

# Laura Feldman

To Whom it May Concern,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the 2,000 gallon Test Bed Initiative Draft RD&D permit.

- ENSURE TOXIC VAPOR PROTECTIONS: Ensure that permit conditions require protection for workers from toxic chemical vapor exposure consistent with the terms and conditions of the Vapor Lawsuit Settlement Agreement.

- ADD DETAIL ABOUT DISPOSITION PLAN FOR BOUNCE-BACK WASTE: Add detail to the permit about the disposition plan Ecology is requiring USDOE to provide in the event that waste that was shipped to the offsite facilities is sent back to Hanford.

- CLARIFY SAMPLING PROCEDURE: Clarify the language in the permit about whether it is one discrete sample per tote or two 250 ml samples per tote (and four 250ml samples for the final tote filled).

- IMPROVE THE PUBLIC PROCESS: In the future, please provide a high-level overview of the cleanup work the administrative tool (permit) is planned to facilitate and how that tool protects the environment, workers, and the public, instead of overly focusing on the administrative tool itself. Please set an expectation that USDOE and contractor staff are available to provide answers to questions instead of directing attendees to submit their questions as a comment. Questions are meant to help attendees understand the issue so they can write informed comments. How are attendees supposed to write informed comments to influence the decision-making process if that information is not provided? Please note that answers do not need to be highly technical, but rather provide clarity in plain language about the work being planned, not just the administrative framework in which that work takes place.

- CLARIFY CONSENT-BASED PROCESS: Require an attachment to the permit that includes information about how consent has been achieved for offsite disposal and transportation routes.

- KEEP THE FOCUS ON VIT: Grout does not meet the "as-good-as-glass" criteria. Please keep the focus on vitrifying tank waste and wait to press go on any alternative tank waste immobilization forms that do not meet the "as-good-as-glass" criteria.

Grouting potentially high level wastes after the cesium is removed to be sent to Texas or Utah, hoping they will take it....doesn't seem prudent. If it comes back to us what then? Too many gaps in this journey to feel safe to me.

I'd like to know what happens if the wastes fails to meet receiver criteria. And for that matter I'd like to know more about the conditions these wastes are to be deposited. I care about how nuclear waste is handled no matter where it ends up because ultimately it impacts all of us.

Too many gaps here. Too much handling and moving around wastes that could potentially become homeless and hopefully not dumped by the side of the road.

Laura Feldman  
Portland, OR