

Commentor No. 2303: Linda Rasmussen

Production, waste management, and health risk disclosure has not been honest or admirable in the past. We do not need more of the same. Emphasis should be on cleaning + disposing of the waste we have. leaving this for future generations is unethical waste
Linda Rasmussen

2303-1

Response to Commentor No. 2303

2303-1: DOE notes the commentor's concerns regarding the existing cleanup mission at Hanford. Although beyond the scope of this NI PEIS, ongoing Hanford cleanup activities are high priority to DOE. Hanford Site environmental restoration activities are conducted in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (i.e., Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Department of Energy). This agreement specifies milestones and schedules for restoration of all parts of the Hanford Site. DOE is fully committed to honoring this agreement.

Commentor No. 2304: Donn Colby

We have the most contaminated
in the Western world in our backyard. FFTF
has been on standby for years without a
clear mission. It is time to shut it down,
stop wasting the taxpayers money, and finish
cleaning up the nuclear mess that already
exists.

Donn Colby, MD
Seattle, WA

If you can
with the
... tru.

2304-1

2304-2

2304-1

Response to Commentor No. 2304

- 2304-1: DOE notes the commentor's concerns regarding the existing cleanup mission at Hanford. Although beyond the scope of this NI PEIS, ongoing Hanford cleanup activities are high priority to DOE. Hanford Site environmental restoration activities are conducted in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (i.e., Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Department of Energy). This agreement specifies milestones and schedules for restoration of all parts of the Hanford Site. DOE is fully committed to honoring this agreement.
- 2304-2: DOE notes the commentor's support for Alternative 5, Permanently Deactivate FFTF.

Commentor No. 2305: Amy Choyani

Dear Secretary
Please don't rob my
daughter of a healthy
environment to grow
up in. The children
are our future. Don't
let this 7777 bull ~~shit~~
up our children's
future from
them.
Amy Choyani

2305-1

Response to Commentor No. 2305

2305-1: The concerns expressed in this comment with respect to the possible impacts of proposed NI PEIS actions are noted. The environmental impacts associated with all nuclear infrastructure activities are presented in Chapter 4 of the NI PEIS.

All air emissions and wastewater discharges would be in accordance with applicable permit and regulatory requirements. The release of air pollutants would result in concentrations well below Federal and state air standards. The release of radioactivity and hazardous chemicals into the atmosphere would have a negligible effect on human health. No long term adverse health effects, including cancer and genetic disorders, would be anticipated. There would be no discernible impacts to groundwater or surface water quality. The management of wastes generated at the various sites would be in accordance with applicable Federal and state laws and regulations and appropriate DOE orders, and would not be expected to adversely affect the environment. All impacts on ecological resources, including animals and fish, would be small.

It is concluded that nuclear infrastructure activities would have small effects on the environment both in the short- and long-term time periods, and would not rob anyone of growing up in a healthy environment.

Commentor No. 2306: Shirley Morrison

How many times are
 have to tell you.
 No. No. No.
 Clean up, clean up
 that mess -
 and don't make any
 more -
 Shirley Morrison
 19 grandchildren
 let them have
 decent world. CLE

2306-1

2306-1: DOE notes the commentor's opposition to Alternative 1, Restart FFTF.

2306-2

2306-2: DOE notes the commentor's concerns regarding the existing cleanup mission at Hanford. Although beyond the scope of this NI PEIS, ongoing Hanford cleanup activities are high priority to DOE. Hanford Site environmental restoration activities are conducted in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (i.e., Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Department of Energy). This agreement specifies milestones and schedules for restoration of all parts of the Hanford Site. DOE is fully committed to honoring this agreement.

Commentor No. 2307: Liesl Zappler Rogers

It is inconceivable to me that the DOE would even THINK of starting up the FFTF at Hanford - the costs, the wastes, the risks to human & environmental life (including CANCER) are far too great. Clean it up - Don't start it up!
Liesl Zappler Rogers

2307-1

2307-2

2307-3

Response to Commentor No. 2307

2307-1: The concerns expressed in this comment with respect to impacts and costs of FFTF startup are noted. The environmental impacts associated with restart of the FFTF, both during normal operations and from postulated accidents, are presented in Section 4.3 of the NI PEIS. The impacts to humans and also to the biosphere (air, water, and land) are shown to be small. No fatalities among workers or in the general public from cancer or other causes would be expected from operations over the full 35-year period. The management of wastes would be in accordance with applicable Federal and state laws and regulations and appropriate DOE Orders and would not be expected to adversely affect the environment.

The costs of proposed actions are not required by NEPA and CEQ regulations to be included in a PEIS. DOE prepared a separate Cost Report to provide additional pertinent information to the Secretary of Energy so that he may make an informed decision with respect to the alternatives presented in the NI PEIS. The cost report was made available immediately upon release of the NI PEIS on the NE web site (<http://www.nuclear.gov>) and in the public reading rooms. A summary of the cost report is included as Appendix P in the final NI PEIS.

2307-2: DOE notes the commentor's concerns regarding the existing cleanup mission at Hanford. Although beyond the scope of this NI PEIS, ongoing Hanford cleanup activities are high priority to DOE. Hanford Site environmental restoration activities are conducted in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (i.e., Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Department of Energy). This agreement specifies milestones and schedules for restoration of all parts of the Hanford Site. DOE is fully committed to honoring this agreement.

2307-3: DOE notes the commentor's opposition to Alternative 1, Restart FFTF.

Commentor No. 2308: Anonymous

The isotopes
are not needed
for medical needs -
we have a steady
& plentiful supply
from domestic sources +
~~Canada~~ Canada.
do not re-start
FFTF under the
guise of saving
people with
cancer!!
It's a lie, & a
dishonor to the
of cancer.

2308-1

2308-1: The United States currently purchases approximately 90 percent of its medical isotopes from foreign producers, most notably Canada. However, Canada only supplies a limited number of economically attractive commercial isotopes (primarily molybdenum-99), and it does not supply research isotopes or the diverse array of medical and industrial isotopes considered in the NI PEIS. As such, reliance on Canadian sources of isotopes to satisfy projected U.S. isotope needs would not meet DOE's mission requirements. Section 1.2.1 of Volume 1 has been revised to clarify DOE's isotope production role and other producers' capabilities to fulfill U.S. isotope needs.

2308-2

Currently, approximately 50 percent of DOE's isotope production capability is being used. Much of the remaining isotope production capability is dispersed throughout the DOE complex. This capability supports secondary missions, but cannot be effectively used due to the operating constraints associated with the facilities' primary missions (basic energy sciences or defense). DOE is currently meeting most of its short-term requirements. However, in the long-term (next 5 to 10 years) there will be a shortfall in available DOE capacity to meet demand. Should the isotope demand grow consistent with the Expert Panel Report, as it has recently, or if DOE's market share increases, there will be a need for expanded isotope production capacity in the short-term (less than 5 years).

2308-2: DOE notes the commentor's opposition to Alternative 1, Restart FFTF. In ongoing clinical testing, therapeutic radioisotopes have proven effective in treating cancers and other illnesses while minimizing adverse side effects, making their use an attractive alternative to traditional chemotherapy and radiation treatments.

Commentor No. 2309: Anonymous

Hanford's waiting for disaster
Rest assured and have no fear
Patty Murray's isotopes will cure
whatever ills you bear
So what's a little cancer
in your kid's anatomy
It builds our GNP

2309-1

Response to Commentor No. 2309

2309-1: The commentor's opposition to the restart of FFTF is noted. This PEIS has provided an estimate of the incremental potential human health impacts associated with a reasonable range of alternatives (including the restart of FFTF) for the production of isotopes for medical uses, research and development, and as heat sources for radioisotope power systems. The methodology used is intended to provide realistic results based upon our current knowledge of the health impact of low doses of radiation. Section 4.3 of Volume 1 provides the results of the evaluation of potential health impacts that would be expected to result from implementation of Alternative 1 (which includes restart of FFTF), including normal operations and a spectrum of accidents that included severe accidents. The environmental analysis showed that radiological and nonradiological risks associated with restarting FFTF would be small.

Commentor No. 2310: Dick Burton

This is the most polluted
 site in North America! Are
 you crazy?! Shut it down immediately
 and start a real clean-up!
 - Dick Burton
 Seattle, WA

|| 2310-1
 || 2310-2

Response to Commentor No. 2310

- 2310-1: DOE notes the commentor's support for Alternative 5, Permanently Deactivate FFTF.
- 2310-2: DOE notes the commentor's concerns regarding the existing cleanup mission at Hanford. Although beyond the scope of this NI PEIS, ongoing Hanford cleanup activities are high priority to DOE. Hanford Site environmental restoration activities are conducted in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (i.e., Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Department of Energy). This agreement specifies milestones and schedules for restoration of all parts of the Hanford Site. DOE is fully committed to honoring this agreement.

Commentor No. 2311: Wenonah Hauter
Public Citizen

No nuclear boondoggle -
No more squandering
taxpayer money. Spend
public money cleaning up
the nuclear disaster at
Hanford - not creating more
waste.
Wenonah Hauter
WASH. I

2311-1

Response to Commentor No. 2311

2311-1: DOE notes the commentor's concerns regarding the existing cleanup mission at Hanford. Although beyond the scope of this NI PEIS, ongoing Hanford cleanup activities are high priority to DOE. Hanford Site environmental restoration activities are conducted in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (i.e., Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Department of Energy). This agreement specifies milestones and schedules for restoration of all parts of the Hanford Site. DOE is fully committed to honoring this agreement.

Commentor No. 2312: P. Zicher

You can't handle
 the waste you've got.
 We don't need The FFTF -
 we need CLEANUP.
 F. Zicher

2312-1

Response to Commentor No. 2312

2312-1: DOE notes the commentor's opposition to Alternative 1, restart FFTF, and concerns regarding the existing cleanup mission at Hanford. Although beyond the scope of this NI PEIS, ongoing Hanford cleanup activities are high priority to DOE. Hanford Site environmental restoration activities are conducted in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (i.e., Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Department of Energy). This agreement specifies milestones and schedules for restoration of all parts of the Hanford Site. DOE is fully committed to honoring this agreement.

Commentor No. 2313: Naomi Gundle

End the Madness!
We are against restarting
the FTF. Listen to facts
and people and safety concerns,
not corporate propaganda

Naomi Gundle
Seattle, WA teacher

2313-1

2313-1: DOE notes the commentor's opposition to Alternative 1, Restart FTF.

2313-2

2313-2: Comment noted. DOE is committed to providing the public with comprehensive environmental reviews of its proposed actions in accordance with NEPA, and to providing ample opportunity for public comment on those actions. DOE gave equal consideration to all comments. In preparing the Final NI PEIS, DOE carefully considered comments received from the public.

Commentor No. 2314: Mark Taylor-Canfield

I am very concerned about potential hazards associated with the use, delivery and storage of radioactive material. Due to common human errors, computer glitches and unseen accidents we are never really sure if we can avoid contaminating our environment for many generations to come (our children).

I'm also concerned that we may cause as many cancers as we cure due to contamination. I do not think you should approve this. Please read Chief Seattle's speech upon the treaty at Elliott point. Thank you,

Mark Taylor-Canfield
 Capitol Hill Community Council
 Citizen's Committee for Government
 Accountability

2314-1

2314-2

Response to Commentor No. 2314

2314-1: This PEIS has provided an estimate of the incremental potential human health impacts associated with a reasonable range of alternatives (including the restart of FFTF) for the production of isotopes for medical uses, research and development, and as heat sources for radioisotope power systems. The methodology used is intended to provide realistic results based upon our current knowledge of the health impact of low doses of radiation. Section 4.3 of Volume 1 provides the results of the evaluation of potential health impacts that would be expected to result from implementation of Alternative 1 (which includes restart of FFTF), including normal operations and a spectrum of accidents that included severe accidents. The environmental analysis showed that radiological and nonradiological risks associated with restarting FFTF would be small.

The NI PEIS identifies (in Chapter 3 of Volume 1) endangered species that live on or near all of the candidate sites, as well as aquatic and wetlands areas that may be impacted by operations at candidate locations. According to an International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) publication (IAEA Technical Report Series No. 332, Effects of Ionizing Radiation on Plants and Animals at Levels Implied by Current Radiation Protection Standards), a dose rate of 100 millirem per year to the most exposed human will lead to dose rates to plants and animals of less than 0.1 rad per day. The IAEA concluded that a dose rate of 0.1 rad per day or less for animals and 1 rad per day or less for plants would not affect these populations. The largest individual dose for any of the nuclear infrastructures alternatives under normal operations would be less than 0.1 millirem, which is three orders of magnitude less than the IAEA threshold for adverse effects. Therefore, implementation of any of the range of reasonable nuclear infrastructure alternatives analyzed would not be expected to result in adverse impacts on plants and animals living in potentially affected areas around the candidate sites.

2314-2: DOE notes the commentor's opposition to Alternative 1, Restart FFTF.

Commentor No. 2315: Tom Caryts

all:
NOT AGAIN! How
MANY TIMES MUST WE SAY
IT? WE DON'T WANT MORE
PLUTONIUM PRODUCTION AT
SME. STOP FFTF.
Tom Caryts

During
SM.
'05/07

2315-1

Response to Commentor No. 2315

2315-1: DOE notes the commentor's support for Alternative 5, Permanently Deactivate FFTF. As discussed in Section 1.2 of Volume 1, plutonium-238 would be produced to support NASA's deep space missions. Plutonium-238 is not used to produce nuclear weapons. All missions considered in the NI PEIS are for civilian purposes.

Commentor No. 2316: Amber Waldref

Dear Sec. Richardson,
 I have found several items
 missing from the PEIS, including
 a lack of study on waste management
 disposal and an independent asses
 of the need for particular medical
 Please take my comments into consi
 and shut down FFTF
 Amber Waldref

2316-1

2316-2

2316-3

Response to Commentor No. 2316

- 2316-1:** Management of wastes that would be generated under implementation of Alternative 1, Restart FFTF, is discussed in Section 4.3 of Volume 1 (e.g., see Section 4.3.1.1.13). Section 4.3.1.1.13 was revised to clarify that, the Hanford waste management infrastructure is analyzed in this PEIS for the management of waste resulting from FFTF restart and operation. This analysis is consistent with policy and DOE Order 435.1, that DOE radioactive waste shall be treated, stored, and in the case of low-level waste, disposed of at the site where the waste is generated, if practical; or at another DOE facility. However, if DOE determines that use of the Hanford waste management infrastructure or other DOE sites is not practical or cost effective, DOE may issue an exemption under DOE Order 435.1 for the use of non-DOE facilities (i.e., commercial facilities) to store, treat, and dispose of such waste generated from the restart and operation of FFTF. In addition, Section 4.3.3.1.13 and 4.4.3.1.13 also address the potential impacts associated with the waste generated from the target fabrication and processing in FMEF and how this waste would be managed at the site.
- 2316-2:** DOE has sought independent analysis of trends in the use of medical isotopes, and of its continuing role in this sector, consistent with its mandates under the Atomic Energy Act. In doing so, it established two expert bodies, the Expert Panel and the NERAC. In 1998, the Expert Panel, which convened to forecast future demand for medical isotopes, estimated that the expected growth rate of medical isotope use during the next 20 years would range from 7 to 14 percent per year for therapeutic applications, and 7 to 16 percent per year for diagnostic applications. These findings were later reviewed and endorsed by NERAC, established in 1999 to provide DOE with expert, objective advice regarding the future form of its isotope research and production activities. DOE has adopted these growth projections as a planning tool for evaluating the potential capability of the existing nuclear facility infrastructure to meet programmatic requirements. In the period since the initial estimates were made, the actual growth of medical isotope use has tracked at levels consistent with the Expert Panel findings. Section 1.2.1 of Volume 1 was revised to incorporate this information and to clarify DOE's role in fulfilling the U.S. research and commercial isotope production needs.
- 2316-3:** DOE notes the commentor's support for Alternative 5, Permanently Deactivate FFTF.

Commentor No. 2317: Anonymous

Should not be any further.

—ST
- cancer survivor -
and I am appalled
at the idea that the
FFTF is even being
considered as a help
to "cure" forms of
cancer. Let's quit trying
to find band-aids and
admit that we cause
cancer. Our Arrogance
at believe that we can
control science and
technology. We are poisoning
ourselves - and we don't even
seem to care. If you're
dead a piece of paper, a
"stump of old

Response to Commentor No. 2317

2317-1

2317-1: The commentor's positions on FFTF, science, and technology are noted. DOE's purpose for producing medical isotopes is described in Section 1.2.1 of Volume 1. As discussed in Chapter 4 of Volume 1 (e.g. sections 4.3.1.1.9, 4.3.1.1.10, 4.3.2.1.9, 4.3.2.1.10, 4.3.3.1.9, 4.3.3.1.10), implementation of Alternative 1, Restart FFTF, would not be expected to result in latent cancer fatalities among the population surrounding the Hanford Site.

Commentor No. 2318: Stephen Bomkamp

PLEASE SHUT DOWN THE
FFTF AND CLEAN UP
HANFORD AS YOU ARE LEGALLY
BOUND TO DO

Stephen Bomkamp
SEATTLE WA

2318-1

2318-1: DOE notes the commentor's support for Alternative 5, Permanently Deactivate FFTF.

2318-2

2318-2: DOE notes the commentor's concerns regarding the existing cleanup mission at Hanford. Although beyond the scope of this NI PEIS, ongoing Hanford cleanup activities are high priority to DOE. Hanford Site environmental restoration activities are conducted in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (i.e., Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Department of Energy). This agreement specifies milestones and schedules for restoration of all parts of the Hanford Site. DOE is fully committed to honoring this agreement.

Commentor No. 2319: Phil M. Guinnier

I raise my kids next door to Humboldt and swim in the Columbia
or Richland. Please listen. This place is safe. God Bless the
Citizens of Seattle but don't be afraid of FFTE. We are
good people and don't waste the payer's money.

Phil M. Guinnier
8230-00

2319-1

Response to Commentor No. 2319

2319-1: DOE notes the commentor's support for Alternative 1, Restart FFTE.

Commentor No. 2320: Charal Stamper

It is scandalous to think that DOE would consider restarting FFTF and producing more radioactive materials when they have yet to deal with the serious hazards posed by Hanford's status as the EPA's biggest Superfund site. Containers are already leaking into the environment, endangering ^{local} residents, as well as people across the country through contamination of agricultural areas & the Columbia River & salmon runs. The recent fire at Hanford is further proof of the dangers lurking, as well as the contempt for public & worker health exemplified by DOE's initial denials of any escape radiation.

We demand that DOE responsibly clean up the radioactive contamination & not create any more deadly isotopes.

Charal Stamper
Seattle, WA

2320-1

Response to Commentor No. 2320

2320-1: DOE notes the commentor's opposition to Alternative 1, Restart FFTF, and concerns regarding the existing cleanup mission at Hanford. Although beyond the scope of this NI PEIS, ongoing Hanford cleanup activities are high priority to DOE. Hanford Site environmental restoration activities are conducted in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (i.e., Washington Department of Ecology, Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Department of Energy). This agreement specifies milestones and schedules for restoration of all parts of the Hanford Site. DOE is fully committed to honoring this agreement.

FFTF is approximately 4.5 miles from the Columbia River. There are no discharges to the river from FFTF and no radioactive or hazardous discharges to groundwater. All environmental parameters (e.g., air, soil, surface water, groundwater, vegetation, animals, etc.) in and around the Hanford Site are monitored on a set frequency. The information is available to the public in annual monitoring reports. As indicated in analyses presented in Chapter 4 of Volume 1 (e.g., Sections 4.3.1.1.4, 4.3.3.1.4, 4.4.3.1.4, 4.5.3.2.4, and 4.6.3.2.4), there would be no discernible impacts to groundwater or surface water quality at Hanford from operation of Hanford facilities that would support the nuclear infrastructure missions described in Section 1.2 of Volume 1.

No radioactive materials were "released" in the Hanford Wildfires of 2000. Wildfires did resuspend some materials already in the environment. The resuspended materials were low, slightly above natural background levels. Real-time measurement equipment does not detect environmental contaminant levels. The low levels required several days of analysis to quantify. DOE reported information as it became available. Worker and public safety are of paramount importance to DOE.

Commentor No. 2321: Orion Berdick

When is this threat
to public health going to
be dealt with in an
adequate manner? Waste
is leaking toward the Columbia!
Shut down FFTF and
fund clean-up!
— Orion Berdick

2321-1

2321-1: DOE notes the commentor's concerns regarding the existing cleanup mission at Hanford. Although beyond the scope of this NI PEIS, ongoing Hanford cleanup activities are high priority to DOE. Hanford Site environmental restoration activities are conducted in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (i.e., Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Department of Energy). This agreement specifies milestones and schedules for restoration of all parts of the Hanford Site. DOE is fully committed to honoring this agreement.

2321-2

FFTF is approximately 4.5 miles from the Columbia River. There are no discharges to the river from FFTF and no radioactive or hazardous discharges to groundwater. As indicated in analyses presented in Chapter 4 of Volume 1 (e.g., Sections 4.3.1.1.4, 4.3.3.1.4, 4.4.3.1.4, 4.5.3.2.4, and 4.6.3.2.4), there would be no discernible impacts to groundwater or surface water quality at Hanford from operation of Hanford facilities that would support the nuclear infrastructure missions described in Section 1.2 of Volume 1.

2321-1

2321-2: DOE notes the commentor's support for Alternative 5, Permanently Deactivate FFTF.

Commentor No. 2322: Anonymous

Alternative 5 - Close
 down the Hanford Facility. are essential.
 If the DOE mission is an essential
 IF we can't take other. Not
 caring that either other. Not
 at Hanford. adding to the
 already existing risks & the
 problems - when DOE has
 so far done no meaningful
 clean-up, and has developed
 a large program which
 gives only a temporary
 fix to the problem. The
 actual clean-up is not
 actually exists. The
 existing & future damage to the
 Columbia River is the
 public's
 should not be compromised
 further.

Physician
 F. O. O.
 F. O. O.

to
 cause
 to
 admit
 cause

2322-1

2322-1: DOE notes the commentor's support for Alternative 5, Permanently Deactivate FFTF.

2322-2

2322-2: DOE notes the commentor's concerns regarding the existing cleanup mission at Hanford. Although beyond the scope of this NI PEIS, ongoing Hanford cleanup activities are high priority to DOE. Hanford Site environmental restoration activities are conducted in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (i.e., Washington State Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Department of Energy). This agreement specifies milestones and schedules for restoration of all parts of the Hanford Site. DOE is fully committed to honoring this agreement.

FFTF is approximately 4.5 miles from the Columbia River. There are no discharges to the river from FFTF and no radioactive or hazardous discharges to groundwater. As indicated in analyses presented in Chapter 4 of Volume 1 (e.g., Sections 4.3.1.1.4, 4.3.3.1.4, 4.4.3.1.4, 4.5.3.2.4, and 4.6.3.2.4), there would be no discernible impacts to groundwater or surface water quality at Hanford from operation of Hanford facilities that would support the nuclear infrastructure missions described in Section 1.2 of Volume 1.