of HSWA provisions. Specifically, the reactor sites in question may be considered Solid Waste Management Units (SWMUs) under HSWA and therefore would need to be addressed in the site permit. Although this regulatory question may not be resolved in the EIS, it should be discussed as it may severely affect any alternative.
3. Section 6.3 discusses the various regulations governing solid waste. The third bullet identifies WAC 173-303 as the state regulatory program for hazardous waste. This is correct, however, it should also point out that these regulations are considerably more stringent than the federal counterparts (RCRA). These differences may restrict alternatives. Of immediate interest is the state Toxicity Designation procedure (WAC 173-303-101) which may designate reactor cores as dangerous or extremely hazardous waste. Similarly, it should be pointed out that Ecology is pursuing authorization for implementing the HSWA provisions and this may occur prior to any activities being completed for this project, thereby subjecting these activities to state oversight.
4. The safe-storage alternatives appear to either totally lack the appropriate groundwater monitoring, or severely underestimate what would be required (see comments 1 and 2 above). This alternative should be reanalyzed to ensure that the appropriate groundwater monitoring programs are planned for and implemented over the possible 96 year safe-storage period.

5. Appendix J discusses the National Historic Preservation Act requirements and invites comment on potential impact. Should the B Reactor be nominated and eventually listed on the National Register of Historic Places, the EIS would need to evaluate a combination of alternatives, such as removal of the remaining 7 reactors while decontaminating B Reactor. These discussions should be included in the final EIS.

The following are specific comments on the remainder of the DEIS.

Page 1.7 - The text should clarify that irradiated lead (653 tonnes) is a mixed radioactive waste subject to regulation.

Page 1.22 - Thermal expansion and contraction plus past removal of metal channel liners resulted in powdered graphite. Would graphite powders (see page 5.4) support combustion?

Page 3.57 - Columbia River flow alteration could be caused by factors in addition to climatic changes. The final EIS should describe erosion and accretion processes which could change the river channel and lead to immersion of reactors.

Page 4.12 - It would be helpful to have figures showing the extent of a probable maximum flood and flooding resulting if 25% and 50% of Grand Coulee Dam were destroyed. An example is enclosed.

Page 4.17 - The text should include a comparison of recharge coming from artificial sources with recharge coming from natural sources and discuss how this pattern is expected to change over time.

Page 4.12 - A review of University of Washington seismic data and reactor siting data indicates that deep seismic data is associated with known and inferred geologic structures.

Page 4.23 - Current monitoring programs for leaking tanks are not refined enough to determine, with any degree of certainty, that leaks from waste storage tanks have or have not resulted in radiation exposure to the public.

Page 4.25 - Have any of the well systems on the Hanford site used for drinking-water ever exceeded radiological drinking-water standards? If so, how did they come into compliance?

Page 6.4 The final EIS should explain how decisions could be influenced because RCRA applies to the hazardous component of radioactive mixed waste but not to the radioactive component of radioactive mixed waste.

Page A.16 - Because masonite and transite are no longer in today's lexicon, the text should give a brief description of each product.

Page A.28 - The final EIS should explain why certain facilities listed in Table A.12 do not contain cadmium but on page 3.4 it states cadmium is alloyed with lead.




Figure 3-27. Flooded area for the probable maximum flood (after ERDA, 1976).

**STATE OF WASHINGTON COMMENTS ON
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT,
DECOMMISSIONING OF EIGHT SURPLUS PRODUCTION REACTORS
HANFORD SITE, RICHLAND, WASHINGTON**

JULY 20, 1989; SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) on Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors at the Hanford Site in Richland. My name is Dan Silver. I am Governor Gardner's Special Assistant on Hanford.

My comments will focus on broad public policy issues involved with decommissioning of the reactors. Detailed comments will be submitted before the public review period ends on July 28.

Governor Gardner and the citizens of Washington applaud the U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) decision to move ahead with decommissioning of the surplus reactors, and we look forward to working with you on this most important project.

L042

The Governor regards decommissioning to be our responsibility. We should not pass this nuclear waste problem down to citizens three or four generations hence. Accordingly, he believes that decommissioning of the reactors must not be delayed for 75 more years.

His preference is that all eight of the reactors be buried in the plateau of the 200 West Area, well away from the Columbia River. This will provide the maximum protection to the public and to the environment from natural catastrophe or human error.

Although the DEIS briefly discusses the various regulatory authorities which may need to be considered during decommissioning activities, the document understates the impact of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and the Washington Administrative Code 173-303 on in situ decommissioning and safe storage. The final draft should more clearly describe the potential regulatory requirements for these alternatives. The final draft should also indicate that the decommissioning will be done in accordance with the terms of the Tri-Party Agreement recently signed by the state and the federal government.

The B Reactor has an exceptionally strong association with the history of the U.S. atomic energy program and the development of the atomic bomb at the end of World War II. In view of its

historic significance, the future interpretive value of the B Reactor should be preserved, if it is technically, environmentally, and economically feasible. Varying degrees of interpretive value could be preserved by maintaining part of the facility in its present condition, construction of a 105-B representative at the site, displaying the control room at the Hanford Science Center or the Smithsonian Institute, or by providing extensive photographs and records at one of the these sites.

The final EIS should evaluate the environmental, cost, scientific heritage, and cultural heritage impacts of each option listed above. Evaluations should assess public accessibility and the ability to illustrate unique construction and operational achievements. Incremental costs associated with maintaining and monitoring the B Reactor in place while the other seven reactor blocks are moved to the 200 West Area should be included in the final EIS. Of course, the historic register decision must not compromise protection of public health, safety, and the environment.

The Washington State Shoreline Management Act (chapter 90.58 RCW) states that it is the policy of the state to provide for management of the shorelines of the state by planning for and fostering all reasonable and appropriate uses. Although the DEIS assumes a time period of 100 years for active institutional

L042

control -- with an intention to maintain institutional control of the site in perpetuity -- there is no discussion about allowing reasonable and appropriate public use of the shoreline.

Decommissioning of the reactors will remove a significant roadblock to opening major sections of the Hanford Reach shoreline to the public. If the reach is designated as a part of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, that portion of the river will remain open for boating and fishing but not for shoreline uses. Protection of historic, archaeological, and cultural properties together with yet to be decommissioned sites would preclude opening of the entire Hanford Reach. However, the final EIS should articulate a federal policy of shoreline use during the period of institutional control. We recommend a phased approach which would allow the public reasonable and appropriate use of the shoreline.

In conclusion, Governor Gardner strongly supports USDOE's effort to move ahead on this key element of Hanford cleanup.



STATE OF WASHINGTON

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
OFFICE OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION

111 West Twenty-First Avenue, KL-11 • Olympia, Washington 98504-5411 • (206) 753-4011 • SCAN 234-4011

June 14, 1989

Mr. Tom Bauman
U.S. Dept. of Energy
Richland Operations Office
P.O. Box 550
Richland, WA 99352

Log Reference: 1275-F-DOE-09
Re: Decommissioning of Eight
Surplus Production Reactors at
the Hanford Site, Richland,
Washington

Dear Mr. Bauman:

We have reviewed the U.S. Department of Energy draft Environmental Impact Statement, Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EIS-0119D), March 1989 and would like to offer the following comments.

Appendix J of the EIS, National Historic Preservation Act Requirements, evaluates only two options with respect to the Hanford 105-B Reactor, which has been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The options identified are the no action alternative, which the EIS concludes is unacceptable for health and human safety reasons, and the "recordation" alternative, which would involve the production of measured drawings and written documentation prior to dismantling.


In view of the extraordinary historic significance of the 105-B Reactor, we believe that it should be treated separately from the remaining seven reactors in determining the options for its decommissioning. One additional option that should be carefully considered is the feasibility of removing only the most hazardous portions of 105-B and retaining in situ as much as possible of the reactor building, control room, mechanical and electrical systems and any other features that are not a long term health risk. Although this approach may present technical problems, we believe that the future interpretive value of 100-B should be preserved in the decommissioning process if it is feasible and prudent.

L042

Mr. Tom Bauman
June 14, 1989
Page 2

As the world's first large scale production reactor, 105-B represents a watershed in the history of science and technology. Although access to the site is now restricted, 105-B is still one of the most compelling and thought provoking historic landmarks in the United States. This issue should be explored in greater detail in the EIS.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Jacob E. Thomas". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the typed name and title.

Jacob E. Thomas
State Historic Preservation Officer

mr

JUL 31 1989

L043

Karen J. Wheelless, Director
Office of Communications
Richland Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland, Washington, 99352

July 28, 1989

Dear Ms Wheelless

I wish to make my comments part of the official record regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement concerning Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington.

After reviewing the Draft EIS I believe the best alternative would be the Immediate One Piece Removal. I have been on the Hanford Reach. I am also a native Washingtonian, and I desire to keep this beautiful place known as the Tri-Cities economically healthy and a great location to raise a family.

This action of Immediate One-Piece Removal will provide a positive impact for the local economy while enhancing the scenic values of the Hanford Reach which is currently under study as a Wild and Scenic River.

The cost of this alternative appears to be moderate in comparison to other options, but inexpensive over the long period - while protecting the environment and quality of the Columbia River.

Again, I encourage your adoption of the Immediate One-Piece Removal Alternative.

Sincerely,

RL COMMITMENT CONTROL

J. Ernesto Balbi

JUL 31 1989

P.O. Box 6697

Kennewick WA 99336-0639

RICHLAND OPERATIONS OFFICE

L044

JUL 31 1989

Office (509) 586-6445

Michael R. Cummings, M.D.

Pathologist

805 South Auburn Street

P.O. Drawer 5898

Kennewick, Washington 99336

PL COMMITMENT CONTROL
891439 OF
SSD
DISTRIBUTION
MGR
AMS
COM

July 27, 1989

Karen J. Wheelless, Director
Office of Communications, Richland Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Ms. Wheelless:

As a member of the Columbia River Conservation League I would like to herein comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement concerning decommissioning of eight surplus production reactors at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington.

In an effort to create a more esthetically pleasing environment and yet one which is economically feasible when considered with the other proposed alternatives we recommend adoption of the Immediate One-Piece Removal Alternative. This choice would enhance the scenic values of the Columbia River's Hanford Reach which are currently under study by the National Park Service.

Too, this alternative would provide for a positive impact on our local economy which has received setbacks with the recent cuts at the Hanford site.

The costs of this alternative at \$190.8 million is in the middle of the five alternatives. We feel that the Immediate One-Piece Removal appears to be a cost effective solution.

We encourage your adoption of this alternative as representing a safe, cost effective method for decommissioning the reactors while enhancing the esthetic attributes and wildlife resources of the Columbia River. Your attention will be most appreciated. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michael R. Cummings
Michael R. Cummings, M.D.

MRC/rre

RL COMMITMENT CONTROL

JUL 28 1989



Confederated Tribes and Bands
of the Yakima Indian Nation

AUG 1 1989

L045

Established by the
Treaty of June 9, 1855

July 28, 1989

Mr. Tom Bauman
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
Richland, Washington 99352

RE: YAKIMA INDIAN NATION COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT, DECOMMISSIONING OF EIGHT SURPLUS PRODUCTION REACTORS AT THE HANFORD SITE, RICHLAND, WA.


Dear Mr. Bauman:

Enclosed are the comments of the Yakima Indian Nation concerning the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on decommissioning eight surplus production reactors at the Hanford site.

As you will note, the Yakima Indian Nation supports DOE actions which minimize or eliminate future environmental damage at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation. Therefore, the Yakima Nation supports the Immediate One-Piece Removal alternative described in the DEIS, which would require removal of the reactor block assemblies to the 200 West Area, along with facilities and equipment contaminated with radioactivity. This alternative provides the maximum environmental, health, and safety protection of the alternatives described in the DEIS.

The Hanford Nuclear Reservation rests on land ceded to the U.S. Government in the Treaty of 1855; the Yakima Nation retains rights to this land and to the Columbia River fishery. The Yakima Indian Nation urges the DOE to take into full consideration the protection of the Columbia River fishery and developing the final EIS.

Sincerely,

Yakima Indian Nation

Ray Olney, Secretary
Yakima Tribal Council
Enclosure

cc: Carroll Palmer, Deputy Director, Natural Resources Dept.
Delano Saluskin, Environmental Protection Program Mgr.

0.81

L045

**YAKIMA INDIAN NATION
COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
DECOMMISSIONING OF EIGHT SURPLUS PRODUCTION REACTORS
AT THE HANFORD SITE, RICHLAND, WASHINGTON**

JULY 28, 1989

**Submitted to:
Mr. Tom Bauman
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550
Richland, Washington 99352**

**Submitted by:
Yakima Indian Nation
P.O. Box 151
Toppenish, Washington 98948**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	<u>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS</u>	1
	A. PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE	1
	B. GENERAL AND SPECIFIC COMMENTS	1
II.	<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	3
	A. TREATY OF 1855	3
	B. MANHATTAN PROJECT	3
	C. YAKIMA INDIAN NATION TRADITIONAL USE AT HANFORD AND RESERVED RIGHTS	4
III.	<u>GENERAL COMMENTS ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</u>	6
	A. PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE	6
	B. NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA)	7
	C. FEDERAL POLICY AND STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	8
	D. NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT (NHPA)	9
IV.	<u>SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</u>	10

I. SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

A. PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE

The Yakima Indian Nation supports the Immediate One-Piece Removal alternative considered in the DEIS. This alternative provides the greatest protection to the health and safety of people in the area, and minimizes potential impacts to the Columbia River. However, the Yakima Nation requests that the Department of Energy consult with the Tribe during planning, site-characterization, cultural resource and archaeological site survey work, and implementation of the selected alternative to ensure the protection of numerous Indian cultural resource sites in the area. Such consultation must include on-site inspection by the Yakima Indian Nation.

The Yakima Nation continues to rely on the fishery of the Columbia River system, and measures which lead to the long-term environmental protection of the fishery are in concurrence with Tribal goals. Though the surplus reactors appear to pose little immediate danger to the river relative to other inactive waste sites, the immediate removal of the reactor blocks to the 200 West Area, along with facilities and equipment contaminated with radioactivity, would provide maximum protection for the environment.

The Immediate One-Piece Removal alternative presented in the Draft EIS best supports the trust responsibility of the Federal government to the Yakima Indian Nation, by minimizing further damage to the natural resources in this area of the ceded land.

B. GENERAL AND SPECIFIC COMMENTS

The Draft EIS is lacking in terms of describing the Treaty between the Yakima Indian and the U.S. government. Though mention is made of ceded land areas, no description is made of the legal status of this land. No mention is made of the Department of Energy's trust responsibility to Indian tribes, as described in Federal law and policy.

Description of cultural resource management of the Hanford site in the Draft EIS, consistent with the National Historic Preservation Act and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, is lacking. The Draft EIS makes mention of the fact that the 100 Areas have not been surveyed for cultural resources, but does not describe how the Yakima Indian Nation will be consulted during such surveys.

The Hanford Reach of the Columbia River is exceptionally significant to the Yakima Nation, in terms of the fishery, cultural and natural resource sites, and religious areas. The Department of Energy must fully consider the impacts of its proposed actions on these resources when developing the Final EIS.

II. INTRODUCTION

A. TREATY OF 1855

Under Article III of the Treaty of 1855, signed by the Yakima Indian Nation and the United States government, the following provisions were agreed to and now form part of the supreme law of the land:

"The exclusive right of taking fish in all streams, where running through or bordering said reservation, is further secured to said confederated tribes and bands of Indians, as also the right of taking fish at all usual and accustomed places, in common with citizens of the Territory, and of erecting temporary buildings for curing them; together with the privilege of hunting, gathering roots and berries, and pasturing their horses and cattle upon open and unclaimed land." (12 Stat. 951, June 9, 1855).

The ceded land referred to in the Treaty is of utmost importance to the Yakima Indian Nation. This is the land which constituted the domain of the Yakima Native people since time immemorial. The Yakima Nation is still reliant on the natural resources of the ceded land area. Of particular relevance to the decommissioning of the Hanford reactors is the protection of the fishery of the Columbia River system, other natural resources dependent upon an uncontaminated environment, and the cultural resources in the area which are an integral part of present day Yakima life.

B. MANHATTAN PROJECT

At the inception of the Manhattan Project in 1943, the Yakima Indian Nation continued to exercise its Treaty rights in the Hanford area, as enumerated in the above passage. Further, those rights not specifically enumerated in the Treaty were, and are, held to be reserved by the Yakima Indian Nation.

The Manhattan Project of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers arose from a national security emergency, in what was determined at the time to be a race between warring powers to develop an atomic weapon. The first three of the eight reactors described in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (105-B, 105-D, and 105-F) were constructed under the urgency of wartime by the Manhattan Project, beginning in early 1943.

The 105-B reactor first began producing weapons grade plutonium 15 months from the time of initial construction. The second atomic weapon dropped on Nagasaki, Japan was built with plutonium produced at the 105-B reactor. Although there cannot be an absolute determination, it is widely believed that use of atomic weapons in the war against Japan helped to shorten the war relative to the probability of an extended conventional war.

In this context, it is important to note that the Yakima Indian Nation has contributed to every war effort and conflict engaged in by the United States since the signing of the Treaty. The Yakima Indian Nation considered the condemnation of the Hanford land by the U.S. government to be a temporary measure to further the war effort. Although private landholders at Hanford were compensated when the Hanford site was secured by the U.S. government, it is unclear whether any formal communication occurred between the U.S. government and the Yakima Indian Nation regarding reserved Treaty rights in the area.

C. YAKIMA INDIAN NATION TRADITIONAL USE AT HANFORD AND RESERVED RIGHTS

The Hanford land holds special significance for the Yakima Indian Nation as part of its ceded area. This land was the traditional wintering area for the Yakima people. For thousands of years, the Yakima people made Hanford their winter home when snow began descending into the valleys from the crest of the Cascades. The low elevation and resulting mild winter temperatures, abundance of wildlife, and the confluence of three major rivers were factors which made the Hanford region a site of rich natural resources. Over thousands of years of habitation the Hanford area assumed great cultural, religious, and traditional significance for the Indian people. This significance remains today, and is the basis for concerns regarding further alteration of the land along the Columbia River.

Nuclear material production activities at Hanford, commencing in 1943 have profoundly altered the land. Construction activities have altered physical features, and nuclear and chemical production operations have contaminated land, air, and water with radioactive and chemical waste. It is now estimated that over \$50 billion will be required to contain, isolate, and dispose of such waste at Hanford. Some waste isolated and immobilized at the Hanford site will remain hazardous for thousands of years. From the Yakima Nation's perspective, however, a thousand years is not such a long time, and represents only another page in history.

The Yakima Nation supports the goals of restoring the Hanford land. The future health and safety of the people living near Hanford depends on conscientious and responsible remediation of inactive waste sites, as well as revision of current waste management activities to minimize or eliminate discharges to the environment. Characterization and remediation of inactive waste sites at Hanford poses an unprecedented challenge, and many economic, social, and technical tradeoffs must be weighed during the lengthy cleanup process.

The Yakima Indian Nation, as a sovereign government, will continue to exercise its rights and responsibilities at Hanford. Of great concern to the Yakima Nation, as regards the reactor decommissioning process, is the attention given to protection of cultural resources, traditional use areas, and religious sites. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement makes note of the potential listing of the B Reactor in the National Register of Historic Places (36 CFR 60). There is no doubt that the B Reactor is a significant historical site, but consideration of its protection should be weighed in the context of preservation of a record of thousands of years of human habitation and development in the same area.

Placing the Hanford reactor decommissioning in a historical context helps to explain the Yakima Indian Nation perspective regarding future actions in this area. The reactors were built specifically to further the war effort in the early 1940's, a time when many Yakima people lived by hunting, fishing, and gathering traditional foods and medicines in the Hanford area. When the decision was made to drop atomic weapons on Japan, Hanford's initial mission in support of national security was realized. The end of World War II, however, did not result in the re-opening of this land for the Yakima people.

In 1943, the Yakima people lost a great traditional and natural resource for the cause of national defense; during this era the Yakima Nation also contributed soldiers to the war effort. The Yakima Nation has not been compensated for the land, cultural sites, and fishery which it lost during World War II. As the environmental restoration of the land along the Columbia River goes forward, the Federal government should consider means of returning access and use of this area to the Yakima Indian Nation, which maintains property rights at Hanford.

III. GENERAL COMMENTS ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

A. PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE

The Yakima Indian Nation supports the Immediate One-Piece Removal alternative considered in the DEIS. This alternative provides the greatest protection to the health and safety of people in the area, and minimizes potential impacts to the Columbia River. However, the Yakima Nation requests that the Department of Energy consult with the Tribe during planning, site-characterization, cultural resource and archaeological site survey work, and implementation of the selected alternative to ensure the protection of numerous Indian cultural resource sites in the area. Such consultation should include on-site inspection by the Yakima Indian Nation.

The No Action alternative, as described in the DEIS, would result in deterioration of the reactor buildings, potential release of radionuclides to the environment, potential human exposure to radioactivity by intrusion, and potential safety hazards to intruders. The No Action alternative is unacceptable.

The Safe Storage Followed by Deferred One-Piece Removal alternative is inadequate because it would cost more than the Immediate One-Piece Removal alternative, and provide only limited reduction in occupational radiation doses. In addition, this alternative increases the risk of contamination to the environment during the storage interval.

The Safe Storage Followed by Deferred Dismantlement alternative is inadequate because it also entails a greater cost, results in greater occupational radiation doses, and increases the potential for release of radionuclides to the environment over the Immediate One-Piece Removal alternative.

The In Situ Decommissioning alternative is grossly inadequate. This scenario would save only a marginal amount in terms of overall cost when compared to the other plausible alternatives (about five percent less than the Immediate One-Piece Removal alternative). Though decommissioning on-site would result in the lowest occupational radiation doses of the plausible alternatives considered, it would yield the greatest impacts to the environment and to cultural resource sites significant to the Yakima Nation. In addition, this alternative would yield the greatest radiation population dose over 10,000 years.

The Yakima Indian Nation supports the objectives cited in Section 2.0, "Purpose of and Need for Action":

"The purpose of decommissioning is to isolate securely any remaining radioactive or hazardous wastes in a manner that will reduce environmental impacts to an acceptable level, especially potential health and safety impacts on the public."

The Yakima Nation continues to rely on the fishery of the Columbia River system, and measures which lead to the long-term environmental protection of the fishery are in concurrence with Tribal goals. Though the surplus reactors appear to pose little immediate danger to the river relative to other inactive waste sites, the immediate removal of the reactor blocks to the 200 West Area, along with facilities and equipment contaminated with radioactivity, would provide maximum protection for the environment.

The Immediate One-Piece Removal alternative presented in the Draft EIS best supports the trust responsibility of the Federal government to the Yakima Indian Nation, by minimizing further damage to the natural resources in this area of the ceded land.

B. NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA)

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement on Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington was prepared under the authority of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (Public Law 91-190). Section 4331 of the Act states, in part, that:

"In order to carry out the policy set forth in this chapter, it is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means, consistent with other essential considerations of national policy, to improve and coordinate Federal plans, functions, programs, and resources to the end that the Nation may --

(1) ...

(4) preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity and variety of individual choice ..."

Because the Hanford Nuclear Reservation has been closed to public access since 1943, many of the cultural resources directly associated with Yakima presence are still intact at Hanford. In other regions of the ceded land, pothunters and amateur archaeologists have irretrievably damaged such resources. The NEPA clause cited above is a clear indication of Congressional intent to preserve cultural aspects of the national heritage. Enough archaeological research has been completed at Hanford to demonstrate the richness and diversity of cultural resources left by Indian people. The Department of Energy should place greater emphasis on preserving these cultural resources in the development of the Final EIS.

C. FEDERAL POLICY AND STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The DEIS states that decommissioning will be carried out in accordance with DOE's environmental policy. It continues:

"Environmental regulations and standards of potential relevance to decommissioning are those promulgated by the EPA under the Atomic Energy Act (AEA), the Clean Air Act (CAA), Clean Water Act (CWA), Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). State environmental regulations have also been promulgated under the authority of some of these federal statutes. Regulations of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission do not apply to the decommissioning of the surplus production reactors."

Current United States administrative policy is to recognize Treaty rights, and to interact with tribes on a government-to-government basis. In addition, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has a policy of treating federally recognized tribes as it does states. Further, many of the major federal environmental laws, including the Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, and CERCLA have been amended by Congress to specifically recognize the authority of Indian tribes to regulate the environment on tribal lands. This authority may extend off-reservation to ceded lands. The DOE should recognize in the Final EIS that Treaty rights and tribal jurisdiction are included in the statutory and regulatory requirements which apply to decommissioning the surplus production reactors.

In addition, regulations which will affect decommissioning alternatives but not listed above are those derived from the National Historic Preservation Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act. These laws should be included in Section 1.6, STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS. Please refer to Section 6.5.

D. NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT (NHPA)

The DEIS refers to the eligibility of the 105-B reactor for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their actions on historic properties and to afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation a reasonable opportunity to comment on such undertakings. The Advisory Council has issued regulations (36 CFR Part 800) on how agencies are to comply with the NHPA; when the regulations were revised in 1986, special attention was given to ensuring that Indian tribes and other Native American groups were provided full opportunity to participate in the review of Federal undertakings under Section 106.

These regulations encourage Federal agencies to "be sensitive to the special concerns of Indian tribes in historic preservation issues, which often extend beyond Indian lands to other historic properties." This language refers to the historical fact of complete and total Indian ownership of lands prior to migration of Indo-European settlers to North America.

In addition, the regulations require a Federal agency which is identifying historic properties impacted by its actions to "seek information in accordance with agency planning processes from...Indian tribes...likely to have knowledge of or concerns with historic properties in the area" (36 CFR Sec. 880.4(a)(1)(iii)). Further, when an undertaking reviewed under the regulations will affect Indian lands, the regulations require that the Federal agency responsible for the undertaking "invite the governing body of the responsible tribe to be a consulting party and to concur in any agreement" (36 CFR Sec. 800.1(c)(2)(iii)).

IV. SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

COMMENT 1, Section 1.3, Page 1.7

The Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS) should explain how designation of the 100 Areas on the CERCLA National Priorities List (NPL) would affect timetables for action on decommissioning. Also, in May of 1989, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Washington State Department of Ecology (WaDOE), and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) signed a Federal Facilities Agreement and Consent Order regarding waste management and environmental restoration activities at Hanford. The Final EIS should explain how this agreement will affect consideration of Draft EIS alternatives as well as implementation of the chosen alternative.

COMMENT 2, Section 1.4.6, Page 1.21

The Draft EIS states that:

"Preoperational surveys at proposed borrow-pit sites and around the reactors will be conducted in advance of any decommissioning operations to ensure that no cultural resource or archaeological site is inadvertently impacted or disturbed."

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA) of 1982 mandated affected Indian tribe participation in DOE's high-level nuclear waste repository program, as a recognition of potential impacts on reserved Treaty rights on the ceded land. During the period from 1983 to 1988, the Yakima Indian Nation was extensively involved in review of technical, socioeconomic, and cultural resource data generated by DOE. The data and information generated by DOE on Indian cultural resources at Hanford was consistently identified by the Yakima Indian Nation as lacking on technical and academic merits. The National Historic Preservation Office has also seriously criticized DOE cultural resource management planning.

The Yakima Indian Nation recommends that DOE develop a policy for ensuring Tribal participation during cultural resource survey work.

COMMENT 3, Section 1.4.6, Page 1.21

The statement in the Draft EIS,

"The Hanford Site is located on lands ceded to the U.S. government by the Yakima and Umatilla Indians and is near lands ceded by the Nez Perce Indians",

should be made under Section 1.6, STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS. Ceded land rights have little relevance to socioeconomic considerations, but are in the domain of legal powers exercised by governments.

COMMENT 4, Section 1.5.12, Page 1.25

The Draft EIS states that:

"Sites used for the acquisition of dirt and gravel will be surveyed for archaeological resources and endangered species, and will be rehabilitated when no more material need be acquired from the site".

Please refer to COMMENT 2.

COMMENT 5, Section 4.6.3, Page 4.38

The Draft EIS states that:

"Three National Register Archaeological Districts, one listed site, and numerous as-yet unevaluated sites are located near the 100 Areas. A detailed description of some of these sites can be found in Rice 1985 and ERDA 1975. The 100 Areas themselves have not yet been surveyed for cultural resources."

The Yakima Nation was contacted by DOE in December, 1987 regarding possible remedial action near the 116-K-2 Trench, an area adjacent to the 105-KE reactor and typical of the land around the other reactors. The issue of concern was potential impacts to Indian burial sites at the site of remedial action. Referring to the archaeological literature, including Rice, DOE produced maps which clearly indicated a lack of adequate information concerning location of the burial sites. Following consultation and on-site inspection by the Yakima Nation the remedial action was approved.

The Yakima Nation recommends that similar consultation by the Department of Energy, including on-site inspection, occurs during cultural resource surveys at the surplus production reactors.

COMMENT 6, Section 4.6.5, Page 4.39

The section in the Draft EIS entitled "Indian Tribes" is completely inadequate, and contains more misinformation than factual material.

The first sentence of the section reads:

"The Hanford Site is located on lands ceded to the U.S. government by the Yakima and Umatilla Indians, who now live on reservations near the Hanford Site (DOE 1987)."

Perhaps one-third of enrolled Yakima Indian Nation members live off the Yakima Reservation. Stating that the Yakima and Umatilla Indians now live on reservations is comparable to stating that Department of Energy employees live in Richland.

The Draft EIS further states:

"As part of their treaty agreements, the Yakima and Umatilla Indians were generally assured of the right to fish at all their usual and accustomed places."

This sentence is an inadequate paraphrase of the actual Treaty language. Refer to the comment INTRODUCTION, PART A., Treaty of 1855.

Finally, the Draft EIS states:

"Consultation with Indian religious leaders may be necessary if the potential exists for abridgement of religious freedom."

This sentence should be changed to read, "Consultation with Indian religious leaders is required by law if the potential exists for abridgement of religious freedom, as set forth in the American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-341)."

The entire Section 4.6.5 entitled "Indian Tribes" should be placed under Section 6.0, "STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS". Indian Tribes are sovereign governments whose rights have consistently been upheld in the highest courts, whose powers are derived from a treaty between governments. Consideration of Indian tribes under a section entitled "SOCIOECONOMICS OF THE AREA SURROUNDING THE SITE" denotes a fundamental misconception of tribal legal standing by the Department of Energy.

L047

AUG 1 1989

Trail and District Environmental Network
c/o Local 480, USWA
910 Portland Avenue
Trail, B.C.

July 27, 1989

Mr. Tom Bauman
US DOE
P.O. Box 550
Richland, WA 99352
U.S.A.

Dear Mr. Bowman:

The Trail & District Environmental Network is a recently formed group who have come together over a common concern for the environment. It has come to our attention that the DOE is asking for public response to the document titled "Decommissioning of the Eight Surplus Production Reactors at the Hanford Site", which is a draft EIS.

We have had an opportunity to review this DEIS and would therefore respectfully wish to make comment as a group whose concern and focus is the environment.

Of the options listed the immediate one piece removal to the 200 W. area would seem to us most likely to achieve the goal of least impact.

Removal to the 200 W. area for final disposal seems obvious to us as the risk of flood waters reaching the higher elevations are less likely. A disaster of this kind would have a much greater impact if the entombment areas were reached by the water.

It would also seem obvious that whatever action is taken should begin right away; deferment to some future date and administration, in an unknown economic climate, is risky at best. It is also another example of mortgaging the future.

Also, consolidation of the wastes in one place has more appeal than spreading it over a wider area. There is already low level waste disposal in the 200 W.; cleaning up the 100 area would allow for its release for public use.

We would like to thank you for this opportunity to express our views and we wish you a speedy and safe completion of the decontamination process.

Sincerely,

Tom Wyman, REPRESENTING THE
TRAIL & DISTRICT ENVIRONMENTAL NETWORK

AUG 1 1989

L048



Kootenay Nuclear Study Group

July 27, 1989

Tom Bauman
US DOE/PO Box 550
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mr. Bauman,

The KNSG agrees with the decision of the DOE to decommission the 8 mothballed reactors referred to in the DEIS. We have long realized that whatever one's belief about "things nuclear", final disposition of waste generated by the operation of nuclear facilities must be dealt with. We regard this as a step in that direction.

There are problems associated with the disposal of these reactors regardless of the method chosen. These methods are unproven, so whatever is done will be an experiment. Unforeseen remedial action may be necessary at some time in the future, the health and economic costs of which are not and in fact can not be dealt with now. Also, it seems that some health and economic costs that do not appear in the DEIS have already been incurred by these mothballed reactors. We would urge that all these costs be added to the estimates contained in the DEIS to give a truer picture of the total cost of producing plutonium for bombs from the mine site to the disposal site. This will give the public better information on which to base their choices in these matters.

Having considered the options discussed in the DEIS, the KNSG has with some reluctance picked option 2 as the best of a less-than satisfactory lot. The sad history of Hanford with the lack of experience in the area of proper disposal and lack of government funding to carry on with the chosen option are reasons why we consider the options less than satisfactory; however; given that retroactive action is not possible, we cannot offer better alternatives. We may only hope that future projects will be influenced by what must now be done.

Immediate one piece removal to the 200 West Area is preferred for the following reasons:

July 27, 1989

1. The higher elevation and increased distance of the 200 Area makes it better situated for the safe disposal of these wastes than is the 100 Area.
2. We feel the wastes will be safer especially in the future, if consolidated in one spot. It makes the affected area easier to look after.
3. By removing the reactors to the 200 Area and cleaning up the vacated sites in the 100 Area, this land could be released for public use.
4. We believe it to be of prime importance that any delays to implementation be avoided, hence our rejection of the deferred options. It is unlikely that any deference would be acceptable to those who have been pushing for clean up at Hanford for so long. This would be seen as a delaying tactic, and the public must believe that Hanford will be cleaned up. Immediate action also avoids the possibility of an accident involving one or more of the reactors during the 75^y safe storage period.

For the purpose of worker safety, we feel that the reactors should be removed in the order of least "radiological inventory" first, to the greatest last (based on the decay of cobalt 60).

The KNSG thanks you for soliciting and considering our comments on this matter.

Sincerely,



Michael Gilfillan
Representative
Kootenay Nuclear Study Group

MG:db



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 10
1200 SIXTH AVENUE
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101

AUG 2 1989

L049

JUL 31 1989

REPLY TO
ATTN OF:

WD-136

Karen Wheelless, Director
Office of Communications
Richland Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland, Washington 99352

Dear Ms. Wheelless:

In accordance with our responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, we have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (draft EIS) for the Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington.

Eight of the nine water-cooled, graphite-moderated plutonium production reactors constructed between 1943 and 1963 at the Hanford Site have been declared surplus and are available for decommissioning. Five decommissioning alternatives are examined in the draft EIS. A preferred alternative is not identified.

Based on our review we have rated the draft EIS LO (Lack of Objections). Our review has not identified any potential environmental impacts that would require any significant changes to the analysis. The enclosed specific comments need to be addressed for clarification.

In particular, regulatory discussions relating to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act need to be revised. The final EIS needs to be consistent with and reference the Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order signed on May 15, 1989. This Agreement is significant as it is designed to ensure that the environmental impacts associated with past and present activities (including decommissioning) are thoroughly investigated and appropriate response action taken as necessary to protect the public health, welfare and the environment.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this draft EIS. Please contact Wayne Elson at (FTS) 399-1463 for any questions concerning our comments.

Sincerely,


Ronald A. Lee, Chief
Environmental Evaluation Branch

Enclosure

cc: Carol Borgstrom, U.S. Department of Energy
Roger Stanley, Washington Department of Ecology

0.99

L049

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Specific Comments on the
Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the
Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production
Reactors at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington

Page 1.1--We agree with the goal to decommission these reactors safely.

Pages 1.7, 6.5, and 6.6--The regulatory requirement discussions are inaccurate and need to reflect the Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order signed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington Department of Ecology, and the U.S. Department of Energy. Section 3.1 of the Action Plan for this Agreement specifically addresses decontamination and decommissioning activities.

Page 1.17--References need to be cited for all the information under the "Geology of the Site" and "Hydrology of the Site" headings.

Page 5.3, First paragraph under "Routine and Accidental Releases"--"Routine release" needs to be defined. Does this include infiltration and migration of contaminants to ground water? If so, will there be a routine release of radionuclides to the ground water as a result of natural recharge? That needs to be stated here, even though it is discussed later in the report.

Page 5.18--What are the "analyses" referred to in the first paragraph? Likewise for the "analysis" referred to in the second paragraph.

Third paragraph: Need to discuss the difference between "infiltration rate" and "recharge rate." These are defined later in the report but really need to be defined here, where they are first discussed.

Also in the third paragraph: The last sentence is incorrect. The statement implies that recharge from precipitation on the Reservation is the sole source of water for the ground-water system under the Hanford Reservation. The ground-water system under the Hanford Reservation is not an isolated, closed system which is surrounded by ground-water divides as is alluded to. Water enters the area from outside the boundaries of the reservation and flows to the Columbia River. The ground-water model is constructed to simulate such flux, and thus, general statements made in other parts of the document should reflect this concept.

Page 5.23--Estimates of human health effects of radionuclides in the Columbia River are very small. Would these same estimates apply to fish and aquatic life and those who consume them?

Page 6.5, last paragraph--It is unclear why the in situ decommissioning alternative would not need to include "conceptual designs for disposal site barriers." This needs to be clarified.

Page C.1, second paragraph--"...years per meter..." should be "...meters per year...".

Also in the same paragraph, the discussion on ground-water movement under the Reservation needs to be expanded to include a discussion on vertical movement of water upward into the Columbia River.

Page C.7, third paragraph--Additional explanations of the water levels used for calibrating the model are needed here. What "computer routine"? This is a steady-state model, so specifically, what water levels were calibrated to?...Pre-liquid waste disposal, time-averaged, present day? If they were time-averaged, what are the time boundaries? This all makes a difference when they say that the water levels were dropped to pre-1945 levels.

Page C.9, map--This map needs to include the Hanford Reservation boundaries and have the burial sites labeled. The study area boundary needs to be delineated because, as depicted, it looks as if the "Basalt Above Water Table" follows straight lines. We assume that this map is illustrating water level contours of the unconfined aquifer. This needs to be stated in the map description.

Page G.5--Ground-water effects should be clarified considering other water recharge rate estimates. See the U.S. Geological Survey report on the Columbia Basin Recharge Model: Estimates of Ground-water Recharge to the Columbia Plateau Regional Aquifer System, for Pre-development and Current Land Use Conditions, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, Bauer, H. H., Vaccaro, J. J., Water Resources Investigation Report 88-4108.

Page H.4-H.5, GROUND-WATER MONITORING--There needs to be a more complete description of the monitoring network, including the vertical location of the base of the piezometers. We suggest installing several piezometers at various depths at each monitoring well site. At least 6 of the 12 monitoring sites at the 100 Area should consist of these multiple piezometers. A monitoring schedule (i.e., how many times a year) should be included in the final EIS. Will a Quality Assurance/Quality Control plan be developed for the sampling and lab analyses procedures? We suggest that one be developed.

Page H.5, first paragraph--The following sentence needs clarification: "The 100- and 200-Area wells have different locations because the ground-water hydrology gradients are better known in the 200 Area than in the 100 Area, due to the influence of the Columbia River on the 100-Area hydrology." The 100- and 200-Area are at different locations spatially, so the wells are of course in different locations. This needs clarification or a different way of explaining what is meant.

L050

AUG 3 1989

Mr. Rex Buck Jr.
Wanapum Tribe
P.O. Box 275
Beverly, WA 99321-0275

July 31, 1989

Mr. Tom Bauman
U.S. Dept. of Energy
P.O. Box 550
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mr. Bauman:

I am sorry for the delay in replying to the Environmental Impact Statement. I hope that you can accept my apology.

On behalf of the Wanapum Band of Indians, the feeling is whatever method is chosen for the decommissioning of the reactors from Hanford by the majority of the people, is fine with us. Our concern is that we will be made aware of the method for we have burial sites, religious sites, medicines, herbs, and roots on the Hanford reservation. We are an indigenous band of people.

Thank you for letting us make our comment. Please send us the final draft. Again, I am sorry for the delay.

Sincerely,

Rex Buck Jr. (LS)

Rex Buck Jr.
Wanapum

RBJ:lb

AUG 10 1989

L051


1532 Thayer
Richland WA 99352
8 August 1989

Tom Bauman
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550
Richland WA 99352

Dear Mr. Bauman:

In regard to the EIS on decommissioning reactors at the Hanford Site, I would like to make one comment as both an archeologist and a technical communicator. People are going to be confused by the discussion of nomination of the B Plant to the National Register of Historic Places. I have already heard some who assumed that meant it would become a museum or National Monument or that a plaque would be placed on it. To prevent such confusion, I recommend adding a short discussion of exactly what inclusion in the National Register means. The current discussion is correct, but people not involved in historic preservation are unlikely to distinguish among the different names assigned to different preservation statuses, and their inevitable confusion could create misunderstandings over what in fact is a nonissue.

Sincerely,


Laurel Kay Grove



SENATOR DEAN SUTHERLAND

AUG 14 1989

L052

August 11, 1989

Tom Bauman, Office of Communications
Richland Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mr. Bauman:

I am writing to comment on the proposed action by the Department of Energy on the Eight Surplus Production Reactors at the Hanford site. As a state senator, I represent an area which includes over 150 miles of Columbia River shoreline.

I want to thank the Department for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on the reactors. The release of the DEIS is a productive early milestone in dealing with this issue. It is better to address this issue now than to delay decisions and burden future decision makers.

I wish to state my preference for the disposal alternative which entails immediate one-piece removal of the reactors to the 200-West Area. This appears to be the most comprehensive and fastest way to dispose of the reactors.

With the exception of the "no action" alternative (which I find unacceptable) the cost of immediate one-piece removal is comparable to or lower than the costs of the other options.

Thank you for consideration of these comments. I will be very interested in the release of the Final Environmental Impact Statement next year.

Sincerely,

DEAN SUTHERLAND



AMERICAN SOCIETY OF
CIVIL ENGINEERS

L053
OCT 27 1989

COLUMBIA SECTION

October 9, 1989

Mr. Jim Goodenough
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
Post Office Box 550
Richland, Washington 99352

Dear Mr. Goodenough

SUBJECT: HISTORIC PRESERVATION OF B-REACTOR

Reference: DOE/EIS-0019D, Draft Environmental Impact Statement,
"Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors at the
Hanford Site, Richland, WA"

The Columbia Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) recommends that there be consideration given to historic preservation of the B-Reactor at the Hanford Site. We recognize that we have missed the formal comment period on the referenced document, but request that you consider our recommendation in preparing your Record of Decision.

The Columbia Section represents about 250 civil engineers in the Yakima, Tri-Cities, Walla Walla, and Pendleton Area. Our national society, which represents over 120,000 civil engineers nationally and internationally, has a historical preservation task group for recognizing and preserving major civil engineering achievements. We feel that the B-Reactor construction falls within this category. We have members of our society who would welcome the opportunity in assisting the Department of Energy in developing plans and detailed recommendations on how to preserve the significance of B-Reactor.

We support some of the recommendations that were made by the Columbia Basin section of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers in their comments on the subject document. We believe that the civil engineering significance could also be effectively recognized without undue cost to the United States tax payers. Specifically, the following, as a minimum, are recommended:

- o Information Kiosk at the Vernita Bridge rest area on Washington State Highway 240. It should point out the construction achievements and innovations, as well as the national significance.
- o Enhanced photography display of construction. This could also be placed at the Vernita Bridge roadside rest, the Hanford Science Center, or as part of a traveling display.
- o Enhanced audio-visual display at the Hanford Science Center. A portion of this should discuss the civil engineering achievements.



Civil engineers make the difference.
They build the quality of life.

0.105

L053

Mr. Jim Goodenough

Page 2

October 2, 1989

- o Preservation of the reactor structure, if possible. The sheer size of the structure would be difficult for many to visualize. If possible, we would prefer seeing the reactor structure preserved, and possibly cleaned up to the point that engineering students and other interested groups could occasionally tour the facility.

Please contact me on 376-5053 (days) if you would be interested in having some of our members pursue a more detailed proposal for preserving this engineering achievement.

Sincerely,



C. M. Conselman, President
Columbia Section, ASCE

dld

cc: Tom Bauman, DOE-RL
Del Ballard, ASCE

TRANSCRIPTS

Richland

Tr-R17 Alton Haymaker

Tr-R20 John Burnham
Tri-Cities Industrial Development
Council

Tr-R24 Gordon Rogers

Tr-R27 Jim Stoffels

Tr-R29 The Honorable Claude Oliver
Benton County Treasurer

Tr-R38 Harry Brown
Columbia Basin Section
American Society of Mechanical
Engineers

Tr-R43 Dick Hammond

Tr-R45 Milton Lewis

Tr-R49 Eleanor Finkbeiner

Tr-R53 The Honorable Raymond Isaacson
Benton County Commissioner

Spokane

Tr-Sp16 Jim Thomas
Hanford Education Action League

Tr-Sp22 Mary Wieman

Portland

Tr-P16 Eugene Rosalie
Northwest Environmental Advocates

Tr-P20 T. H. McGreer

Tr-P22 Ruth McGreer

Tr-P24 David Stewart-Smith
Oregon Department of Energy

Tr-P36 JoAnn Oleksiak

Transcripts

Tr-P39	Martha Odom
Tr-P47	Bill Jones
Tr-P50	Eugene Rosalie Northwest Environmental Advocates
Tr-P52	Kathleen Maloney
<u>Seattle</u>	
Tr-Se15 ^(a)	Dan Silver Washington State Governor's Office
Tr-Se24	Barbara Zepeda Washington Democratic Council
Tr-Se48	Sharon Gann
Tr-Se48	Frank Hammond Sierra Club, Cascade Chapter
Tr-Se52	Mark Bloome Heart of America Northwest
Tr-Se55	Brendon Mahaffey
Tr-Se60	Donna Bernstein Heart of America Northwest
Tr-Se65	Russ Childers
Tr-Se68	Mark Bloome Heart of America Northwest

(a) These comments repeat those of L042, and are recorded under L042.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SURPLUS PRODUCTION REACTOR DECOMMISSIONING (SPRD)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

July 11, 1989

10:00 o'clock a.m.

Federal Building

Richland, Washington

BRIDGES & KENNEDY
Registered Professional Reporters
P. O. Box 223
Pendleton, Oregon 97801
(503) 276-9491

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X O F C O M M E N T E R S :

<u>Name:</u>	<u>Page:</u>
Alton Haymaker	17
John Burnham	20
Gordon Rogers	24
Jim Stoffels	27
Claude Oliver	29
Harry Brown	38
Dick Hammond	43
Milton Lewis	45
Eleanor Finkbeiner	49
Raymond Isaacson	53

1 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Good morning, ladies and
2 gentlemen. At this time I will formally open this morning's
3 public hearing.

4 This is the United States Department of Energy
5 proceeding number DOE EIS 0119-D. This is being held on the
6 11th day of July, 1989 in Richland, Washington, for the
7 purpose for receiving public comment regarding the Draft
8 Environmental Impact Statement prepared to analyze potential
9 environmental impacts of decommissioning the eight surplus
10 production reactors located at the Department of Energy
11 Hanford Site located near Richland, Washington.

12 This EIS when finalized will provide environmental
13 information to decision makers regarding selection of the
14 decommissioning alternative for these reactors.

15 My name is Roy Eiguren, and I'm an attorney in
16 private practice with the law firm of Lindsay, Hart, Neil &
17 Weigler, which has offices in Portland, Oregon; Boise, Idaho;
18 Seattle, Washington; San Francisco, California and Washington,
19 D.C. My practice and that of our law firm is heavily
20 concentrated in energy, environmental and natural resources
21 law.

22 I personally have had over 11 years experience in
23 conducting and participating in hearings of this type, first
24 as special assistant to the Administrator of the Bonneville
25 Power Administration within the Department of Energy, as

1 Senior Deputy for the Attorney General for the State of Idaho,
2 and in private practice.

3 I have conducted NEPA hearings and meetings for the
4 Department of Energy for more than three years throughout the
5 United States.

6 I have been retained by the Department of Energy as
7 an independent Hearing Officer to help assure that all the
8 interested persons and organizations have the opportunity to
9 accomplish two things here at this hearing.

10 Number one, that all members of the public are given
11 the opportunity to obtain information concerning the
12 Department of Energy's proposed decommissioning of the eight
13 surplus production reactors, with a particular emphasis on the
14 key environmental issues that have been identified relative to
15 the Project. And I will be presenting this information on
16 this particular matter in a few moments.

17 And secondly, to allow members of the public the
18 opportunity to comment on all significant issues for
19 additional environmental evaluation and analysis, in the
20 development of the Final Environmental Impact Statement
21 associated with the SPRD Decommissioning Project.

22 In my role as a Hearings Officer, I do not serve as
23 an advocate for or against the proposed action in this
24 proceeding. My sole purpose at this hearing is to provide
25 that all interested persons have a fair and equal opportunity

1 to comment, on the record, concerning the issues of concern
2 relative to the potential environmental impacts of the
3 proposed decommissioning action.

4 At this point, I would like to introduce the senior
5 representative representing the Department of Energy who is
6 seated with me at the table at front, as the official hearing
7 panel to receive your comments. Mr. James Goodenough, who is
8 the chief of Environmental Restoration Branch here at the
9 Richland Operations.

10 I would like to indicate at this point that this
11 is not an interactive hearing, that is to say, those of us
12 on the hearing panel will not be responding specifically to
13 comments or questions that are made by members of the public
14 today.

15 The purpose of this hearing is to receive public
16 comment for the record about the proposed action of the
17 Department of Energy. I would, however, point out that
18 members of the hearing panel may ask our commenters today
19 clarifying questions to make sure that the full import of what
20 you're saying is fully understood for the record.

21 I would like to briefly discuss at this point the
22 federal environmental decision-making process that's
23 applicable to this particular project. The National
24 Environmental Policy Act of 1969, or NEPA as it's commonly
25 known, requires that the potential environmental impacts of

1 major Federal decisions be assessed by Federal agencies and
2 that the public be given the opportunity to consider and
3 comment on those impacts.

4 This process is accomplished through the
5 preparation of the Environmental Impact Statements, or
6 EIS's, which in turn are made available to the public for
7 review and comments.

8 Hearings, such as the one we are conducting here
9 today, are held to receive public input on the document. The
10 Environmental Impact Statement development process is governed
11 by Council on Environmental Quality regulations, that Council
12 being an agency within the executive office of the President
13 of the United States, as well as the Department of Energy
14 guidelines that define the type of procedures and policies the
15 Department of Energy will follow in conducting and developing
16 these types of documents.

17 These guidelines and regulations in their entirety
18 have been previously marked by me as Exhibit Number 1 and
19 have been submitted for the record of the proceeding.

20 Publication of the notice in the Federal Register,
21 which in this case was entitled Notice of Intent to Prepare an
22 EIS and Decommissioning the eight Shutdown Production Reactors
23 located at the Hanford Site near Richland, Washington, dated
24 May 16th, 1985, initiated the Environmental Impact Statement
25 process that we're in. The May 16th, 1985 Notice of Intent

1 began a 30 day comment period during which interested parties
2 were provided with an opportunity to comment on alternatives
3 and issues to be considered in the preparation of the Draft
4 Environmental Impact Statement.

5 35 comment letters were received in response to the
6 Notice of Intent and were considered in preparing the DEIS. I
7 have marked and included as Exhibit Number 2 in the record of
8 this proceeding a copy of the Federal Register notes, which is
9 labeled 50 Federal Register 20489.

10 The Department of Energy announced the Notice of
11 Availability of this Draft Environmental Impact Statement for
12 the SPRD on April 28th, 1989. That was in 54 Federal Register
13 18325. The publication of the Notice of Availability of the
14 DEIS marked the beginning of the 90 day comment period during
15 which all interested parties may provide input concerning the
16 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The comments that we
17 received at these hearings will be considered in preparing the
18 Final EIS. I have marked and included as Exhibit Number 3 in
19 the record of this proceeding copy of the Federal Register
20 notice announcing the availability of the Draft EIS.

21 Receipt of public comments on the Draft EIS is the
22 purpose of the hearing. To assure that all parties
23 potentially interested in commenting on this Draft
24 Environmental Impact Statement were informed of its
25 preparation and availability and afforded the opportunity to

1 provide input on it, the Department of Energy conducted a
2 significant number of public involvement and public
3 information activities in advance of these hearings. These
4 activities included issuing news releases, fact sheets, the
5 conduct of individual and group news media interviews and the
6 display of decommissioning exhibits at 12 locations in eight
7 Northwest communities. A comprehensive list of these public
8 involvement activities has been marked and included by me as
9 Exhibit Number 4 in the record of this proceeding.

10 This hearing is a part of the public comment process
11 in that it provides another opportunity for interested parties
12 to provide input on the draft. Both oral and written comments
13 received at this hearing will receive equal consideration
14 along with written comments submitted throughout the entire
15 comment period, which will close on the 28th day of July,
16 1989. Comments received after the 28th day of July will be
17 considered, to the extent practical. Additional public
18 hearings on this Draft EIS have now been scheduled in Spokane,
19 Washington, for Thursday of this week; Spokane, Washington,
20 July 13th; Portland, Oregon, on July 18th and Seattle,
21 Washington, on July 20th.

22 Those of you who are here today but not prepared to
23 make an oral statement today but wish to submit written
24 comments, may do so by either submitting the written comments
25 to me as the Hearing Officer or in the alternative, you may

1 mail them to Mr. Tom Bauman, the Office of Communications, at
2 the Richland Operations Office. We do have the exact mailing
3 address on a card out at the registration table if you would
4 like to obtain it.

5 Moving onto the process, my description of the
6 Federal environmental decision-making process. After
7 reviewing the record that we're developing at these public
8 hearings, as well as the written comments that will be
9 received for the record, the Department of Energy will
10 consider the comments in finalizing the EIS. The Department
11 will also as it may -- excuse me, the Department may also
12 choose to modify, supplement or reissue the Draft Environmental
13 Impact Statement prior to issuing a Final EIS.

14 Following the issuance of the Final EIS, tentatively
15 scheduled for the summer of 1989, a Record of Decision, or
16 ROD, will be issued which will identify the environmentally
17 preferred alternative chosen by the Department, along with any
18 practical means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from
19 the alternative selected. It will also be issued no sooner
20 than 30 days following the issuance of the Final EIS.

21 So to put it differently, the document that will
22 ultimately emanate out of this series of proceedings will be
23 a Final EIS and the Record of Decision which will define the
24 alternative that is the most preferred by the Department.

25 Before discussing the procedures that we are going

1 to follow at these hearings, I would like to outline the
2 Department's proposed action and the alternatives that are
3 considered in this Draft EIS.

4 From 1943 to the mid 1950's, eight nuclear reactors
5 were built at the Hanford Site. These reactors were used in
6 various times through 1971 for the production of plutonium for
7 the nation's defense program. The last of these reactors
8 operated in 1971, in the 1970's and early 1980's they were
9 declared surplus by the government.

10 The action proposed in the Draft EIS is to
11 decommission these eight reactors.

12 The purpose of the Draft EIS is to provide the
13 environmental information that will assist the Department of
14 Energy in deciding which alternative action is the most
15 appropriate.

16 The scope of the Draft EIS includes the reactors,
17 their associated fuel storage basins and the buildings that
18 house these facilities.

19 The fuel slugs were removed from these reactors in
20 the 1960's and early 1970's. A ninth reactor, the N-Reactor,
21 began operating in 1964 and operated through early 1987. The
22 N-Reactor currently is in "wet layup" and is not included in
23 the scope of this EIS.

24 The scope also does not include the cribs, burial
25 grounds and settling basins associated with the eight

1 reactors. These facilities were evaluated in the Final
2 Environmental Impact Statement entitled Hanford Waste
3 Management Operations, Hanford Reservation, U. S. Energy
4 Research and Development Administration. ERDA 1538, 1975.

5 Further, the Department of Energy is presently
6 re-evaluating these facilities as part of DOE's
7 responsibilities under the Comprehensive Environmental
8 Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, or CERCLA
9 as it is commonly known.

10 The purpose of decommissioning is to reduce the
11 potential environmental, health, and safety impacts of the
12 contaminated facilities, which may include the stabilization,
13 reduction, or removal of radioactive and hazardous materials
14 or the demolition of facilities.

15 Because the reactors contain irradiated reactor
16 components and because the building that housed the reactors
17 are contaminated with low levels of radioactivity, the
18 Department of Energy has determined that there is a need for
19 action to ensure the long term protection of the environment
20 and public health and safety.

21 The alternative actions considered in this Draft
22 Environmental Impact Statement include the following:

23 Number one, immediate one-piece removal of the
24 reactor-block assembly to a low-level waste burial ground in
25 the center of the Hanford Site and the dismantlement and

1 removal of the contaminated equipment and components of the
2 fuel storage basins and reactor building.

3 The second alternative is safe storage followed by
4 deferred one-piece removal. That is, continuation of current
5 maintenance activities for approximately 75 years followed
6 then by one-piece removal.

7 The third option is safe storage followed by
8 deferred dismantlement and removal to the burial ground of the
9 reactor-block assembly and other contaminated-components.

10 The fourth option is in-situ decommissioning, that
11 is, the demolishing and sealing and burial under engineered
12 protected mounds of the reactor facilities at their present
13 locations.

14 And, finally, the mandated no action alternative,
15 which is continued present surveillance, monitoring and
16 maintenance.

17 Because the reactors are located along the Columbia
18 River, it is necessary to evaluate the effects of any
19 decommissioning actions with respect to flood hazards,
20 floodplain management, and wetlands protection.

21 In accordance with Executive Order Number 11988,
22 which is Floodplain Management, Executive Order 11990, which
23 deals with Protection of Wetlands and DOE regulations 10 CFR
24 1022, which deals with the compliance with floodplain and
25 wetlands Environmental Review Requirements, DOE has prepared a

1 floodplain wetlands assessment for decommissioning of the
2 surplus production reactors, and this is contained in Appendix
3 B of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. No reactor is
4 in a wetland or the 500 year critical action floodplain as
5 defined by the regulations, is within that area. Let me state
6 that again. No reactor is in a wetland or within the 500 year
7 critical action floodplain as defined by these regulations.

8 As a part of the review of the Draft EIS and in
9 compliance with executive orders and regulations regarding
10 floodplain management and wetlands protection, the DOE
11 solicits public and agency comments on these determinations.

12 The Department of Energy and the Washington State
13 Historic Preservations Officer have determined that the
14 B-Reactor is eligible for inclusion in the National Register
15 of Historic Places according to the procedures in 36 CFR 800,
16 protection of Historic and Cultural Properties, and the
17 criteria in 36 CFR 60, which deals with criteria for inclusion
18 in the National Register of Historic Places.

19 These findings are discussed in Appendix J of the
20 Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

21 Department of Energy solicits public and agency
22 comments on whether or not the B-Reactor should be nominated
23 for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places on
24 the potential impacts of decommissioning on the inclusion of
25 the B-Reactor in the National Register and on means identified

1 to mitigate potential impacts of the decommissioning action.

2 That concludes my preparation relative to the
3 Federal environmental decision making that is applicable to
4 this particular proceeding.

5 At this time I would now like to turn to the
6 procedures that we're following in this as well as all of
7 the other public hearings that we're conducting in this
8 series.

9 We have developed a series of procedures in
10 consultation with the Department of Energy and these
11 procedures which were developed for the purpose of maximizing
12 public input are available at the registration table, if you
13 so desire. The procedures are fairly straight forward.

14 First, all participants of these hearings will be
15 listed in the official record as will the comments they
16 present orally. To the extent that any of you have prepared
17 written comments and would like to submit them as a supplement
18 to your oral comments here today, I have requested that you
19 would bring them forward when you testify and give them to me
20 or to the court reporter for inclusion in the record. We'll
21 mark them as exhibits and include them as received.

22 Once again, I would like to indicate that written
23 comment will receive the same weight in the record as oral
24 comment.

25 Second, as I have previously mentioned, comments

1 received by July 28th, 1989, will be assured consideration in
2 preparation of the Final EIS. So to the extent that you would
3 like to provide written comment but do not have written
4 comment with you today, you may mail them to the address that
5 we have provided to you at the registration table and they
6 will be considered, provided they are mailed by the 28th day
7 of July. We do have comment forms also at the registration
8 table on which you can write your written comment.

9 Following my remarks, we will receive comment from
10 any elected federal, state and local officials, as well as
11 designated spokesmen for Indian Tribes, and following that
12 we will begin receipt of comments from members of the
13 public.

14 All speakers at these public hearings have five
15 minutes within which to offer their comments. We do have a
16 set of signal lights here at the podium to assist you in
17 determining where you are at in your allocated five minutes.
18 After the elapse of four minutes, the green light goes on.
19 At the end of five minutes, the red light goes on. Given
20 the fact that we have a relatively large -- or excuse me, a
21 relatively small number of commenters at this hearing, we
22 are going to be somewhat liberal in the use of the five
23 minute rule. That is to say, we are going to give you a
24 little bit more than five minutes within which to make your
25 comments if you need that.

1 Any of those who have pre-registered for comments
2 at this hearing will come to the podium first. Following
3 that we will receive comments from any folks who have signed
4 up at the registration table for the purpose of commenting
5 here at this public hearing.

6 I would indicate that as a Hearing Officer, I'm not
7 going to limit the scope or the content of any comments
8 received from the public. I would like to emphasize, however,
9 that in my opinion and that of the Department, those comments
10 that are related to the proposed decommissioning of the eight
11 surplus production reactors are relevant to the EIS process.
12 Other comments are not.

13 Finally, I want to stress that this is a formal
14 proceeding under the National Environmental Policy Act and
15 accordingly it is a recorded proceeding. That is to say,
16 everything that is said at this as well as the other public
17 hearings in this proceeding will be recorded and a full
18 transcript will be made. Copies of the transcript will be
19 made available to the public at a later time for review.

20 The Department's decision making in this proceeding
21 will be based upon the record that we develop at these public
22 hearings. So accordingly, it is imperative that when you do
23 provide your comment, particularly oral comment, that you
24 speak very clearly into the microphone so that our court
25 reporter here can pick up all of your comments and that prior

1 to giving your comment, you give us your name and address for
2 the record.

3 At this point I would be glad to respond to any
4 questions you might have on procedure. If there are any
5 questions on procedure, I will respond to those at this
6 point, and then following that we will go ahead and begin
7 the receipt of public comment. Any questions?

8 Very well. Then I will go up to the table there
9 and we'll start the receipt of public comment. Again, we
10 would ask, when your turn comes to comment, you would step
11 forward to the podium here and give us your name and address
12 and go ahead and begin your comment.

13 Our first scheduled commenter this morning is Mr.
14 Larry Caldwell. Mr. Larry Caldwell.

15 I would indicate for the record that in the event
16 we call a name and there is no response, we will call these
17 names later in our hearing and make sure that we have not
18 missed anybody.

19 Our next pre-registered commenter is Mr. Alton
20 Haymaker.

21 MR. ALTON HAYMAKER: Good morning. I am Alton
22 Haymaker. 1721 Cottonwood Drive, Pasco, Washington, and I'm a
23 Franklin County farmer and orchardist.

24 I have been a down-winder since 1954 and I'm
25 presently living at the same farm location. I would like to

1 comment -- or rather compliment the DOE for the preparation
2 they have made with regards to the text. I'm a farm boy.
3 I'm not going to probably use the language that would be
4 appropriate.

5 But certainly the language that was used in the text
6 was one that I could understand and somewhat relate to. So my
7 compliments to DOE in the way that they have presented this
8 and especially the material I picked up this morning, which is
9 a very nice job of summation.

10 I feel in somewhat of an ego situation, but I do
11 want to kind of present a little background so that you
12 appreciate the fact that I am here for probably some reasons
13 that others are not.

14 I think this is a technical issue. It's not an
15 emotional issue. And so therefore those people that are
16 uncomfortable in the areas of technical portion or the
17 aspects, I should say, of the reactors I am sure are not here
18 for that reason. So I apologize for those, and especially my
19 farming community, that perhaps are not comfortable in being
20 here to discuss this with you.

21 Between 1944 and '46 I was with the Navy as a
22 Seabee. In 1974 I was a member of the participating group
23 that moved a 120 pound -- or a 120 ton barracks from the Pasco
24 Naval Base to North Richland.

25 1974 to '79 I was with the General Electric lab.

1 I had the good fortune of having a Chicago chemist teach me
2 my -- re-teach me my high school chemistry. That was a nice
3 experience. I was a water analyst in the 100-F before I
4 decided to leave and go to California, Santa Monica Tech,
5 where I spent two years in college and two years on-the-job
6 training.

7 At that time I received in 1952 my journeyman papers
8 from the International Association of Machinists.

9 I returned then to the Hanford Project and from 1952
10 to 1968 I worked for Kaiser General Electric, J. A. Jones,
11 Boeing and the Corps of Army Engineers. I took a one year
12 withdrawal from the International Machinists in 1968.

13 Okay. I will submit my brief letter and it reads as
14 follows: I understand from the report that the eight reactors
15 are basically structurally sound. I am proud to say that I
16 was a member of the technological team. I support "continued
17 present action," page 3.7, which I believe is in the best
18 interest of the national budget. I believe that -- excuse me.
19 I believe with the present rate of scientific advancement
20 worldwide that the eight reactors may prove to be a research
21 asset rather than the present thought of a liability.
22 Sincerely, Alton Haymaker. Thank you.

23 Are there any questions?

24 MR. ROY EIGUREN: I have none. Thank you, Mr.
25 Haymaker.

1 We'll go ahead and include your letter as Exhibit
2 Number 6 in the written record.

3 For the purpose of keeping the record straight,
4 Exhibit Number 5 was a set of written comments that were
5 submitted to us prior to the commencement of our hearing this
6 morning, Exhibit 5 will be the written comments of Ivan M. A.
7 Garcia of P. O. Box 682, Richland, Washington.

8 Also I would like to make a correction for the
9 record. I misspoke earlier. The Final EIS for this
10 particular project will be available in the summer of 1990 as
11 opposed to this summer, 1989.

12 Our next scheduled commenter is John Burnham.

13 MR. JOHN BURNHAM: My name is John Burnham,
14 371 Quailwood Place, Richland, Washington.

15 I would like to speak for the Hanford Division,
16 the Tri-Cities Industrial Development council of the
17 Tri-Cities.

18 I have 40 years of experience, working the nuclear
19 industry. My work has included risk analysis and preparation
20 of Environmental Impact Statements. Now I work with the
21 Hanford Division of TRIDEC.

22 We're interested in preserving the Hanford Site
23 and developing site activities.

24 I'm pleased to see the Department of Energy come
25 out with this EIS on the site's retired production reactors.

1 The government has a responsibility to move
2 forward with a permanent, safe disposal of these reactors
3 and the low-level waste contained in the reactor blocks.

4 Implementing one of these decommissioning options
5 along with the actions taken as a part of the Tri-Party
6 Agreement is evidence of the Department's interest in cleaning
7 up the Hanford Site efficiently and completely.

8 We are certainly interested in seeing that the
9 reactors are decommissioned properly. This means the
10 decommissioning work must ensure worker safety, community
11 safety and environmental safety. The decommissioning must be
12 technically sound as well.

13 The Draft EIS compares four alternatives, taking
14 into account cost and health impacts. I am particularly
15 interested in the health impacts, as safety is a prime
16 consideration. The characteristics of the reactor blocks must
17 be considered.

18 The surplus reactors have been maintained safety
19 since the shutdown of the last reactor in 1971. 95 percent of
20 the radionuclides are contained within the blocks, each block
21 is protected by 20 to 25 centimeters of cast iron thermal
22 shielding, plus a biological shield of alternating layers of
23 steel plate and masonite, which are 100 to 200 centimeters
24 thick.

25 This shielding provides excellent confinement so

1 that there's no imminent danger of low-level waste moving into
2 the environment. Keeping the block in tact with its
3 protective shielding is important. Because the radionuclides
4 are contained within the block, the less direct interaction
5 required with the block is the better.

6 Because of this, DOE should not seriously consider
7 dismantlement options which means moving of the reactor
8 blocks to the 200 Area. Once the protected shielding of the
9 reactor-block is breached, the risk of exposure to workers
10 and ultimately the public and the community is greatly
11 increased.

12 As the EIS points out, there is a far greater
13 opportunity for exposure to workers with these options.

14 Common sense tells us that there are also practical
15 risks in moving 9,000 to 11,000 ton blocks several miles
16 inland. These risks need to be carefully weighed against the
17 environmental benefit of moving the blocks to a higher
18 elevation and a few miles from the Columbia River. It is all
19 too easy to confuse present sure exposure to workers with
20 hypothetical future exposure to the public. This error must
21 be avoided.

22 Once DOE determines the best option, it is important
23 that decommissioning work receive adequate levels of funding.
24 I encourage DOE and the Congress to continue to work for the
25 funding necessary to implement the decommissioning option on a

1 meaningful schedule.

2 DOE has also asked for comments on the designation
3 of B-Reactor as a national historic site. I support this.

4 B-Reactor has been an important site in the
5 evolution of the U.S. history, in ending World War II, and
6 certainly in the history of the nuclear industry.

7 The B-Reactor was constructed in 1944, just 45 years
8 ago. That is a few short years in the scope of history.

9 An appreciation of the historical significance of
10 this first full scale defense reactor will grow over the
11 years.

12 B-Reactor should be preserved as much as possible
13 to give the public an opportunity to share in the historical
14 significance.

15 Of course, with any efforts to preserve B-Reactor
16 and to make it more available to the public, health and safety
17 must also be considered.

18 In summary, we support the Department of Energy's
19 effort to move forward in decommissioning the surplus reactors
20 on the Hanford Site as part of the total cleanup effort. The
21 final option the DOE chooses must make the best engineering
22 and scientific sense. And it must take into account the total
23 risk to workers and the public.

24 TRIDEC supports DOE's activities and cleanup efforts
25 at Hanford. On behalf of TRIDEC, thank you for this

1 opportunity to suppress our views.

2 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Thank you very much. We will
3 take your written comments and include those in the record as
4 Exhibit Number 6. I am sorry. Exhibit Number 7.

5 Next scheduled commenter is Mr. Gordon Rogers.

6 MR. GORDON ROGERS: Good morning. My name is
7 Gordon Rogers. 1108 Road 36 in Pasco.

8 I have been a resident of the Tri-City area since
9 1947 and during my 38 year career on the Hanford Project I had
10 occasion to be significantly involved both with the upgrades
11 at one time of the old reactors and various improvements to
12 their safety while they were still operating. I have a great
13 affection for them, as having an important place in my prior
14 work history.

15 I would also commend the DOE for an extremely
16 thorough and comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement
17 assessing the impacts of decommissioning of these eight old
18 plants.

19 I think for me the most important information in the
20 entire EIS is the absolutely trivial and insignificant health
21 risks from any of the decommissioning alternatives examined
22 for these plants. This is both due to the remaining low-level
23 radioactive waste in the plants and for the chemical
24 constituents that are also involved there.

25 In the case of the radioactivity, the health impacts

1 are absolutely insignificant compared to those due to natural
2 background radiation. And it's also of interest that for the
3 chemical wastes, hazards to anyone downstream using the
4 Columbia River water are practically non-existent. All
5 releases are well within drinking water standards.

6 If it were my own money and we had some other
7 political climate in this country other than the, I'll call
8 it demagoguery, for lack of a better term, regarding almost
9 anything with the word nuclear in it, I would favor the
10 action, to continue the present action of decommissioning
11 alternative. However, we have to recognize facts as they
12 are.

13 In line with the nationwide effort to clean up
14 existing waste sites and as part of the cleanup of the wastes
15 on the Hanford Reservation, these old reactors are a
16 significant low-level radioactive and chemical waste hazardous
17 site.

18 So from the realities, I strongly urge the
19 Department to pursue the decommissioning in place alternative.

20 I can't believe the cost estimates, that this is
21 almost as expensive as hauling the reactors in one block
22 several miles inland for disposal in the 200 Areas, but I
23 certainly support the comments offered by Mr. Burnham, that
24 dismantling or even moving intact the blocks is inherently a
25 much more unsatisfactory way of handling this problem than

1 decommissioning them in place.

2 This alternative is, according to the facts of the
3 DOE, the next least expensive and I strongly support that as a
4 taxpayer. It also permits the completion of the cleanup
5 action in the shortest time. And that has a psychological
6 advantage, if no other, in today's climate of action for waste
7 cleanup.

8 You also request comments respecting the
9 preservation of B-Reactor as a national historic site.

10 My personal recommendation is that the DOE take
11 action to preserve major amounts of information concerning the
12 B-Reactor. They have mentioned photographic and written
13 records. I would also suggest perhaps a Hollywood type stage
14 set model of certain of the features that could be seen by a
15 visitor to the reactor, such as the front face and the rear
16 face and perhaps the horizontal, vertical rod systems. I
17 think this could be done at a reasonable cost and would still
18 give a visitor some feeling for the immense and interesting
19 features of this historic plant.

20 In reality, B-Reactor, important as it is locally,
21 is only one of a very large number of unique complex plants
22 that were built under absolutely extraordinary circumstances
23 and which had a major part in bringing World War II to a
24 speedy and successful conclusion.

25 So I favor applying the in place decommissioning

1 to B-Reactor also, but preserve the information concerning
2 it in other ways.

3 Thank you very much for the opportunity to present
4 my views.

5 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Thank you, Mr. Rogers.

6 Our next registered commenter this morning is Mr.
7 Jim Stoffels.

8 MR. JIM STOFFELS: My name is Jim Stoffels. I
9 live at 1219 Del Mar Court in Richland.

10 Ladies and gentlemen, were you ever in a place that
11 made you tingle with a combined sense of awe, excitement and
12 eeriness?

13 I was two years ago when I toured Hanford's first
14 plutonium production reactor, the historic B-Reactor. I
15 felt awe, excitement, and eeriness.

16 Awe at seeing that huge reactor face, massively
17 scaled up in just a matter of months from Enrico Fermi's
18 first critical pile. Excitement that must have been felt
19 back then by the participants in the Manhattan Project. The
20 excitement of a race, a deadly race for the survival of a
21 free world.

22 Eeriness. As if the ghosts of Fermi and his
23 co-workers still inhabited that empty control room.

24 The war that gave birth to the Manhattan Project, to
25 Hanford, and to the B-Reactor, was one of the great human

1 tragedies of our lifetime. The historical facts are that
2 B-Reactor produced the plutonium for the first manmade nuclear
3 explosion, the Trinity test, and for the bomb that destroyed
4 much of the city and people of Nagasaki.

5 By the grace of God our need for nuclear weapons is
6 rapidly disappearing. And era, the era of nuclear weapons, is
7 passing. And while we cannot yet see the end of that era, we
8 have already seen the beginning of the end. This hearing on
9 the decommissioning of the Hanford reactors is evidence of
10 that hopeful reality for our future. And Hanford has a role
11 in that future.

12 I believe that part of Hanford's future lies in its
13 past. Not in the preservation of its original mission, but in
14 the preservation of its history.

15 I want to see B-Reactor preserved as a permanent
16 monument to that passing era. Because of the wartime secrecy
17 in which the Manhattan Project was born, many Americans of the
18 present do not know the history of the atomic bomb. This will
19 be even more true of future generations, unless we save some
20 of the relics, such as B-Reactor, for their immense historic
21 and educational value.

22 Therefore, I urge that the Hanford B-Reactor be
23 preserved intact on site as a national historical monument and
24 museum, that it be upgraded with relevant historical and
25 educational displays and that it be provided with public

1 vehicle access from State Highway 240. With these steps
2 accomplished, many other Americans and neighbors from around
3 the world can visit that historic place and tingle with awe,
4 excitement and eeriness for the past, and with hope for a
5 future of peace. Thank you.

6 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Thank you.

7 Our final pre-registered commenter for our hearing
8 this morning is Mr. Claude Oliver:

9 The written comments of Mr. Jim Stoffels will be
10 included as Exhibit Number 8 in the record of this
11 proceeding.

12 Exhibit Number 9 will be the written comments of
13 Mr. Claude Oliver.

14 MR. CLAUDE OLIVER: Good morning. I'm Claude
15 Oliver, Benton County Treasurer for eight years, previously
16 serving this area as a State Representative for four years,
17 eight years as a commercial loan officer with a financial
18 institution, working in all three communities, Pasco, Richland
19 and Kennewick.

20 I'm offering public comment, response to the
21 Environmental Impact Statement as offered by the Department of
22 Energy for public hearing as of this date, July 11, 1989.

23 At this time of public input on the U. S. Department
24 of Energy's planning process to de-activate eight nuclear
25 production reactors, we should reflect on the original Hanford

1 mission. What was the intent of Congress and President
2 Franklin Delano Roosevelt when they created and activated this
3 vast federal facility of over 350,000 acres in Benton,
4 Franklin and Grant Counties?

5 National forces driven by the urgency of World War
6 II against the background of a legitimate question of national
7 survival compelled the United States to produce the ultra
8 secret, the Manhattan Project.

9 Even after details of perhaps the greatest World War
10 II secret became known, the late 1940's and '50's ushered us
11 into an era of the cold war standoff between the United States
12 allies and the Soviet Union.

13 In order to understand where we are today, it is
14 important to clarify the activities of the federal government
15 in our area as they occurred in an era which was largely void
16 of public knowledge or involvement.

17 From a national, state and local government
18 objectives, it is important that we give a definition to
19 original intent for Hanford startup in order to properly plan
20 conclusion for these facilities and lands.

21 The 1940 federal census gave Benton County 12,053
22 people. With World War II activity, it became necessary to
23 provide a special census which was taken in 1944, which
24 revised Benton County's total to 70,987 people. This six fold
25 increase in population totally overwhelmed our local education

1 systems, county roads deteriorated without funds to repair or
2 replace them, and county courts and offices were sent reeling
3 with totally unexpected and unplanned service demands.

4 Though Benton County property values increased from
5 nine million dollars to twelve million dollars during this
6 time, county taxes were being levied at the maximum 10 mills
7 allowed under state law. It was necessary in addressing one
8 emergency in 1946 to receive \$76,000 from Washington State for
9 Benton County operations for war time unreimbursed expenses of
10 the previous year.

11 The courthouse journals evidence one financial
12 impact after another on the people of this county. The people
13 of Benton, Franklin and Grant Counties, however, rallied to
14 the war effort and the national policy of essential war
15 victory gladly, and, in fact, recognized the need to make
16 national sacrifices as an accepted practice of the day. Thus,
17 Hanford was created.

18 So that we can now proceed to address resource use
19 of the land and its impact on the people of Benton, Franklin
20 and Grant Counties, please answer the following:

21 Number one: What was the original Congressional
22 intent of taking and establishing the Hanford land area in
23 carrying out the World War II secret Manhattan Project?

24 Number two. Did the 1942-1943 United States
25 Congress and the Department of Army Corps of Engineers

1 evaluate their actions with knowledge that some portion or all
2 of the Hanford Federal Reservation land taken for this project
3 would be contaminated and unsuitable to return to its previous
4 use? In their deliberations, did they offer consideration to
5 assess the ultimate plan for future generations that are now
6 in the genesis of this Environmental Impact Statement on our
7 communities?

8 Number three. What was the determination used in
9 the amount of lands originally condemned for the Hanford
10 Reservation in Benton, Franklin and Grant Counties? Is it
11 planned by the federal government or yet to be determined that
12 this portion of land will be kept off the tax roles of Benton,
13 Franklin and Grant Counties indefinitely. What lands set
14 aside is necessary to address your environmental impact
15 containment of the eight idled reactors?

16 Number four. Water allocation from the Columbia
17 River for irrigation purposes has been conducted for a number
18 of years. The resource of water combined with land grows
19 crops in ready abundance throughout the world. Recognizing
20 that the Hanford Reservation was created in the middle of a
21 vast agricultural plane has the U. S. Department of Energy
22 given consideration for the need to reserve water rights for
23 future irrigation needs of the Hanford lands now held in its
24 trust? If not, why not?

25 Number five. With the original Hanford national

1 mission now significantly declining, what consideration is
2 being given by the U. S. Department of Energy for future
3 community impact plan? Does the U. S. Department of Energy
4 have any comparable environmental impact consideration plans
5 for deactivation of any comparable facilities? 30 percent of
6 Benton County's tax base, 16,000 acres in Franklin County and
7 25,000 acres of Grant County lands have been left off the tax
8 roles since 1944, the main community and the U. S. Department
9 of Energy missions of World Peace Through Strength, though not
10 conducted without incidence, have certainly worked. We could
11 all pray that nuclear genie of atomic war was not out of the
12 bottle, but it is. We also do recognize the full value of the
13 peaceable use and continuing development of the atom that has
14 and will significantly benefit mankind.

15 The people of Benton, Franklin and Grant Counties
16 have played proud roles these past 45 years. Their
17 contributions to future endeavors by the U. S. Department of
18 Energy, both known and unknown in origin, will be significant
19 and valued as future generations will evidence.

20 However, we now must address a legacy to one chapter
21 of the cold war and a community that has accepted
22 responsibility without hesitation. Let us adequately explain
23 the basis of our genesis so that we can arrive at the best
24 intelligent assessment of where we came from, so that we can
25 truly plan for our future wisely.

1 Recent national policy changes by the U. S.
2 Department of Energy to de-emphasize production and emphasize
3 safety is indeed refreshing and highly professional.

4 Though we live in a world that could be considered
5 vast and boundless, we certainly must recognize that
6 responsible limitations for living standards and future
7 generations can only be best maintained and enhanced if we are
8 willing to preserve them.

9 In this regard, land use planning and socio-economic
10 impacts need much more attention and emphasize than is given
11 in the March, 1989 Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
12 Answers specific to the issues enumerated above, especially
13 item five, are respectfully requested.

14 Thank you for taking this public comment.

15 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Thank you, sir. We will
16 mark your written comments as Exhibit Number 9 and include
17 those in the record, and give those to the gentleman in the
18 blue shirt there. Thank you for coming.

19 Ladies and gentlemen, that concludes our list of
20 pre-registered commenters for our public hearing today.

21 I would ask if there is anybody in the room who
22 has not had the opportunity to comment that would like to do
23 so.

24 There being no one in that category, then, what we
25 are going to do under the procedures of this hearing is go

1 into recess until the hour of 3:00 p.m. at which time we have
2 another pre-registered commenter. In the event that we should
3 have other walk-in registered commenters for this public
4 hearing, we will go back on the record as necessary.

5 We will be in recess until the hour of 3:00 p.m.
6 Thank you very much.

7 (Recessed at 11:00 a.m.)

8 MR. ROY EIGUREN: It is now 3:02 p.m. on July
9 11, 1989. This is a resumption of the United States
10 Department of Energy proceeding, DOE 0119-D. It is a public
11 hearing being held in Richland, Washington, for the purpose of
12 receiving public comment regarding the Draft Environmental
13 Impact Statement prepared to analyze the potential
14 environmental impacts of decommissioning eight surplus
15 production reactors located at the Department of Energy's
16 Hanford Site located near Richland.

17 This EIS, when finalized, will provide additional
18 environmental information to decision makers regarding
19 selection of a decommissioning alternative for these
20 particular reactors.

21 We commenced this public hearing this morning at
22 10:00 a.m. this is the first in a series of four public
23 hearings being held on this Draft Environmental Impact
24 Statement. As I mentioned, we began the hearing at 10:00 this
25 morning. We had six individuals who were pre-registered to

1 come and who did come at that time. We went into recess at
2 approximately 11:15 a.m. until the hour of 3:00 p.m. for the
3 purpose of receiving comment from additional individuals who
4 either were pre-registered to comment this afternoon or who
5 were registered at the door to present comments at this public
6 hearing.

7 In my introductory comments this morning I indicated
8 that my name is Roy Eiguren. I'm an attorney in private
9 practice with the law firm of Lindsay, Hart, Neil & Weigler,
10 which has offices in Portland, Oregon; Boise, Idaho; Seattle,
11 Washington; San Francisco, California; and Washington, D. C.

12 I have been retained as an independent third party
13 as a Hearing Officer to conduct these public hearings to make
14 sure that all interested citizens have the opportunity to
15 provide their comment in a fair and equal way on the record
16 relative to the environmental impacts or potential
17 environmental impacts relative to the proposed federal action.

18 With me here in front of the room is Mr. Roger
19 Freeberg who is the Chief of the Environmental Restoration
20 Branch of the Department of Energy's Richland Operations
21 Office. The two of us constitute the hearing panel that's
22 receiving public comment on this Draft Environmental Impact
23 Statement.

24 The rules of this proceeding provide that interested
25 members of the public who wish to comment on the Draft EIS may

1 do so ^{by} / either pre-registering or registering at the door to
2 provide their comment during the hearing.

3 For this afternoon's session, we have one individual
4 who pre-registered who will be speaking first and then
5 following that individual we have two additional individuals
6 who have registered at the door who would like to comment here
7 this afternoon.

8 The rules provide that all interested parties do
9 have the opportunity for five minutes of comment for the
10 record. Given the fact that we have a very limited number
11 of individuals who are testifying at this public hearing,
12 however, we are being somewhat liberal in the application of
13 the five minute rule and so you have a bit more than five
14 minutes if you would like to take a bit more than five
15 minutes to present your remarks.

16 What I will do is at the conclusion of four
17 minutes of testimony time, I will turn on a little green
18 light at the podium that indicates that we have a minute
19 remaining. The red light means that five minutes has
20 elapsed. Once you see the red light, I would ask that you
21 would begin the process of bringing your comments to a
22 conclusion.

23 I have also stressed earlier that written comment
24 receives equal consideration in the record as does oral
25 comment, and so if you do have oral comment with you -- excuse

1 me, written comment with you, we would like to have you
2 present that to me as a part of the record, or for inclusion
3 in the record as an exhibit. The close of comment for this
4 particular proceeding is July 28th, and so if you don't have
5 written comment with you but would like to present written
6 comment for the record, we would ask that you would send those
7 written comments to the Department by that date at an address
8 that we would provide to you at the registration table outside
9 the hearing room.

10 So with that, we will begin now the receipt of
11 public comment for those of you who have registered to comment
12 this afternoon. Our first registered commenter is Mr. Harry
13 Brown.

14 Mr. Brown, we would ask that you step forward to the
15 podium here, sir. We would like to have your name and address
16 for the record and go ahead and begin your comment.

17 MR. HARRY BROWN: My name is Harry Brown. My
18 address is 1507 South Tweedt Court in Kennewick. I'm here
19 today to speak on behalf of the Columbia Basin Section of
20 the America Society of Mechanical Engineers. And I'd like
21 to read a position paper which we have prepared for the
22 Section.

23 This is a proposal for special treatment for the
24 Hanford B-Reactor during the subsequent decommissioning to
25 preserve and commemorate its historical status, submitted as

1 comment to the Environmental Impact Statement, document DOE
2 EIS 0119-D by the Columbia Basin Section of the America
3 Society of Mechanical Engineers. Respectfully submitted by
4 Janet Hibbard, Chairman.

5 EIS Document DOE/EIS 0119-D describes alternate
6 methods of decommissioning the currently shutdown Hanford
7 production reactors constructed beginning in 1943 for the
8 production of plutonium for the first atomic bombs. The
9 America Society of Mechanical Engineers, ASME, a nationally
10 and internationally recognized technical society, acknowledges
11 the historical significance of these reactors to the future
12 nuclear industry by certifying the Hanford B-Reactor as a
13 national historic mechanical engineering landmark in 1976.

14 ASME supports of safe decommissioning of nuclear
15 facilities, including total demolition and site restoration,
16 where necessary.

17 However, in the case of historic landmarks such as
18 the B-Reactor, ASME believes that steps should be taken to
19 preserve and commemorate the landmark and retain some degree
20 of its historic status.

21 For the Hanford B-Reactor, various alternatives are
22 offered by way of comment on the EIS. The historical
23 background of the reactor and the ASME history and heritage
24 program are also described briefly to provide a frame of
25 reference for the ASME proposals.

1 2.0 The historical background and significance of
2 the Hanford B-Reactor.

3 The Hanford B-Reactor was the first plutonium
4 production reactor to be placed in operation. Its startup
5 followed successful operators of three test scale reactors,
6 including the Chicago pile and the Hanford test reactor which
7 proved that all of the physics calculations and engineering
8 decisions required for the construction of the graphite pile
9 and cooling system, were correct and within proper limits to
10 sustain a controllable chain reaction.

11 From an engineering standpoint, the significance of
12 the B-Reactor lies in achieving the results of the startup
13 after designing the mammoth production reactor based on the
14 data from the much smaller test reactors.

15 For example, the B-Reactor moderating pile alone
16 contains 2,000 tons of graphite blocks, penetrated by over
17 2,000 aluminum process tubes. The pile, as high as a four
18 story building, was surrounded by a skin of cast iron ten
19 inches thick and a shield of masonite, steel and concrete four
20 feet wide. The B-Reactor complex is said to contain more
21 concrete than Alonzo Stagg Stadium under which the Chicago
22 pile operated. However, outside of its contribution to the
23 defense of the United States, the full significance of the
24 B-Reactor startup was realized in later years with the
25 development of the domestic nuclear industry.

1 Thus, the successful operation of the Hanford
2 B-Reactor was a major milestone for the Manhattan Project
3 and made possible the subsequent development of commercial
4 atomic energy utilization.

5 The research, engineering and planning required to
6 make the reactor operate should be included in history as one
7 of man's most brilliant scientific and advanced engineering
8 achievements.

9 Historically B-Reactor began as part of the
10 Manhattan Project in 1942 with the breaking of ground in
11 April, 1943, for support facilities. Construction of the
12 reactor started in June, 1943 and was completed during
13 September, 1944. This was followed in rapid succession by
14 fuel loading and startup during the same month. Three months
15 later, on Christmas day, 1944, the first irradiated fuel was
16 discharged from the reactor.

17 The facility operated intermittently until it was
18 shut down permanently in 1968.

19 3.0 The designation of B-Reactor as a national
20 historic landmark.

21 The ASME historic landmarks program is an
22 outgrowth of a relationship between ASME and the Smithsonian
23 Institute. ASME contributes historical material
24 particularly related to mechanical engineering to the U. S.
25 National Museum of History and Technology in Washington,

1 D.C.

2 In 1971 ASME established its history and heritage
3 program for the society, and the landmarks program was added
4 in 1973.

5 A national landmark is a mechanical engineering
6 achievement with national or international significance, one
7 associated with persons or events that have contributed to the
8 general development of mankind. All nominations are approved
9 by the ASME national history and heritage committee. Once a
10 nomination is approved, a history brochure and bronze plaque
11 are prepared and presented to an appropriate organization for
12 display in the vicinity of the monument being dedicated.

13 The Hanford B-Reactor plaque is displayd in the
14 Hanford Science Center. Hanford B-Reactor was nominated for
15 landmark status in 1975 by the Columbia Basin Section, ASME.
16 This nomination was subsequently approved by the history and
17 heritage committee, which cited the B-Reactor as a technical
18 achievement and because much of the reactor core, cooling
19 system, shielding, and auxiliary support systems were designed
20 by mechanical engineers, although many different types of
21 scientists and engineers contributed to the ultimate success.

22 4.0 The preservation of B-Reactor as a historic
23 landmark.

24 Alternative proposals described below are offered
25 to support the belief by the Columbia Basin Section, that

1 the B-Reactor represents as a significant achievement that
2 continued recognition of the facility as a historic landmark
3 is warranted.

4 The proposals are intended to be consistent with
5 requirements of the decommission mode selected based on the
6 EIS.

7 I'm not going to describe each of these, but I
8 will mention the five alternative -- or four alternative
9 methods that we had proposed.

10 One is an information kiosk to be installed at a
11 rest area such as the Vernita rest area; an enhanced audio
12 visual display to accompany the plaque here at the Hanford
13 Science Center; a reactor memorial such as an obelisk which
14 would be placed on State Highway 240 near the B-Reactor as a
15 historical landmark; and facility access, withholding a part
16 of the B-Reactor from decommissioning and putting it on
17 display to the public.

18 Thank you very much.

19 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Sir, we will take your written
20 comments and include that in the record as Exhibit Number 10.

21 Next call Mr. Hammond.

22 MR. DICK HAMMOND: Dick Hammond, 1522 Haines,
23 Richland, Washington. Thank you, Eiguren and Mr. Freeberg and
24 the Department of Energy for the opportunity to talk about
25 this subject matter.

1 As a past person interested in and active in the
2 field of mechanical engineering, I would like to second all
3 the information provided by Mr. Brown, for the ultimate
4 activity on B-Reactor.

5 As far as action on the old reactors are concerned,
6 B, C, D, DR, F, H, KE, and KW, built in that order, the first
7 mentioned objective, no action, with continuing present
8 action, seemed to me to be the most logical of the several
9 provided in your EIS analysis.

10 There are objectives and benefits to the other
11 possible alternatives, as well. But I see no action one,
12 continued present action, is the logical one, from my
13 standpoint.

14 And my standpoint is a person who has worked at
15 B-Reactor for some six years in engineering, as well as the
16 other -- all the other eight older reactors for a period of
17 some 30 years, and perfectly familiar with the engineering
18 details as well as the operational details, maintenance and
19 that sort of thing. So that I would accept your data on
20 comparison of alternatives by costs and environmental impact
21 as probable. The least cost action being the no action,
22 present action, is obviously going to save the taxpayers a lot
23 of money over the long haul.

24 The other feature, the population over 10,000 years
25 in person-rem is much higher than some of the others.

1 However, it's divided under, I'm certain, many thousands of
2 additional people who would be exposed, so that per person,
3 I'm sure that it would be a very small figure, too, as
4 compared to others.

5 I think your mechanism of pulling the alternatives
6 noted in your EIS as well as the facts about Hanford
7 presentation are acceptable. Certainly your figures on the
8 size of the reactor and what's done over the years is a true
9 thing.

10 I think Tom Dunn must be congratulated for having
11 the forethought to give extra attention to B-Reactor. I
12 certainly agree that because of a strong association over the
13 history of the United States, nuclear program, that we should
14 indeed give the extra attention which Harry Brown has
15 described. Thank you.

16 Any questions from you, by the way?

17 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Thank you, Mr. Hammond.

18 Next we will call Mr. Milton Lewis.

19 MR. MILTON LEWIS: My name is Milton Lewis, 2600
20 Harris Street in Richland.

21 I, too, would like to support the in-situ
22 decommissioning alternative for two reasons.

23 One of those reasons was stated this morning. I'd
24 like to support that. That is, that in the first alternative,
25 the in-situ decommissioning, we have a known radiation dosage

1 that would be experienced by the population, since we know
2 very well what the current situation is, radiation-wise, in
3 the reactors where they stand. Any movement of the blocks
4 could result in a larger, much larger radiation dosage in the
5 event of an accident in the movement operations, and so
6 there's some unknown really radiation dosage that would be
7 accompanied by such a movement.

8 Even though as mentioned by Mr. Hammond, the figures
9 show a higher population dose over 10,000 years for that first
10 in-situ decommissioning, the footnote I believe is
11 significant. It says the same population would receive nine
12 billion person-rem over the 10,000 years from natural
13 radiation.

14 So any of the alternatives is insignificant by
15 comparison with what the natural radiation to the population
16 will be over that period of time.

17 So mainly my point there is that let's not trade
18 some unknown radiation dosage by moving the blocks for some
19 well known, well defined radiation dosage by leaving them
20 where they are.

21 My second point was not mentioned earlier today,
22 and I'm not sure what it's value is, but let me mention it.

23 Those reactor cores consist of thousands of tons of
24 the purest graphite ever known to mankind. In addition to
25 that, they consist of probably thousands of tons also of

1 aluminum and steel. All of these materials having been
2 irradiated to very high neutron exposures.

3 It is conceivable that sometime in the future there
4 would be a new use or a discovered use for the long life radio
5 isotopes that exist in those materials. I don't know what it
6 is. But it may develop perhaps not within our lifetime, but
7 at some time in the future.

8 I would like to see the cores preserved in such a
9 way that those materials could be removed if desired at some
10 future date.

11 So the point I would like to make is that the future
12 value of those irradiated core materials might be such that we
13 should provide a method of access so that they could be mined
14 out at some future date, perhaps hundreds of years from now,
15 but there is no other such supply of those materials.

16 So on the basis of that, then, to sum up, I strongly
17 urge that the Department of Energy consider the in-situ
18 decommissioning rather than the moving of the blocks.

19 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Thank you, Mr. Lewis.

20 Ladies and gentlemen, that completes our list of
21 commenters for this afternoon. I would ask if there's anybody
22 in the room who has not had an opportunity to comment who
23 would like to do so at this point?

24 There being no one in that category, we'll go ahead
25 and once again recess this public hearing until the hour of

1 7:00 p.m. this evening at which time, pursuant to Federal
2 Register notice, we are scheduled to recommence this hearing.

3 I would note for the record at this juncture that we
4 do not have any pre-registered commenters for this evening,
5 but as required per the Federal Register notice, we will once
6 again reconvene at 7:00 o'clock and remain here as long as
7 necessary to take any at-the-door commenters who might wish to
8 go on the record.

9 So with that we'll stand in recess until the hour of
10 7:00 p.m. Thank you.

11

12

(Recessed at 3:30 p.m.)

13

14 MR. ROY EIGUREN: We will now formally go back
15 on the record for this our public hearing being held on July
16 11th, 1989 in Richland, Washington. It is now approximately
17 4:00 p.m., Pacific Daylight Time, and as per our prior
18 announcement on the record, we went into recess at
19 approximately 3:30, having received comment from three
20 individuals at that point in time.

21

22 Since then we have had one additional member of the
23 public who has appeared at the door who's requested the
24 opportunity to go on the record for public comment relative to
25 the environmental issues associated with decommissioning of
the eight surplus production reactors that are located at the

1 Hanford Site near Richland, Washington.

2 We now have Eleanor Finkbeiner who is here and
3 would like to testify on the record for the purposes. For
4 the purposes of introduction, Mrs. Finkbeiner is from 1415
5 Haines Avenue?

6 MRS. ELEANOR FINKBEINER: Yes.

7 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Here in Richland, Washington.
8 99352. Mrs. Finkbeiner, you have five minutes for the comment
9 on the record. If you would like to proceed, we would like to
10 hear your comment.

11 MRS. ELEANOR FINKBEINER: Okay. I see it as
12 good stewardship to use what we have, and we have these
13 reactors, it seems to me, with the big influx of population on
14 the west side of the state, that we have a contribution to
15 make environmentally and economically, ecologically, and that
16 is, the use of power. We need power down through the
17 centuries to come and this is a contribution that we can make
18 to the state by the use of what reactors there are available
19 for the use of power.

20 Last winter we came very short, to the spot, so the
21 news media recorded, that we were running out of power in
22 February. And it is poor stewardship to throw away something
23 usable.

24 I come from the old school where you use what you
25 have, and you use it until it's gone and worn out. And I

1 think we need, not to be part of contributing to the factor of
2 throwing away things that are usable, and that includes the
3 energy that's out there spilled on the ground, that that
4 energy could be reconverted into things that are usable.

5 And I think that we have brains enough and insight
6 enough collectively to use this, and to figure out ways that
7 it can be helpful to humankind.

8 To destroy that which is not usable and to get rid
9 of it, bury it, however, and to use what we have and to not
10 be out searching for other things, but to be wise stewards
11 of God's good earth. That is my message.

12 MR. ROY FIGUREN: Thank you. We have no
13 questions, so thank you very much. We appreciate your being
14 here. There being no further individuals who are here at this
15 time to testify on the record, we will once again go into
16 recess until the hour of 7:00 p.m. this evening to resume our
17 public hearing here in Richland.

18 MRS. ELEANOR FINKBEINER: And I thank you for
19 coming.

20 MR. ROY FIGUREN: It is nice to be here.

21

22

(Recessed at 4:10 p.m.)

23

24

25

MR. ROY FIGUREN: It is now 7:01 p.m. on July
11th, 1989. We will once again go back on the record and

1 resume our formal public hearing being held here in Richland,
2 Washington, for the purpose of receiving public comment
3 relative to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that's
4 been prepared to analyze potential environmental impacts of
5 decommissioning the eight surplus production reactors located
6 at the Department of Energy's Hanford Site near Richland,
7 Washington.

8 Prior to taking recess we received comment from
9 approximately nine individuals during this, our July 11th
10 public hearing being held in Richland, Washington, which
11 convened this morning at 10:00 a.m.

12 It has been the practice of this particular hearing
13 panel to go into recess at those points in time when we do not
14 have individuals who are here ready to comment on this Draft
15 Environmental Impact Statement.

16 As I had mentioned in my opening marks earlier
17 during this hearing, my name is Roy Eiguren. I'm an attorney
18 in private practice with the law firm of Lindsey, Hart, Neil &
19 Weigler. I have been retained by the Department of Energy as
20 an independent third party to serve as a hearings officer for
21 this series of public hearings that are being held here in the
22 Pacific Northwest to receive public comment on this Draft
23 Environmental Impact Statement.

24 In addition to the hearing that's being held here
25 today in Richland, Washington, additional hearings are

1 scheduled for Spokane, Washington, for Portland, Oregon and
2 Seattle, Washington, over the course of this and in the
3 following week.

4 At this point we have now gone back on record as per
5 the Federal Register notice that announced these particular
6 hearings. The Federal Register notice provides that the
7 hearings that will be held in the four cities will commence at
8 10:00 a.m. each morning and run until 5:00 in the afternoon,
9 recommence at 7:00 in the evening and run until 10:00 p.m.

10 Given the fact that we have no pre-registered
11 speakers and we only have one at-the-door registered commenter
12 or speaker for this evening's hearing, it would be our intent
13 to go ahead and receive the comment from the one commenter who
14 is here, willing to testify, ready to testify.

15 We will then go into recess after the receipt of
16 that comment and we'll stay in recess until the hour of 8:30
17 p.m. this evening. If in fact we have additional commenters
18 who do arrive at this hearing room here at the Federal
19 Building to provide comment for the record, we'll receive that
20 comment. If we do not have any additional commenters who
21 arrive prior to 8:30 p.m. this evening, then we'll formally
22 close the record of this proceeding for this, the July 11th,
23 1989 public hearing here in Richland, Washington.

24 At this time we would now like to begin the receipt
25 of public comment once again, and we're pleased to have with

1 us one of the Benton County Commissioners, Raymond Isaacson,
2 who is here to testify.

3 Commissioner, we would like to have you step
4 forward, sir, to the podium, give us your name and address for
5 the record.

6 The rules provide that you have five minutes to
7 comment, but, Commissioner, under the circumstances we'll let
8 you comment as long as you like to.

9 MR. RAYMOND ISAACSON: Well, thank you very
10 much.

11 For the record, my name is Raymond E. Isaacson. I
12 reside at 2106 Lee Boulevard here in Richland.

13 As Commissioner of Benton County, the district that
14 I represent includes everything north of the Yakima River, up
15 here to Lee, back to the Columbia River, and then at the
16 county line, it continues south back to the Yakima River. So
17 the Hanford Project, then, is entirely within my district,
18 District I.

19 In my formal remarks, I do, and I will provide a
20 typewritten copy, again, for the record, because some of it is
21 a table that's very lengthy and I cannot read that into the
22 record this evening, but it is apparent that the Environmental
23 Impact Statement for the decommissioning of the eight surplus
24 reactors will cause essentially inconsequential damage to the
25 environment, regardless of the method of decommissioning.

1 However, I believe that the method of
2 decommissioning that should be selected is the one that would
3 result in the least amount of additional disturbance of the
4 environment, and that would result in the least occupational
5 radiation dose to the worker.

6 I would think that you should opt for that which
7 creates the least consequences.

8 While the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
9 appears to be quite thorough, land use planning is inadequate
10 and does require further consideration. When the Hanford
11 Project was started approximately 570 square miles was
12 acquired by condemnation and other methods and reserved for
13 atomic materials -- atomic bomb materials -- production. The
14 majority of this land area was required for radioactive
15 isolation, public safety and security purposes.

16 Now that all of the Hanford reactors have been shut
17 down and decommissioning is being considered for age of the
18 nine reactors that were built, it is obvious that the land
19 once taken out of agricultural production is no longer needed
20 for isolation and security purposes.

21 Also the land that has not been adversely affected
22 by radioactivity should be evaluated for return to productive
23 use.

24 To put this issue in perspective it is necessary to
25 know how much land could be made available for various crops

1 by type. Considerable area was under irrigation when it was
2 acquired for the Manhattan Project. The evaluation of
3 returning land to productive agricultural use should include
4 provisions for irrigation water systems that will deliver
5 water to specific areas such as Cold Creek Valley adjacent to
6 Highway 240. Reconsideration of the economic value of the
7 arid lands ecology reserve should be included.

8 If there is justification for keeping this land out
9 of productive agriculture, consideration must be given to
10 providing payment in lieu of taxes to municipal local
11 government so that the adverse economic impact that now exists
12 can be rectified.

13 Tables of estimated acreage and incomes for various
14 crops harvested in Benton County during 1988 are attached and
15 can be used for reference in the studies. The total value of
16 agricultural products was about \$217,267,319 in 1988. These
17 data were prepared by Mr. Jack Watson and Ms. Jean Smith of
18 the Benton County Cooperative Extension.

19 Because of the time limitations this presentation
20 must be kept brief. If additional dialogue is needed, I will
21 be available and will provide any needed input.

22 The table is by acreage, yield per acre, total
23 production, dollar price unit, and does include dryland wheat
24 as well as irrigated land wheat.

25 And I believe that since the area talked about

1 is in relative close proximity to the Columbia River, the
2 irrigation, the crop type, should include only the irrigated
3 types. And now we're talking about row crops and fixed crops
4 such as our emergent grapevine vineyards and various kinds of
5 orchards. And I would emphasize those. Also potatoes,
6 asparagus, sweet corn, onions and carrots are grown in the
7 county very effectively and very efficiently.

8 So with that, then, I would close my remarks and
9 submit this, then, with the tables, for use in the studies
10 that we are requesting.

11 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Thank you. Commissioner, I
12 might point out, that the rules of the proceeding do allow the
13 hearing panel, which includes myself and Mr. Roger Freeberg of
14 the Department, to ask clarifying questions, and if I might, I
15 would like to ask one clarifying question.

16 MR. RAYMOND ISAACSON: Certainly.

17 MR. ROY EIGUREN: I believe it was Mr. Oliver
18 from Benton County, the treasurer, earlier spoke to the same
19 issue you did, sir, and that is, apparently Benton County is
20 of the opinion or the position that once these eight reactors
21 are decommissioned, that the land under which the government
22 originally withdrew -- or the land that the government
23 originally withdrew for these particular reactors may now
24 revert back to non-governmental ownership.

25 Is that correct?

1 MR. RAYMOND ISAACSON: Yes. The point is, the
2 lands were acquired by condemnation procedures for a specific
3 purpose.

4 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Yes.

5 MR. RAYMOND ISAACSON: This is evidence that
6 that purpose no longer exists. And even if discussions of
7 such things as using some of the other area, such as W.P. No.
8 1 to return to a tritium production reactor, that has in
9 essence been rejected, other sites have been selected. This
10 site has been rejected.

11 Obviously the Department of Energy does not have an
12 intent to continue defense materials production at this site,
13 and for that reason we ask that that land that is not
14 producing any revenue for the county, and by the way, this
15 year the county had to reduce its expenditures by six percent
16 in the face of increasing inflation. We had to reduce our
17 number of employees by 16 out of 325, leaving about 309 left.
18 We raised the property taxes the full allowable six percent.
19 And we still are having to take about a quarter million
20 dollars out of reserve and our reserve account is going down.

21 In other words, there are not too many years that
22 we can continue to run on the bank, so to speak, to balance
23 the budget. So the county is in economic distress and we
24 need to find some kind of economic development, replacement,
25 to replace the defense production here so that this county

1 can maintain its infrastructure, provide the services to the
2 people that are required by law, and in order to do that, we
3 must have a revenue base, and to leave those plants idle out
4 there is totally unfair in our estimation, to leave them
5 unproductive, because that just leaves it on the rest of the
6 people in the county, rest of the taxpayers, without having,
7 you know, as I say, a fair return for that land.

8 MR. ROY EIGUREN: The point I am driving to,
9 Commissioner, apparently it's the position of the Benton
10 County Commission that the original purpose for which these
11 lands were originally condemned by the government no longer
12 exist because the facilities are being decommissioned, and so
13 you believe as a matter of public policy, if not as a matter
14 of law, these lands then should revert back to non-federal
15 government ownership status?

16 MR. RAYMOND ISAACSON: Yes, where they can be.
17 Now, I do realize, and I understand that there are
18 areas that are radioactively contaminated and there are still
19 areas that will have to be reserved from beneficial
20 agricultural use because of the long term waste storage
21 requirements, 200 Areas especially.

22 So with those considerations, then I think the
23 balance of the land that was taken should be returned and
24 reverted to a productive use.

25 The constraints of residual radioactivity would

1 limit the amount of land that could be made available. So the
2 study should delineate those areas that could be released back
3 to productive agriculture and identify those areas that would
4 have to be reserved for isolation purposes and for safety
5 reasons.

6 MR. ROY FIGUREN: I would think, then, that for
7 the purposes of Mr. Freeberg and his staff in analyzing the
8 record of this proceeding, if the Commission could provide
9 additional supplementation record as to your legal and public
10 policy analysis, as to why the land should revert back to
11 non-governmental ownership status, that would be most helpful
12 in their analysis.

13 MR. RAYMOND ISAACSON: Correct. And of course,
14 I have to go back and examine the original Atomic Energy Act
15 of 1946 to determine what reference there might be there.

16 We do recognize also that Atomic Energy Act of 1946
17 provisions for payments in lieu of taxes were provided for.
18 However, they were never collected. There were some funds
19 provided to the City of Richland but to my knowledge none have
20 ever been provided to the county. Yet the county must
21 maintain all the infrastructure required to support the
22 Hanford Reservation, including services to those people who
23 reside in the unincorporated area that still work on the
24 Hanford Site. And so there are some other issues that need to
25 be addressed and perhaps redress provided in those instances,

1 as well.

2 It's not that we're trying to put, you know, the tap
3 on the government, but having gone, literally, through hell
4 last year in trying to balance this budget and being forced to
5 reduce our budget, as I say, by six percent in the face of
6 increasing inflation, it made it painfully obvious that the
7 Department of Energy and its contractors were not carrying
8 their fair share of the burden to provide the infrastructure
9 to support that large industry that does exist here in Benton
10 County.

11 MR. ROY EIGUREN: As I say, that legal analysis
12 and public policy analysis as to that reversion issue will be
13 very helpful.

14 MR. RAYMOND ISAACSON: Yes.

15 MR. ROY EIGUREN: If you would provide that,
16 we would greatly --

17 MR. RAYMOND ISAACSON: We may have to hire some
18 consultants to do that. It would impose a cost burden on this
19 county, which we are not prepared to do at this time. We
20 would hope that the funds that's essential to provide the
21 background information could be provided by the Department of
22 Energy.

23 MR. ROY EIGUREN: I'm sure that the Department
24 would be glad to have further consultations with you to
25 discuss that issue and try to bring some resolution to it.

1 MR. RAYMOND ISAACSON: All right. I appreciate
2 that very much. Thank you.

3 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Thank you, Commissioner.
4 We'll receive your written comments and mark them as Number 11
5 for the record, and include them as received. And we do
6 appreciate your coming here, Commissioner, to present both
7 your written as well as your oral testimony.

8 I would ask at this point, if there are additional
9 individuals in the room here who have not had the opportunity
10 to do so, we would be glad to give you that opportunity at
11 this point. If not, it would be our intent to stand in recess
12 until the hour of 8:30 p.m. this evening, in the event that we
13 do have additional walk-in individuals walk in and register,
14 commenters, who would like to comment, we will receive their
15 comment.

16 If we have no one that does so, walk in prior to
17 8:30, the record will automatically and officially close for
18 this, the July 11th, 1989, Richland, Washington, public
19 hearing at precisely 8:30 p.m.. Thank you.

20

21

(Short recess.)

22

23 MR. ROY EIGUREN: We'll go back on the record
24 at 7:25 on July the 11th, 1989.

25

First I would like to correct the fact that the

1 Hearing Officer throughout the course of this hearing has
2 inadvertently stated June 11th as the date for the hearing
3 when in fact it actually is July 11th, and secondly, I would
4 like to point out that the comments made by Commissioner
5 Isaacson on behalf of Benton County were his personal comments
6 as opposed to an official position as expressed by the County
7 Commission.

8

9

(Recessed at 7:30 p.m.)

10

11

*

*

*

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24


25

1 STATE OF OREGON)
2 County of Umatilla) ss.

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I, WILLIAM J. BRIDGES, do hereby certify that at the time and place heretofore mentioned in the caption of the foregoing matter, I was a Registered Professional 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 62 typewritten 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 24th day of July, 1989.


WILLIAM J. BRIDGES
Registered Professional Reporter
Notary Public for Oregon
My Commission Expires: 6/2/90



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SURPLUS PRODUCTION REACTOR DECOMMISSIONING (SPRD)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

July 13, 1989
10:00 o'clock a.m.
Sheraton Hotel
Spokane, Washington

BRIDGES & KENNEDY
Registered Professional Reporters
P. O. Box 223
Pendleton, Oregon 97801
(503) 276-9491

1 Because these remarks are identical to the first 16 pages of
2 the Richland transcripts, they are not repeated here.

3
4
5
6
7
8 At this point I would be glad to respond to any
9 questions that you have about the procedures or the conduct of
10 this hearing.

11 If there are no questions, then we'll go ahead and
12 begin the receipt of comments from those of you who have
13 pre-registered as well as anyone else who would like to
14 comment.

15 The first commenter today is Mr. Jim Thomas.

16 MR. JIM THOMAS: Good morning.

17 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Good morning.

18 MR. JIM THOMAS: My name is Jim Thomas and I am
19 staff researcher for HEAL, the Hanford Education Action
20 League. Our address is South 325 Oak Street, Spokane,
21 Washington, 99204.

22 HEAL endorses the immediate one-piece removal option
23 for all eight reactors, including the B-Reactor. The main
24 reasons HEAL supports the immediate one-piece removal option
25 are:

1 One, it moves the reactors which are still
2 radioactive away from the Columbia River. the reactors should
3 be buried away from their present location near the Columbia.
4 By being along the river, the reactors would remain too
5 accessible by the general public. The option of leaving them
6 in their present location and burying them under a mound of
7 dirt and gravel is not a demonstrated technology. The EIS
8 does not even offer an estimate of how long the quote/unquote,
9 engineering barrier might last before allowing the
10 contaminated reactor blocks to be exposed to the environment.

11 Two. By doing the job immediately, citizens have a
12 greater assurance that the reactors will not be forgotten,
13 that Hanford will be cleaned up, and that the federal
14 government will restore the land to public use. It will also
15 make it possible to keep the entire Hanford mess within the 30
16 year cleanup agreement.

17 In answer to a series of questions by HEAL on the
18 Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Department of Energy
19 responded in part that the start of the decommissioning will
20 depend on the availability of funding and on the priorities
21 established by the Department. Again, we apparently have a
22 case of the Department not respecting the will of the citizens
23 it is supposed to serve. On numerous occasions over the past
24 several years the citizens of the northwest have made it
25 abundantly clear that we want Hanford to be cleaned up

1 immediately. We now have the greatest likelihood of obtaining
2 the necessary funding and skilled work force to safely dispose
3 of these atomic age relics. If we wait for 75 years as is
4 proposed by two of DOE's options, we run a very high risk of
5 not being able to complete the job of decommissioning.

6 Three. This option requires the least amount of
7 land area to be barred from public access. HEAL has
8 repeatedly raised the point that there is no overall
9 government strategy for minimizing the amount of land at
10 Hanford which will have to be off limits for centuries and in
11 some cases millennia. We again call upon the state, EPA and
12 the Department of Energy to develop a plan which will limit to
13 the greatest extent possible the amount of land at Hanford
14 which will be fenced off and in effect turned into a national
15 sacrifice zone. Before such a plan is in place, it is only
16 common sense to pursue those cleanup options which require the
17 least amount of area that will be left contaminated.

18 There is one other point which should be addressed.
19 At various places throughout the Environmental Impact
20 Statement, the Department of Energy states that once the
21 reactor areas are cleaned up, they will be available for other
22 DOE use. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement goes so far
23 as to say that the federal ownership and the presence on the
24 Hanford Site is planned to be continuous. Nowhere does the
25 Energy Department stipulate the basis for its claim to

1 Hanford.

2 HEAL strenuously objects to the Department's regal
3 attitude. The future use of Hanford is a decision which the
4 citizens of Washington State and the affected Native American
5 Tribes should and must make.

6 Thank you for listening to our concerns this
7 morning.

8 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Thank you. Mr. Thomas, if I
9 could ask you one clarifying question.

10 MR. JIM THOMAS: Sure.

11 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Obviously, you are very
12 familiar with the various remedial efforts planned, and you
13 say HEAL believes that this project should be high in the
14 priority of what should be done in terms of cleanup.

15 Did you assign any particular prioritization to
16 it? I mean, this set of projects versus other types of
17 remediation projects at the site?

18 MR. JIM THOMAS: No. Obviously, we think that
19 the continuing contamination that's happening with the
20 operation of PUREX and its support facilities are dumping
21 hundreds of millions of gallons of low-level radioactive water
22 into the soil at Hanford should be stopped immediately.
23 That's obviously, by far and away, the most serious
24 environmental consequence that's happening at Hanford now.
25 That needs to stop first.

1 With regards to the decommissioning of these eight
2 reactors and taking them to the 200 Areas is concerned, I
3 think that the cleanup agreement establishes an adequate
4 framework for both public comment and for the state and the
5 EPA to assess the priorities and where in that 30 year time
6 frame the decommissioning should occur.

7 MR. ROY EIGUREN: So you go to the agreement
8 process as the mechanism for determining the relative
9 prioritization of cleanup activities?

10 MR. JIM THOMAS: Yes.

11 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Thank you very much. We
12 appreciate your being here.

13 Our next scheduled commenter is Mary Wieman.
14 She's not here. That's my complete list of
15 scheduled commenters. I would ask if there's anyone else here
16 who would like to comment at this point in time. If not, what
17 we propose to do is recess until the hour of 11:00 o'clock at
18 which time Mary Wieman is scheduled to be here. Both Mr.
19 Goodenough and I are available for any questions that you may
20 have in the interval, so in the meantime we will simply go off
21 the record and be in recess until 11:00. Thank you.

22

23

(Recessed at 10:30 a.m.)

24

25

MR. ROY EIGUREN: It is now 11:00 a.m. on July

1 13th, 1989. We'll resume our public hearing being held in
2 Spokane, Washington, the Department of Energy Proceeding Number
3 EIS 0119-D.

4 The purpose of this hearing is to receive public
5 comment regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
6 that has been prepared to analyze potential environmental
7 impacts of decommissioning eight surplus production reactors
8 located at the Department of Energy's Hanford Site near
9 Richland, Washington. This Draft EIS is scheduled to be
10 finalized next summer.

11 The purpose of this public proceeding is to receive
12 comment from members of the public to assist the Department in
13 determining whether or not the Draft EIS needs to be modified
14 in some fashion prior to its finalization.

15 The Final EIS, when prepared, will provide
16 environmental information to federal decision makers regarding
17 the selection of decommissioning alternatives for these
18 reactors.

19 As I mentioned at the outset of this hearing earlier
20 today, my name is Roy Eiguren. I'm an attorney in private
21 practice with the law firm of Lindsey, Hart, Neil and Weigler.
22 I'm an independent third party that has been retained by the
23 Department for the purpose of conducting this meeting.

24 As a consequence, I am not an advocate for or
25 against the Department's position. My only role is to provide

1 interested parties the opportunity to comment on the record
2 relative to their concerns about this particular issue.

3 Prior to going to recess, we had one commenter, Mr.
4 Jim Thomas, on behalf of HEAL, who made his comments.

5 We now have our second scheduled commenter who is
6 here, ready to testify this morning. This is Mary Wieman.

7 You have five minutes for your comment. We would
8 ask if you come up to the podium, please, use that so our
9 court reporter can get down all of your comments. You do have
10 five minutes for comment. If you would like to go longer than
11 that, you are free to do so.

12 MRS. MARY WIEMAN: Like the vast majority of
13 the American citizens, I wasn't consulted when nuclear weapons
14 were developed originally, decades ago, but I'm taking the
15 opportunity to speak to you DOE representatives today on
16 nuclear reactor decommissioning alternatives.

17 In my opinion, stand-by N-Reactor should be
18 decommissioned, along with the eight surplus production
19 reactors, since it appears to be in danger of Columbia River
20 flooding from a 50 percent Coulee Dam failure, like seven
21 others; that C-Reactor is within three meters of that fate;
22 and that B-Reactor should not be included in the National
23 Register of Historic Places for the same reason. Photos of
24 the latter reactor will have to suffice for the record.

25 From a map, it appears that 100 Areas aren't as

1 distant from the river bank as are the 200 West Areas, when
2 one piece removal and waste disposal are being considered.
3 Immediate removal the greater distance is desirable. But
4 decontamination measures could be affected at the existing
5 reactor sites, instead of at the 200 West Areas, as an
6 alternative.

7 Hopefully, the 200 West Areas will be provided with
8 a highly protective barrier to prevent new radioactivity
9 leaking into the soil.

10 As you know, costs of the work to be done are
11 mounting continuously, due to continuous price inflation, so
12 it can't be too soon for decommissioning to begin.

13 Further delay will only worsen the present
14 problems, which I don't need to describe to you. There
15 should be some way in which the radionuclide tritium can be
16 salvaged to preserve the usefulness of existing nuclear
17 weapons.

18 To conclude, I'm a proponent of the immediate over
19 12 years' time one-piece plus the reactor block removal but
20 still on the Hanford Reservation Site alternative, with the
21 changes noted.

22 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Two minutes and 20 seconds.
23 Thank you.

24 MRS. MARY WIEMAN: Is that all?

25 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Yes. We have no questions for

1 you. So we thank you very much for being here.

2 We would like to receive your written comments, if
3 we could. We will include that in the record. This will be
4 Exhibit Number 12 for the record.

5 The written comments of Mr. James Thomas on behalf
6 of HEAL will be included in the record as Exhibit Number 11.

7 I would ask if there is anyone else in the room who
8 would like to comment who has not had the opportunity to do so.
9 We would be glad to have you go on the record.

10 If not, given the fact that we have no other
11 scheduled commenters at this time, we'll stand in recess
12 until the hour of 7:00 p.m. this evening. In the event that
13 we do have someone who presents themselves at the
14 registration table before the hour of 5:00 p.m. today, we'll
15 go ahead and reopen the record and take their comment when
16 they arrive.

17 So we'll stand in recess, as I mentioned, until
18 the hour of 7:00 p.m. this evening unless and until we have
19 additional commenters who wish to testify. Thank you.

20

21

(Recessed at 11:15 a.m.)

22

23

24

25

MR. ROY EIGUREN: It is now 8:30 p.m. We have
been waiting since 11:15 this morning for other persons who
wished to speak, and we have not had anyone register to speak.

1 Therefore, the record is closed at this time.

2

3

4

* * *

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF OREGON)
2 County of Umatilla) ss.

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I, WILLIAM J. BRIDGES, do hereby certify that at the time and place heretofore mentioned in the caption of the foregoing matter, I was a Registered Professional 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 25 typewritten 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 24th day of July, 1989.



WILLIAM J. BRIDGES
Registered Professional Reporter
Notary Public for Oregon
My Commission Expires: 6/2/90

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SURPLUS PRODUCTION REACTOR DECOMMISSIONING (SPRD)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

July 18, 1989

10:00 o'clock a.m.

Execulodge Hotel

Portland, Oregon

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X O F C O M M E N T E R S :

<u>Name:</u>	<u>Page:</u>
Eugene Rosalie	16
T. H. McGreer	20
Ruth McGreer	22
David Stewart-Smith	24
JoAnn Olekniak	36
Martha Odom	39
Bill Jones	47
Eugene Rosalie	50
Kathleen Maloney	52

Because these remarks are identical to the first 16 pages of the Richland transcripts, they are not repeated here.

1 At this point I would be glad to respond to any
2 questions you may have. If there are none, we'll just go
3 ahead and begin to receive comment.

4 MR. MCGREER: I have a question about the
5 timing. The 20th is the day after tomorrow.

6 MR. EIGUREN: If I said the 20th, I meant to
7 say the 28th.

8 MR. MCGREER: That's what you said the first
9 time.

10 MR. EIGUREN: The 28th. Excuse me. With that,
11 then we will go ahead and receive public comment, and our
12 first commenter is Eugene Rosalie. First give your name
13 and address for the record.

14 MR. ROSALIE: My name is Eugene Rosalie and I
15 represent Northwest Environmental Advocates at 408
16 Southwest Second, Suite 406, Portland, Oregon. ZIP code,
17 97204.

18 MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

19 MR. ROSALIE: We will submit written comment by
20 the July 28th date. I do have several oral comments that
21 I would like to make at this time. First of all, we
22 would like to say we are in support of what is known as --
23 or outlined as option one, which is the immediate one-
24 piece removal of the eight reactors. We believe it's
25 imperative that these reactors be removed from the

1 Columbia River as soon as possible.

2 If the Department of Energy is serious about
3 cleaning up the Hanford site, they will choose the
4 immediate one-piece removal.

5 Second, I would also like to go on record
6 opposing the designation of the B reactor as a national
7 historic site. I think the reasons for this are very
8 clear. The B reactor was involved in making plutonium
9 for the bomb dropped on Nagasaki. We do not believe that
10 this is one of the bright spots in American history. In
11 fact, it is a black mark in American history, and thus
12 the B reactor should not be designated as a national
13 historic site.

14 I guess my final comment would be -- has to
15 deal with the inclusion of the N reactor in the
16 decommissioning plan. In the EIS it states that no
17 further long-term use of any of the eight surplus
18 reactors has been identified by D.O.E. and that D.O.E.
19 has declared them surplus. We would like to see a
20 statement from D.O.E. as to why the N reactor is not
21 included in the decommissioning plan.

22 That's about all the comments I have right now.

23 MR. FIGUREN: Could I ask just one clarifying
24 question?

25 MR. ROSALIE: Sure.

1 MR. EIGUREN: You indicated that your group's
2 position, as option one, is the preferred alternative,
3 because that would be the most immediate --

4 MR. ROSALIE: Option one as stated by you.

5 MR. EIGUREN: Right. I assume that you're
6 generally familiar with the various remediation programs
7 that are being contemplated by D.O.E. for the Hanford
8 site. To the extent that you are, where would you place
9 the decommissioning issue? Towards the very top of the
10 list priorities?

11 MR. ROSALIE: Well, that's a hard one. I
12 haven't thought about it. Everything is a priority, and
13 right now it's hard for me to say where that would fall.
14 I think it's something that needs to happen right away
15 along with everything else. I mean, there is a lot out
16 there and it's our understanding that there is some leaks
17 from the reactors into the soil and those leaks need to
18 be taken care of. It seems in the greater scheme of
19 things we are talking about approximately \$190 million
20 to do this work and get it started and get it going. And
21 I think in terms of -- It needs to happen along with
22 everything else and we need to make that commitment to do
23 it. And if D.O.E. is interested in showing the public
24 that it's serious about cleaning up Hanford and about
25 cleaning up the other military production sites around

1 the country, I think that getting started on this
2 decommissioning immediately would be a sign to the public
3 that, yes, we are serious about doing this. That's a
4 long answer.

5 MR. FIGUREN: No, I appreciate that. We've
6 been asking that throughout the course of the hearings.

7 MR. GOODENOUGH: No, I guess I don't have any
8 questions. We are interested in the public's view of the
9 B reactor and national historic sites, so if you have any
10 more background that you would like to submit on that, or
11 rationale, any written comments, we would be interested
12 in hearing about that in your written comments.

13 MR. ROSALIE: Yeah, we will. As I said, we're
14 basically opposed to designating this as a national
15 historic site because we don't feel that dropping the
16 bomb on Nagasaki was an event that should be celebrated.

17 I guess if D.O.E. does decide to go ahead and
18 make it a national historic site, we would like to see --
19 First of all, we think it should be decommissioned.

20 My understanding is that D.O.E. has planned is
21 maybe keeping it intact, one option. Another option is
22 to decommission it through either, one, place removal or
23 some other means and then saving all the records and
24 maybe building an exhibit. And if D.O.E. decided to do
25 that, we would strongly urge that in that exhibit the

1 effects of the bombing of Nagasaki be visually displayed
2 in that exhibit.

3 MR. GOODENOUGH: Okay.

4 MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. We appreciate it.

5 Our next commenter is T. H. McGreer.

6 MR. T. H. MCGREER: I'm T. H. McGreer. I live
7 in Hood River, Oregon, at 3389 Cherry Drive, and the ZIP
8 code is 97031.

9 MR. EIGUREN: Thank you.

10 MR. T. H. MCGREER: I haven't had time to
11 digest very much of this, but I'm looking at, I think at
12 the moment, as a taxpayer and I don't think they have
13 given me enough information in here to look at it that
14 way.

15 In the first place, no action calls for a
16 50,000 person rems. How was that figure arrived at?
17 Who? If I were to receive the 50,000 rems all at once,
18 there would be no question. But this is scattered over
19 what population? Over what year? 10,000 years? Are we
20 saying that people in the future have no control over
21 these things at all? 10,000 years from now, is somebody
22 going to get a cancer because of this machine?

23 As a taxpayer, I look at this, the total costs
24 of these things, and I wonder where are our priorities?
25 Right now we have 24,000 people killed each year by

1 drunken drivers, most of them themselves. That
2 difference of \$140 million, how many lives would that
3 save versus spending \$140,000 to -- or \$140 million to
4 remove this reactor someplace else and bury it again?

5 Certainly the railroad people have given us an
6 example of far less money and they've reduced the
7 railroad crossing injuries and deaths remarkably. What
8 could we do with \$140 million to reduce the deaths of
9 cancer from tobacco? How many thousands of people can be
10 affected? The same thing applies to alcohol-related
11 deaths. What can we do educationally with our children,
12 who some of them become addicted to alcohol in the grade
13 schools. With that \$140 million would apply to educating
14 these children and perhaps saving them? The same thing
15 could be said about dope. Who knows which one of our
16 daughters is going to become a prostitute to get enough
17 money to maintain her habit.

18 Where are our priorities? I see this 50,000
19 rems. I know that would kill a few people, but who?
20 Would somebody over in Eastern Oregon be affected by
21 this? Are the people downriver going to be affected by
22 it? Isn't this a "what if" proposition? What if there
23 is a leak among these reactors? What if that leak gets
24 into the groundwater? What if that leak gets into the
25 Columbia River? What if some fish becomes contaminated

1 and some person eats the fish and some nuclide causes a
2 cancer 5,000 years from now versus spending our money now
3 for some of these other projects that prove and result in
4 immediate lifesaving and better quality of life?

5 Now, I expect that I'll try to put this in
6 writing in the next seven or eight days and maybe get
7 some better figures, but I would appreciate it if you
8 could tell me where this 50,000 figure number comes from
9 and where these cost estimates come from. You know, are
10 these something that somebody just reached up and got a
11 number out of the sky, or are they real figures that you
12 can be documented?

13 MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. I have no other
14 individuals who are registered to comment at this time.
15 I'd ask if there is anybody in the room that hasn't
16 commented that would like to comment, I would be glad to
17 give you the opportunity at this point. Yes, ma'am?

18 MRS. RUTH MCGREER: I am Ruth McGreer from Hood
19 River.

20 MR. EIGUREN: Just a minute. Can you hear her?

21 THE COURT REPORTER: I can hear her fine.

22 MRS. RUTH MCGREER: Can you hear me fine?

23 THE COURT REPORTER: Yeah. Thanks.

24 MRS. RUTH MCGREER: I would like to know -- In
25 speaking to other people, one of the questions that pops

1 up is, who decided the early safety of Hanford? How safe
2 is it, which they think it isn't. Nowhere in here do I
3 find this record. How did you get there?

4 MR. EIGUREN: In the procedure for these
5 hearings don't provide for us to comment back. What we
6 will do is we will go ahead and provide in writing a
7 response to your oral questions.

8 MRS. RUTH MCGREER: Thank you. Thank you.

9 MR. EIGUREN: Anyone else? If not, our next
10 scheduled commenter is scheduled for one o'clock. He is
11 speaking on behalf of the Oregon Department of Energy and
12 is presenting the State's position. So what we'll do is
13 we'll go into recess until the hour of one o'clock.
14 However, in the event we should have someone else that
15 would arrive at the door that would like to go on the
16 record, then we will go on the record, if necessary. We
17 will be in recess until 1:00 p.m.

18 (Recess: 10:35 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.)

19 MR. EIGUREN: We'll now formally go back on the
20 record and I will reconvene. This is a July 18th, 1989,
21 hearing being held in Portland, Oregon. This is the
22 United States Department of Energy proceeding 0119-D,
23 which is being held for the purpose of receiving comments
24 regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, which
25 has been prepared to analyze the potential environmental

1 impacts of decommissioning the eight surplus production
2 reactors located at the Department of Energy's Hanford
3 site in Richland, Washington.

4 The DEIS when completed will provide additional
5 environmental information to federal decision makers
6 regarding selection of the decommissioning alternative
7 for these reactors.

8 As I mentioned earlier, my name is Roy Eiguren,
9 an attorney in private practice. I have been retained to
10 be the hearings officer for this series of public
11 hearings being held in Spokane and Seattle, in Portland
12 and the Tri-Cities to receive comment on the Draft EIS.
13 We commenced the hearing this morning at 10:00 a.m for
14 the purpose of receiving public comment. We did receive
15 comment from two members of the public, at which time we
16 then went into recess until the hour of one o'clock for
17 the purpose of receiving comment from a representative of
18 the State of Oregon.

19 So without further adieu we'll go ahead and
20 introduce David Stewart-Smith, a member of the Oregon
21 Department of Energy staff, speaking on behalf of the
22 State of Oregon. We welcome you, Mr. Smith, and we would
23 ask that you first start by giving us your designation
24 title for the record and proceed from there.

25 MR. STEWART-SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Hearings

1 Officer. My name is David Stewart-Smith. I am the
2 acting administrator of the Nuclear Safety and Energy
3 Facility Siting Division of the Oregon Department of
4 Energy.

5 My testimony and our written comments represent
6 the State of Oregon's response to the Draft Environmental
7 Impact Statement for the decommissioning of eight surplus
8 reactors at Hanford. Our written comments are in a
9 separate document submitted for the record. We thank
10 USDOE for bringing this hearing to Portland.

11 USDOE is doing better at recognizing Hanford's
12 downriver constituencies on both sides of the Columbia.
13 My testimony today will be brief. Oregon's technical
14 comments center on one revelation in the DEIS and I will
15 confine my comments to that issue.

16 Before the DEIS was published, the
17 decommissioning issue was ranked low on Oregon's list of
18 Hanford priorities. While the eight old reactors are low
19 level radioactive waste, we regarded them as almost
20 benign compared to high level and chemically hazardous
21 nuclear weapons waste, problems at N reactor, and
22 transuranic waste transport. Those issues, and nuclear
23 weapons waste cleanup in particular, were and still are
24 Hanford's hot spots in our view.

25 The eight old reactors have languished in place

1 for 20 to 30 years. We didn't expect any surprises in
2 the decommissioning DEIS. We were, in fact, poised to
3 support an option for deferred action. So long as the
4 old reactors posed no threat to the people or the
5 environment, Oregon was ready to counsel against any
6 decision that might compromise cleanup of Hanford's high
7 level and transuranic nuclear weapons waste.

8 We cannot offer that counsel now. In fact,
9 we're compelled to say that the eight reactors, their
10 fuel storage basins, and any residual contamination
11 should be moved away from the river immediately.

12 Why? Because the DEIS, in an almost casual
13 aside, notes that a leak in a fuel basin has left a
14 "significant inventory" of radionuclides and
15 contamination.

16 That's it. One sentence, but it raises a host
17 of questions: How large was the leak? Precisely what is
18 a "significant inventory" of radionuclides? Is there a
19 flume? If so, where is it and where will it go? How
20 fast will it travel? How much soil has been
21 contaminated? Can the contamination be retrieved and
22 disposed? What are the implications of various
23 characterizations? Is the river in imminent danger?
24 Does this mean that there is a higher likelihood of other
25 undetected leaks? How soon will USDOE finish its studies

1 on the leak and its implications? And last, in view of
2 this litany of unknowns, how can USDOE opt for any action
3 now but to complete an immediate removal of the reactors
4 and the fuel basins?

5 That concludes my remarks. If you have any
6 questions, Mr. Hearing Officer, I would be happy to
7 answer them.

8 MR. GOODENOUGH: No, I don't have any questions.

9 MR. EIGUREN: If I might, Mr. Smith, you had
10 indicated in your testimony that the Oregon Department of
11 Energy had gone through essentially a ranking process in
12 terms of priorities of issues that you felt should be
13 addressed at the Hanford by way of remediation?

14 MR. STEWART-SMITH: Uh-huh (affirmative response).

15 MR. EIGUREN: I am taking it that in terms of
16 that initial inventory, that the decommissioning issue
17 was relatively low in priority and now based upon the
18 information you receive from this Draft document, that's
19 now changed?

20 MR. STEWART-SMITH: That's right. Our
21 understanding has changed because we were not aware of
22 any fuel basin leak that happened at one of the reactors.
23 We were not aware of an additional inventory of
24 underground radioactive contamination. If it had not
25 been for that, we were in fact ready to suggest that

1 there are ever higher issues that the available federal
2 funding needs to be applied to first at Hanford.

3 Certainly cleaning up the high level waste in single or
4 double-shelled tanks is a good example of that, as well
5 as potential retrieval of the transuranic wastes at
6 Hanford.

7 However, with the information and the scarcity
8 of the information of DEIS on the potential for leaks in
9 the past from these reactors, we have to suggest that
10 concurrent cleanup, decommissioning of the old reactors
11 as well as moving forward on high level waste
12 vitrification at Hanford is necessary.

13 MR. EIGUREN: Okay. I might note for the
14 record, Mr. Smith, that given the fact that the
15 Department's position was publicly stated prior to the
16 hearing and the department was aware of that, the
17 department is in a position to be able to respond to some
18 of the specific concerns that you've raised in advance of
19 completing the final DEIS, which is scheduled a year from
20 now. So, I'm sure at the conclusion of the hearing on
21 the record today, they'll be glad to provide what
22 information they have in hand that can be given to you
23 and any additional information that you might request.

24 MR. STEWART-SMITH: I would be happy to talk to
25 them.

1 MR. EIGUREN: Thank you very much, Mr. Smith.
2 We appreciate your being here. We will take the written
3 testimony, provide it the Oregon Department of Energy.
4 I'll mark it as Exhibit No. 12 for the record of this
5 proceeding and include it as received. So we have two
6 separate sets. We'll mark it as Exhibit 12, which was
7 the testimony presented by Mr. Smith, and Exhibit No. 13
8 will be a more detailed document in response to a number
9 of specific issues in the Draft Environmental Impact
10 Statement.

11 At this time we have no further individuals who
12 are registered to comment this afternoon. I'd ask if
13 there is anybody in the audience who has not had a chance
14 to comment, if you would like to do so, we would give you
15 that chance at this point. If not, we will then be in
16 recess until the hour of 7:00 p.m this evening, which
17 pursuant to our Federal Register notice is the next time
18 we will be going back into a hearing mode. I will note
19 for the record, however, that we will be here, me,
20 meaning myself, and the hearing panel as well as D.O.E.
21 staff until 5:00 p.m. this afternoon to go back on the
22 record in the event that we have any individuals show up
23 that would like to comment on this Draft Environmental
24 Impact Statement. So with that, we will be in recess
25 until 7:00 p.m. this evening. Thank you.

Because these remarks are identical to the first 16 pages of the Richland transcripts, they are not repeated here.

17 At this point I have three individuals who have
18 registered to comment. We'll take them in the order that
19 we received them and then also if anyone else would like
20 to comment, you will be free to do so once they have
21 given their comments.

22 Our first scheduled commenter is JoAnn Olekniak.

23 THE COURT REPORTER: JoAnn, if you could give
24 your full name and spell your last name?

25 MS. JOANN OLEKNIAK: My name is JoAnn. My last

1 name is spelled O L E K N I A K.

2 I'm testifying on behalf of myself this evening
3 and my comments are going to be brief. I am planning on
4 submitting substantial written material to the record
5 before it closes.

6 MR. FIGUREN: Thank you.

7 MS. JOANN OLEKNIAK: I favor the immediate
8 removal and burial of all of the reactors and I think the
9 N reactor should be included in that list. We don't want
10 to see the N reactor functioning again as it's designed
11 purpose. I think it should also be removed.

12 I would like to talk some about the concept of
13 having the B reactor be part of the National Register of
14 Historic Sites. It's just unbelievable to me that the
15 U.S. Department of Energy is even considering such a
16 plan. The times that I have heard B reactor described,
17 phrases such as "engineering marvel", "ended World War
18 II", et cetera, et cetera, have been thrown around and I
19 think that it is exactly those kinds of limited thinking
20 that has gotten us into our present predicament where we
21 have some 60,000 odd nuclear weapons on the planet
22 threatening our lives.

23 The B reactor, which produced the plutonium for
24 the Nagasaki bomb, is responsible for the immediate
25 deaths of some 80,000 people in the city of Nagasaki,

1 with many more dying later because of radiation-related
2 illnesses. To describe the B reactor and its purpose as
3 an engineering marvel is just beyond belief. It would be
4 as though someone was describing the gas chambers in
5 Germany and using glowing terms as to how effective they
6 were in exterminating the people.

7 And I think we need to come back to real values
8 of where we enhance life and respect life, and we cannot
9 do that if we hold up places like the B reactor for
10 people to visit and marvel at. So, I just abhor the
11 very thought of placing B reactor on the National
12 Register of Historic Places.

13 The other thing that I would like to mention is
14 these public hearings -- public such as they are with
15 only a sprinkling of us here to testify -- I think enough
16 of us have been through this process enough times and
17 have watched Hanford issues over a long enough period of
18 time to really feel very deeply that this whole process
19 has nothing to do with us voting with our presence about
20 which of the various probably inadequate plans are really
21 going to solve the problem.

22 Now, you can read the document; it's an inch
23 thick; and if you have the time and you really want to
24 keep that by your bed and pick it up and maybe do a
25 little light reading before you fall asleep. Maybe there

1 are some people in this room that have read it and really
2 looked at every proposal in detail. The problem I have
3 with it is it doesn't do any good for us to vote about
4 which of those proposals we think is preferable because
5 if that were the case, then not only would many of
6 Hanford's facilities now be closed, but many of them
7 would not ever have been built if our little voices were
8 actually taken into account.

9 And so I protest the whole process even as I
10 stand here before you. That's it. One more thing. I --
11 Hanford is no longer the secret, hidden project that it
12 has been for so long in the early '40s, during World War
13 II, and during the cold war times in the '50s and '60s.
14 We have watched with horror all of the things that have
15 happened there and the people that have been directly
16 affected by Hanford, and we're here to say that those
17 times are over and, repeatedly, we're going to tell you
18 that in a million different ways. Thank you.

19 MR. EIGUREN: Thank you. Our next commenter is
20 Martha Odom.

21 MS. MARTHA ODOM: My name is Martha Odom. Last
22 name is O D O M.

23 My first question is I really don't understand
24 why the decommissioning of the reactors is essential, the
25 stage of major production number, when considering the

1 major problems at Hanford, this is a relatively small
2 one. And I don't want to downplay the problems of the
3 reactors, but in comparison to the tank farm which in one
4 leak in 1973 released 115,000 gallons. And I believe the
5 1988 total was something like 90,000 gallons of not only
6 highly radioactive, but corrosive material is leaking.
7 This seems like a pretty fancy production number for
8 relatively strong -- a small piece of the problem.

9 I do recall a quote earlier this year, I think
10 it was January, when D.O.E. was responding to the total
11 for 1988. The answer was, "The tanks get old and they
12 leak. We're monitoring them. The tanks are a real
13 problem. They have been an ongoing problem."

14 And we will not be amused or deferred or
15 distracted by, "Oh, look, we can move reactors."

16 I would like to point out in response to a
17 D.O.E. comment today about, "Well, the tanks have been
18 public knowledge for a long time," that the manager of
19 the group responsible for the analyses of leak detection
20 brought the data to the attention of D.O.E., and it was
21 suggested to him that it might be in his best interests
22 not to report these things. And in a subsequent D.O.E.
23 Rockwell report said that no leaks were determined and it
24 was not cost beneficial to try and find a cause for these
25 abnormal readings.

1 We also have a concern that the test wells at
2 Hanford, the majority of which are unlined until early in
3 this decade or until early 1980s, the test wells were
4 unlined completely. In recent years I understand that
5 the wells have been lined and there does seem to be an
6 indication that these wells that are designed to monitor
7 groundwater contamination serves as the elevator, the
8 conduit, the jet stream to get the contamination down
9 into the groundwater.

10 Further, we have a question about is there
11 groundwater technology? How do you vacuum up the
12 groundwater, clean out the radiation and put it back as
13 groundwater? Is there such technology? It's our
14 groundwater you all are messing up.

15 I would like to just note that I really didn't
16 want one of these. I think we should conserve paper and
17 I have been told that there were copies available at the
18 Multnomah Library, and I made several phone calls.
19 Several people asked several other people and I believe
20 the two references in the total EIS that they are
21 available at the Multnomah County Library are in error
22 for I find no one at the library who could find one of
23 them.

24 Within the EIS I found no comparative
25 evaluation of the risk to workers for immediate

1 dismantlement and removal versus the release of
2 contamination from the sludge and the leaking storage
3 basins. Those seem to be really critical things. In
4 other documents that I have read, the preferred mode of
5 decommissioning is deferred, secured storage with future
6 dismantlement for each removal because in 50 or 75, 100
7 years allows a considerable amount of decay. So it's
8 much safer in 75 or 100 years to go moving these blocks
9 around. But I find no comparison that said, well, if we
10 leave them there, the storage basins with X amount of
11 sludge are going to potentially put this amount of stuff
12 in.

13 And there is a little part there that I have an
14 attitude problem with. The D.O.E. has a history of
15 making mistakes, oversights, disinformation and
16 misinformation, so I want D.O.E. to really prove it to
17 me.

18 When it came to reading through this EIS, and I
19 will refer first in my orientation to Appendix E,
20 "Radiation dose". Now, it says radiation dose is a
21 combination of the inventory, the release rates and the
22 transport conditions. I'm going to take release rates
23 just as a piece of this because it moves real easy back
24 to Appendix D. And Appendix D says, well, to determine
25 release rates, we took a lot of published literature and

1 relevant reports and studies that had been done.
2 Sometimes we took them and adapted them and then we used
3 these as part of our formula, and that reminded me a lot
4 of the old whispering story around a circle: The 1948
5 report goes into the 1953 report that goes into the 1957
6 report. And then when the whispered story comes out,
7 right here in this one, it never, ever whispers around
8 the circle like it started.

9 Furthermore, on page D 5, here is this one
10 paragraph that talks about the release rates of carbon
11 14 in graphite under dry storage conditions. And to the
12 best of my knowledge, carbon 14 in the graphite is going to
13 be one of the most significant isotopes in decommissioning.

14 Now, to make us all feel real confident about
15 this, I'm going to skip some of the technical phrases and
16 just give you the adjectives and the adverbs: "These
17 approximately are a linear function for relative
18 humidity", "statistically equivalent to about 25
19 percent", "possibly indicating", "it is quite probable",
20 "if this is indeed the case, then the linear relationship
21 might underestimate", "average relative humidity may well
22 be higher", "a linear relationship will probably
23 survive", "a best estimate given the uncertainties in the
24 remainder of the calculations".

25 I tell you guys, if this was a physics term

1 paper, you would have flunked. Okay. Now, that just
2 seemed sort of interesting, but then we take this release
3 page over here at Appendix E and we are talking about
4 radiation dose. This is one big -- one of the three
5 factors that go into radiation dose. Already you've lost
6 me on these approximate and complex equivalents and stuff
7 like that. When you give me a dose of radiation, I don't
8 think you know what you are telling me.

9 Now, there is this other little piece, you
10 know, that just pisses me off. The doses calculated for
11 this Draft Environmental Impact Statement are based on
12 the metabolism of the standard man. An average male
13 worker obviously does not fit every individual in the
14 general public. Actual doses depend on age and sex
15 specific relationships, body size, metabolism rate. The
16 long-term differences, however, will tend to average out
17 and may not be significant unless you are a
18 three-year-old weighing 25 pounds getting a dose that
19 this says of a 200-pound male is going to get, or unless
20 you are a pregnant woman, or unless you are an elderly
21 person with a somewhat erratic metabolism.

22 So, first of all, we don't have much confidence
23 in what you say is coming in as release rates, and those
24 translate also to those other things that are based upon
25 the whisper around the circle. But then -- well, you

1 know, this is just for the standard average man and any
2 of you who weigh 98 pounds or 25 pounds or are over 70 or
3 a pregnant woman, well, it may not be significant.

4 Now, I can sort of emphasize -- what does it
5 say? -- "It is also difficult, if not possible, to
6 quantify these differences." So let's turn to page E 11.
7 We have this beautiful formula. Yeah, it's pretty. And
8 we come to the factors involved in testing how plants get
9 radiation, and I'm just going to skip through some of
10 these because it goes on for three pages. It's too
11 complex and difficult to measure the differences in
12 humans, that a three-year-old child will get, what an
13 elderly little lady will get with reduced calcium in her
14 bones might get. But if we are going to measure plants,
15 we can get average air concentration of the radionuclide,
16 deposition rate, concentration in water use for
17 irrigation, irrigation rate, fraction of initially
18 deposited material retained in vegetation, weathering
19 removal constant, time above ground for vegetation
20 exposure, the yield, the fraction of the roots of the
21 plow layer, time for buildup in the soil, soil surface
22 density, thickness of the plow layer, concentration
23 available for plant uptake from residual contamination in
24 the soil plow layer. Sounds like a much more simple
25 factor than if you weigh 30 pounds or 100 or 120. And

1 the hold up time between the harvest and food
2 consumption.

3 That's a pretty complex formula. It takes up
4 two big lines of a page. I sort of believe that plants
5 give to their equivalent on the whole scale of it, but it
6 does seem interesting that one can't come up with a
7 little bit of a formula that will say at least body
8 weight is involved.

9 I would like, in conclusion, to answer -- to
10 speak to the B reactor. I find nothing where it talks
11 about it's structurally sound, how it should be the first
12 nuclear bomb park, how would people be secured from other
13 Hanford contamination or contamination in the B reactor.
14 And I do not know how we memorialize, where I think we
15 should never forget, that a hot summer morning in August
16 of 1945 we were responsible for society laid to waste.
17 We are responsible for a half a million deaths, including
18 those of our own fathers, brothers and sons who were sent
19 in after the bomb to bulldoze and to tend the wounded and
20 the dying.

21 Can we remember this as a historical landmark?
22 I think not and I would hate to tribulize the B reactor
23 as an engineering marvel when it is the source of so many
24 deaths and a blot on our history that will remain
25 forever. Thank you.

1 MR. EIGUREN: Next scheduled commenter is Bill
2 Jones.

3 MR. BILL JONES: I'm Bill Jones from Willard,
4 Washington, formerly a resident of Southern Grand County
5 in the late '40s when I got a dose of radioactive iodine.
6 What it's going to do to me I don't know, but I am
7 concerned about what's going to happen from now on.

8 I am saddened by the fact that so few citizens
9 attend these meetings, probably because they don't
10 understand half-life and millirams and ignorantly trust
11 the government. Some of them, on the other hand, think
12 that it's worthless and it's a waste of time and people
13 in Washington, D.C., will decide what they want to no
14 matter what these hearings bear.

15 I'm a member of and represent the Columbia
16 River United, a group of people who got together when the
17 shipping port reactor was barged up the river and we've
18 been active ever since. We include Native Americans,
19 board sailors, sports fishermen, and lots of other people
20 who live in small towns along the Columbia River
21 downstream from Hanford. We number about 100 people now
22 and we've come to the realization that in Washington,
23 D.C., our small numbers along the Gorge don't count for
24 very many votes.

25 One of the things we are doing, we are trying

1 to unite the people as a political voice to speak out
2 against what's going on at Hanford. Our number one
3 concern is the water quality in the Columbia River. All
4 our attention is focused on that now. We want it to be
5 clean enough to drink. Our other concerns, we're
6 concerned that the Hanford reservation is a radioactive
7 mess and the D.O.E. itself has 60 billion, 100 billion,
8 400 billion different amounts that they say it will take
9 to clean it up.

10 We're concerned that the D.O.E. continues to
11 authorize dumping at Hanford despite the mess, a bigger
12 mess. We're concerned that the D.O.E. has a record of
13 lying and withholding information from the public and we
14 do not agree that burial is a safe way of disposing of
15 anything. You only have to drive through the Gorge in
16 the wintertime and see the ice whiskers popping out of
17 the rock cliffs, out of the basalt, to know how well
18 water travels through there and we know that waste will
19 be leaching into the groundwater. They have already. We
20 don't know how far because there is no monitoring of the
21 river, say, in the area from below the Tri-Cities to
22 Bonneville Dam.

23 We're really in favor of the decommissioning
24 the reactors and including the N reactor, but we
25 certainly do not think they should be buried. Gas

1 storage tank at refineries, not at service stations -- at
2 service stations they just have all kinds of problems
3 when they put them underground -- but at refineries they
4 do not store underground. Underground storage of waste
5 or gasoline or oil or whatever cannot be monitored. I
6 think that scientifically we are a little shortsighted
7 that we haven't considered some type of vessel in an
8 earthquake active zone like Hanford, some type of vessel
9 that goes on the surface where the waste is put in that
10 vessel and leaks can be detected.

11 Residents of the Columbia Gorge from Umatilla
12 to the Bonneville Dam are downstream from Hanford and are
13 very much concerned about things they don't understand.
14 And there are libraries in The Dalles, Binjon, Hood
15 River, White Salmon and Stevenson and not one of these
16 libraries received a copy of the Environmental Impact
17 Study. We do have copies of the Environmental Impact
18 Study which we have read which we received from Oregon
19 Senator Wayne Fawbush, but the libraries did not get
20 them.

21 I note in reading the Environmental Impact
22 Study that the 100-Area is on an alluvial terrace. When
23 I was in school taking geology, alluvium was not rock as
24 the EIS says. Alluvium is soil deposited by this drop
25 when the river slows down. That's an error in the EIS.

1 This alluvium terrace in the 100-area is only nine meters
2 above the normal river level, and I don't think it would
3 take much time for radioactive liquids to leach nine
4 meters. That concerns me.

5 Also, on page 1.19 of the summary it states
6 that Washington Department of Ecology classifies the
7 Columbia River from Grand Coulee to the mouth as A, and
8 the latest thing that I have read, they have stated that
9 human uses are not supported from Bonneville to the
10 mouth, which means taking fish, swimming, wading and so
11 on.

12 We are, the Columbia River United Group, very
13 actively writing to every politician that we can find
14 who's interested. And among the things that we are
15 doing, we are supporting the D.O.E.'s request for cleanup
16 funding in our actions. We think it's time to clean up
17 and we're supporting that 100 percent.

18 MR. ROY EIGUREN: All right. That concludes a
19 list of individuals that I have registered to comment.
20 Is there anyone else here that would like to comment that
21 is not registered? Yes, Eugene?

22 MR. EUGENE ROSALIE: You asked me a question
23 and I would like to respond further to that.

24 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Why don't you give your name
25 for the record.

1 MR. EUGENE ROSALIE: My name is Eugene Rosalie
2 with Northwest Environmental Activities. You asked me
3 this morning about how I would place this in terms of
4 priorities of cleanup actions out at Hanford, and I have
5 been giving it some thought during the day.

6 And it seems to me, at least one thing I know
7 that could be dropped or put on hold is the shipment of
8 transuranic waste from Hanford to New Mexico. Obviously,
9 there are numerous problems with the New Mexico site and
10 we don't need to create another Hanford in New Mexico.
11 It's doubtful that the WIP site in New Mexico will ever
12 open anyway and so I think perhaps maybe taking money
13 from the shipment of that transuranic waste, which in my
14 understanding poses very little risk to the public, and
15 using that money to proceed with decommissioning these
16 reactors and doing other work up at Hanford would be more
17 productive.

18 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Thank you for providing the
19 education. Thank you for coming back. I might add,
20 Gene, that I just finished conducting the SEIS hearings
21 on the WIP project and your point of view is shared by
22 several thousand people in New Mexico.

23 Are there other commenters this evening that
24 would like to go on the record? I would mention once
25 again that the record remains open through the 28th day

1 of July. Written comments receive the same weight as
2 oral comment in this particular proceeding. So if you
3 would like to provide written comment, you can either
4 leave it with me here this evening or at the registration
5 table or mail it to the department. We're going to be
6 here until 8:30 in the event that anybody else should
7 arrive and would like to go on the record.

8 MS. KATHLEEN MALONEY: I would like to go on
9 the record.

10 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Okay. Note for the record we
11 have one additional individual that would like to go on
12 the record and comment at this time.

13 MS. KATHLEEN MALONEY: My name is Kathleen
14 Maloney. I don't have comments to say about the DEIS. I
15 haven't read it, but I do have a comment about the public
16 announcement, or lack of this hearing, and I found out
17 through some friends who are active on the issue, which I
18 used to be, that this was happening. And I couldn't get
19 ahold of him yesterday. They were busy, and so I called
20 O.D.O.E. to ask them for a verification. And you should
21 know that they told me -- and I called, and the woman who
22 answered the phone said that she didn't know anything
23 about the hearing and she would get back to me. And she
24 called me back and told me that the hearings were in
25 Richland and that there weren't any in Portland.

1 So if that's any indication of the public
2 outreach that you are doing to solicit comment, maybe we
3 should sit down and talk about public outreach programs.

4 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Point well taken. I have
5 previously submitted for the record a listing of all of
6 the things that the department did by way of public
7 outreach. We will give a copy of that to you.

8 MS. KATHLEEN MALONEY: Great.

9 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Mr. Bauman is here and would
10 be glad to visit with you, also, about what they have
11 done. Thank you.

12 If there is no further comment, we will be in
13 recess until 8:30 to take additional comment from folks
14 who may arrive between now and then. If we have no
15 additional commenters at 8:30, we will close the record
16 at that time. Thank you for coming. We will be in
17 recess until 8:30.

18 (Recess: 7:40 to 8:22 p.m.)

19 MR. EIGUREN: Once again, we resume our public
20 hearing being held July 18th, 1989, in Portland, Oregon.
21 It is now 8:22 p.m. and we have been at recess for
22 approximately 45 minutes. We've had no additional
23 individuals come forward to testify at this public
24 hearing, so, accordingly, by prior decision of the
25 department and the hearing officer, we will now formally

1 close the record of this, the July 18th, 1989 hearing.

2 (Hearing Concluded)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF OREGON)
) ss.
County of Multnomah)

I, Julie La Fon Henderson, Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public for the State of Oregon, do hereby certify the commenters personally appeared before me at the time and place mentioned in the caption herein; that the oral presentation of said commenters was taken down by me in stenotype and thereafter reduced to typewriting; and, that the foregoing transcript, pages 1 to 54, both inclusive, constitutes a full, true and accurate record of said hearing, and of the whole thereof.

Witness my hand and notarial seal at Portland, Oregon, this 24th day of July, 1989.


Julie La Fon Henderson
Notary Public for Oregon
My Commission expires: 1-29-93



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SURPLUS PRODUCTION REACTOR DECOMMISSIONING (SPRD)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

July 20, 1989

10 a.m.

Hilton Hotel

17620 Pacific Highway South

Seattle, Washington

Timothy A. Hale, Reporter
Gee, Green, Anderson & Associates
Seattle, Washington

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

INDEX OF COMMENTORS

Name	Page
Mr. Dan Silver	15
Ms. Barbara Zepeda	24
Mr. Frank Hammond	48
Mr. Mark Bloome	52
Mr. Brendon Mahaffey	55
Ms. Donna Bernstein	60
Mr. Russ Childers	65
Mr. Mark Bloome	68

Because these remarks are identical to the first 16 pages of the Richland transcripts, they are not repeated here.

22 The Council on Environmental Quality regulations that
23 govern the NEPA proceedings require the Federal agencies to
24 seek out with particularity comment from state and local
25 governments, and as consequence of that, we're always pleased

1 when we have official representatives from state or local
2 governments here to comment on such documents. We have someone
3 who is from the State of Washington serving in the capacity of
4 Special Assistant to Governor Booth Gardner. Mr. Dan Silver is
5 here to represent the Governor.

6 Mr. Silver, if you would like to take the podium,
7 sir, I would we would like to hear your comments, and any
8 written comments you have we will mark as an exhibit and
9 include those in the record also.

10 MR. DAN SILVER: Good morning, Mr. Eiguren,
11 Mr. Freeberg. Thank you very much for the opportunity to
12 comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

13 My name is Dan Silver. I am Special Assistant to
14 Governor Gardner. My comments this morning will focus on the
15 broad public policy issues involved in decommissioning the
16 reactors, and we will submit detailed comments prior to the
17 completion of the comment period next week.

18 Governor Gardner applauds the Department of Energy in
19 its decision to move forward with the decommissioning of the
20 surplus reactors, and we look forward to working with you on
21 this very important project.

22 The Governor regards decommissioning to be our
23 responsibility. We should not pass this nuclear waste problem
24 down to our descendants three or four generations from now.
25 Accordingly, he believes that the decommissioning of the

1 reactors must not be delayed for 75 more years.

2 His preference is that all eight of the reactors be
3 buried in the plateau of the 200 West Area well away from the
4 Columbia River. This will provide the maximum protection to
5 the public and to the environment from natural catastrophe or
6 human error.

7 Although the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
8 briefly discusses the various regulatory authorities which may
9 need to be considered during the decommissioning activities,
10 the document understates the impact of the Resource
11 Conservation and Recovery Act and the Washington
12 Administrative Code on in situ decommissioning and safe
13 storage. The final draft should more clearly describe the
14 potential regulatory requirements for these alternatives.

15 Whatever the final option, the final draft should
16 also indicate that the decommissioning will be done in
17 accordance with the terms of the Tri-party Agreement which we
18 have recently negotiated with the Federal government.

19 The B Reactor has an exceptionally strong association
20 with the history of the United States Atomic Energy Program and
21 the development of the atomic bomb at the end of World War II.
22 In view of it's historic significance, the future interpretive
23 value of the B Reactor should be preserved if it is
24 technically, environmentally, or economically feasible.

25 Varying degrees of interpretive value could be

1 preserved by maintaining part of the facility in its present
2 condition, creation of a B Reactor representative at the site,
3 displaying the control room at the Hanford Science Center or
4 room at the Smithsonian Institute, or by providing extensive
5 photographs and records at one of these sites.

6 The Final Environmental Impact Statement should
7 evaluate the environmental cost, the scientific heritage, and
8 cultural heritage impacts of each of these options. The
9 evaluation should assess public accessibility and the ability
10 to illustrate and meet construction and operational
11 achievements.

12 Incremental costs associated with maintaining and
13 monitoring the B Reactor in place while the other seven reactor
14 blocks are moved to the 200 West Area should also be included
15 in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Of course, the
16 Historic Register decision must not compromise protection of
17 the public health, safety, or the environment.

18 The Washington State Shoreline Management Act states
19 that it is the policy of the State to provide for management of
20 the shorelines of the State by planning for and fostering all
21 reasonable and appropriate uses. Although the Draft
22 Environmental Impact Statement assumes a time period of a
23 hundred years for active institutional control with an
24 intention to maintain institutional control in perpetuity,
25 there is no discussion about allowing reasonable and

1 appropriate public use of the shoreline.

2 Decommissioning of the reactors will remove a
3 significant roadblock to opening major sections of the Hanford
4 Reach shoreline to the public. If the Reach is designated as a
5 part of the National Wild and Scenic River System, that portion
6 of the river will remain open for boating and fishing, but not
7 for shoreline uses.

8 Protection of historic, archaeological, and cultural
9 property together with yet to be decommissioned sites would
10 preclude opening of the entire Hanford Reach. However, the
11 Final Environmental Impact Statement should articulate a
12 Federal policy of shoreline use during the period of
13 institutional control. We recommend a phased approach which
14 would allow the public reasonable and appropriate use of the
15 shoreline.

16 Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment.
17 The Governor strongly supports the Department's effort to move
18 forward on this key element of Hanford cleanup.

19 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Mr. Silver, I have with me
20 Mr. Roger Freeberg who is a member of the DOE operations staff
21 in Richland in the Environmental Restoration Branch. Under the
22 rules of our proceedings, we're entitled to ask clarifying
23 questions, and if you have no objections, at least I have a few
24 just to clarify a few points.

25 MR. DAN SILVER: I would be very happy to answer

1 questions.

2 MR. ROY EIGUREN: One issue relates to your
3 reference to the Shoreline Management Act of the State of
4 Washington.

5 As I understand the Governor's position, that Act may
6 in fact apply to this section of the Federal Reservation if, in
7 fact, the reactors are removed from that location?

8 MR. DAN SILVER: It applies to all shorelines in
9 this state.

10 MR. ROY EIGUREN: So you're asking that the
11 Final Environmental Impact Statement articulate what the
12 Federal policy will be relative to those shorelines?

13 MR. DAN SILVER: That's correct.

14 MR. ROY EIGUREN: And how that would be
15 integrated with the State's Shoreline Management Act?

16 MR. DAN SILVER: Yes.

17 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Secondly, you indicated that
18 the Governor would like to have the Final Environmental Impact
19 Statement articulate additional options related to the
20 B Reactor in terms of historical preservation.

21 MR. DAN SILVER: Yes.

22 At present, I think the Environmental Impact
23 Statement only identifies two options. We would like to see
24 additional possibilities explored in the Final Environmental
25 Impact Statement.

1 MR. ROY FIGUREN: Along the lines that you've
2 mentioned?

3 MR. DAN SILVER: Yes.

4 MR. ROY FIGUREN: Then finally, one issue that
5 was not directly addressed in your comments but one that we
6 have been asking representatives from other states who have
7 appeared at these proceedings, and that perhaps it would be in
8 the State's written comments we will receive, is there any
9 particular ranking in terms of priority of this particular
10 project, i.e., the decommissioning project at the Hanford Site
11 versus other types of environmental mediation that might be
12 contemplated for that site?

13 MR. DAN SILVER: No, nor will we make that
14 ranking in our written comments either.

15 MR. ROY FIGUREN: So the State will have no
16 position in terms of ranking of the priority?

17 MR. DAN SILVER: No.

18 MR. ROY FIGUREN: Thank you.

19 Mr. Freeberg?

20 MR. ROGER FREEBERG: I have no questions. Thank
21 you very much.

22 MR. ROY FIGUREN: Thank you very much for
23 coming, we appreciate it.

24 MR. DAN SILVER: Thank you.

25 MR. ROY FIGUREN: Are there others here who

1 retained for the exclusive purpose of serving as the hearings
2 officer at this and the other public hearings in this
3 particular proceeding.

4 We have had three public hearings to date. Prior to
5 today, we have had hearings in Portland, Oregon; Spokane,
6 Washington; and Richland, Washington. Today's hearing will
7 conclude this particular series of hearings on the Draft
8 Environmental Impact Statement.

9 I am an independent third party in this proceeding.
10 By that I mean that I am not an advocate for or against the
11 Department's proposed action in this proceeding. My role in
12 being here is simply to provide an unbiased forum for all
13 individuals to have a fair and equal opportunity to comment on
14 the record on issues of concern relative to potential
15 environmental impacts of this proposed action.

16 The action which is contemplated by the Department is
17 the decommissioning of these eight surplus production reactors.
18 There are five different options that the Department has
19 currently under consideration by way of decommissioning these
20 facilities. The options are examined in some considerable
21 detail in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

22 The purpose of this hearing is to receive comment
23 from the public on those options, and to receive input as to
24 what members of the public as well as local and state
25 governments think is the appropriate option that should be

1 selected by the Department in decommissioning the reactors.

2 The time frame for this particular proceeding is as
3 follows:

4 The record will close on the 28th day of July, so
5 written comment is in order and will be received and included
6 in the record of the proceeding if it is mailed to the
7 Department of Energy prior to the 28th day of July. Written
8 comment as well as the transcript of the public hearings will
9 be used by the Department of Energy in its decision making in
10 the selection of the option it chooses.

11 Once the process of reviewing the record is complete,
12 the Department then will do one of several things: It will
13 either issue a Final Environmental Impact Statement in the same
14 form as the draft Environmental Impact Statement; secondly, it
15 may choose to modify the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
16 prior to putting it into its final form; or thirdly, it may
17 choose to substantially revise the Draft Environmental Impact
18 Statement and reissue it in draft form after which there would
19 be additional public comment on the reissued draft, and a Final
20 Environmental Impact Statement would be prepared. The Final
21 Environmental Impact Statement will then lead to the
22 preparation of a Record of Decision by the Secretary of Energy.

23 The Record of Decision will select the Department's
24 preferred alternative relative to decommissioning. If there
25 are particular environmental impacts associated with that

1 particular option, the Record of Decision will also define the
2 various mitigation measures the Department will put into place
3 to mitigate those particular environmental impacts.

4 I am here, as I mentioned, for the purpose of
5 receiving comment from the public. Mr. Roger Freeberg, who is
6 the Director of the Environmental Restoration Branch of the
7 Richland Operations Office of DOE, is also with me. We
8 comprise the hearing panel.

9 Our purpose is to receive public comment and, as
10 appropriate, to ask members of the public who are commenting
11 clarifying questions after their comments to make sure we
12 understand the full import of what they are telling us.

13 I mentioned prior to going to recess that this public
14 hearing commenced this morning at 10 a.m. for the purpose of
15 receiving comment from members of the public. We did receive
16 comment this morning from the Governor's representative,
17 Mr. Dan Silver. I indicated that we would recess until the
18 hour of 3 p.m., at which time, we had another preregistered
19 commentor scheduled to be here.

20 That preregistered commentor is here a bit early,
21 Barbara Zepada, so without further ado I will turn the
22 microphone over to you, Barbara, for your comments on this
23 particular issue.

24 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: I'm Barbara Zepada. I am
25 speaking for the Washington Democratic Council, which has been

1 very much concerned about the use of our rate paying ability
2 under our Public Utility System to subsidize Hanford.

3 There's been no accounting for either the money, the
4 dollars, or the waste, and how it has affected our direct
5 electric rates. There has been a continuing issuing of WPPSS
6 bonds using the City of Seattle's bonding capacity, City
7 Light's bonding capacity. The waste is buried in an accounting
8 system that the citizens can really not fathom. I don't even
9 know what kind of physical or fiscal accounting system there is
10 for finding out either past, present, or future waste that is
11 being created by either the military or the so-called peaceful
12 uses of the nuclear processes at Hanford.

13 I haven't received this report until just now. The
14 question I have raised repeatedly over the last decade at these
15 hearings is:

16 Is this country, the Department of Energy, actually
17 lobbying for the international regulation of nuclear materials
18 as both the Heart of America, Greenpeace, the other
19 environmental organizations, and certainly the Washington
20 Democratic Council has called for this at meetings over the
21 last decade?

22 We need to begin an accurate accounting system of
23 both the money that's being spent, the waste that's been
24 deposited, and the actual proposals for both the accounting
25 system and some kind of objective outside international

1 accounting because you read of stories every month in the paper
2 about nuclear weapons, nuclear waste, showing up in very
3 strange places.

4 I would like to leave something on the record here, a
5 candidate that feels that the City of Seattle, the only
6 candidate running for mayor that feels that the City of Seattle
7 should find out exactly what its liability is in the Hanford
8 process.

9 We can't take care of our regular garbage and
10 certainly the nuclear garbage that has been created by the
11 Supply System at Hanford is not clear, either the long-term
12 environmental heritage or the long-term financial cost.

13 I just went to a luncheon, that's why I couldn't get
14 here this morning. A speaker from the Grace Commission -- and
15 it was a very good luncheon. We got free beer and we also got
16 a free book. We had to pay for the luncheon, I thought it was
17 expensive at first, but evidently the Federal government has
18 17 pages of specifications on the chocolate chip cookie, and
19 we've got to stop wasting money in the Federal government on
20 this type of so-called accountability, it's just a waste of
21 money.

22 We have paper after paper where we ask the same
23 questions, the citizens, over and over again, and what we need
24 to do is maybe get something that's clear about how we're
25 handling our plutonium. I would like to see the specs,

1 frankly, are they in any documents, the specs for handling
2 plutonium?

3 MR. ROY EIGUREN: I don't have a direct answer
4 for you, but we can provide one to you in writing.

5 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: Either the physical or the
6 fiscal because this is absurd. We're creating a debt that is
7 beyond all control.

8 The energy people talk about money being
9 fungible but energy is fungible in the fact that we've had a
10 transportation system based on wasting oil energy that has
11 justified building nuclear energy that we really didn't know
12 how to handle.

13 Is there any effort by the government to work with
14 the International Nuclear Regulatory Agency? I've raised this
15 question every time, and I have never gotten an answer. People
16 have said they would send me an answer and they have never sent
17 me an answer. The Seberg proposal, Glenn Seberg's proposal.

18 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Ma'am, I won't be able to give
19 you an answer at this point, but I promise you we will make a
20 written response to you.

21 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: Glenn Seberg has made
22 repeated speeches and proposals, I don't know even know if he's
23 still alive, he's from California -- I'm not sure where he's
24 from, but he was in California the last time I heard.

25 That's basically the only thing I'm going to state is

1 just the same old request that we set up standards that are
2 accounting standards for the money, for the waste, that we know
3 where we've been, where we are, and where we're going. Until
4 we do that, we can't, proposals are paper. That's all I'm
5 going to say.

6 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Would you like to include
7 those in the record, ma'am?

8 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: Yes.

9 MR. ROY EIGUREN: What I will do is mark those
10 for inclusion in the record.

11 Before you leave, I believe Mr. Freeberg has a
12 question for you.

13 MR. ROGER FREEBERG: I just had a clarifying
14 question.

15 You mentioned the Supply System several times and
16 their bonding and so forth, and I wanted to make a clarifying
17 statement that the Department of Energy has no connection or
18 responsibilities to the Washington Public Power Supply System
19 and their bonding. That's a separate public utility and it is
20 not under the auspices of the Department of Energy.

21 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: You mean nuclear energy is
22 not under the Department of Energy, nuclear regulations, the
23 NRC regulations?

24 MR. ROGER FREEBERG: The NRC is not under the
25 Department of Energy. NRC is a separate regulatory body of the

1 Federal government.

2 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: But it's supposed to be
3 setting up funds and procedures by which these plants operate.

4 MR. ROGER FREEBERG: Yes, and they do that, they
5 definitely do that.

6 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: The regulations of how
7 something operates is almost an engineering requirement.

8 MR. ROGER FREEBERG: I wanted to make myself
9 clear, though, in the context of your statement about the
10 obligations of WPPSS and their accounting systems and their
11 bonding and so forth. I just want to make it clear that the
12 Department of Energy doesn't have any responsibility for the
13 Washington Public Power Supply System.

14 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: It licenses it?

15 MR. ROGER FREEBERG: No, it does not.

16 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: Who licenses it?

17 MR. ROGER FREEBERG: The Nuclear Regulatory
18 Commission, it's a separate regulatory agency within the
19 Federal government, not the Department of Energy.

20 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: I'm sorry, but the
21 Department of Energy has a budget and has oversight over the
22 nuclear industry and proposes ways to -- I mean the NRC is a
23 regulatory body that the DOE has some impact on. The DOE is
24 the administrative body of energy in the country.

25 MR. ROGER FREEBERG: Not for all energy. The

1 Department of Energy has its own key programs and we have
2 responsibility for those programs. The nuclear energy under
3 the Washington Public Power Supply System is regulated by the
4 Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which is another separate
5 Federal government regulatory body. I just wanted to make that
6 distinction.

7 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: But you say the NRC doesn't
8 have any relationship with the Department of Energy.

9 MR. ROGER FREEBERG: Well, it's an agency of the
10 Federal government and it does exercise regulatory authority
11 over some facets of the nuclear business that we're in, just
12 like they have regulatory authority over the nuclear business
13 of the Power Supply System.

14 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: That's what I'm saying.
15 Maybe the problem is that the discussion we're having here
16 shows how fuzzy the whole thing is to the general public, I
17 mean, how unclear it is to the general public.

18 MR. ROGER FREEBERG: I understand. I was just
19 trying to clarify that.

20 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: It's hard to find anybody
21 that's responsible for anything.

22 MR. ROGER FREEBERG: Your point is well taken.
23 I was trying to make a clarifying distinction between the
24 Washington Public Power Supply System which resides on the
25 Hanford Site, but they are on leased property and they work as

1 a separate and distinct body and we have no government
2 authority or responsibility for that.

3 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: But you're responsible for
4 the waste.

5 MR. ROGER FREEBERG: Not for the Washington
6 Public Power Supply System waste.

7 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: Where does it show how
8 you've separated the waste you are responsible for and the
9 other waste?

10 MR. ROGER FREEBERG: Well, I don't have a good
11 answer for that. There are many many documents that do
12 identify where the Department of Energy waste inventories are.

13 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: Are you saying that you're
14 only responsible for the defense waste?

15 MR. ROGER FREEBERG: That's correct.

16 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: The Department of Energy is
17 only responsible for defense waste.

18 MR. ROGER FREEBERG: Well, there is some waste
19 generated in what we call the civilian nuclear energy program
20 which would generate some waste, but that's under the
21 Department of Energy.

22 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: Is this paid for by a line
23 item in the Department of Defense budget at all?

24 MR. ROGER FREEBERG: Not the Department of
25 Defense.

1 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: Is the Department of Energy
2 considered a civilian agency?

3 MR. ROGER FREEBERG: Yes, it is.

4 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: Yet it handles defense
5 waste?

6 MR. ROGER FREEBERG: Yes.

7 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: Then that in itself is very
8 bad.

9 MR. ROGER FREEBERG: It handles defense waste
10 from the programs -- This is going to get confusing again, but
11 we have programs in the Department that support the National
12 Defense Program and that is the production of material, nuclear
13 material, for the Department of Defense. The wastes that are
14 generated from the production of those nuclear materials are
15 the responsibility of the Department of Energy.

16 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: This is the justification
17 of the original statement.

18 MR. ROY EIGUREN: I'm going to interject myself
19 at this point. The rules provide for clarifying questions, not
20 a give and take.

21 At this point, what I think I will do is go ahead and
22 bring this portion of the hearing to a close, and then I will
23 have Mr. Bauman and Mr. Freeberg visit with Ms. Zepeda and
24 provide some additional information.

25 With that, we will stand at recess until the hour of

1 7 p.m. this evening, or we will go back on the record if
2 additional commentors come forward.

3 Prior to that, I am going to mark and include in the
4 record of this proceeding as Exhibit No. 15 a document provided
5 to me entitled Hegamin for Mayor, both sides of it, which deals
6 with "Seattle has a billion dollar budget, why is it not
7 enough."

8 The next exhibit, which will be marked as
9 Exhibit No. 16, is produced by Citizens Against Government
10 Waste. It first appeared on Wednesday, July 19, 1989, in the
11 Seattle Times. It is entitled "A Smart Cookie or a Waste of
12 Dough.?"

13 With that, we will stand in recess until the hour of
14 7 p.m.

15 (RECESS TAKEN.)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Because these remarks are identical to the first 16 pages of the Richland transcripts, they are not repeated here.

16 This is not an interactive proceeding. We are here
17 to receive your comments, so although you may have questions
18 for the record, we are not in a position to respond directly to
19 those questions this evening. However, when we finish the
20 receipt of all of the comments here tonight and go off the
21 record, the hearing panel as well as the DOE folks who are in
22 the back of the room will remain here to respond to specific
23 issues or questions you may have.

24 With that, I will go ahead and take questions on the
25 procedures at this point and then we will turn to receiving

1 public comment.

2 Yes, ma'am?

3 MS. GANN: I would like to comment on the
4 location. I think it was very inconvenient for me to come out
5 here.

6 MR. ROY FIGUREN: Could I have your name for the
7 record?

8 MS. GANN: Yes, it is Sharon Gann. I think it
9 was very inconvenient to come out to the airport. We have a
10 relatively small turnout here, but I think had you had it in
11 the city proper, perhaps at the Seattle Center or even at the
12 downtown Hilton, you would have had many more participants.

13 MR. ROY FIGUREN: Thank you, I will note that
14 for the record.

15 Are there any other procedural issues? Hearing none,
16 we will turn to the receipt of public comment.

17 As I say, everyone has five minutes. I am going to
18 be liberal in terms of interpreting that so if you need to go
19 beyond that, that's fine.

20 Our first scheduled commentor is Mr. Frank Hammond.

21 MR. FRANK HAMMOND: My name is Frank Hammond, I
22 live at 109 East Roanoke Street, Seattle, and I'm speaking on
23 behalf of the Cascade Chapter of the Sierra Club.

24 The Sierra Club, Cascade Chapter, has reviewed the
25 Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the decommissioning of

1 the eight surplus production reactors at the Hanford Site. The
2 Sierra Club thanks the Department of Energy for the opportunity
3 to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact
4 Statement.

5 The Sierra Club is highly concerned about the
6 potential for serious environmental impact from the
7 decommissioned production reactors if they are allowed to
8 remain in their present location in the 100 Area of the Hanford
9 Site.

10 We feel that the decommissioning alternatives in the
11 Draft Environmental Impact Statement have been well described
12 and well researched by the Department of Energy. We believe
13 that excellent work was done by the Department of Energy in
14 analyzing the various decommissioning alternatives. In this
15 testimony today, we intend to provide comments on what we
16 believe is the best decommissioning alternative.

17 The Sierra Club believes that the longer the eight
18 surplus reactors are allowed to remain in their present
19 condition, at the present site, even with adequate air, water,
20 and soil monitoring, the greater will be the potential for a
21 severe environmental disaster. In table B.2 of the Draft
22 Environmental Impact Statement, it illustrates that a
23 catastrophic or 50 percent failure of the Grand Coulee Dam
24 would place all but 1 one the surplus reactors below flood
25 level at the first floor elevation level of the reactors. A

1 severe seismic event could cause such a failure of the dam.

2 Appendix H of the Draft Environmental Impact
3 Statement discusses flood protection in the case of
4 decommissioning on-site. It does not discuss the case where
5 severe seismic activity has simultaneously weakened the
6 proposed riprap layer around the reactor. While the
7 Environmental Impact Statement does indicate that severe
8 seismic activity is very unlikely in the Hanford area, the
9 possibility of a catastrophic occurrence is not impossible or
10 totally improbable.

11 If this layer around the reactor decommissioned in
12 place were also cracked at the time of the dam failure, we
13 could have a severe flooded area within that area and we could
14 have an impact on the river.

15 The closeness of the reactors to the river allows no
16 space for leakage if there is any serious impact to the
17 reactors themselves. While this has not occurred during the
18 time the reactors have been in place, we cannot be certain it
19 will not occur over the next century or longer if the reactors
20 are left in that condition. Therefore, we feel that
21 decommissioning of the reactors in place, an in situ
22 decommissioning, is not the preferred alternative. It also
23 happens to be as costly as any of the alternatives and leaves
24 us with a higher contamination risk to the Columbia River.

25 Our preference would be to eliminate the reactors and

1 all the components from the Hanford Site with the removal of
2 all of the radioactive materials to the National Repository.
3 However, there is no National Repository at this time to move
4 the reactor materials to, so we feel that the reactors should
5 be placed in a temporary storage, for whatever period of time
6 we don't know, in the 200 Area.

7 The question then is should you do an immediate
8 one-piece removal or a delayed one-piece removal. The Sierra
9 Club supports the immediate one-piece removal decommissioning
10 alternative, and we support this for the following reasons:

11 The immediate one-piece removal option is less costly
12 than any other acceptable alternative and it's only 9 million
13 dollars more than leaving the reactors on-site and doing an in
14 situ alternative. The environmental impact of the one-piece
15 removal is minimal, and the radiation dosage to the general
16 public off the reservation is low or lower than any other
17 alternative shown.

18 The only negative impact we could find was a higher
19 radiation dosage sustained by the workers on the
20 decommissioning team. While we are concerned about situations
21 where the workers are exposed to more than minimum permitted
22 radiation levels, we feel in this case the Department of Energy
23 will be required to use whatever sufficient number of workers
24 over the 12-year span of the decommissioning project in order
25 to assure that no single individual receives more than the

1 acceptable level of radioactivity per the present maximum
2 occupational dosage levels.

3 Again, we we will state that the immediate one-piece
4 removal of the surplus reactors is the best alternative and the
5 one that should be selected.

6 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Thank you, sir. If you have
7 an extra copy of your written comment, I would be glad to
8 include that as an exhibit.

9 MR. FRANK HAMMOND: Yes, I do.

10 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Thank you, Mr. Hammond.

11 We will include as Exhibit No. 16 in the record to
12 this proceeding the written comments of the Sierra Club on
13 behalf of this particular issue. Thank you for your testimony.

14 Our next scheduled commentor is Mr. Mark Bloome.

15 MR. MARK BLOOME: My name is Mark Bloome. I'm
16 Chairman of the Board of Heart of America Northwest, a
17 citizen's organization that has been leading the fight for
18 Hanford cleanup. We would like to comment upon the choices
19 that have been put forth.

20 We, like the Sierra Club, support the immediate
21 removal of the core materials from the reactors and making them
22 immediately safe. Our country and our communities have all
23 benefited from the services provided by those reactors. That
24 has been the democratic process. But as those who have
25 benefited, it is only fair that we pay the price now for the

1 benefits we have received. It is eminently unreasoned to delay
2 for 75 years the decommissioning.

3 The fact that there is absolutely no way in which
4 anybody can predict the economic status of our country 75 years
5 from now is quite plain. The gurus on Wall Street can't
6 predict 75 hours from now. It would be a moral injustice for
7 us to leave those reactors knowing that the likelihood of
8 anything happening in 75 years is slim to none and therefore
9 the results would be that we would have radioactive material
10 that would be decaying. The people of the future generations
11 would pay a terrible price for this problem.

12 The history of safe doses of radioactivity is clear.
13 The greatest scientific minds have shown that what was
14 acceptable levels of radiation in 1945 are grossly unacceptable
15 levels of radiation in 1989. Evidence seems to continue to
16 indicate that all exposures to radiation are negative impacting
17 upon the health of our people. To have reactors there 60, 70,
18 80, a hundred years from now can only negatively impact upon
19 our country and upon our people, not only the reactors, but the
20 whole cleanup situation altogether.

21 We also would like to speak that we are deeply
22 concerned for the economic well-being of our region and the
23 health problems of our region. We have witnessed the
24 devastation of Washington agriculture through an Alar scare.
25 We have seen cherries that don't even use Alar have to be

1 dumped at sea because in Taiwan there's an Alar scare on our
2 cherries.

3 There is nothing more reactive than the American
4 public when it comes to the fear of anything radioactive. I
5 can quote you study after study out of risk analysis that show
6 that that is the most fearsome thing in the American public's
7 mind, and I would think from what I could discern, it is the
8 most fearsome thing in most of the world population's minds.

9 Should our products become mildly radioactive in any
10 way due to any leakages from these reactors or from anything at
11 Hanford, our economic enemies would use this to destroy the
12 well-being of our people, and our country cannot afford this
13 kind of devastation. We are in economic trouble enough. We
14 need no more health threats, we need nothing but to get this
15 thing cleaned up.

16 I am reminded as I look at this problem of teenage
17 adolescents and a dirty room, and what I'm hearing from DOE is
18 that their alternatives are to clean it now or clean it
19 75 years from now. We would not allow adolescents to clean
20 their room 75 years after making it dirty, and I don't think
21 DOE as a responsible mature organization can adopt that policy
22 with any sense of responsibility.

23 The State of Washington and the Northwest in the late
24 forties the invited and allowed nuclear production at the
25 Hanford Reservation because there was a deep need, our country

1 needed this. We were at war and victory was unsure. While I
2 will not speak for Heart of America, I can say that I supported
3 personally those decisions to produce the bomb, and I supported
4 the decision to use the bomb at the time because that's what
5 war is all about. But time has come and time has gone, and we
6 believe that we have been welcoming neighbors and allowed this
7 to go on on our land, and it is time that as conscious human
8 beings that the Department of Energy live up to its
9 responsibilities.

10 I have been the president of a large corporation, and
11 I know what it is to look at the bottom line. But the question
12 that is going to be before DOE, which is an organization that
13 is run primarily by human beings, is: Where does their
14 conscience lie? Does it lie on the dollar sign or does it lie
15 in human life. Thank you.

16 MR. ROY EIGUREN: I am informed that the next
17 two prescheduled commentators, Andrew Gezesh and Marie Savorini
18 are not here this evening. I would call their names just to
19 make sure they are not.

20 Is Andrew Gezesh or Marie Savorini here? If not, I
21 would then call Brendon Mahaffey.

22 MR. BRENDON MAHAFFEY: My name is
23 Brendon Mahaffey, I live at 424 Northeast Maple Leave Place in
24 Seattle. I'm here speaking partly on behalf of myself tonight,
25 although I am a member of Heart of America Northwest.

1 I guess my first comment is the location of this
2 place is totally inadequate and not really acceptable. The
3 meetings that I have been to in Seattle have had what I would
4 feel is a decent turnout, and you can tell by the location that
5 it definitely had its effect.

6 I don't know why we're here. A comment was made
7 earlier about parking being a problem in Seattle. I think that
8 I would rather walk four or five blocks than drive 20 miles.

9 My stand on all this is that I feel like the reactors
10 need to be cleaned up immediately. I don't claim to be an
11 expert, and I think what the Sierra Club says makes a lot of
12 sense. I don't know exactly how to do it, but I know it needs
13 to happen now.

14 I know that Department of Energy's irresponsibility
15 of their nuclear waste disposal has directly effected the food
16 chain in our state. Whenever there's nuclear waste in the
17 water, it gets into plants, it gets into animals, and it gets
18 into us. Nuclear waste doesn't go away real quick. So that
19 really bugs me.

20 We know that there has been thousands of curies
21 released into the air and covered up and lied about numerous
22 times. We know that thousand of gallons of high level
23 radioactive waste has been leaked into our aquifers. I have
24 spoken with people who were at a high level at Hanford in the
25 fifties and sixties saying that you can bet that there has been

1 nuclear waste that has made it into the Columbia River and into
2 the Pacific Ocean. Again, this is effecting not only our food
3 chain but people everywhere.

4 I don't think that an organization like DOE has the
5 right to make decisions for people all over the world, and
6 that's what happens when nuclear waste gets into our oceans.
7 I'm saying this because I think that DOE should clean it
8 upright now.

9 From what I understand, the Department of Energy
10 doesn't have the final say in their Environmental Impact
11 Statement anyway, it's under the jurisdiction of the
12 Environmental Protection Agency, and I didn't hear them
13 mentioned in the facts about Hanford. I would like to go on
14 record as stating that I think it's important that the EPA does
15 have a strong involvement. Obviously the DOE has not proven to
16 us that they are trustworthy.

17 Also, I feel that the Environmental Impact Statement
18 was nothing more than an academic exercise with inadequate
19 records. As far as I know, there has not been any on-site, or
20 has not been extensive on-site testing, and any kind of
21 Environmental Impact Statement that draws strict conclusions
22 needs to have a lot more time than just one year or probably
23 even a year and a half, and it needs to be a lot more than just
24 research from records that have been admitted time and time
25 again by DOE that are scarce if none at all.

1 We all know, including DOE, that records in the
2 forties and fifties were very loosely kept if kept at all. We
3 have all heard stories about radioactive jeeps being dug up by
4 accident. They don't even know where all the sites are.

5 I've also been reading through some newspaper
6 articles in the Times about the eight forgotten reactors, and I
7 notice that a quote from that, or a very close to quote was
8 rumors of removal of reactors would open up river front. I
9 would like to remind people about the court cases going on in
10 Ohio about children playing in sand boxes and contracting
11 leukemia, having their legs amputated. I don't know that
12 anybody in their right mind would want to have any kind of fun
13 in river front next to an ex-reactor, whether it's buried,
14 moved, or whatever. I find this option ludicrous.

15 I don't think that leaving them for 75 years is an
16 option. If the reason they want to leave them is because it's
17 to dangerous for workers to go in there and decommission them,
18 then are we talking about low-level waste. It was my
19 impression that low-level waste could be worked around and
20 high-level waste could not, so what is it, which brings me back
21 to the Environmental Impact Statement.

22 How extensive is this Environmental Impact Statement?
23 Is it high-level waste, is it low-level waste, what is it? If
24 you can't have workers working around it, I find it hard to
25 believe it's low-level nuclear waste. If it is low-level

1 nuclear waste, then maybe we ought to change our standards.

2 I know that the Department of Energy seems to be
3 pushing towards leaving the reactors, the only other reason I
4 can imagine is because of funding. Again, it comes back to
5 dollars versus people: How much is a human life worth and how
6 much is our food chain worth, how much is the economy of
7 Washington State worth? If this waste gets into the Columbia
8 River, the next step is into our wheat fields in a big way,
9 which ruins the economy of our state.

10 I think the immediate removal of the reactors is
11 imperative to the quality of life in our state. I think that
12 the Department of Energy has continually put us off, and we
13 can't allow them to do it again.

14 Again, I can't say it enough times. I know from the
15 experts I've talked to that EPA has the final jurisdiction over
16 the Environmental Impact Statement. If they choose not to
17 exercise their right, then it goes to the Department of
18 Ecology.

19 Also, I know -- I don't know this, but I suspect that
20 the reason they're pushing for a long-term waiting is that they
21 don't want to spend the money. It hurts me to see our
22 government more apt to spend money on producing more nuclear
23 waste which they don't know what to do with and spending money
24 in places that may not be the best place rather than
25 safeguarding the human lives of our country. Thank you.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. ROY EIGUREN: Thank you.

Our next scheduled commentor is Donna Bernstein. We will include as Exhibit No. 17 in the record of this proceeding the written comments made by Donna Bernstein on behalf of Heart of America.

MS. DONNA BERNSTEIN: I am Donna Bernstein, I am also speaking on behalf of Heart of America Northwest. We are a 16,000 member group around the State dedicated to advancing our region's quality of life.

It has always been a big issue with us that Hanford is cleaned up in a credible and timely manner both for our economy and our environment. We do not feel this Draft Environmental Impact Statement was done through legal means because under the alternative that they're leaning to, which is to leave it for 75 years, it says pretty much in their own wording, part of the reason for this is budget.

Given all the facts already cited such as we don't know what will happen in 75 years, both environmental disasters or economy or simply public mood, given the fact that it is as Brendon said, it must be high level if it's so dangerous that workers can't touch it for 75 years, but is it only that dangerous because DOE has not funded the studies which would maybe let us see a way that workers could handle it?

I would like to read a definition of facility as contained in the law from CERCLA, "Any building, structure,

1 installation, equipment, pipe or pipeline, well, pit, pond,
2 et cetera. It is a facility, and it is covered under CERCLA.

3 We do believe these reactors pose a significant
4 threat of release. As we said, if it's so dangerous it has to
5 be left for 75 years, you can just look at a map and see it
6 sits on the Columbia River.

7 I would like to read again from the law, "Whenever
8 there is a release or a substantial threat of release into the
9 environment of any pollutant or contaminant which may present
10 an imminent and substantial danger to the public health or
11 welfare, the President is authorized to act consistent with the
12 national contingency plan to remove or arrange for the removal
13 of, et cetera, et cetera. It needs to be done. It is a
14 threat.

15 I want to go on to the next paragraph of
16 Section 89604. "In no event shall a potentially responsible
17 party be subject to a lesser standard of liability, receive
18 preferential treatment, or in any other way benefit from any
19 such arrangements, et cetera, et cetera." It seems to me that
20 under the law DOE must spend the money necessary to do the
21 studies required to provide a real Draft Environmental Impact
22 Statement.

23 They don't have the current records to even know what
24 they're doing out there, they have not gone through all of the
25 analysis that's required by CERCLA, so what we're looking at is

1 an Environmental Impact Statement based on inadequate data with
2 budget as a priority over human life. We feel DOE has
3 sidestepped the law and that their decision regarding the final
4 dismantlement has been very biased for budget on their side and
5 not human life and not within the statutes of our law.

6 I would like to go on with the second reason we feel
7 this Draft Environmental Impact Statement is not under the
8 current law, which is that in the time line given, if they come
9 out with their final decision next summer, the amount of
10 time -- when I was at the last quarterly meeting with EPA on
11 the Tri-party Agreement, it seemed that in their time line they
12 were going to look at it sometime later. You can imagine that
13 if DOE has already made a definite decision, has already
14 started on the project and three years later EPA looks at it,
15 EPA is then not given the final jurisdiction.

16 As this is a facility as defined under the law, as it
17 is a potentially hazardous threat that we're talking about,
18 under the law it is EPA or the Washington Department of Ecology
19 that needs to have the final say on what happens with these
20 reactors. We feel DOE is given preferential treatment.

21 If they were in the private world, the agency that
22 had the waste could indeed make their Draft Environmental
23 Impact Statement if they went through the law-required
24 analysis, which we don't believe DOE did, but they would not be
25 the ones to give the final okay on the cleanup procedures.

1 Here we're not talking about some Chevron gas station
2 spill in the Duwamish River. We read about all sorts of sites
3 like that which are awful in themselves, but we're talking
4 about radioactive nuclear waste in our rivers going out to our
5 oceans. We feel strongly that the Washington Department of
6 Ecology and EPA must stand strong, must regard the law and say
7 that they have the final decision on this Draft Environmental
8 Impact Statement, that more studies must be done, and that
9 these studies were not done in respect to that law.

10 Again, we feel that immediate dismantlement is best.
11 We feel that this alternative was not looked as because of
12 budget decisions and that it is not in keeping with the law.
13 It must be decommissioned immediately in full accord with State
14 and Federal environmental laws. More studies must be done.
15 Real studies must be done with the help of EPA and the
16 Washington Department of Ecology and the final decision must be
17 made by EPA or Washington Department of Ecology.

18 Just as a small aside, I find it very amusing, well,
19 not really amusing, but the Department of Energy can find time
20 to fund little things like Hanford visits Wenatchee where they
21 presented very one-sided political views on such agenda items
22 as scenic rivers and Canadian hydroelectric power and yet can't
23 find the time to do the studies to save our population.

24 Since you're making this longer, can I have one more
25 second?

1 MR. ROY EIGUREN: By all means.

2 MS. DONNA BERNSTEIN: From my own personal
3 perspective, not Heart of America, whatever their stand might
4 be, on the monument. I read a few times that they were
5 thinking of making it a national monument. Now, they haven't
6 said in what context. Is it in the context of isn't this very
7 fascinating that here we made a bomb that we had to use but it
8 killed many civilians, or is it in the context of the
9 glorification of the military, the glorification of the United
10 States Army, or is it in the context of how wonderful nuclear
11 power is and why we should all use it.

12 I think that's very very integral to any monument.
13 You can look at two different monuments like the Viet Nam
14 Memorial in D.C. which has a very strong effect on the side
15 of -- whether you're for or against war, either way -- it is
16 not a high rising glorification of war. Then you can compare
17 that to the Gettysburg Memorial in Pennsylvania and see that is
18 a total glorification of the Army. I think that before you can
19 decide if you're going to make that a memorial and whether the
20 people would like it, you need to really make clear what kind
21 of a view is this memorial going to give.

22 Again, all those comments were just from
23 Donna Bernstein, they're not Heart of America on the memorial.
24 That's what I have to say. Thank you very much.

25 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Thank you.

1 Our next scheduled commentor is Russ Childers.

2 MR. RUSS CHILDERS: My name is Russ Childers, I
3 live at 223 14th Avenue East in Seattle. Most of what I want
4 to say people have already said, but I will say it anyway.

5 First of all, I'm also in favor of immediate cleanup
6 of the eight reactors. Just the fact that they're on such a
7 major important river, whether you're looking at it from the
8 economic standpoint or health standpoint, they can't be left
9 there for the next flood or earthquake or whatever could cause
10 major damage to the economy and health of the people.

11 Again, the DOE does not have the right to be deciding
12 what happens here as I understand it under the law. They have
13 a right to come up with suggestions and let the EPA decide or
14 whoever is in charge, but they shouldn't be making the decision
15 here.

16 I don't consider myself to be a cynical person, but
17 it's hard not to be when the DOE is involved. They, in my
18 opinion, don't have much credibility in these issues. They
19 have been covering things up for years. They have been lying
20 for years about what has been going on with the way they are
21 polluting the environment, and it's hard for me to accept that
22 they're really trying now to do the right thing, take care of
23 the people and the economy, the environment, and not just
24 trying to prolong what they see as in their interests. I don't
25 think they see the environment and the health of the people in

1 their interests. I think they see the continued production of
2 the weapons and whatever else goes on out there to be their
3 interests.

4 They have been dumping out at Hanford for over
5 40 years and covering it up. The recent study by the GAO shows
6 that when they have done studies they have not been interested
7 in finding out the real facts, they've been setting up studies
8 to produce results or at least to make it appear to produce
9 desired results which show that they should continue on. I
10 hope that's going to get a bit more press.

11 Again, the DOE says that this is low-level waste, but
12 if they have to leave it there for 75 years for anybody to
13 touch it, low-level waste must be very high level.

14 Also, on the point of having this meeting here, I
15 personally don't own a car. I know a lot of other people don't
16 own cars, and if I didn't know someone with access to a car who
17 was coming here tonight, I wouldn't be able to be here. That's
18 part of what makes me cynical about the DOE.

19 I think if they were interested in people showing up
20 to these meetings and having input into how things are done in
21 our state, in our country, they would have made these meetings
22 far more accessible.

23 Just the fact, a minor thing, but my cynicism says
24 that maybe even putting a phone number that you have to make a
25 long-distance phone call to sign up for it is just another

1 thing to perhaps convince a few more people to just not deal
2 with it.

3 That's all I have to say. Thank you.

4 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Thank you.

5 That concluded our list of preregistered commentors
6 for this evening. I would ask if there is anyone else who is
7 here who has not commented that would like the opportunity to
8 do so? .

9 UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: I would like to say
10 something.

11 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Yes, ma'am. Please, may we
12 have your name and address for the record?

13 UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: Do I have to give my name
14 and address to make public comment?

15 MR. ROY EIGUREN: We need to have your name.

16 UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: Is that right?

17 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Yes.

18 UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: In order for me to comment
19 as a public citizen, I have to give my name?

20 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Yes.

21 UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: That's outrageous.

22 MR. ROY EIGUREN: I'm sorry.

23 Is there anyone else who would like to comment?

24 MR. MARK BLOOME: I have one additional comment.

25 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Yes, sir.

1 MR. MARK BLOOME: My name is Mark Bloome, and I
2 spoke earlier. I would just like to stress in the strongest
3 terms possible what was said by the speaker before me, that
4 this meeting was not held in a place where public
5 transportation was available for citizen input. I think that
6 that needs to be very careful looked at, and I protest this
7 entire meeting because of the place in which it was held.

8 I do not think it really complies with the intention
9 of public input when a criteria to attend this meeting is
10 either to pay for an extremely expensive taxicab which is
11 beyond the norm of the average citizen or to own a car. This
12 is a very undemocratic process devoted to this distance.

13 MR. ROY EIGUREN: It's noted for record, sir.
14 Are there further comments?

15 UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: Please note for the record
16 also that I was here ready to speak and that you refused to
17 take my comments without my name.

18 MR. ROY EIGUREN: Fine.

19 UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: I can give plenty of
20 testimony as to why I don't want to give my name.

21 MR. ROY EIGUREN: It's noted for the record.

22 There being no further comment, we will go ahead and
23 formally close this public hearing being held on the 20th day
24 of July, 1989, in Seattle, Washington. The hearing panel will
25 remain here until 8:30 in the event that we should have

1 additional individuals that arrive and would like to comment.

2 If that happens, we can go back on the record at that time.

3 With that, we stand formally adjourned. Thank you.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

EXHIBITS

Ex01	CEQ Guidelines
Ex02	Notice of Intent
Ex03	Notice of Availability
Ex04	Schedule of Public Involvement Activities
Ex05	Ivan M. A. Garcia
Ex06	Alton Haymaker
Ex07	John Burnham Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council
Ex08	Jim Stoffel(s)
Ex09	The Honorable Claude Oliver Benton County Treasurer
Ex10	Harry Brown Columbia Basin Section American Society of Mechanical Engineers
Ex11	The Honorable Raymond E. Isaacson Benton County Commissioner
Ex11	Jim Thomas Hanford Education Action League (Exhibit 11 was misnumbered by the hearing reporter. The comments are recorded in the FEIS under L018.)
Ex12	Mary R. Wieman
Ex12, Ex13	David Stewart-Smith Oregon Department of Energy (Exhibit 12 was misnumbered by the hearing reporter. All of the State of Oregon's comments are recorded in the FEIS under Exhibit 13.)
Ex14	Hale Weitzman
Ex15	Barbara Zepeda Washington Democratic Council

Exhibits

Ex16

Frank Hammond
Sierra Club, Cascade Chapter

Ex17

Donna Bernstein
Heart of America Northwest

the same fashion (exclusive of scoping) as a draft and final statement unless alternative procedures are approved by the Council.

§ 1502.10 Recommended format.

Agencies shall use a format for environmental impact statements which will encourage good analysis and clear presentation of the alternatives including the proposed action. The following standard format for environmental impact statements should be followed unless the agency determines that there is a compelling reason to do otherwise:

- (a) Cover sheet.
- (b) Summary.
- (c) Table of Contents.
- (d) Purpose of and Need for Action.
- (e) Alternatives Including Proposed Action (secs. 102(2)(C)(iii) and 102(2)(E) of the Act).
- (f) Affected Environment.
- (g) Environmental Consequences (especially sections 102(2)(C) (i), (ii), (iv), and (v) of the Act).
- (h) List of Preparers.
- (i) List of Agencies, Organizations, and Persons to Whom Copies of the Statement Are Sent.
- (j) Index.
- (k) Appendices (if any).

If a different format is used, it shall include paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (h), (i), and (j), of this section and shall include the substance of paragraphs (d), (e), (f), (g), and (k) of this section, as further described in §§ 1502.11-1502.18, in any appropriate format.

§ 1502.11 Cover sheet.

The cover sheet shall not exceed one page. It shall include:

- (a) A list of the responsible agencies including the lead agency and any cooperating agencies.
- (b) The title of the proposed action that is the subject of the statement (and if appropriate the titles of related cooperating agency actions), together with the State(s) and county(ies) (or other jurisdiction if applicable) where the action is located.
- (c) The name, address, and telephone number of the person at the

agency who can supply further information.

(d) A designation of the statement as a draft, final, or draft or final supplement.

(e) A one paragraph abstract of the statement.

(f) The date by which comments must be received (computed in cooperation with EPA under § 1506.10).

The information required by this section may be entered on Standard Form 424 (in items 4, 6, 7, 10, and 18).

§ 1502.12 Summary.

Each environmental impact statement shall contain a summary which adequately and accurately summarizes the statement. The summary shall stress the major conclusions, areas of controversy (including issues raised by agencies and the public), and the issues to be resolved (including the choice among alternatives). The summary will normally not exceed 15 pages.

§ 1502.13 Purpose and need.

The statement shall briefly specify the underlying purpose and need to which the agency is responding in proposing the alternatives including the proposed action.

§ 1502.14 Alternatives including the proposed action.

This section is the heart of the environmental impact statement. Based on the information and analysis presented in the sections on the Affected Environment (§ 1502.15) and the Environmental Consequences (§ 1502.16), it should present the environmental impacts of the proposal and the alternatives in comparative form, thus sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice among options by the decisionmaker and the public. In this section agencies shall:

- (a) Rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, and for alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated.
- (b) Devote substantial treatment to each alternative considered in detail including the proposed action

so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits.

(c) Include reasonable alternatives not within the jurisdiction of the lead agency.

(d) Include the alternative of no action.

(e) Identify the agency's preferred alternative or alternatives, if one or more exists, in the draft statement and identify such alternative in the final statement unless another law prohibits the expression of such a preference.

(f) Include appropriate mitigation measures not already included in the proposed action or alternatives.

§ 1502.15 Affected environment.

The environmental impact statement shall succinctly describe the environment of the area(s) to be affected or created by the alternatives under consideration. The descriptions shall be no longer than is necessary to understand the effects of the alternatives. Data and analyses in a statement shall be commensurate with the importance of the impact, with less important material summarized, consolidated, or simply referenced. Agencies shall avoid useless bulk in statements and shall concentrate effort and attention on important issues. Verbose descriptions of the affected environment are themselves no measure of the adequacy of an environmental impact statement.

§ 1502.16 Environmental consequences.

This section forms the scientific and analytic basis for the comparisons under § 1502.14. It shall consolidate the discussions of those elements required by secs. 102(2)(C) (i), (ii), (iv), and (v) of NEPA which are within the scope of the statement and as much of sec. 102(2)(C)(iii) as is necessary to support the comparisons. The discussion will include the environmental impacts of the alternatives including the proposed action, any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented, the relationship between short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and any irre-

versible or irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposal should it be implemented. This section should not duplicate discussions in § 1502.14. It shall include discussions of:

(a) Direct effects and their significance (§ 1508.8).

(b) Indirect effects and their significance (§ 1508.8).

(c) Possible conflicts between the proposed action and the objectives of Federal, regional, State, and local (and in the case of a reservation, Indian tribe) land use plans, policies and controls for the area concerned. (See § 1505.2(d).)

(d) The environmental effects of alternatives including the proposed action. The comparisons under § 1502.14 will be based on this discussion.

(e) Energy requirements and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures.

(f) Natural or depletable resource requirements and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures.

(g) Urban quality, historic and cultural resources, and the design of the built environment, including the reuse and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures.

(h) Means to mitigate adverse environmental impacts (if not fully covered under § 1502.14(f)).

§ 1502.17 List of preparers.

The environmental impact statement shall list the names, together with their qualifications (expertise, experience, professional disciplines), of the persons who were primarily responsible for preparing the environmental impact statement or significant background papers, including basic components of the statement (§§ 1502.6 and 1502.8). Where possible the persons who are responsible for a particular analysis, including analyses in background papers, shall be identified. Normally the list will not exceed two pages.

§ 1502.18 Appendix.

If an agency prepares an appendix to an environmental impact statement the appendix shall:

(a) Consist of material prepared in connection with an environmental impact statement (as distinct from material which is not so prepared and which is incorporated by reference (§ 1502.21)).

(b) Normally consist of material which substantiates any analysis fundamental to the impact statement.

(c) Normally be analytic and relevant to the decision to be made.

(d) Be circulated with the environmental impact statement or be readily available on request.

§ 1502.19 Circulation of the environmental impact statement.

Agencies shall circulate the entire draft and final environmental impact statements except for certain appendices as provided in § 1502.18(d) and unchanged statements as provided in § 1503.4(c). However, if the statement is unusually long, the agency may circulate the summary instead, except that the entire statement shall be furnished to:

(a) Any Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved and any appropriate Federal, State or local agency authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards.

(b) The applicant, if any.

(c) Any person, organization, or agency requesting the entire environmental impact statement.

(d) In the case of a final environmental impact statement any person, organization, or agency which submitted substantive comments on the draft.

If the agency circulates the summary and thereafter receives a timely request for the entire statement and for additional time to comment, the time for that requestor only shall be extended by at least 15 days beyond the minimum period.

§ 1502.20 Tiering.

Agencies are encouraged to tier their environmental impact statements to eliminate repetitive discussions of the same issues and to focus on the actual issues ripe for decision

at each level of environmental review (§ 1508.28). Whenever a broad environmental impact statement has been prepared (such as a program or policy statement) and a subsequent statement or environmental assessment is then prepared on an action included within the entire program or policy (such as a site specific action) the subsequent statement or environmental assessment need only summarize the issues discussed in the broader statement and incorporate discussions from the broader statement by reference and shall concentrate on the issues specific to the subsequent action. The subsequent document shall state where the earlier document is available. Tiering may also be appropriate for different stages of actions. (Sec. 1508.28).

§ 1502.21 Incorporation by reference.

Agencies shall incorporate material into an environmental impact statement by reference when the effect will be to cut down on bulk without impeding agency and public review of the action. The incorporated material shall be cited in the statement and its content briefly described. No material may be incorporated by reference unless it is reasonably available for inspection by potentially interested persons within the time allowed for comment. Material based on proprietary data which is itself not available for review and comment shall not be incorporated by reference.

§ 1502.22 Incomplete or unavailable information.

When an agency is evaluating significant adverse effects on the human environment in an environmental impact statement and there are gaps in relevant information or scientific uncertainty, the agency shall always make clear that such information is lacking or that uncertainty exists.

(a) If the information relevant to adverse impacts is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives and is not known and the overall costs of obtaining it are not exorbitant, the agency shall include the information

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Office of the Secretary

Intent (NOI) To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement on Decommissioning the Eight Shutdown Production Reactors Located at the Hanford Site Near Richland, WA

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice is hereby given that the Department of Energy (DOE) intends to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pertaining to the decommissioning of eight federally owned, shutdown production reactors located at the DOE Hanford Site, in the State of Washington.

SUMMARY: The DOE announces its intent to prepare an EIS, in accordance with section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to provide environmental input into the decision on the proposed selection and implementation of a decommissioning alternative for the eight shutdown production reactors at the Hanford Site, near Richland, Washington. The DOE's Hanford Site is a 570 square mile, controlled access area that is dedicated to a variety of nuclear-related activities which include producing nuclear power for commercial use, waste management, defense reactor operations, fuel fabrication/processing and nuclear research. This EIS will consider only the disposition of the eight reactors, associated fuel storage basins, and buildings used to house these systems, located in the 100 Area of the Hanford Site in general.

The purpose of this NOI is to present pertinent background information on the proposed scope and contents of the EIS, and to invite interested agencies, organizations, and members of the general public to submit comments or suggestions for consideration in connection with the preparation of the draft EIS.

Upon completion of the draft EIS, its availability will be announced in the Federal Register and local news media for public review and comments. Comments received on the draft will be used in preparing the final EIS.

ADDRESS: DOE invites interested agencies, organizations, and the general public to submit comments or suggestions for consideration in the preparation of the EIS. Written comments or suggestions on the scope of the EIS may be submitted to: Judy L. Torkaz, External Affairs Officer, US/DOE, RL, P.O. Box 550, Richland, WA 99352, (509) 376-7378.

For general information on the DOE EIS process, please contact: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Safety, and Environment, U.S. Department of Energy, Attn: Ms. Carol M. Borgstrom, PE-252, Forrestal Building, Room 3G092, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20585, (202) 252-4600.

Written comments postmarked within 30 days of publication of this NOI in the Federal Register will be considered in the preparation of the draft EIS. Comments received after that date will be considered to the degree practicable.

Background

In 1943, the Manhattan Engineer District of the U.S. Corps of Engineers selected the 570 square mile Hanford Site in Southeastern Washington for production of special nuclear materials, principally plutonium, for national defense activities. Between 1943 and 1955, eight graphite moderated reactors were constructed at the Site, approximately 30 miles north of Richland, Washington, along the Columbia River, to support the plutonium production effort. They are the B, C, D, DR, F, H, KE, and KW reactors. A ninth production reactor, N Reactor, was started up in 1963 and is still in operation. The decommissioning of N Reactor is not within the scope of this EIS.

The Hanford reactors were operated by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and its successors the U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) and the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE).

In early 1964, a presidential decision to begin closing down the older Hanford reactors resulted in deactivating and removing the fuel from all eight reactor sites by the end of 1971. Due to the technical nature of the reactors, their unique design and purposes, and the age of the facilities, no future long-term beneficial use has been identified. The eight reactors contain irradiated reactor components, and the buildings that house the reactors are all contaminated to some degree with low levels of radioactivity. Safe storage of the reactors, since deactivation, has consisted of short-term surveillance and maintenance actions adequate to protect the workers and the environment.

Proposed action

The proposed decommissioning of the shutdown reactors will permanently remove or better isolate any remaining radioactive wastes in a manner that minimizes the potential health and safety impacts on the public and the environment. The proposed EIS will evaluate several decommissioning

alternatives for potential short-term and long-term environmental impacts, and for engineering and cost considerations.

Preliminary Definition of Alternatives To Be Considered in the EIS

1. Safe Storage/Deferred Dismantlement

This alternative involves temporarily storing the reactor in a safe, secure status for a predetermined period of time to allow decay of resident radionuclides to a level permitting hands-on, low radiation exposure dismantlement work. For the eight reactors, the estimated storage period is 75 years. If this alternative were implemented, some additional upgrading of the reactor buildings would be needed, followed by a continued routine maintenance and surveillance program with major maintenance repairs of the buildings conducted every 20 years. After 75 years, the reactors would then be dismantled piece by piece and any remaining radioactive waste transported to approved low-level waste burial areas on the Hanford Site. The maximum distance from the reactors to the proposed burial site is approximately 15 miles, with the transport routes being entirely within the Hanford Site.

2. Immediate Dismantlement

In this alternative, the entire reactor facility is promptly removed from the present reactor site. All radioactive waste material is packaged and transported to an approved low-level waste burial area on the Hanford Site. Dismantlement is accomplished by first removing facility equipment and materials for reuse or disposal, and then demolishing the building. The reactor block is removed in one piece by excavating under the block, positioning a tractor crawler under it, and slowly lowering the block onto the platform. Once the reactor block is physically and radiologically secured aboard the crawler, the crawler is driven across the Hanford Site along predetermined route to the waste burial area. The 15 mile trip to the waste burial area would take approximately 48 hours per reactor.

3. In Situ Disposal

In situ disposal involves leaving the reactor at its present location, as opposed to relocating it to an alternate waste disposal area on the Hanford Site. Facility equipment, reactor components, and other materials that have a potential for reuse are removed. The reactor block is left intact on its foundation, with special care taken to prevent damage to it during the in situ decommissioning process. Loose

federal, state, local agencies,
affected Indian tribes

[6450-01]

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

**Availability of Draft Environmental Impact Statement
on Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors
at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington**

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ACTION: Notice of Availability of Draft Environmental
Impact Statement (EIS).

SUMMARY: The Department of Energy (DOE) announces the availability of a draft EIS on "Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington" (DOE/EIS-0119D). The draft EIS contains information on the potential environmental impacts of alternatives for the proposed decommissioning of eight surplus plutonium production reactors at the Hanford site in Richland, Washington. The DOE has not identified a preferred alternative. Public comments are invited on the draft EIS for consideration in preparing the final EIS.

Ex03

Four public hearings will be held to receive oral comments on the draft EIS.

DATES: Written comments on the draft EIS should be sent to DOE by July 28, 1989, to ensure consideration in preparation of the final EIS. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable. Public hearings will be held on July 11, July 13, July 18, and July 20, 1989, as described in this notice. Individuals desiring to make oral statements at the hearings should notify Tom Bauman at the address below, so that DOE may arrange a schedule for presentations.

ADDRESSES: Requests for copies of the draft EIS, written comments on the draft EIS, requests to present oral comments at the hearings, and requests for further information concerning this draft EIS should be directed to:

Tom Bauman, Office of Communications
Richland Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550
Richland, Washington 99352
Attention: "SPRD Draft EIS"
(509) 376-7501

For general information on the procedures DOE followed in complying with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) contact:

Carol Borgstrom, Director
Office of NEPA Project Assistance (EH-25)
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20585
(202) 586-4600

PUBLIC OUTREACH ACTIVITIES: Prior to the public hearings, public information and outreach activities related to the draft EIS are planned in multiple Northwest locations. The purpose of these activities is to present information on the alternatives and issues discussed in the draft EIS. This information may be helpful in preparing comments on the draft EIS. These activities will also serve to publicize the public hearings that will be held to receive oral comments on the draft EIS. There will be no formal record of the public outreach activities. The dates and locations of these activities will be announced in the news media.

PUBLIC HEARINGS: Public hearings on the draft EIS will be held at the following times and locations:

Federal Building Auditorium
825 Jadwin Street
Richland, Washington
Date: July 11, 1989
Time: 10:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.

Sheraton Hotel
North 322 Spokane Falls Court
Spokane, Washington
Date: July 13, 1989
Time: 10:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.

Ex03

Execulodge Inn (Portland International Airport)
6221 N.E. 82nd Avenue
Portland, Oregon
Date: July 18, 1989
Time: 10:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.

Hilton Hotel (Sea-Tac International Airport)
17620 Pacific Highway South
Seattle, Washington
Date: July 20, 1989
Time: 10:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.

Members of the public, organizations, and government agencies are invited to present comments on the draft EIS at any scheduled hearing. Persons desiring to make an oral presentation should notify Mr. Bauman at the above address, so that the DOE may arrange a schedule for the presentations. Persons who have not submitted a request to speak in advance may register to speak at a hearing. To ensure that everyone has the opportunity to present comments, five minutes will be allotted to each speaker. Individuals and representatives of organizations or agencies presenting comments are requested, if possible, to have written copies of their comments for the hearing record. Written and oral comments will receive equal consideration in preparation of the final EIS. The DOE will arrange the schedule of speakers and will establish rules and procedures for conduct of the hearings. The hearings will not be adjudicatory and there will be no cross examination of speakers. Any other procedural rules for the conduct of the hearings will be announced by the presiding officer at the

beginning of each hearing. A verbatim transcript of the hearing will be prepared, and placed in the reading rooms and libraries indicated below.

The draft EIS and documents referenced in the draft EIS are available for public inspection at the following locations:

U.S. Department of Energy Public Reading Room
Room 157
Federal Building
Richland, Washington 99352
(509) 376-8583

Multnomah County Library
801 SW 10th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97205
(503) 223-7201

The draft EIS and copies of major references used in preparing the draft EIS are also available for public inspection at the following locations:

U.S. Department of Energy
Freedom of Information Reading Room, Room 1E-190
Forrestal Building
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585
(202) 586-6020

Pasco Public Library
1320 West Hopkins Street
Pasco, Washington 99301
(509) 545-3451

Walla Walla Public Library
238 East Alder Street
Walla Walla, Washington 99362
(509) 525-5353

Ex03

Kennewick Public Library
405 South Dayton Street
Kennewick, Washington 99336
1-800-572-6251 or (509) 586-3156

Richland Public Library
Swift and Northgate Streets
Richland, Washington 99352
(509) 943-9117

Yakima Valley Main Public Library
102 North 3rd Street
Yakima, Washington 98901
(509) 452-8541

Public Reference Center
Washington Department of Ecology
5826 Pacific Avenue
Lacey, Washington 98503
(206) 459-6675

Spokane Public Library
West 906 Main Avenue
Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 838-4226

Seattle Public Library
1000 4th Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98122
(206) 386-4636

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The U.S. Government established the Hanford Site in 1943 to produce plutonium for military purposes. Nine water-cooled, graphite-moderated plutonium production reactors were constructed along the Columbia River between the years 1943 and 1963 in a location designated as the 100 Areas. Eight of these reactors are now retired from service (B, C, D, DR, KE, KW, F, and H), have been declared surplus by DOE, and may be

decommissioned. The ninth reactor (N) is in a standby mode and its decommissioning is outside the scope of this EIS.

PROPOSED ACTION AND SCOPE OF THE DRAFT EIS: The proposed action is to decommission the eight surplus reactors. The purpose of the draft EIS is to provide environmental information that will assist the DOE in deciding which alternative action is most appropriate. The scope of the draft EIS includes the reactors, their associated fuel storage basins, and the buildings that house these facilities. All fuel elements have been removed from the reactor cores. The scope does not include the 100-Area cribs, burial grounds, or settling basins. These facilities were evaluated in the "Final Environmental Statement, Hanford Waste Management Operations, Hanford Reservation," U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration, ERDA-1538, 1975. Further, the DOE is presently re-evaluating these facilities as part of DOE's responsibilities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980.

The purpose of decommissioning is to reduce the potential environmental, health, and safety impacts of contaminated facilities; decommissioning actions may include the stabilization, reduction, or removal of radioactive and hazardous materials or the demolition of facilities.

Ex03

Because the reactors contain irradiated reactor components and because the buildings that house the reactors are contaminated with low levels of radioactivity, the DOE has determined that there is a need for action to ensure the long-term protection of the environment and public health and safety. Alternative actions considered in the draft EIS include:

- 1) immediate one-piece removal (to the 200-West Area) of the reactor-block assembly and the dismantlement and removal of contaminated equipment and components of the fuel storage basins and reactor building;
- 2) safe storage followed by deferred one-piece removal (i.e., continuation of current maintenance activities for up to 75 years followed by "one-piece removal");
- 3) safe storage followed by deferred dismantlement and removal of the reactor-block assembly and other contaminated components;
- 4) in situ decommissioning (i.e., the sealing and burial of the reactor facilities at their present location under an engineered protective mound); and
- 5) no action (i.e., continue present surveillance, monitoring, and maintenance).

FLOODPLAIN/WETLANDS: Because the reactors are located along the Columbia River, it is necessary to evaluate the effects of any decommissioning actions with respect to flood

hazards, floodplain management, and wetlands protection. In accordance with Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management), Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands) and DOE regulations 10 CFR 1022 (Compliance with Floodplain/Wetlands Environmental Review Requirements), DOE has prepared a floodplain/wetlands assessment for decommissioning of the surplus production reactors (see Appendix B of the draft EIS). No reactor is in a wetland or the 500-year (critical action) floodplain as defined by the regulations. As a part of the review of the draft EIS and in compliance with executive orders and regulations regarding floodplain management and wetlands protection, the DOE solicits public and agency comments on these determinations.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION: The DOE and the Washington State Historic Preservation Officer have determined that the B Reactor is eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places according to the procedures in 36 CFR 800 (Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties) and the criteria in 36 CFR 60 (Criteria for Inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places). These findings are discussed in Appendix J of the draft EIS. The DOE solicits public and agency comments on whether or not the B Reactor should be nominated for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places, on the potential impacts of

Ex03

decommissioning on the inclusion of the B Reactor in the National Register, and on means identified to mitigate the potential impacts of the decommissioning action.

Issued in Washington, DC on April 14, 1989.



Peter N. Brush
Acting Assistant Secretary
Environment, Safety, and Health

PUBLIC OUTREACH EVENT STAFFING SCHEDULE

(As of 5/10/89)

<u>Date</u>	<u>Facility</u>	<u>Tech Staffers</u>	<u>PR Assist</u>
May 11 Thurs	Columbia Center, Richland	Goodenough/Speer	Harvey/Engel
12 Fri	Same	Goodenough	Harvey/Engel
13 Sat	Same	Goodenough	Harvey/Engel
May 18 Thurs	Riverpark Square, Spokane	Moore/Heine	Harvey
19 Fri	Northtown Mall, Spokane	Moore/Heine	Harvey
20 Sat	University City, Spokane	Mihalic/Heine	Harvey
May 25-27 Thurs-Sat	<u>Memorial Day Weekend</u>		
Jun 1 Thurs	Moses Lake	Goodenough	Holloway
2 Fri	Indian Offices, Toppenish*	Clarke	Holloway
3 Sat	Yakima Mall, Yakima	Defigh-Price	Holloway
Jun 9 Fri	Red Lion Inn, Pendleton, OR	Winship	Harvey
10 Sat	Eastgate Mall, Walla Walla	Winship	Harvey
Jun 15 Thurs	Seattle Public Library	Moore/Heine	Harvey
16 Fri	Westlake Center Mall, Seattle	Moore/Heine	Harvey
17 Sat	Same	Moore/Heine	Harvey
Jun 22 Thurs	Multnomah Pub. Lib., Portland	Goodenough/Heine	Engelsman
23 Fri	Eastport Plaza Mall, Portland	Goodenough/Heine	Engelsman
24 Sat	Same	Goodenough/Heine	Engelsman

Both technical and PR support individuals are responsible for assigned staffing positions. If they are unable to attend a scheduled assignment, please contact a replacement. Call G. Harvey for any required assistance in finding a suitable replacement and notify him of the schedule change as soon as possible.

* - This date is tentative and subject to change.

Ex05

July 11, 1989

Mr. Tom Bauman
U. S. Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
P. O. Box 550
Richland, Washington 99352

DOE/EIS 0119 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT - DECOMMISSIONING OF EIGHT SURPLUS PRODUCTION REACTORS AT THE HANFORD SITE

I have read the subject draft and offer the following comments:


1. My appraisal of the draft is that it is very comprehensive, well detailed and documented and an excellent pattern for the proposed decommissioning activities at Hanford.
2. Seismicity is addressed in 4.3.2, floods are mentioned in 4.2.2. A comparison table should be included of the five alternatives versus natural disasters.
3. Paragraph 4.6.1, the estimate of employees on DOE related projects at Hanford should be revised downward.
4. Paragraph 3.2.5 recognizes that a major structural upgrade of the reactor foundation would be required. It should also consider banding or otherwise securing the upper structure to prevent fissures during removal and transit.
5. Paragraph 5.3.1 addresses to the block-drop accident. Two other accident scenarios, not as dramatic as the block drop, but more probable are the loss of synchronism of the four transporter drives while in transit, and the jamming of the hydraulic mechanism necessitating the sacrifice of the transporter in the pit at the 200 area.

6. Appendix J - National Historic Preservation. I support and endorse the option of no action for the B Reactor. I am completely opposed to the option of "Extensive Recordation". I have discussed these opinions with many of my engineering associates and they are all in agreement with them.

7. I believe that a national register of historic places nomination should be prepared for the B Reactor. Aside from the Fermi Pile (CP-1) under the west stands of the stage field at the University of Chicago, the B Reactor is the most historic in the controlled release of nuclear energy. The CP-1 has been dismantled. The B Reactor has the potential of being the mecca for scientific and technical personnel from all over the world.

Sincerely,

IVAN M. A. GARCIA
P. O. Box 682
Richland, WA 99352


I. M. A. Garcia

GE/Design - Hanford - 20 years
UN/Consulting - Hanford - 6 years
Vitro/QA - Hanford - 10 years
DOE Programs - Hanford - 1 year

Dept. of Energy
Richland Operations

July 11, 1987
Comments between
1000 - 1100

Decommissioning of 8 reactors

Public hearing group,

I understand from the report that the eight reactors are basically structurally sound.

I am proud to say I was a member of that technological team.

I support "Continue Present action" page 3.7, which I believe to be in the best interest of the National budget.

I believe with the present rate of scientific advancement, world wide, that the 8 reactors may prove to be a research asset rather than the present thought of liability.

Sincerely,
Alton Haymaker
172 Cottonwood Dr
Pasco, Wn. 9930
509 266 4629

371 Quakerwood

Hanford Division of the

My name is John Burnham, and I would like to speak for the Tri-City Industrial Development Council of the Tri-Cities.

I have 40 years of experience working in the nuclear industry. My work has included risk analysis and preparation of environmental impact statements. Now I work ^{with} ~~for~~ the Hanford division of TRIDEC. We are interested in preserving the Hanford Site and developing site activities.

I am pleased to see the Department of Energy come out with this EIS on the site's retired production reactors. The government has a responsibility to move forward with permanent, safe disposal of these reactors and the low-level wastes contained in the reactor blocks. Implementing one of these decommissioning options, along with the actions taken as part of the Tri-Party Agreement, is evidence of the Department's interest in cleaning up the Hanford Site efficiently and completely.

We are certainly interested in seeing that the reactors are decommissioned properly. This means the decommissioning work must insure worker safety, community safety and environmental safety. The decommissioning must be technically sound as well.

The draft EIS compares four alternatives, taking into account cost and health impacts. I am particularly interested in the health impacts, as safety is a prime consideration. The characteristics of the reactors blocks must be considered. The surplus reactors have been maintained safely since the shutdown of the last reactor in 1971.

Ex07

Ninety-five per cent of the radionuclides are contained within the blocks. Each block is protected by 20 to 25 centimeters of cast iron thermal shielding, plus a biological shield of alternating layers of steel plate and masonite which are 100 to 200 centimeters thick. This shielding provides excellent ^{confinement} ~~containment~~, so there is no ^{environment} ~~danger~~ of the low-level waste moving into the environment.

Keeping the block intact with its protective shielding is important. Because the radionuclides are contained within the block the less direct interaction required with the block the better. Because of this, DOE should not seriously consider ~~the one-piece removal of~~ dismantlement options which mean moving the reactor blocks to the 200 area. Once the protective shielding of the reactor block is breached, the risk of exposure to workers - and ultimately the public and our community -- is greatly increased.

As the EIS points out, there is a far greater opportunity for exposure to workers with these options. Common sense tells us that there are also practical risks in moving 9,000 and 11,000 ton blocks several miles inland. These risks need to be carefully weighed against the environmental benefit of moving the blocks to a higher elevation and a few miles from the Columbia River.

It is all too easy to confuse present, pure exposure to workers with hypothetical future exposure to the public. This error must be avoided.

Once DOE determines the best option, it is important the decommissioning work receive adequate levels of funding. I encourage DOE and Congress to continue to work for the funding necessary to implement the decommissioning option on a meaningful schedule.

DOE has also asked for comments on the designation of B Reactor as a National Historic Site. I support this. B Reactor has been an important site in the evolution of U.S. history, in ending World War II, and certainly in the history of the nuclear industry. B Reactor was constructed in 1944 -- just 45 years ago. That is a few short years in the scope of history. An appreciation of the historical significance of the first full-scale defense reactor will grow over the years. B Reactor should be preserved as much as possible to give the public an opportunity to share in the historical significance. Of course, with any efforts to preserve B Reactor and make it more available to the public, health and safety must also be considered.

In summary, we support the Department of Energy's efforts to move forward in decommissioning the surplus reactors on the Hanford Site as part of the total cleanup effort. The final option that DOE chooses must make the best engineering and scientific sense and it must take into account the total risk to workers and the public. TRIDEC supports DOE's activities and cleanup efforts at Hanford.

On behalf of TRIDEC, thank you for this opportunity to express our views.

Ex08

Save B-Reactor!

Were you ever in a place that made you tingle with a combined sense of awe, excitement, and eeriness?

I was two years ago when I toured Hanford's first plutonium production reactor, the historic B-reactor. I felt awe, excitement, and eeriness.

Awe...at seeing that huge reactor face, massively scaled up in a matter of months from Enrico Fermi's first critical pile.

Excitement...that must have been felt back then by the participants in the Manhattan Project. The excitement of a race—a deadly race for the survival of a free world.

Eeriness...as if the ghosts of Fermi and his co-workers still inhabited that empty control room.

The war that gave birth to the Manhattan Project, to Hanford, and to the B-reactor was one of the great human tragedies of our lifetime. The historical facts are that B-reactor produced the plutonium for the first manmade nuclear explosion—the Trinity test—and for the bomb that destroyed much of the city and people of Nagasaki.

By the grace of God, our need for nuclear weapons is rapidly disappearing. An era—the era of nuclear weapons—is passing. And while we cannot yet see the end of that era, we have already seen the beginning of the end.

This hearing on the decommissioning of the Hanford reactors is evidence of that hopeful reality for our future. And Hanford has a role in that future.

I believe that part of Hanford's future lies in its past, not in the preservation of its original mission, but in the preservation of its history. I want to see B-reactor preserved as a permanent monument to that passing era.

Because of the wartime secrecy in which the Manhattan Project was born, many Americans of the present do not know the history of the atomic bomb. This will be even more true of future generations unless we save some of the relics, such as B-reactor, for their immense historic and educational value.

Therefore, I urge that the Hanford B-reactor be

- * preserved intact, onsite as a national historical monument and museum; that it be
- * upgraded with relevant historical and educational displays; and that it be
- * provided with public vehicle access from state highway 240.

Ex08

With these steps accomplished, many other Americans and neighbors from around the world can visit that historic place and tingle with awe, excitement, and eeriness for the past...and with hope for a future of peace.

Thank you.

Statement presented at the public hearing on Hanford reactor decommissioning, Richland, Washington, 11 July 1989.


Jim Stoffel(s)
1219 Del Mar Court
Richland WA 99352
(509) 946-8087



Ex09

Claude L. Oliver
Treasurer
BENTON COUNTY

Prosser Phone 786-2255
Tri-Cities 783-1310

P O Box 630
Prosser, Washington 99350

July 11, 1989

Mr. Mike Lawrence, Director RL
U.S. Department of Energy
Federal Building
P. O. Box 550
Richland, Washington 99352

RE: Decommissioning Environmental Impact Statement on Idled Hanford Nuclear Reactors

Dear Mr. Lawrence:

At this time of public input on the U.S. Department of Energy's planning process to de-activate eight nuclear production reactors, we should reflect on the original Hanford mission. What was the intent of Congress and President Franklin Delano Roosevelt when they created and activated this vast Federal Facility of over 350,000 acres in Benton, Franklin and Grant counties? National forces driven by the urgency of World War II against the background of a legitimate question of National survival compelled the United States to produce the ultra secret, "The Manhattan Project".

Even after details of perhaps the greatest World War II secret became known, the late 1940's and 1950's ushered us into an era of the Cold War stand off between the United States allies and the Soviet Union. In order to understand where we are today, it is important to clarify the activities of the Federal Government in our area occurred in an era which was largely void of public knowledge or involvement. From a National, State and local government objectives it is important that we give definition to original intent for Hanford "start-up" in order to properly plan "conclusion" for these facilities and lands.

The 1940 Federal Census gave Benton County 12,053 people. With the World War II activity it became necessary to provide a special census which was taken in 1944, which revised Benton County's total to 70,987 people. This six fold increase in population totally overwhelmed our local education systems, county roads deteriorated without funds to repair or replace them and county courts and offices were sent reeling with totally unexpected and unplanned service demands. Though Benton County property values increased from 9 million dollars to 12 million dollars during this time, County taxes were being levied at the maximum 10 mills allowed under state law. It was necessary in addressing one emergency in 1946 to receive \$76,000 from Washington State for Benton County operations for war time un-reimbursed expenses of the previous year. Courthouse

journals evidence one financial impact after another on the people of this county. The people of Benton, Franklin and Grant counties, however, rallied to the War effort and the national policy of essential war victory gladly and in fact, recognized the need to make national sacrifices as an accepted practice of the day. Thus Hanford was created.

So that we can now proceed to address resource use of land and its impact on the people of Benton, Franklin and Grant counties, please answer the following:

1. What was the original Congressional intent of taking and establishing the Hanford land area in carrying out the World War II "Secret" Manhattan Project?
2. Did the 1942-1943 United States Congress and the Department of Army Corp of Engineers evaluate their actions with knowledge that some portion or all of the Hanford Federal Reservation land taken for this project would be contaminated and unsuitable to return to its previous use? In their deliberations, did they offer consideration to assess the ultimate plan for future generations that are now in the genesis of this environmental impact statement on our communities?
3. What was the determination used in the amount of lands originally condemned for the Hanford Reservation in Benton, Franklin and Grant counties? Is it planned by the Federal Government or yet to be determined that this portion of land will be kept off of the tax rolls of Benton, Franklin and Grant counties indefinitely? What land set aside is necessary to address your environmental impact containment of the eight idled reactors?
4. Water allocation from the Columbia River for irrigation purposes has been conducted for a number of years. The resource of water combined with land grows crops in ready abundance throughout the world. Recognizing that the Hanford Reservation was created in the middle of a vast agricultural plane, has the U.S. Department of Energy given consideration for the need to reserve water rights for future irrigation needs of the Hanford lands now held in its trust? If not, why not?
5. With the original Hanford National mission now significantly declining, what consideration is being given by the U.S. Department of Energy for a future community impact plan? Does the U.S. Department of Energy have any comparable environmental impact consideration plans for deactivation of any comparable facilities?

30% of Benton County's tax base, 16,000 acres in Franklin County and 25,000 acres of Grant County lands have been off the tax rolls since 1944, the main community and U.S. Department of Energy missions of World Peace Through Strength, though not conducted without incidence, has certainly worked. We could all pray the nuclear genie of Atomic War was not out of the bottle, but it is. We also do recognize the full value of the peaceful use and continuing development of the "Atom" that has and will significantly benefit mankind.


The people of Benton, Franklin and Grant Counties have played proud rolls these past 45 years. Their contributions to future endeavors by the U.S. Department of Energy both known and unknown in origin will be significant and valued as future generations will evidence.

Ex09

However, we must now address legacy to one chapter of the Cold War and a community that accepted responsibility without hesitation. Let us adequately explain the basis of our genesis so that we can arrive at the best intelligent assessment of where we came from, so that we can truly plan for our future wisely. Recent national policy changes by the U.S. Department of Energy to de-emphasize production and emphasize safety is indeed refreshing and highly professional. Though we live in a world that could be considered vast and boundless we certainly must recognize that responsible limitations for living standards and future generations can only be best maintained and enhanced if we are willing to preserve them. In this regard land use planning and socioeconomic impact needs much more attention and emphasis than it is given in the March 1989 draft Environmental Impact Statement. Answer specific to the issues enumerated above, especially item 5, are respectfully requested.

Thank-you for taking this public comment.

Very truly yours,



CLAUDE L. OLIVER
Benton County Treasurer

A PROPOSAL for SPECIAL TREATMENT
for
THE HANFORD B REACTOR
DURING AND SUBSEQUENT TO DECOMMISSIONING TO
PRESERVE AND COMMEMORATE ITS HISTORICAL STATUS

Submitted by: Janet Hibbard, Chairman
Columbia Basin Section, ASME

Prepared by: Paul Kelly

Reviewed by: Dennis Armstrong

Harry Brown

Dan Mildon

Elwood Werry

Ed Renkey

Ex10

A PROPOSAL for SPECIAL TREATMENT
for
THE HANFORD B REACTOR
DURING AND SUBSEQUENT TO DECOMMISSIONING TO
PRESERVE AND COMMEMORATE ITS HISTORICAL STATUS

Submitted as comment to the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) document DOE/EIS 0119D by the Columbia Basin Section of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Janet Hibbard, Chairman.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

EIS document DOE/EIS 0119D describes alternate methods of decommissioning the currently shut-down Hanford production reactors constructed beginning in 1943 for the production of plutonium for the first atomic bombs. The American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME), a nationally and internationally recognized technical society, acknowledged the historical significance of these reactors to the future nuclear industry by certifying the Hanford B reactor as a National Historic Mechanical Engineering Landmark in 1976.

ASME supports the safe decommissioning of nuclear facilities, including total demolition and site restoration where necessary. However, in the case of Historic Landmarks such as the B Reactor, ASME believes that steps should be taken to preserve and commemorate the Landmark and retain some degree of its historic status. For the Hanford B Reactor, various alternatives are offered by way of comment on the EIS. The historical background of the reactor and the ASME History and Heritage program are also described briefly to provide a frame of reference for the ASME proposals.

2.0 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HANFORD B REACTOR

The Hanford B reactor was the first plutonium production reactor to be placed in operation. Its startup followed successful operation of three test-scale reactors, including the Chicago pile and the Hanford Test Reactor, which proved that all of the physics calculations and engineering decisions required for construction of the graphite pile and cooling system were correct and within proper limits to sustain a controllable chain reaction.ⁱ From an engineering standpoint, the significance of B Reactor lies in achieving the results of the startup after designing the mammoth production reactor based on data from the much smaller test reactors. For example, the B Reactor moderating pile alone contains 2000 tons of graphite blocks, penetrated by over 2000 aluminum process tubes. The pile, as high as a four-story building, was surrounded by a skin of cast iron ten inches thick and a shield of masonite, steel, and concrete four feet wide. The B Reactor complex is said to contain more concrete than Alonzo Stagg Stadium under which the Chicago Pile operated.

However, outside of its contribution to the defense of the United States, the full significance of the B Reactor startup was realized in later years with the development of the domestic nuclear industry. Thus the successful operation of the Hanford B Reactor was a major milestone for the Manhattan Project and made possible the subsequent development of commercial atomic energy utilization. The research, engineering, and planning required to make the reactor operate should be included in history as one of man's most brilliant scientific and advanced engineering achievements.

i

Reference: Smyth, H. D. 1945. Atomic Energy for Military Purposes: The Official Report on the Development of the Atomic Bomb Under the Auspices of the U. S. Government, 1940 - 1945. University Press, .

Ex10

Historically, B Reactor began as part of the Manhattan Project in 1942 with the breaking of ground in April, 1943, for support facilities. Construction of the reactor started in June, 1943, and was completed during September, 1944. This was followed in rapid succession by fuel loading and startup during the same month. Three months later, on Christmas day, 1944, the first irradiated fuel was discharged from the reactor. The facility operated intermittently until it was shut down permanently in 1968.

3.0 DESIGNATION OF B REACTOR AS A NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK

The ASME Historic Landmarks program is an outgrowth of a relationship between ASME and the Smithsonian Institute. ASME contributes historical material particularly related to Mechanical Engineering to the U.S. National Museum of History and Technology in Washington, D.C. In 1971, ASME established its History and Heritage program for the society, and the Landmarks program was added in 1973.

A National Landmark is a mechanical engineering achievement with national or international significance, one associated with persons or events that have contributed to the general development of mankind. All nominations are approved by the ASME national History and Heritage Committee. Once a nomination is approved, a history brochure and bronze plaque are prepared and presented to an appropriate organization for display in the vicinity of the monument being dedicated. The Hanford B Reactor placque is displayed in the Hanford Science Center.

Hanford B Reactor was nominated for Landmark status during 1975 by the Columbia Basin Section, ASME. This nomination was subsequently approved by the History and Heritage Committee, which cited the B Reactor as a technical achievement and because much of the reactor core, cooling system, shielding, and auxiliary support systems were designed by mechanical engineers, although many different types of scientists and engineers contributed to the ultimate success.

Ex10

4.0 PRESERVATION OF B REACTOR AS AN HISTORIC LANDMARK

Alternative proposals described below are offered to support the belief by the Columbia Basin Section that the B Reactor represents such a significant achievement that continued recognition of the facility as an Historic Landmark is warranted. The proposals are intended to be consistent with requirements of the decommissioning mode selected based on the EIS.

A. Information Kiosk

Information kiosks located in rest areas located adjacent to the nation's interstate highways are effectively used to convey information to the traveler about features of the surrounding country. For example, a series of kiosks along Interstate 84 in Oregon effectively tell the story of the Oregon Trail and its pioneers at various key locations in that state. A similar installation for B Reactor could be located at the Vernita Bridge rest area on Washington State Highway 240. The kiosk, consisting of several information panels covered to protect them against the weather, could be designed to tell the B Reactor story, even if decommissioning were to consist of total removal of the facility.

B. Enhanced Audio-visual Display

The B Reactor display currently located in the Hanford Science Center could be enhanced by producing a videotape of the facility and periodically showing the videotape at the Science Center or at the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) Visitor's Center. The videotape could be assembled from a combination of historic still shots and videotape recordings of the exterior and interior of the reactor facility before, during, and after demolition for decommissioning.

C. Reactor Memorial

An obelisk detailing key features of B Reactor could be located along Washington State Highway 240 or some other suitable location as an historical marker.

D. Facility Access

Some key part of the B Reactor facility, such as the control room, could be saved during demolition for decommissioning and converted for visitor access. Because B Reactor is relatively close to Washington State Highway 240, the control room could be allowed to remain at the reactor site or moved to another location for public access.



Ex11

Board of County Commissioners
BENTON COUNTY

P O BOX 190 PHONE (509) 786-5600 OR 783-1310 PROSSER, WASHINGTON 99350

Ray Isaacson
District #1

Robert J. Drake, Sr.
District #2
Sandi Strawn
District #3

July 11, 1989

Ms. Karen J. Wheelless
Office of Communications, Richland Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland, Washington 99352

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Statement--Decommissioning of Eight
Surplus Production Reactors at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington.
March 1989.

Dear Ms. Wheelless:

It is apparent that the environmental impact of decommissioning the eight surplus reactors will be essentially inconsequential regardless of the method of decommissioning. However, I believe that the method of decommissioning that should be selected is one that would result in the least amount of additional disturbance of the environment and that would result in the least occupational radiation dose to the worker.

While the draft environmental impact statement appears to be quite thorough, land use planning is inadequate and requires further consideration.

When the Hanford Project was started, approximately 570 square miles was acquired by condemnation and other methods and reserved for atomic bomb materials production. The majority of this land area was required for radioactivity isolation, public safety and security purposes. Now that all of the Hanford reactors have been shut down and decommissioning is being considered for eight of the nine reactors that were built, it is obvious that the land once taken out of agricultural production is no longer needed for isolation and security purposes. Also, the land that has not been adversely affected by radioactivity should be evaluated for return to productive use.


To put this issue in perspective it is necessary to know how much land could be made available for various crops by type. Considerable area was under irrigation when acquired for the Manhattan Project. The evaluation of returning land to productive agriculture should include provisions for irrigation water systems that will deliver water to specific areas such as Cold Creek Valley adjacent to Highway 240. Reconsideration of the economic value of the Arid Lands Ecology Reserve should be included. If there is justification for keeping this land out of productive agriculture, consideration must be given to providing

payment in lieu of taxes to units of local government so that the adverse economic impact that now exists can be rectified.

Tables of estimated acreage and incomes for various crops harvested in Benton County during 1988 are attached. The total value of agricultural products was about \$217,267,319. These data were prepared by Mr. Jack Watson and Ms. Jean Smith of the Benton County Cooperative extension.

Because of time limitations this presentation must be kept brief. If additional discussion and dialogue is needed, I will be available for any needed input.

Respectfully submitted,



Raymond E. Isaacson

Attachments (2)

Ex11

1988 ESTIMATED GROSS FARM CROP INCOME BENTON COUNTY

Ex11

CROP	ACREAGE	YIELD ACRE	TOTAL PRODUCTION	DOLLAR PRICE UNIT	VALUE OF PRODUCT
Wheat - Dryland	129,000	19.5 bu	2,515,500	4.13/bu	10,389,015
Wheat - Irrigated	10,758	105 bu	1,129,590	3.89/bu	4,394,105
Barley - Irrigated	550	3.0 ton	1,650	103/ton	169,950
Barley - Dryland	7,000	.75 ton	5,250	103/ton	540,750
Corn Silage	3,450	25 ton	86,250	24/ton	2,070,000
Summer Fallow	144,000				none
Field Corn	36,190	5.0 ton	180,950	110/ton	19,904,500
CRP	32,225			48.82 aver.	1,573,225
Alfalfa	16,500	5.0 ton	82,500	80/ton	6,600,000
Irrigated Pasture	18,000	2 aum	36,000	12.00/aum	432,000
Dryland Range	257,122	.08 aum	20,570	6.60/aum	135,760
Grass Seed	1,620	700 lb	1,134,000	1.25 lb	1,417,500
Sugar Beets	637	39 ton	24,843	\$38.00 ton	944,034
Rape Seed	160	1,500 lbs	240,000	.08/lb	19,200
Potatoes	22,970	27.5 ton	631,675	80/ton	50,534,000
Asparagus	2,800	2,800 lb	7,840,000	.53/lb	4,155,200
Sweet Corn	4,100	8.5 ton	34,850	66/ton	2,300,100
Onions	630	420 cwt	264,600	11/cwt	2,910,600
Carrots	575	525 cwt	301,875	6/cwt	1,811,250
Hops	5,350	1,720	9,202,000	1.30/lb	11,962,600
Peppermint-Spearmint	2,000	110 lb	220,000	14/lb	3,080,000
Concord Grapes	6,900	6.7 ton	46,230	205/ton	9,477,150
Wine Grapes (includes non-bearing vines)	5,600	4.7 ton	26,320	364/ton	9,580,480
Misc., Bulbs, Turf, etc.	3,500			800/acre	2,800,000
Apples	8,600	13 ton	111,800	450/ton	50,310,000
Cherries	3,000	5.0 ton	15,000	1,000/ton	13,500,000
Peaches	450	10 ton	4,500	375/ton	1,687,500
Pears	630	10 ton	6,300	250/ton	1,575,000
Prunes & Plums	560	8.5 ton	4,760	190/ton	904,400
Almonds	300	7.0 ton	2,100	690/ton	1,449,000
Walnut	160	8 ton	1,280	500/ton	640,000

**Estimated income (grower payment plus alternate crop) TOTAL VALUE 217,267,319
BENTON COUNTY COOPERATIVE EXTENSION
Prepared by: Jack Watson, Jean Smith

1986
BENTON COUNTY CROP ACREAGE & LIVESTOCK NUMBERS
COUNTY AGENT'S BEST ESTIMATES

Ex11

CROP	IRRIGATED ACRES	DRYLAND ACRES	TOTAL ACRES	1986 TOTAL
Wheat	10,758	129,000	139,758	156,578
Barley	550	7,000	12,050	15,655
Sugar Beets	640			482
Alfalfa	16,500			16,700
Irrigated Pasture	18,000			18,000
Corn Silage	3,450			3,226
Summer Fallow	0	144,000		160,000
Dryland Range		257,122		254,272
Dry Beans	50			344
Hops	5,350			5,100
Peppermint & Spearmint	2,000			2,600
Field Corn (some may be silage)	36,190			32,950
Asparagus	2,800			3,394
Sweet Corn	4,100			1,500
Onions	630			780
Carrots	575			475
Potatoes	22,970			21,850
Peas	370			457
Grass Seed	1,620			152
Rape Seed	160			0
Concord Grapes	6,900			6,900
Wine Grapes	5,700			5,920
Misc. Bulbs, Berries, Currants				
Vegetables and Turf	3,500			3,100
d not farmed	6,500	1,500	8,000	11,000
ORCHARD	32,225			
Apples	8,600			7,500
Cherries	3,000			2,900
Peaches	450			575
Pears	630			520
Prunes	560			560
Apricots	300			225
Nectarines	160			145
	13,700			
TOTALS	195,238	538,622	733,860	733,860

LIVESTOCK	HEAD OF ANIMALS
Beef	23,500
Sheep	3,100
Hogs	1,900
Dairy	2,500
Horses	2,000
Poultry	3,500

Total County Acres	1,095,910
Federal Land, AEC Other	- 326,200
	<u>769,710</u>
Roads, Canals, Cities	- 35,850
	<u>733,860</u>
733,860 ACRES LAND FOR AGRICULTURE CROPS	

pared by: Jack Watson
Jean Smith, Livestock and Economics

2/89/rt

Ex11

Testimony of the Hanford Education Action League
on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement:
"Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Production Reactors
at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington"
July 13, 1989

My name is Jim Thomas and I am Staff Researcher for HEAL, the Hanford Education Action League. Our address is S. 325 Oak Street, Spokane, WA. 99204.

HEAL endorses the Immediate One-Piece Removal option for all eight reactors, including the B reactor.

The main reasons HEAL supports the Immediate One-Piece Removal option are:

1. It moves the reactors, which are still radioactive, away from the Columbia River.

The reactors should be buried away from their present location near the Columbia. By being along the river, the reactors would remain too accessible by the general public. The option of leaving them in their present location and burying them under a mound of dirt and gravel is not a demonstrated technology. The EIS does not even offer an estimate of how long the "engineered barrier" might last before allowing the contaminated reactor blocks to be exposed to the environment.

2. By doing the job immediately, citizens have a greater assurance that the reactors will not be forgotten, that Hanford will be cleaned up, and that the federal government will restore the land to public use. It will also make it possible to keep the entire Hanford mess within the thirty-year cleanup agreement.

In answer to a series of questions by HEAL on the EIS, the Department of Energy responded in part that the "(s)tart of the decommissioning will depend on the availability of funding and on the priorities established by the Department." Again we apparently have a case of the Department not respecting the will of the citizens it is supposed to serve. On numerous occasions over the past several years the citizens of the Northwest have made it abundantly clear that we want Hanford to be cleaned up immediately.

We now have the greatest likelihood of obtaining the necessary funding and skilled workforce to safely dispose of these atomic age relics. If we wait for 75 years as is proposed by two of DOE's options, we run a very high risk of not being able to complete the job of decommissioning.

3. This option requires the least amount of land area to be barred from public access.

HEAL has repeatedly raised the point that there is no overall government strategy for minimizing the amount of land at Hanford which will have to be off-limits for centuries, and in some cases, millennia. We again call upon the state, EPA and the DOE to develop a plan which will limit (to the greatest extent possible) the amount of land at Hanford which will be fenced off and in effect, turned into a national sacrifice zone. Before such a plan is in place, it is only common sense to pursue those cleanup options which require the least amount of area that will be left contaminated.

There is one other point which should be addressed. At various places throughout the EIS, the DOE states that once the reactor areas are cleaned up, they will be available for "other DOE use." The EIS goes so far as to say that "federal ownership and the presence on the Hanford Site is planned to be continuous." Nowhere does the Energy Department stipulate the basis for its claim to Hanford. HEAL strenuously objects to the Department's regal attitude. The future use of Hanford is a decision which the citizens of Washington and the affected Native American tribes should and must make.

Thank you for listening to our concerns this morning.

Ex12

TO: Department of Energy

Subject: Public comments on draft EIS

Date: July 13, 1989

FROM: Mary R. Wieman
W. 242 Riverside Ave., #311
Spokane, WA 99201

Like the vast majority of American citizens, I wasn't consulted when nuclear weapons were developed, originally, ^{decades ago,} but I'm taking the opportunity to speak to you D.O.E. representatives today on nuclear reactor decommissioning alternatives.--

In my opinion, Standby N Reactor should be decommissioned along with the 8 surplus production reactors, since it appears to be in danger of Columbia river flooding from a 50% Coulee Dam failure like ^{seven} ~~the~~ others; that C Reactor is within 3 meters of that fate; and that B Reactor should not be included in the National Register of Historic Places for the same reason.-- Photos of the latter reactor will have to suffice for the record.

From a map, it appears that the 100 areas aren't as distant from the river bank as are the 200 West areas, when one-piece removal and waste disposal are being considered. Immediate removal the greater distance is desirable, but decontamination measures could be effected at the existing reactor sites, instead of at the 200 West areas, as an alternative.

Hopefully, the 200 West areas will be provided with an highly protective barrier to prevent ^{new} radioactive leaching into the soil.

As you know, costs of the work-to-be-done are mounting continuously, due to continuous price inflation, so it can't be too soon for decommissioning to begin. Further delay will only worsen

cont.-

the present problems, which I don't need to describe to you.

There should be some way in which the radionuclide tritium can be salvaged to preserve the usefulness of existing nuclear weapons.

To conclude, I'm a proponent of the Immediate (over 12 years' time) One-Piece (plus the reactor block) Removal (but still on the Hanford Reservation site) Alternative, with the changes noted.

Ex13

TESTIMONY

Of The

STATE OF OREGON

On the U.S. Department of Energy's

Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the

Decommissioning of Eight Surplus Reactors at the

Hanford Nuclear Reservation

July 18, 1989

Portland, Oregon

Members of the Panel, ladies and gentlemen: I am David Stewart-Smith. I am Acting Administrator of the Nuclear Safety and Energy Facility Siting Division of the Oregon Department of Energy.

My testimony and our written comments represent the State of Oregon's response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the decommissioning of eight surplus reactors at Hanford. Our written comments are in a separate document submitted for the record.

We thank USDOE for bringing this hearing to Portland. USDOE is doing better at recognizing Hanford's downriver constituencies on both sides of the Columbia.

My testimony today will be brief. Oregon's technical comments center on one revelation in the DEIS and I will confine my comments to that issue.

Ex13

Before the DEIS was published, the decommissioning issue was ranked low on Oregon's list of Hanford priorities. While the eight old reactors are "low level radioactive waste" we regarded them as almost benign compared to high level and chemically hazardous nuclear weapons waste, problems at N Reactor, and transuranic waste transport. Those issues -- and nuclear weapons waste cleanup in particular -- were and still are Hanford's "hot spots" in our view.

The eight old reactors have languished in place for 20 and 30 years. We did not expect any surprises in the decommissioning DEIS. We were, in fact, poised to support an option for deferred action. So long as the old reactors posed no threat to people or the environment, Oregon was ready to counsel against any decision that might compromise cleanup of Hanford's high level and transuranic nuclear weapons waste.

We cannot offer that counsel now. In fact, we are compelled to say that the eight reactors, their fuel storage basins, and any residual contamination should be moved away from the river immediately. Why? Because the

DEIS, in an almost casual aside, notes that a leak in a fuel basin has left a "significant inventory" of radionuclides and contamination.

That's it. One sentence. And it raises a host of questions:

-How large was the leak? Precisely what is a "significant inventory" of radionuclides?

**-Is there a plume? If so, where is it? Where will it go?
How fast will it travel?**

-How much soil has been contaminated? Can the contamination be retrieved and disposed?

**-What are the implications of various characterizations?
Is the river in imminent danger?**

-Does this mean there is a higher likelihood of other undetected leaks?

-How soon will USDOE finish its studies on the leak and its implications? And last:

Ex13

In view of this litany of unknowns, how can USDOE opt for any action now but complete and immediate removal of the reactors and fuel basins?

That concludes my remarks. If you have questions, I will be glad to answer them.

Thank you.

f:\pub-info\wjs\dsdecom

OREGON COMMENTS

on the
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS)
Regarding the
DECOMMISSIONING OF EIGHT SURPLUS PRODUCTION REACTORS
AT THE HANFORD SITE, RICHLAND, WA.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

1. The U.S. Department of Energy has listed four options by which the eight surplus nuclear reactors and fuel basins could be disposed. USDOE did not identify its preferred option.
2. In a one-sentence aside, USDOE notes a "significant leak" in one fuel storage basin in the 100 Area. The leak contaminated soil under the basin and could contaminate local ground water. Option 2, which includes removal of the basin and contaminated earth, addresses this issue.
3. USDOE has failed to develop the data and scientific knowledge needed to support any option but Option 2 -- "Immediate One-Piece Removal" of the reactors.
4. In our view, cost is not a factor among the choices. The cost of each option is within 17 percent of the cost of the others.

The Tri-Party Cleanup Agreement between the State of Washington, the US DOE and the US EPA includes the surplus reactors. This agreement has a 30-year schedule for cleanup of all defense wastes. The schedule depends on Congressional funding.

Funds for decommissioning also come from Congress. The cost of surplus reactor decommissioning must not compete with current and future levels of funding for cleanup of nuclear weapons waste at Hanford.

CONCLUSION

Unless or until USDOE assures us that this or other leaks do not put the river at risk, Oregon must support Option 2.

Ex13

- 2 -

BACKGROUND

The U.S. government built eight reactors at Hanford between 1943 and 1955. These and N reactor made plutonium for nuclear weapons. The mothballed N reactor is not included in this DEIS.

The reactors are situated along the Columbia River. All nuclear fuel has been removed. The reactor parts and buildings are "low level radioactive waste".

OPTIONS

1. Continued present action (continued surveillance and monitoring).
Estimated cost-\$41 million.

2. Immediate one-piece removal.

One piece removal means moving the reactor block on a tractor-transporter about ten miles to the 200 West Area. The intent is to bury the wastes and cover them with a protective barrier. A ground water monitoring system and markers would be installed.

The option also calls for removal and disposal of fuel storage basins by similar shallow burial in the 200 West Area.

Estimated cost-\$191 million

3. Safe storage and deferred one-piece removal.

The same plan as in (2) except removal would be put off for 75 years. The long delay allows cobalt-60 to decay to less than one ten-thousandth of its initial radioactivity. This would reduce the radiation dose to workers.

Estimated cost-\$198 million

4. Safe storage and deferred dismantlement.

Dismantle the reactors after 75 years. Package and transport the contaminated equipment and transport to the 200 Area for burial. Dispose of the fuel storage basins in the same way.

Estimated cost-\$217 million

5. In Situ (In-place) decommissioning.

Build a protective barrier mound over the reactors and the fuel storage basins.

Estimated cost-\$181 million

COMMENTS

These comments address only issues of geology and hydrology.

page 3.4

TEXT: "The soil column under the KE fuel storage basin contains a significant, but not yet fully characterized, radionuclide inventory from a past leak that has been repaired."

COMMENT: When did the leak occur? Is there a radioactive plume? The depth to which this leak has moved toward the water table is a serious concern. Could there be other undiscovered leaks?, Has fluid waste moved to the water table? Could it take considerably less than the DEIS estimate of from 260 to 880 years? The DEIS admits that the travel time models are "...based on a simple one-dimensional view of the problem." The DEIS states that estimated ground water travel time to the Columbia River is only one year after reaching the water table. The water table is only about 20 meters below the reactors. This close proximity to the water table and the river does not allow for any error in estimating ground water travel time of pollutants.

Characterization plans and schedules on this issue should be included in the final DEIS. When will characterization studies be complete? Will the results be published for public comment?

One sentence in the DEIS about the fuel storage basin leak falls far short of addressing an important public safety and environmental issue. US DOE raises the spectre of radioactive contamination seeping into the Columbia River.

This treatment reveals an unfortunate but familiar USDOE/Hanford mindset" that is insensitive to public perception and opinion.

Ex13

- 4 -

page 3.57

TEXT: "Climatic changes that alter the flow of the Columbia River could result in long-term erosion under a reactor in the 100 Areas and eventual immersion of that reactor in the river."

COMMENT: More information would be helpful on how US DOE reached this conclusion. A time frame and probability are needed. A specific reference would help. There are 13 references cited in section 3.8. Lack of a specific reference requires the reviewer to obtain and read all 13. The image of a reactor submerging in the Columbia River deserves more than one paragraph in the DEIS.

page 5.19

TEXT: "For the 100 Area alternatives, there is no difference in dose between the two recharge rates." (0.5 cm./yr and 5.0 cm/yr).

COMMENT: The different recharge rates produce different dose rates in the 200 Area calculations due to dilution factors. Is dilution not a factor in the 100 Areas? This needs clarification.

Appendix C, page 1:

TEXT: "Water travels downward at rates measured years per meter in the Hanford environment."

COMMENT: Should read.... "meters per year."

Appendix C, page 6:

TEXT: The DEIS discusses travel time calculations for water moving down through the vadose zone to the water table. On page C.6, travel time is 4,200 years (200 Area). Data were taken from or agree with Volume 3, Appendix Q, of the Final EIS, Disposal of Hanford Defense High Level Wastes. The DEIS assumes that the protective barrier keeps recharge to .1 cm/yr and no breach. However, the 1987 Defense EIS also includes assumed recharge rates of 5 cm/yr. Recharge at that rate shows travel time to the water table of 100 years. This points out how ground water travel time calculations are greatly affected by changes in recharge rate input. These additional recharge rates and their shorter travel times are important. The DEIS should include all available data.

Page 5.41 says: "Impacts from Hanford defense wastes were calculated for0.5 and 5.0 and for 15 cm/yr for failure over 10 percent of the barrier." (Dose rates). The DEIS did not include the travel time calculations for these recharge rates. The dose rates were included.

It appears that only the least conservative travel time data was selected for the DEIS. All available, relevant data should be included in the final EIS.

Appendix C, page 8:

TEXT: "The geohydrology of the 100 Areas is not well defined. For that reason, a detailed ground water model is not available..... Modeling is based on a simple one-dimensional view of the problem....."

The text also states that from the 100 Area the ground water travel times in the vadose zone ranged from 260 to 880 years (using .1 cm/yr infiltration rate) and then one year to the river after reaching the water table.

COMMENT: What were the travel time calculations to the water table for .5, 5.0 and 15 cm/yr recharge rates in the 100 Area? Why are they not included?

Based on the above statements "Geohydrology ...is not well known...Modeling is based on a simple...view of the problem...", the public cannot be expected to have any great confidence in a decision for In-Situ decommissioning. The fear of contamination of the Columbia River from nuclear and associated chemical wastes will demand more definitive scientific assurance upon which to base decisions.

Appendix H, page 1:

TEXT: Discusses the leak protection system, liner/leachate collection system, marker system and ground-water monitoring systems. "and leak-detection systems are omitted from in situ decommissioning because of the impracticality of installing these systems under the reactor blocks."

COMMENT: Plans include a leak detection system seven miles from the river and 200 ft. above the water table in the 200 Area. A similar system within 200 meters of the river and 20 meters above the water table is considered impractical. Why is a

Ex13

- 6 -

detection system important away from the river and not essential near the river? If such a system is important in the 200 Areas, it is vital in the 100 Areas. Has the US DOE considered lifting the reactors (as in the one piece removal option) to install the leak detection systems?

Appendix H, page 4:

TEXT: (Ground-water monitoring) "Quarterly water-level monitoring, batch sampling, and water-well analysis would be carried out.specifically for lead and radioactivity."

COMMENT: The DEIS does not outline the long term goals of the monitoring. What level of lead or radioactivity will require action? Is there some plan to deal with elevated levels? How long does the monitoring continue? At some time the well seals will fail in the monitoring wells. Will they be replaced? Will the eventual deterioration of monitoring well seals allow an avenue of faster travel time to ground water?

This could be of special concern in the 200 Area where tank wastes leaked. Retrieval of tank waste options are under review. Retrieval decisions are scheduled for the year 2004.

The location of monitoring wells in relation to leaked tank wastes is a concern.

FINDINGS

The overall cost of each option (except Continued Present Action-\$41M) is within 17 percent of the others. Thus, cost is not a major factor.

The DEIS admits that scientists know very little about the hydrogeology of the 100 Area. This implies that the reliability of groundwater computer models cannot be taken for granted.

We must know how serious the contamination is in the 100 Area. Needed characterization studies could show that any deferred option is risky. It is also essential to build a hydrologic data base. This work is imperative before making long range decisions.

The US DOE does not have the data and hydrogeologic knowledge needed to support any option but One-Piece Removal. To protect the Columbia River, US DOE should move the reactors, radioactive wastes, and fuel disposal basins away from the river as soon as possible.

RAD-MAT\MLB\reaffinal.wp5

7/18/89 Ex14

I Don't want to die from Radiation

Why hearing held here away from Bus lines, etc.

The United States General Accounting office says the department of energy's report stating little or no environmental threat from nuclear storage tanks on the Columbia is false. The reactors that you are proposing to move have already also begun to leak. This Radiation has the potential of killing humans and causing birth defects to many future generations.

Our government has enough warheads to blow this planet to bits many times over. It's time you officials that work for us get over the illusion that anything goes to protect us from Russia with Nuclear warheads, while slowly poisoning us from within from deadly Nuclear leaks. You keep saying their "harmless" "no danger", etc. until another independent study contradicts you.

Personally as a taxpayer I think we should pay whatever it takes to dismantle every reactor and entomb them above ground where we can keep an eye on them until they are relatively safe to bury. I believe it's a crime to fire up the Savannah River Reactor to make more tritium and to play on producing more plutonium when we can recycle some from existing warheads without losing "blowing up earth potential" for possibly enough time to learn how to get along with other countries, without threatening the only planet with known life on it.

One other concern is a competency test given to the people that have the authority to push the nuclear button that could end all life on earth and give that test yearly, with an independent competent doctors.

[Handwritten signature]

Hal WEITZMAN
26. Wheatonstone Lakeside 00 OR.
97035

EXHIBIT 68-81-2
14
WEITZMAN

HEGAMIN FOR MAYOR



BOB HEGAMIN is a graduate of Seattle University with degrees in Electrical Engineering and General Science. He is a retired Seattle City Light engineer. While there, he also temporarily served in the office of Equal Employment Opportunity.

BOB HEGAMIN is the only mayoral candidate who, as early as 1981, called for a moratorium on permits for construction of highrise buildings. The moratorium would have remained in place until a city-wide utility plan could be developed. Almost 10 years later we still have no plan! Instead, our present Mayor and City Council have given us traffic gridlock, higher property taxes and excessively high utility rates.

Tim Ramsey, Treasurer 337-2131
3419 S.W. Raymond Seattle, WA 98126



**SEATTLE HAS A BILLION DOLLAR BUDGET — WHY ISN'T IT ENOUGH?
SEATTLE FACES A DEBT CRISIS — IT CAN BORROW
ONLY ANOTHER \$150 MILLION**

(Comprehensive Financial Plan July 1987)

Four years ago, Hegamin ran for the office of the Mayor of Seattle. In 1985 (PI 6/21/85) identified and talked about issues which — ignored by the Mayor and City Council for these 4 years — have today gotten out of hand. Not surprisingly some of those who created the problems are suggesting that they — as mayor — can solve them.

Hegamin says the taxes we already take in annually are enough to take care of the problems we currently face. He has not "suddenly" discovered our problems (both social and fiscal) but has actively studied them over the years. **HE HAS SOLUTIONS.**

The financial condition of the city determines our standard of living. If the city needs money, it raises its taxes, its fees, its utility rates. It will also get the voter to pass bond and levy measures whose enforcement of payment may be limited only by the bankruptcy of the property taxpayer. In other words: **YOU'LL PAY UNTIL YOU DROP.**

Hegamin is the only candidate who has worked for financial accountability both as a city employee and as a concerned citizen. He has fought City Light rate hikes and has helped expose techniques used by our elected officials to "con" the electorate into passing bond issues and levies.

Hegamin has always argued that our elected officials had been "giving the city away". Public money subsidizes highrise and downtown developers; the city's money assumed the Port of Seattle's responsibility for the construction of the West Seattle Bridge; Seattle City Light still sits on the WPPSS Board furnishing one-half the underlying bonding capacity of WPPSS; and, the questionable use of the city property taxes — instead of state gas taxes — go to maintain Seattle's arterial streets. **Let's clean house — ELECT HEGAMIN MAYOR OF SEATTLE**

Testimony for the Sierra Club
Comments on the Decommissioning of Eight Surplus
Production Reactors
at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington

To be Given at the Public Hearing Thursday, July 20, 1989
Hilton Hotel (Airport), Seattle, Washington

The Sierra Club, Cascade Chapter has reviewed the draft environmental impact statement (EIS) on the decommissioning of eight surplus production reactors at the Hanford site. The Sierra Club thanks the DOE for the opportunity to review and comment on the draft EIS.

The Sierra Club is highly concerned about the potential for serious environmental impact from the decommissioned production reactors if they are allowed to remain in their present location in the 100 area of the Hanford site.

We feel that the decommissioning alternatives in the Draft EIS have been well described and well researched by DOE. We believe that excellent work was done by the DOE in analyzing the various decommissioning alternatives. In this testimony today we intend to provide comments on what we believe is the best decommissioning alternative.

The Sierra Club believes that the longer the eight surplus reactors are allowed to remain in their present condition, at the present site, even with adequate air, water and soil monitoring, the greater will be the potential for a severe environmental disaster. Table B.2 in the Draft EIS illustrates that a Catastrophic (50%) failure of the Grand Coulee Dam would place all but one of the surplus reactors below flood level at the First-Floor Elevation level of the reactors. A severe seismic event could cause such a failure of the dam.

Appendix H of the Draft EIS discusses flood protection in the case of the In Situ Decommissioning Alternative, however, it does not discuss the case where severe seismic activity has simultaneously weakened the proposed riprap layer around the reactor. While the EIS indicates that severe seismic activity is unlikely in the Hanford area, the possibility of a catastrophic occurrence is not impossible, or totally improbable. If this riprap layer were also cracked at the time of the dam failure, the reactor building would be in the flooded area without the benefit of the protective layer. In addition, the closeness of the reactors to the river allow no space for leakage without serious impact into the river. While this has not occurred, we cannot be certain that it will not over the next century, therefore we feel that In-Situ decommissioning is not the preferred alternative. The In-Situ alternative is as costly as one-piece removal and it leaves us with a higher risk of contamination of the Columbia River.

Our preference would be to eliminate the reactors and all components from the Hanford site. This is impractical as no storage facility exists at this time to relocate the radioactive and contaminated material. In addition, the reactors are too "hot" to be dismantled in the near future. In addition, we are very concerned about the transportation of the material to another site; it would be hazardous and have possible environmental consequences, particularly if an accident occurred in transporting the reactor parts.

At this time the only realistic alternative seems to be to transport the reactors to the 200 area and place them in temporary storage. The question then is one of immediate one-piece removal vs. delayed one-piece removal.

The Sierra Club supports the one-piece immediate removal decommissioning alternative. We support this for the following reasons.


The immediate one-piece removal option is less costly than any other acceptable alternative and only \$9 million more than the In-Situ alternative. The environmental impact of one-piece removal is minimal and the radiation dosage to the general public (off the reservation) is as low or lower than any other alternative.

The only negative impact is the higher radiation dosage sustained by the workers on the decommissioning team. We are concerned with situations where workers are exposed to more than minimal radiation levels. We feel that in this case the DOE will be required to utilize a sufficient number of workers over the twelve year span of the decommissioning project in order to ensure that no single individual receives more than an acceptable level of radioactivity per the present maximum occupational dosage levels.

Again, we feel that the immediate one-piece removal of the surplus reactors is the best alternative and the one that should be selected.

Ex16

A Smart Cookie Or A Waste Of Dough?



Every year, the US Government spends \$100 billion of taxpayers' money on senseless waste \$730 million from Seattle citizens alone

Believe it or not, the Pentagon actually issues a 15-page manual on how to bake cookies. To research, write and publish absurd regulations like these costs millions of dollars annually

Who pays for the government's half-baked spending practices? You do. Out of your pocket, your paycheck, your savings, your plans for the future

Citizens Against Government Waste knows that's not

the way the cookie should crumble. And our 350,000 members know it too.

Since 1984, Citizens Against Government Waste has saved taxpayers more than \$152 billion — \$1.1 billion for Seattle citizens.

We've got practical ideas that will save even more money in the years ahead — another \$272 billion by the time we're done.

Stop the government from wasting your dough. Join Citizens Against Government Waste today.

CITIZENS AGAINST GOVERNMENT WASTE

Call toll free **1-800-USA-DEBT**

0.328

STATEMENT OF HEART OF AMERICA NORTHWEST
ON
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT:
DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING OF
EIGHT PRODUCTION REACTORS,
HANFORD NUCLEAR RESERVATION

OVERVIEW:

Heart of America Northwest is a citizens group of 16,000 members dedicated to advancing our region's quality of life. As such, we have been in the forefront of efforts to secure a credible and timely clean-up of nuclear and chemical wastes at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation in accord with federal and state environmental laws. Hanford Clean-Up is an issue vital to both the economic and environmental vitality of our region.

The Nuclear Reactors which line the banks of the Columbia River at Hanford are more than overwhelmingly stark symbols of the need to clean up the Hanford site. They are facilities which pose significant risks of releases of radionuclides and chemical wastes to the Columbia River and the environment of the Northwest. Our position is that they must be cleaned up - decontaminated and decommissioned - in full accord with all procedures and standards of the relevant laws governing such threats. We are not an organization with any position on the production of nuclear weapons material, or which calls for Hanford shutdown. We do insist that Hanford be cleaned up in accord with the law.

The Draft EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) produced by the USDOE (US Dept. of Energy) FAILS TO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE CLEAN UP OF THE REACTORS MUST BE DONE IN ACCORD WITH FEDERAL AND STATE ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.

THOSE LAWS DO NOT GIVE THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY THE AUTHORITY TO MAKE THE FUNDAMENTAL DECISION AS TO THE FATE OF THE REACTORS AS CALLED FOR IN THE EIS.

THE DRAFT EIS CALLS FOR A DECISION TO BE MADE BY THE DOE PRIOR TO THE INTENSIVE ON-SITE CLEAN-UP STUDIES (i.e., remedial investigations and feasibility studies) CALLED FOR BY FEDERAL AND STATE LAW PRIOR TO ANY DECISION REGARDING CLEAN-UP AND DECOMMISSIONING OF A FACILITY WHICH POSES SUCH A CLEAR POTENTIAL THREAT OF RELEASE OF CONTAMINANTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT. THE POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS OF THOSE ACTS ARE IGNORED BY THE USDOE IN THIS DRAFT EIS.

THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, DEPT. OF ECOLOGY, AND THE U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (EPA) SHOULD BE THE FUNDAMENTAL DECISION-MAKERS REGARDING THESE EIGHT REACTORS, RATHER THAN DOE.

BUDGETARY CONSIDERATIONS HAVE APPARENTLY DRIVEN THE EVALUATION BY THE USDOE OF ALTERNATIVES IN THE DRAFT EIS, LEADING TO A BIAS TOWARDS LEAVING THE REACTORS IN PLACE ALONG THE COLUMBIA RIVER, EITHER PERMANENTLY OR FOR A SEVENTY FIVE YEAR PERIOD - WHEN SOME FUTURE GENERATION CAN BE FACED WITH A DECISION, IF THERE HAS NOT BEEN A PRIOR RELEASE. THIS BIAS LED THE USDOE TO FAIL TO CONSIDER THE ALTERNATIVE OF IMMEDIATE DISMANTLEMENT, WITH APPROPRIATE WORKER AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SAFEGUARDS, DUE TO COST.