

Anonymous Anonymous

Hello and thank you for the opportunity to comment. Over thirty years ago I worked on a documentary about Hanford's toxic legacy, and am stunned (but sadly not surprised) that the dangers have not been meaningfully addressed in the intervening decades.

Now it's 2024 and once again efforts to meaningfully address the ongoing crises fall short. I'm deeply concerned that Hanford's tanks continue to leak without any action to stop the leaks. The Agreement must include enforceable requirements to remove leakable liquids from leaking tanks starting next year, and to prioritize full retrieval of wastes from the tank farms that have leaking tanks. Is this so much to ask? It is not acceptable to let those tanks keep leaking until sometime after 2040. How is it that we continue subsidizing pollution all over the nation yet lag so hard on cleaning up messes dating back to the mid 20th century?

Additionally, Washington State and Ecology need to adopt conditions that ensure the wastes will be treated and solidified before shipment through Spokane or Oregon. Treatment and solidification before shipment is available and a necessary mitigation measure for inherently greater risks from shipping liquid wastes. This is a no-brainer--it would be grossly negligent to do otherwise. And under SEPA, Ecology has a duty to adopt such a mitigation measure before it can adopt any USDOE NEPA finding of no significant impact or that impacts were discussed in an outdated EIS 25 years ago.

Pursuant to federal and state hazardous waste laws--and proper care for the health of one's neighbors, the general public and the wildlife of the Pacific Northwest--removal of leakable liquids is required "as soon as practicable." The Agreement fails to include any commitment to meet this fundamental environmental protection standard. If removal of liquids from a leaking tank is documented as not being practical, then that tank should be prioritized for early retrieval.

The agencies must also explain the rationale for why they did not include the tank farm with leaking tanks (T Farm) to be amongst the 3 tank farms they chose to be retrieved by 2040 in the Agreement. Not only is 2024 a grossly slow timeline that keep sour communities in danger--it doesn't even include all of the leaking tanks!

Lastly, an EIS is required to review the impacts of decisions, such as not retrieving waste from leaking tanks; and to present reasonable alternatives to stop the leaks and speed up retrieval before more tanks leak.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment and for considering our comments.