

Buildings and Debris Cleanup EECA

From: Jeanne Raymond [raymondj@peak.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2010 11:53 AM
To: ^DOE
Subject: Re: Notice of Upcoming Public Comment Period

Reply to Department of Energy

Regarding Hanford Decommissioning

I think number (3) near-term buildings/structures demolition, waste disposal, and debris cleanup, is the only acceptable action.

This choice of the three seems obvious. However, not all of the facts are presented. Articles in the paper have suggested that it will be very costly and that, it may be impossible to stop the contamination. What are the facts?

1) Remember the initial promise to citizens to clean up Hanford. The impetus for the clean up was the radioactive wastes that were threatening the health of those in Washington and Oregon, and of all living things in proximity to the Hanford reservation, including the ecosystems. The Columbia River was, and still is, threatened with ground water contamination. It must not be allowed to continue.

Additional comments:

2) Any additional hazardous radioactive material brought to the Hanford Reservation must not be allowed, because of the danger to those in Washington and Oregon. Transportation, storage, and decommissioning of any new materials is dangerous and a reversal of the original intended purpose of the clean up.

3) Since there is no National Depository for radioactive wastes (including the disallowed Yucca Mountain site), the U.S. should be highly skeptical of producing new nuclear weapons or nuclear power plants.

4) There are those who have already forgotten Three Mile Island, Chernobyl, the Nevada test sites, and even Hanford. However, it is costly to clean up these waste sites. We have an awful reminder of the costs to our health, economy, and the environment.

5) There is political pressure to build "safe" nuclear plants in the U.S.. (That may be what is considered to be an oxymoronic statement). I have heard that, "People in New York and Washington D.C. think that nuclear plants will help with their energy needs". That is short term thinking. Have they considered what it will cost for production, transportation, storage, clean up and the dubious and hazardous "recycling" of the wastes. They should, because no one wants their wastes in our back yard. No new nuclear weapon or nuclear power plant should be built. Clean up of the hazardous waste must proceed.

Sincerely,
 Jeanne Raymond
 Corvallis, OR 97330

On Feb 11, 2010, at 10:10 AM, ^DOE wrote:

