

**From:** Judi Edwards <edwards.jc@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 23, 2017 6:39 PM  
**To:** PrivatelSF  
**Subject:** Response to RFI on Private Initiatives to Develop Consolidated SNF Storage Facilities

Looking at your questions, I'm responding to two of them.

## 2. Benefiting communities

It seems the target community may receive money... but this is encouraging them to take direct financial benefits with a likely loss in property value -- and more importantly risking their health, even lives. Nearby communities may have the same risks without even the financial incentives.

Additionally, if this is seen as "benefiting" the community, one would expect communities to be enthusiastic about them. Yet they end up being foisted on poorer communities, particularly those high on POC. If richer communities are not wanting these, then be clear with all communities about their high risks in trade for short-term benefits.

## 5. What assurances are appropriate...?

The most important assurance would be that no hazardous waste would ever be released. The damage to persons and property may be incalculable -- and it is hard to see how such assurances could be honestly given.

Additionally, historically contractors on government projects have budget overruns, and the government (we the people) pay the difference. So the whole project should be privately financed and the agreement require fixed costs.

Thank you.

Judi Edwards  
Seattle, Wa

Sent from XFINITY Connect Mobile App