

As a taxpayer, and from a risk perspective I am absolutely amazed there are any issues associated with the TBI. I would like for ecology to answer the following simple questions:

- 1) What approach provides the quickest risk reduction using existing treatment technologies, existing DOT certified packaging, existing transportation infrastructure, and existing operating disposal facility outside of the state of Washington?
- 2) Why would I be against moving curies out of the state of Washington to Texas where the Department of Energy has agreed to take title to WCS - Federal Disposal Cell in perpetuity. The federal cell was built and operates specifically and exclusively to accept DOE generated waste.
- 3) From a risk perspective (comparing performance assessments between the WCS facility, and IDF) which facility provides the most protective configuration for long term disposal.
- 4) Can TBI waste be transported to Texas in a solid waste form using existing DOT certified packages, and transportation infrastructure (rail)?
- 5) What approach immobilizes 100% of the isotopes as part of the treatment (grout or glass)? What happens to the TC99 during vitrification operations? Why is the TC99 not fully captured during vitrification operations? What is the largest risk driver from a performance assessment perspective (TC99)?
- 6) Which approach closes tanks the fastest – which is important given the tanks are all degrading everyday like ticking timebombs?
- 7) How could anyone be against a TBI approach? What logic could possibly be used to be against it?

It is rumored Ecology's reluctance for the TBI is jobs. It is clear the TBI if instituted as the disposal option of the LAW would reduce the treatment/disposal cost by billions (see GAO report on the subject). A reduction in cost would likely have an equal cut in jobs associated with LAW treatment. Understanding the strength of the Bechtel lobby, and the influence of the local unions, I can see the reluctance by the State. If this is all about jobs, and not meaningful risk assessment then it won't matter what the answers to my questions are, because jobs will be reduced. Note the public downstream of the Columbia river should have some say in the matter.

Although I am knowledgeable of the TBI, I have nothing financially to gain from implementing the TBI, my only interest is seeing the government make the right decisions for the general public in terms of risk reduction, and proper use of taxpayer funds.