Appendix B

All Comments

All comment documents received are identified here in alpha-numeric order based on the outline in Table 1.2. The alpha/numeric identifiers correlate with Sections 3.6 and 3.7.

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Maura O'Neill [oneillm@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 22, 2002 10:27 AM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Comments

1 | Please focus on cleaning Hanford up and stop bringing new waste to the site.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

Maura O'Neill

E001

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Carol Lindahl [carolal@winstarmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 22, 2002 7:27 AM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: nuclear waste at Hanford

Dear Sirs
1 | I understand that DOE is proposing to transport nuclear waste on our public highways and to dump it into trenches at Hanford. PLEASE consider the unquestionably deleterious long-term effects of this action on the health of both the local
2 | and global environment, and find a more responsible way to either avoid making the waste or to safely dispose of it.

Thank you
Carol Lindahl
7721 17th NE
Seattle, WA 98115
(206) 525-2101

E002

1055 Edmonds Street
Edmonds, WA 98020

SUSIE SCHAEFER

August 21, 2002

Michael S. Collins
HSW EIS Manager
Richland Operations Office
US Dept. of Energy
PO Box 550
Richland, WA 99352-0550

Dear Mr. Collins,

1 I am writing to you about the Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement. I do not believe this EIS is inadequate and I am requesting that it be withdrawn, redone and issued again before any action is taken by your agency. I am a long time Washington State resident and am very familiar with the Tri-Cities Hanford area. I am also knowledgeable with necessary elements of an adequate EIS.

2 This EIS fails to address many important issues that must be included in a meaningful study of the effect on the environment. For example, it does not include an adequate assessment for endangered species. It fails to disclose impacts on groundwater. The most serious flaw is the lack of attention to the long history of dangerous waste burial and does not integrate all waste site analysis of the cumulative effects on the area.

3 As stated, additional analysis and study is needed. The Department of Energy needs a much more thorough EIS before proceeding. This EIS does not meet minimum standards nor address issues of concern to Washington citizens. This EIS does not
4 protect public and environmental health.

5 In conclusion, I want to voice my opposition to the addition of anymore radioactive waste at Hanford particularly without action on the already inadequate storage of such waste. I am awaiting your response and trust that as the representative of the Department of Energy you will act in behalf of the public and withdraw this inadequate EIS immediately.

Sincerely,
Susie Schaefer

E003

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: jay johnson [runjay@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2002 9:16 PM
To: solid_waste_EIS_-_DOE@rl.gov
Subject: EIS

Jay Stacer Johnson
7851 56th PL NE
Seattle, WA 98115-6330
runjay@yahoo.com
August 21, 2002

Michael S. Collins
HSW EIS Manager
Richland Operations Office
US Dept. of Energy, A6-38
PO Box 550
Richland, WA 99352-0550

Dear Mr. Michael S. Collins

The current draft Hanford Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Environmental Impact Statement does NOT protect public and environmental health on the following points.
The EIS does not -- but should -- include the following.

1 • No more radioactive waste (and certainly not the 70,000 truckloads being proposed!) should be brought to Hanford before the existing waste burden is under control.

2 • The EIS should integrate all waste site analyses tc determine the full cumulative impacts on Hanford and nationwide.

3 • The EIS should include adequate analysis for DOE's upcoming decisions about importing and burying low-level and mixed (including hazardous chemicals) radioactive waste, and about expanding unlined soil trenches for disposing of this waste.

4 • The EIS should include analysis of the effects of importing transuranic wastes, and plans to retrieve and deal with the impacts of this dangerous

E004

52

4 (cont) radioactive waste buried before 1970.

5 • The Tribes should be consulted before the EIS is released.

6 • The EIS should disclose impacts to groundwater and human health.

7 • The EIS should include an adequate assessment for endangered species.

8 • The EIS should include an alternative that does NOT import low-level waste and mixed low-level waste from other sites.

9 • The EIS should include a reasonable alternative that ends the use of unlined burial trenches.

10 • The EIS should charge the generators of the waste for the long-term costs of disposal, treatment or storage of the wastes.

11 • The EIS should included detailed analysis of offsite wastes for hazardous substances before any more waste is imported.

For these reasons I think the EIS should be withdrawn, revised and reissued.

Sincerely - Jay Stacer Johnson

E004a

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Forcreeks@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2002 9:20 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford EIS comments

from:
Steven Berliner
4455 SE Aldercrest Rd.
Milwaukie, OR 97222

Dear Mr. Collins:

I'll keep my comments pretty short. I'm sure you get many similar letters from concerned citizens.

I've lived my nearly 52 years in Portland, OR near the Columbia River. I'm a stakeholder in that I co-own a sizeable business property along the Columbia Slough South Shore. We are participating with the City of Portland to dramatically rehabilitate the degraded slough and riparian corridor. Our own piece of it is coming along beautifully after hundreds of native plants were installed at our personal expense, some five years ago, and are still being maintained today.

I'm very worried about the Hanford ground pollution leaching into the Columbia River, and am strongly opposed to any further dumping of toxic
1 wastes at Hanford until cleanup and control of leak potential is completely in-hand. I specifically oppose the current plan to double the amount of
2 radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination.

Please put my comments into the EIS record in this matter. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Steven Berliner

E005

53

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Beth Meshke [accnscc@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2002 6:03 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@RL.gov
Subject: Hanford Solid Waste EIS Public Comment

Dear Mr. Collins,

Here is my opinion regarding the Hanford Solid Waste EIS.

1 The plan to truck nuclear waste to Hanford should not be approved. We need less nuclear waste at Hanford, not more. There is no way to store it without
2 damaging the groundwater and Columbia River; please redo the environmental studies to be more realistic.

3 I am alarmed by the plan to truck highly dangerous waste all over the states. There is no safe way to ship nuclear waste in trucks to Hanford. I am
4 disappointed that apparently your EIS didn't even mention the danger involved with transporting the waste.

5 I think there is no safe way to store and transport nuclear waste. I think we should stop producing it. Nuclear power and weapons should be stopped for many reasons, but surely a big one is we humans just never will have a way to safely store it.

Sincerely,
Beth Meshke
6848 29th Ave NE
Seattle WA 98115

E006

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: cynthia@threeam.com
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2002 6:24 AM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Stop importing waste to the Hanford Nuclear Reservation

Dear Mr. Collins,

1 I am demanding that we NOT ship more radioactive waste to be stored at the Hnaford Nuclear Reservation in Washington State in the unlined storage trenches there.

2 Since Hanford is located on the Columbia River, a river that many, many fish and people rely on, not to mention a major river that runs directly to the sea, it seems unthinkable to store any more waste in this location.

3 It continues to baffle me, why the U.S. produces a substance that is deadly for thousands and thousands of years and has not real way of getting rid of. BUT, in lieu of doing the
4 ultimate smart thing, (cease producing the stuff), it seems we should NOT store it on a major waterway where precious salmon live as well as supplies the ocean.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cynthia K. Cruver
Bremerton, Washington

Cynthia Cruver
P.O. Box 13310
Bremerton, WA 98337

E007

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: margotf39@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2002 12:08 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Stop importing waste to the Hanford Nuclear Reservation

Dear Mr. Collins,

I attended the very liovely meeting last week at the Mountaineers building, and I agree
1 with all the comments I heard (I left after the Raging Grannies) that the DOE must adequately address cleaning up what's there, preventing future contamination, and not allow any more radioactive waste until conditions are pristine.

Sincerely,

Margot Fetz

Margot Fetz
1901 7th W
Seattle, WA 98119

E008

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: brian@soundings.com
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2002 12:32 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Stop importing waste to the Hanford Nuclear Reservation

Dear Mr. Collins,

1 Please do not dump nuclear waste at Hanford.

Sincerely,

Brian Cisneros
1705 Fairhaven Ave
Bellingham WA 98227
brian cisneros

98227

E009

164

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: pballard@oz.net
Sent: Friday, August 16, 2002 7:35 AM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Stop importing waste to the Hanford Nuclear Reservation

Dear Mr. Collins,

I am writing you as a citizen concerned with the cleanup of Hanford, one of the most contaminated places in the world.

1 Sometimes I am amazed at how short-sighted we as a people are. I worked very hard for three years in the late 80's with scores of other people to help shut down WPPSS in this
2 state. One of our major concrens was that we don't yet know how to manage our waste, epsecially our radioactive waste. It is a sad state of affairs to see the horrible way we are handling nuclear waste around the country. It is doubly depressing when we see the
3 plans to truck this unwanted waste throughout the nation searching for some place to dump it and then have that place be in our back yard.

4 We just came off a political battle to stop FFTF. Now, when we should be turning our attention back to clean-up, we instead must deal with increased insanity and inneptitude at dumping tons more waste on top of the already mismanaged waste we've already generated and received over the past decades.

When is this insanity goi8ng to cease? I would appreciate a complete response to my comments.

Sincerely,

Paul Ballard
416 NW 92nd
Seattle, WA 98117

E010

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Trent M Elwing [trelwing@juno.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 22, 2002 7:56 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@RL.gov
Subject: The pathetic DOE EIS for shipping plutonium-laden waste to Hanford typifies your incompetency. Please resign.

Michael Collins
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550, A6-38
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mr. Collins,

1 Shipping ca. 70,000 loads of plutonium-laden waste via truck to Hanford is sheer idiocy and sounds like a bit for a "Simpsons" episode. The current Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SWEIS) fails to mention the potential for traffic accidents involving these trucks. Your implied
2 disregard for the safety of emergency response officials of the muncipalities through which these trucks will run is shameful. Additionally, you personally have failed to adequately address the human
3 health and environmental impacts of adding this plutonium-contaminated waste to Hanford. Please
4 either resign or redo your analysis and stop importing more waste until you have cleaned up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford.

Sincerely,

Trent Elwing

4033 NE 58th St.

Seattle, WA 98105

E011

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Paula Holden [pholden@scn.org]
Sent: Thursday, August 22, 2002 2:46 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford Solid Waste EIS

Dear Mr. Collins.
Please include my opinion on the Hanford Solid Waste EIS.
1 Dumping radioactive waste from across the country into unlined soil trenches at Hanford is dangerous and should not be allowed.
2 The waste will contaminate the groundwater flowing into the Columbia River.
3 The risk of transporting nuclear waste has not been considered in the EIS. More waste on the roads means a greater risk of accidents.
4 Dumping the waste in unlined trenches provides no protection from soil or groundwater contamination.

PLEASE REPLY.
Sincerely,
Paula Holden
7021 Sand Point Way N.E.
Seattle, Wa. 98115

E012

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Hyun Lee [hyun@heartofamericanorthwest.org]
Sent: Thursday, August 22, 2002 11:56 AM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@RL.gov
Subject: additional comments from Heart of America Northwest

Revw1 (1).doc

Dear Mr. collins,

I Fed Ex'd additional comments from Heart of America Northwest to you yesterday regarding the Hanford SWEIS. I am also attaching the additional comments to this e-mail.

Please call with questions at (206) 382-1014. Thank you for your time

Hyun Lee

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: KarinEngstrom@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, August 22, 2002 12:01 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov; management_plan@rl.gov
Cc: mpow461@ECY.WA.GOV; office@heartofamericanorthwest.org; Geno1924@aol.com
Subject: DOE/EIS -0286D

August 22, 2002

To: Michael Collins
US Dept. of Energy
PO Box 550, A6-38
Richland, WA 99352
solid_waste_eis__-_doe@rl.gov

Yvonne Sherman
US Dept. of Energy
PO Box 550 A7-75
Richland, WA 99352
management_plan@rl.gov

From: Karin Engstrom karinengstrom@aol.com
PO Box 84245 Seattle, WA 98124
206/937-2605

Re: DOE/EIS-02861 EIS Draft for Hanford Site Solid Waste Program
Performance Management Plan for Accelerated Clean Up

I have read and agree with the comments of Max Power from the Washington Department of Ecology and Gerald Pollet, JD of the Heart of America Northwest regarding DOE/EIS-02861.

The reason I am writing both of you is that these plans seem to contradict one another. I understand you and your staff have a very difficult planning task. Your proposals and decisions impact the health and well-being of our Northwest environment including the rocks, soils, water, air, animals (including us humans) and plants. We are all connected and affected by these plans.

I ask you to consider and answer the following questions:

1 1. How can we reduce risk of nuclear contamination and restore the Columbia River if more storage of nuclear waste (whether high or low level) from other sources is being considered to store at the Hanford site?

2 On the radio this morning, I heard that a shipment of nuclear waste left Hanford for New Mexico today. Are we exchanging one type of nuclear waste

E014

49

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: susan gideon [susanmarsh1@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 11, 2002 9:12 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford

Mr. Collins,

1 I urge the Department of Energy to provide the public with an adequate analysis of all the impacts to human and environmental health, including risks from groundwater contamination,
2 transportation accident, and how importing this waste effects the future cleanup of the Hanford site. The current Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement does not address these risks.

I am extremely concerned about this latest plan for Hanford.

Sincerely,
Susan M. Gideon
19539 NE 181st Street
Woodinville, WA 98072

E015

Amaya, Jodi P

From: ^Solid Waste EIS - DOE
Sent: Tuesday, July 23, 2002 9:58 AM
To: Amaya, Jodi P; Abrams, Cynthia
Cc: Rhoads, Kathleen
Subject: FW: No more dumping of radioactive wastes at Hanford!

-----Original Message-----
From: Gennykortes@aol.com [mailto:Gennykortes@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2002 7:11 AM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@RL.gov
Subject: No more dumping of radioactive wastes at Hanford!

1 Please do NOT implement the plan to dump 70,000 more truckloads of radioactive wastes in unlined trenches at Hanford.

E016

From: S L Spence [mailto:slspence@spiritone.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 21, 2002 10:40 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Cc: Ken D ROSENBERG; John Stull
Subject: Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact

July 15, 2002

Mr. Michael Collins
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550, A6-38
Richland, WA, 99352

Dear Mr. Collins:

I am writing you as a citizen concerned with the cleanup of Hanford, one of the most contaminated places in the world. I am also writing you as an experienced analyst of health data, including cancer and birth defects incidence, prevalence, and cluster data.

1 The U.S. Department of Energy is proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which increases the risk to life and health of all living beings, including the human ones. When you risk soil and groundwater contamination, you risk the health and well being of every member of the population residing for an unknown length of time in an unknown vicinity of that soil or groundwater -- including those yet to be born. The fact alone that you can not know the extent
2 of damage you may do should deter you from this action. It should not cause you to assume the action is appropriate because unfavorable results have not been demonstrated. Have we so quickly forgotten the events on the border between Texas and Mexico? Infants born with no brain function and no hope of survival.

While there may be unknowns, much is known about the dangers of radioactive waste. Please explain how you have adequately addressed the following human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS):

3 * What will be the risks of an increase in waste received from other nuclear weapons plants, labs and private companies and stored as proposed? Are these

E017

3 (cont) risks of direct poisoning by the radioactive hazard or risks of contamination of the groundwater?

* What is the relative risk of using unlined soil trenches with limited groundwater monitoring vs. other alternatives, such as lined and continuously monitored trenches?

4 * If the groundwater proves to be contaminated, what risks does it present, can the groundwater contamination be cleaned up, and how much will it cost to clean up the water? What would the cleanup process, completeness, and cost be if a safer method were used?

5 * What is the liability that the taxpayer will have to assume if contaminated groundwater is later associated with increased cancer cases or birth defects? What is the risk of the taxpayer assuming that liability if an alternative, safer approach is used?

6 * The U.S. Department of Energy's proposal to increase the amount of waste coming to Hanford and the number of truckloads containing waste increases the risk of accidents. What is the increased transportation risk of

7 importing 70,000 truckloads of radioactive waste, who is at risk, and what measures can be taken in the event of a radioactive waste spill? Would any of those measures be new to the persons required to carry them out, because the transportation route is new?

8 * In light of these concerns, how are U.S. taxpayers to view the recent discussions about allowing the U.S. Department of Energy to reclassify solid waste without oversight?

9 I urge you consider the impact of your actions on our children and grandchildren. If you are unable to define

10 that impact, consider the current cost to the taxpayer of special epidemiogolical teams brought in after the fact, projects to clean superfund sites, and the ongoing cost of unforseen problems and illnesses because of the lack of success in decontaminating those sites. Please do not

11 defer until after the damage is done a complete assessment of the risks involved. Please consider now the risks of importing and burying waste, the risks of the lack of a plan to monitor and clean the existing radioactive waste dump sites already at Hanford, the risks to the health of the public, and the possible financial burden on the public. **E017a**

Sincerely,
Sherry Spence
Maternal and Child Health (MCH)
Data Systems Coordinator

cc: Dr. Ken Rosenberg, MCH Epidemiologist
Dr. John Stull, Pediatrician, birth defects researcher

E017b

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: gerry-pollet [gerry-pollet@msn.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2002 12:17 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Cc: hoa; amber@heartofamericanorthwest.org
Subject: Additional documents and comments to be considered as part of Heart of America Northwest comments on Hanford Site Solid Waste EIS

To: Micheal Collins, USDOE NEPA Document Manager
FR: Gerald Pollet, Executive Director, Heart of America Northwest
Date: Aug. 11, 2002

1 Please fully consider and revise the Draft EIS (and then reissue it for public comment, per our prior comments) to include the comments submitted to USDOE-Richland by our organization on the Draft Environmental Assessment for Trench Construction and Operation in the 218-E-12B and 218-W-5 Low-Level Burial Grounds, Hanford Site (DOE/EA-1371), March 28, 2001. The comments on the Draft EA were to be taken into account by USDOE for the scope of analysis in the Draft EIS, covering expansion of the same bruial grounds. However, USDOE has failed to either respond to our extensive comments on the Draft EA or address the issues raised in our comments in the current Draft EIS (Hanford Site Solid Waste EIS).

2 Please also fully consider and include in the scope of the revised EIS, our cross-site comparison contained in the Citizens' guide prepared for the Draft EIS hearings. This has been separately delivered to USDOE staff at the public hearings, and will be resent in the mail.

3 Specifically, we expect the Draft EIS to be reissued considering the following as presented in our prior comments, as well as other points raised in those comments: a) only the waste volumes previously considered for the national programmatic decisions on which the current EIS relies, as considered in USDOE's 1997 Waste Management Programmatic EIS (WMPEIS) - any consideration of waste shipments to Hanford, and disposal at Hanford, of waste quantities or types not fully considered in the WMPEIS will not be in compliance with the requirements of NEPA; b) discussion in our prior

4 comments of the need to consider the reasonable laternative of utilizing offsite, commercial, regulated Low-Level Waste disposal at a site that has not released hazardous substances to the environment (SEE Section 3 of our Draft EA comments). USDOe can not dismiss this reasonable alternative for those waste streams for which such disposal is

5 available; c) charging all generators the fully burdened, long-term costs of disposal, including creation of segregated long-term monitoring and closure funds (per Sec. 2 of our commetns on the Draft EA).

E018

Secretary, The

From: MESSA@VICLINK.COM
Sent: Tuesday, August 27, 2002 4:31 PM
To: the.secretary@HQ.DOE.GOV
Subject: Environmental Quality

FROM: MESSA@VICLINK.COM
NAME: MARTHA MESSA
SUBJECT: Environmental Quality
ZIP: 97132
CITY: NEWBERG
PARM.1: TO:the.secretary@hq.doe.gov
STATE: OR
TOPIC: HAZARDOUS WASTE
SUBMIT: Send Comments
CONTACT: email
COUNTRY: USA

MESSAGE: Mr. Michael Collins, I am in agreement with Senator Ron
1 Wyden's opposition to the Department of Energy plan to ship radioactive waste from around the country through the state of Oregon to Hanford. Trucks laden with radioactive waste should not move through major metropolitan areas possible endangering the lives and welfare of large population centers. In addition,
2 Hanford is already considered the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere. It therefore should be designated for a cleanup -- not more radioactive waste. Let's focus on other
3 forms of energy that don't cost us so dearly in cleanup, threats to our lives and health and to our environment. Sincerely, Martha Messa
MAILADDR: 701 EAST FRANKLIN STREET

E019

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Julian Powers [julianjane@icehouse.net]
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2002 6:18 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Form posted from Microsoft Internet Explorer.

comments=Michael Collins
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550, A6-38
Richland, WA 99352

Re: Hanford Radioactive Waste

Dear Mr. Collins,

1 The approach of putting 70,000 truckloads of radioactive waste in UNLINED trenches at Hanford is ludicrous. Yes, no problem for a decade or so. Long term this is idiotic. I have not heard of a more irresponsible proposed action on a serious, really long-term
2 problem. Just what would be required to mitigate problems of leaching? Are you going to say: "merely remove the bad waste and put it somewhere else?"

3 This proposed action would be comical except that it has such significant negative impacts on future generations.

I would appreciate a complete response to my comments.

Sincerely,

firstname=Julian
lastname=Powers
address=2028 S. Adams
state=Spokane, WA
zip=99203-1238

E020

481

Collins, Michael S

From:	Collins, Michael S
Sent:	Wednesday, August 14, 2002 7:01 AM
To:	'Eileen Newman'
Cc:	Collins, Michael S
Subject:	RE: Hanford Meeting - Portland

I will be happy to get the comment added to the letter.

-----Original Message-----
From: Eileen Newman [mailto:eileen14800@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2002 12:00 AM
To: michael_s_collins@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford Meeting - Portland

Hi Michael,

I had thought the meeting was for this Wednesday (8/14), not next Wednesday. Unfortunately, I have plans for that night. (If things change, I will be at the meeting.)

I would appreciate it if you would transfer the comment below to the public record. Thanks!

- Eileen Newman

I attended the Public Meeting on July 30 and felt very distressed and sad by what I heard. I moved to Portland five years ago and have enjoyed my stay.

At the meeting, I learned that there are currently trucks containing radioactive materials moving up the I-5 corridor to Highway 84 (through Portland) toward Hanford. I live near I-5 in the Portland area and no longer feel safe.

1 To top it off, the DOE plans to send a portion of the additional 70,000 truckloads of radioactive waste on I-5 and Highway 84 through the center of Portland. I would not want to be on the highway near one of these trucks. (What are the health impacts of riding near one of the trucks?) I also wonder about the impact of a truck accident and cleanup. I do not understand why traveling though the highly populated city of Portland is considered okay by the government of the United States.

Also, a few months ago, I learned that there was an on-going cleanup effort at Hanford and that the Columbia River in the Portland area was already contaminated by leaching from Hanford. I had thought
2 that was the worst news until I attended the July 30th meeting and heard about the 70,000 additional truckloads of radioactive waste scheduled for delivery/transport to Hanford. Why add to an already bad situation?

E021

1

After the July 30th meeting, I cried. I wanted to make Portland my long-term home. I like the people and the area. However, the DOE meeting taught me that I need to move away from I-5 (to stay away from the current radioactive waste filled trucks) soon and leave the area completely when the massive trucking starts. I hate to think about what impact this new plan will have on the people of Portland - to the water, health, wildlife, long-term livability, and more. 3

Please, DOE and rest of US Government, please, please rethink this plan. The people of Portland and the Northwest deserve something better. Please show heart and save this wonderful region and it's people....

Eileen Newman
Lake Oswego, Oregon

E021a

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Al Johnson [AJohnson@starbucks.com]
Sent: Friday, August 23, 2002 3:23 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: No More Radioactive Waste at Hanford

Michael Collins
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550, A6-38
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mike,
I am writing to urge you to stop plans to import more nuclear waste to Hanford. Common sense tells you to focus on cleaning up the existing mess, rather than adding to it. 1
Please provide me the courtesy of a reply to indicate you received this letter, and are taking it seriously.
Sincerely,

Al Johnson
1101 NW Norcross Way
Seattle, WA 98177

E022

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Lynn Ford [lynf69@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, August 23, 2002 2:28 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Fwd: Comments re: HSWEIS

--- Lynn Ford <lynf69@yahoo.com> wrote:
> Date: Thu, 22 Aug 2002 14:14:18 -0700 (PDT)
> From: Lynn Ford <lynf69@yahoo.com>
> Subject: Comments re: HSWEIS
> To: solid_waste_eis_doe@rl.gov
>
> Michael Collins, NEPA Document Manager, U.S. Department of Energy Richlands
> Operations Office
>
> Mr. Collins:
> The Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is unacceptable and
> must be withdrawn and done over. If the workers who actually engineer, run
> and
> build the nation's nuclear facilities did their work as poorly as the Draft
> has
> been designed and written, we all would have died of radiation poisoning

E023

> already. But there is still one parallel with the original operation and
> building of Hanford. Under the pressure of wartime emergency, immediate
> results overruled long term considerations. That approach is the source of
> leaking tanks, polluted groundwater, and radioactive waste scattered in
> unmarked and unrecorded holes. In short, a site U.S. Sen. Ron Wyden called
> the
> most polluted in the Western Hemisphere.
> After more than a decade of concerted struggle by activists, honest nuclear
> professionals and public servants to bring some balance to the Dept. of
> Energy's priorities and get progress cleaning up the site, this document
> shows
1 > the Dept. and this administration are dedicated to ignoring the fate of the
> land and water and wildlife and people of the Northwest to promote the
> pursuit
> of war. That is the source of this document's underlying logic, which is do
> it quick and dirty to save cleanup money for building better bombs. That is
> why this Draft ignores huge categories of impacts, and why it is cloaked in
2 > circular rationalizations, referring back to the Programmatic EIS, which
> floated on the ether of promises to analyze impacts in the Solid Wasted EIS,
> which now blithely floats on the coasts along on an ephemeral Record of an
> arbitrary Decision based not on data but on bureaucratic fiat.
> The Draft EIS ignores the specific environmental effects of the original
3 > "quick and dirty" approach by imposing more waste without cleaning up what is
> already there or even limiting or specifically delineating the quantity or
> characteristics of the proposed additions.
> The Draft exclusion of transportation impacts is specious and totally without
> foundation, citing the PEIS for ignoring the effects of thousands of
4 > truckloads
> of nuclear waste pouring through hundreds of town, near homes, schools,
> offices, parks, factories, and local toxic sites, over deteriorating Oregon
> roads and over cracked Oregon bridges. Nearly all of it will bottleneck
> through eastern Oregon, where a state highway supervisor already testified to
> the frequency of winter road closures by weather. The same weather
> frequently
> comes howling down the Columbia Gorge straight for Portland. What are the
> chances of Portland getting a glowing Rudolph Xmas present of a glowing
> radioactive snowstorm? Maybe annually, maybe never, maybe it will only get
> to
> Hood River. The Draft simply doesn't say.
> The measure of the Draft's poor quality and the Department's disdain for
> human
> and is that even the Tri-Cities representatives on the Hanford Advisory Board
> agreed to a unanimous advisory utterly rejecting the draft and demanding that
5 > the Department withdraw and completely revamp it . That would probably also
> involve doing the same with the Programmatic EIS. That is the minimum
> action
> that would provide any assurance of adequate environmental and protection.
> Please provide a written response to me at my address:
> Lynn Ford
> 401 N. Blandena St.
> Portland, OR 97217

E023a

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Joyce & Len Farr [ljfarr@koalas.com]
Sent: Monday, August 26, 2002 9:47 AM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: The Hanford Waste Dump

1 Dear Mr. Collins, Please stop the Hanford Waste Dump! It is important to save the Columbia River & protect our citizens. Thank you, Joyce Farr

E024

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: NeilEMcCauley@webtv.net
Sent: Monday, July 29, 2002 9:08 AM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford public comment

1 I am not in favor of adding anything to the Hanford reservation until the existing hazard abatement and cleanup program is accomplished.

2 The problem with the Hanford site at this time is the same lack of preparation for the results of its missions as would be perpetuated by continuing to add any additional radioactive material to the site without the establishment of funding and procedures sufficient to provide adequate security.

It would be absurd to establish a new program with contemporary standards in order to handle new waste material, without first providing for what is now a condition of negligence and hazard.

Neil McCauley
2609 NE 53rd Street
Vancouver WA 98663-1923

E025

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Mark Wahl [mathman@markwahl.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 30, 2002 3:19 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford Solid Waste EIS

Dear Mr. Collins, et al.,
1 I expect a thorough and honest Environmental Impact Statement regarding plans to dump even more radioactive waste at the Hanford Site which has not as yet experienced any kind of reasonable cleanup. The Columbia is now
2 threatened by poorly tended waste from years of activity and it is a real stretch to postulate that the new waste plans will do anything other than distract funds and manpower from the cleanup and add to potential pollution scenarios. Isn't there something ironic in hauling waste to be stored to the most polluted site in North America? (Unless of course the DOE would just like to write off the site--and the Columbia-- as a total loss.)
Please enter a "no" on the storage plan in my name.
Regards,
Mark Wahl

E026

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Hazlett [hazlett@aracnet.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2002 4:35 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Bush Administration/DOE Plan to Truck 70,000 Loads of Radioactive Waste to Hanford

Mr. Collins,
I attended the Public Meeting in Portland last night, July 30,2002. I was appalled to learn that some waste is already being
1 trucked to Hanford. If we can't clean up what's there...it is leaking into the Columbia River...what sense does it make to
2 truck more in, possibly for burial in unlined trenches. I feel badly when people treat you and other members of the DOE
3 disrespectfully but frankly I too am getting sick and tired of attending meetings about new uses for Hanford and more
4&5 waste at Hanford. I don't like nuclear power, I don't like nuclear waste and I don't want it in my state. I say whatever state generates it should be forced to store it. I am angry that Hanford has been allowed to become the toxic site that it has. I
6 want it cleaned up. I want no new waste brought there. I only want what's there cleaned up.
Pat Hazlett

E027

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Larry Asher [larrya@workerbees.com]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2002 7:55 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: STOP the Hanford Radioactive Waste Dump

Mr. Collins,

1 Before allowing more loads of waste to be brought into Hanford, I'm urging you to provide the public with an adequate analysis of all the impacts to human and environmental health, including risks from groundwater contamination, transportation accident, and how importing this waste effects the future cleanup of the Hanford site. The current Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement does not address these risks.

2 With millions of people and millions more animals living right outside Hanford's back door, anything less than a thorough analysis of the risks of accepting this waste is not acceptable. Thank you very much for your serious consideration of my request.

Larry Asher
2935 71st Ave. SE
Mercer Island, WA 98040

E028

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Kathy [kathroyce@attbi.com]
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2002 7:21 PM
To: Kathy Royce; Solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov; Nancy Crumpacker
Subject: Hanford

Michael Collins
USDOE
Richland Operations Office
(Attn: HSW EIS)
PO Box 550 MSIN A6-38
Richland, Wa 99352

Fax 509/372-1926
email: <Solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov>

Dear Mr. Collins,

1 As I review the history and mission of Hanford, I become acutely aware that the current move to increase the load of toxic waste onto this site is contrary to Hanford's purpose. Adding many tons of toxins to unlined waste
2 troughs to drain eventually into our ground and river water is not only contrary, it's alarming. The potential destruction from the storage of
3 these wastes is magnified by the transport for their deposit.
As a health care worker I am dismayed that we are seeing an evergrowing increase in various types of neurologic disease and cancers in adults and CHILDREN.
4 While we can't specifically pinpoint their origin to be tied to nuclear waste, it only makes sense that we use prudent judgement in protecting our environment from accidental spills and contaminated ground water.

5 Please readdress the information gathered regarding environmental costs. While it may seem like a good business move for the community, I expect that the environmental costs and the subsequent effect on all of us and our families will not make the short-term economic uplift to be worth the cost.
Please study the issues and listen to your conscience/heart.

Kathy Royce, RN, Breast Cancer Survivor
Board of Directors, Rachel's Friends, Breast Cancer Coalition

E029

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Amber Waldref [amber@heartofamericanorthwest.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2002 9:37 AM
To: 'solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov'
Subject: FW: Hanford, WA

ATT00004.html

Please take this comment into consideration. It was sent to me by mistake.

Thanks

-----Original Message-----
From: dalecalkin [SMTP:calkindale@qwest.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2002 1:49 AM
To: amber@heartofamericanorthwest.org
Subject: Hanford, WA

To Whom It May Concern:

1 I am afraid that with Hanford continuing to operate and the collection of hazardous waste will inevitable contaminate "our" wonderful Columbia River. Please, STOP these procedures of escalation of nuclear
2 waste, now.
Sincerely, a concerned citizen. Dr. Dale M. Calkin

E030

Page 1 of 1

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Angie [mayas@centurytel.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2002 4:39 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@RL.gov
Subject: Hanford dumping

1 Please reduce or stop the waste buried at Hanford. Stop the plans to increase the waste – I understand that in Jan2003 the amount planned for dumping will be doubled. Our waters need to be contaminated
2 less NOT MORE. Please!

Angela May
PO Box 2414
Gig Harbor, WA 98335
253.858.3290

E031

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Rachel Steele [rachelray@wpsr.org]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2002 4:01 PM
To: solid_waste_EIS_-_DOE@RL.gov
Subject: comment on Solid Waste EIS

Dear Michael Collins:

1 Please provide a full analysis of the impacts of the Solid Waste EIS on public and environmental health. I feel very strongly that NO MORE radioactive—including mixed
2 waste—should be imported to Hanford without this analysis or before the soil and ground water are cleaned up.

Sincerely,
Rachel Ray Steele

E032

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: JUllstrom@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2002 9:05 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Draft DOE Proposal for Hanford

Michael Collins
US Department of Energy
PO Box 550, A6-38
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mr. Collins:

1 I am writing you at this time as I have been informed that the U. S. Department of Energy has proposed storing a large amount of additional radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches at Hanford.

While I cannot claim expert knowledge of all of the technical details and
2 issues involved in this proposal, I am aware that there is already a problem of groundwater contamination at Hanford and that there is a large clean-up activity in progress to try to reduce this problem. It does not seem reasonable to store additional waste in a manner that seems certain to result in additional contamination in the future.

I urge you to reconsider this action and to expend whatever additional effort is needed to find a solution that is safe for both the citizens of the Northwest and of the Nation.

I would appreciate your response to my comments.

Respectfully,

John E. Ullstrom
18133 NE 196th Street
Woodinville, WA 98072

jullstrom@aol.com

E033

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Beth Call [trollshouse@bmi.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2002 1:10 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@RL.gov
Subject: Fw: NO MORE RADIOACTIVE WASTE AT HANFORD!

----- Original Message -----
From: Beth Call <mailto:trollshouse@bmi.net>
To: solid_waste_eis_eis_-_doe@rl.gov <mailto:solid_waste_eis_eis_-_doe@rl.gov>
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2002 1:07 PM
Subject: NO MORE RADIOACTIVE WASTE AT HANFORD!

1 I write to express my strong opposition to burying more Radioactive Waste at Hanford. It is insane to store nuclear waste
2 in unlined trenches which will inevitably contaminate groundwater flowing toward the Columbia River, bringing birth
3 defects, illness, and death, not only to those living now, but to future generations for thousands of years to come. Not even ordinary household waste is stored in unlined trenches. Concentrated poisonous fumes of carbon tetrachloride are already spewing out of one of the trenches.

4 You do not even consider in your Environmental Impact Statement the immediate risks of terrorism or accident in shipping nuclear waste across the country, some containing deadly plutonium.

5 Your plan could more than double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined sooil trenches at Hanford. How can Hanford take on more waste when the present deadly waste in the tanks has yet to be glassified so it can be stored in relative safety? In fact the present Administration proposes to CUT funds for Hanford Cleanup!

Please do NOT sacrifice the lives of those living in the Columbia Basin and along the Pacific Coast for what you must see as "the greater good"!

Thank you,
Beth Call
102 Otis St.
Walla Walla, WA

E034

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: A. Stevens [astevens@u.washington.edu]
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2002 1:19 PM
To: solid_waste_EIS_-_DOE@RL.gov
Subject: HSW-EIS

1 Dear Mr. Collins: The proposed draft of the Hanford Solid Waste EIS seems to be quite inadequate, in that it certainly does NOT protect public and environmental health.

2 It fails to include adequate analysis for upcoming decisions about importing and burying low level and mixed radioactive waste, and about expanding unlined soil trenches for their disposal. Of course, unlined
3 burial trenches permit ultimate leakage of radioactivity into soil and thence into the Columbia River.

4 The EIS shold disclose impacts to groundwater and to human health.

It should include an adequate consideration of endangered species.

5 It should present an alternative to importing low level waste from other sites.

6 I believe the EIS should be withdrawn and revised. No more radioactive waste should be brought to Hanford until the existing waste burden is under control.

As a retired medical oncologist, quite aware of the long term effects of radiation on a population, I feel strongly that the DOE is not doing a good job.

Sincerely,

Alexander R. Stevens MD
5711 N.E. 77th St.
Seattle WA 98115
206-525-8895

E035

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: AmyStrange.com [davepa@speakeasy.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2002 12:46 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: ATTN: HSW EIS

ATTN: HSW EIS

To: Michael Collins,

The Draft Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Program Environmental Impact Statement (HSW EIS) does not really address many things, but specifically the following three issues:

1 1) the toxic seepage into the watertable from past toxic waste dumping, or future dumpings (especially and specifically) in unlined trenches,

2 2) characterization of past and future waste, and

3 3) future harm to future generations of humans and animals and plants and all present and future life on earth for thousands of decades and maybe even more

4 In conclusion, I don't think this draft HSW EIS adequately addresses the above mentioned three issues, and not to mention the problems raised by our current war on terrorism.

Thank you for reading and taking into consideration my comments above,

Dave Ayotte
3043 59th Avenue SW #2
Seattle, Washington 98116
206.933.8298

E036

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Karin Link [kmurr25@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2002 8:39 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Further radioactive shipment to Hanford

Dear Mr. Collins,

As a resident of Washington State (and sometime resident of Oregon), I strongly urge you to reconsider the shipment of 70,000 truckloads of radioactive waste through Oregon to the Hanford site. Dumping more
1 radioactive waste will have a permanently deleterious effect on the Columbia River. From what I understand this radioactive waste is to be left in
2 unlined trenches: soil and groundwater will be further contaminated. Health hazards in the Hanford area are already very great, as a result of similar
3 conditions. This situation has already lead to numerous cancer deaths in the immediate region and will increasingly impact all of us. It is unthinkable that any of us should be put at further risk. The diseases that result from this shipment and from badly contained radioactive waste at Hanford will be truly horrible.

Thank you very much for your attention, Karin Link

E037

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Michelle.K.Poyourow@directory.reed.edu
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2002 11:22 AM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Dumping at Hanford

To Whom it May Concern,

I heard recently that the DOE has plans to dump radioactive waste at Hanford on the Columbia River.
1 I think it's absurd to take such a huge step backward. I know that this waste must be disposed of, and that whatever site is ultimately chosen will have to be in someone's backyard, but there must be better alternatives to dumping at the Columbia river.
2 This year and last year the salmon runs were greater than they have been in a long time. Pacific Northwest residents are excited and optimistic about the future of the Columbia. We know it will never be returned to it's original state, but maintaining some it's beauty and it's resources is very important to us. Dumping more waste at Hanford does the opposite. While it may be a short term solution, I can't imagine that it works out well for Columbia residents, farmers, fisherman, recreationists, businesses and tourists in the long run. On top of that, how will all of this waste be
3 transported? On crowded urban and suburban highways? In Mac trucks? Tell me when so I can stay off the roads.
What a poor choice.
4 Find somewhere else to dump the junk, and I'll buy renewable energy so there's less junk in the future.
Thanks,

Michelle Poyourow
Reed College
Portland, OR

E038

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Maharamtri@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2002 9:09 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: No Subject

Attention: Michael Collins

1 Of course I am in opposition to the plan to bring seventy thousand dumploads of radioactive waste anywhere, but I certainly don't want it here in the
2 Northwest.

3 We need to keep our rivers clean, our land sound, if that is possible, and our people healthy.

Please hear our voices.

E039

Thank you, Trish Maharam

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Dangerama [dangerama@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 15, 2002 9:02 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford dumping

1&2 | Mr. Collins I am writing to urge you to not dump anymore radioactive waste into unlined trenches at Hanford. This a health
3 | disaster waiting to happen. Please improve or change this policy.

Sincerely yours,

Mark Mac Donald
Seattle, WA

E040

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Gail Owens [caliope@myexcel.com]
Sent: Friday, August 23, 2002 11:20 AM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@RL.gov
Subject: Fw: Hanford Radioactive Waste Dump

In addition, in case it hasn't occurred to you, all that travelling radioactive material would be an extreme security risk multiplied many times...irrestible targets for terrorists. ...GO

----- Original Message -----
From: Gail Owens <mailto:caliope@myexcel.com>
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov <mailto:solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2002 7:46 PM
Subject: Hanford Radioactive Waste Dump

Michael Collins
U.S. Department of Energy

I am a concerned citizen writing about serious issues near my home. I was born under the shadow of Hanford in Benton County, Washington State. I now live near Portland, Oregon, but still on the banks of the Columbia River.

1 | Hanford is an unsafe storage place for the nuclear waste it holds now. There are several known groundwater leaks with great potential hazard to the Columbia River and populations of Washington and Oregon. To transport more waste,
2 | strewing contamination all along the way, not to mention the potential for catastrophic accident is unneccessary. The Columbia River and the I-5/ I-84 corridors are far from low populated and relatively safe areas to transport such waste.
3 | Your commission must do a more complete analysis and publicise the results.
4 | The alternative of leaving waste materials where they are and doing local disposal case by case should be a much safer solution.

Please respond to this post.

Gail Owens
130 S.E. Whitney St.
Camas, WA 98607

E041

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Judith W Ginn [rjginn@juno.com]
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2002 8:01 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: nuclear waste disposal

Dear Mr. Collins,

1 It has come to my attention that there is a proposal to put solid waste at Hanford in Washington State in unlined trenches. I must tell you that I think that is sheer folly and negligence. NEVER should waste be just dumped. Please do not do this and also please oppose
2 any other plans to simply dump waste. ALL waste should be disposed of properly, i.e. composed, reused, recycled, properly contained so as not to enter ground water, rivers, lakes, etc. We do
3 not want to leave a giant mess behind us. It is very poor stewardship. After all, the land is not ours to destroy. We are only caretakers of the earth.

Judith W. Ginn
4818 East Mercer Way
Mercer Island, WA 98040

E042

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Kim Schmidt [kimbawitch05@wildmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2002 10:52 AM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Radioactive waste at Hanford

Mr. Collins:

1 I am extremely concerned to hear the plan by the US Dept of Energy to dump 70,000 tons of nuclear waste at Hanford, OR.

2 I strongly urge you STOP this action and to provide the public with an adequate analysis of all the impacts to human and environmental health, including risks from groundwater contamination, transportation accident, and how
3 importing this waste effects the future cleanup of the Hanford site. The current Solid Waste Environmental Impact
4 Statement does not address these risks!!!!

PLEASE Don't encourage the Bush administration to pollute our earth!

Thank you
Kim Schmidt
5724 Owens Drive
Pleasanton CA 94588

E043

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: David Paul Meyer [paulmeyer@seanet.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2002 9:23 AM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@RL.gov
Subject: Waste at Hanford

Dear Mr. Collins:

1 I attended the hearing in Seattle on Aug 7 and while I understand that something needs to be done with the waste materials discussed in the EIS, I do not understand why adequate containers are not required and a safe
2 transport plan is not in place before Hanford or anyplace else is designated for this function. Handford clean up is woefully lagging even its very liberal schedules for completion, and because of that, the plan to bring
3 more material into the area is not sensible. Clean up should be top priority and must be brought back on schedule before any addition pollution is brought to Hanford.

Sincerely,

Paul Meyer
4900 S. Hudson
Seattle WA 98118

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: rowren@attbi.com
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2002 11:02 AM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford Clean-up

1 It is most more than troubling that you are considering shipping more nuclear wast into the Hanford Site.
2 It is my understanding that the truck-load sof waste will be stored in unlined trenches.

We try to minimize our impact on the environment by using car wash facilities, discarding paint, etc. properly to protect our environment.

3 Why does our government so casually dumps nuclear waste, that will be around for thousands of years, into a common ditch?

This is a very unaccebtable and needs to be stopped imme

E045

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: BethOrDave Meshke [bdmeshke@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2002 5:33 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford Solid Waste EIS Public Comment

I have a statement on the Hanford Solid Waste
1 Environmental Impact Statement. I oppose importing
radioactive waste to Hanford. The waste already there
2 is polluting the Columbia river. The waste at Hanford
3 should be cleaned up, not increased. Groundwater will
4 be contaminated if more waste is stored at Hanford,
5 especially since they use unlined trenches. It is an
invitation to terrorists and other disasters to put
6 deadly nuclear waste on trucks and drive it to Hanford
day after day.

David Meshke
27310 112th St E
Buckley WA 98321

E046

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Anne [annchr@attbi.com]
Sent: Friday, August 23, 2002 1:13 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford Nuclear Reservation

Hanford Nuclear Reservation

1 Stop the waste disposal at this site please
Anne J Christensen

E047

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Betsy Mendelsohn [b_mendelsohn@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 23, 2002 12:29 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford

Dear Secretary,

Please reject the current proposal to deposit more radioactive waste at
1 Hanford.

The reservation and land downwind (or downplume) should not be condemned as
a national sacrifice zone. The proposed plan to accept radioactive waste
2 does not provide adequate containment and will therefore increase the amount
of radioactive leachate from the reservation.

3 Removal of radioactive waste from one part of the country should not expose
people elsewhere to a higher risk. If containment cannot be done without
4 leakage at Hanford under the current proposal, then you should reject the
proposal.

Regards,

Betsy Mendelsohn
Postdoctoral Fellow in the History of the Environment and Technology
Division of Technology, Culture and Communications
School of Engineering and Applied Sciences
University of Virginia
PO Box 400744
Charlottesville VA 22904-4744
434-924-6113

E048

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Kerry Schaefer [kladybug4@wildmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2002 9:40 AM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford EIS Public Comment

1 I grew up in Hood River, playing in the Columbia River and enjoying the plants and wildlife. Back then I didn't know how lucky I was. Now, returning to the valley after five years away I realize how unique and special this area is. I want it to stay that way. As I leave and return, and eventually settle here there is no good reason it should change. But if the Hanford mess doesn't get cleaned up it will.

2 In high school people joked about how the windsurfers glowed at night from the toxic waste polluting our river. Though we knew there was some truth to it, we laughed and jumped back in the river unconcerned for our health. And so it will be. The children, adults and tourists will continue to enjoy the river and thus endanger their health. And you, the DOE, wants to put more waste in Hanford.

3 I understand that the solid waste, which you plan to place here won't leak as the liquid waste did before, but that's not the point. The point is that you can't clean up some place while you are putting more mess on top of it. Hanford desperately needs to be cleaned up. The mess that is there has unfortunately become an ingrained part of the environment, the ecosystem, around us. Therefore, you can't write an EIS that doesn't consider the waste that is already there. An EIS, according to the CRCIA guidelines you agreed to use in 1998, all aspects of the ecosystem which would be affected. You can't do that correctly if you don't represent the current ecosystem correctly in the first place.

4 And what else is going to be affected? We already know that the fish are coming into contact with the waste. Fish which we ship around the world. So your mess is not only harming the local Pacific Northwesterners, but the entire world population.

At the forum that was held in Hood River about this EIS many identified themselves as not only Oregonians, but Americans as well. Another added on saying that we are not just Oregonians, but humans. Well, I'm an Oregonian, an American and human, but, more importantly, I'm an inhabitant of this earth. As inhabitants with the biggest brain capacity it is up to us to protect this world for all the other inhabitants - humans, plants, animals alike. With our big brains we've been able to totally screw up the earth, someday soon we'd better try to use these brains to turn it around again.

5 The earth does not belong to us, we belong to it. It gives us life. What would you do if you couldn't breathe? Die. What would you do if you couldn't eat? Die. These are long term effects

E049

4 (cont) of uncleaned up waste. Take that into consideration when you rewrite that EIS.

5 By adding waste to Hanford, or anything less than making a concerted effort to clean up the mess that is already there, we are failing in our duty to this earth and all it inhabitants. Please consider all these inhabitants in your next draft of the EIS, only then will it be complete and truly comprehensive.

Thank you for your time.

Kerry Schaefer
3725 Thomsen Road
Hood River, OR 97031
(541) 354-2095
KLadybug4@wildmail.com

Care2 make the world greener!
Your Actions Can Help!
Support Strong Environmental Protections
http://www.care2.com/go/z/2532

E049a

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Csilvrbllt@aol.com
Sent: Friday, August 23, 2002 8:42 AM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: dumping at hanford

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

1 Please do not bring in 70 thousand truck loads of waste to Hanford.

2 Please do not bury the waste in unlined ditches.

Thank you for your time to read this message.

E050

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Rich Maggiani [rich@pdicreative.com]
Sent: Friday, August 23, 2002 1:27 PM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford Nuclear Reservation

1 I am appalled that more nuclear waste is planned to be added to the waste
2 already leaking into the Columbia River from the Hanford Nuclear Reservation. This new material will only contribute to the existing problem,
3 a problem whose solution (a clean-up) is already underfunded.

Adding to this problem is not wise policy. As a corporate President and citizen, I oppose this policy wholeheartedly.

Richard P Maggiani
President/CEO
Page Designs Inc
Two Church Street, Suite 3A
Burlington, VT 05401
802.658.4207
802.658.8418 fax
www.pdicreative.com

E051

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Gail Owens [caliope@myexcel.com]
Sent: Friday, August 23, 2002 11:20 AM
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@RL.gov
Subject: Fw: Hanford Radioactive Waste Dump

1 In addition, in case it hasn't occurred to you, all that travelling radioactive material would be an extreme security risk multiplied many times...irrestible targets for terrorists. ...GO

----- Original Message -----
From: Gail Owens <mailto:caliope@myexcel.com>
To: solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov <mailto:solid_waste_eis_-_doe@rl.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2002 7:46 PM
Subject: Hanford Radioactive Waste Dump

Michael Collins
U.S. Department of Energy

I am a concerned citizen writing about serious issues near my home. I was born under the shadow of Hanford in Benton County, Washington State. I now live near Portland, Oregon, but still on the banks of the Columbia River.

Hanford is an unsafe storage place for the nuclear waste it holds now. There are several known groundwater leaks with great potential hazard to the Columbia River and populations of Washington and Oregon. To transport more waste, strewing contamination all along the way, not to mention the potential for catastrophic accident is unneccessary. The Columbia River and the I-5/ I-84 corridors are far from low populated and relatively safe areas to transport such waste. Your commission must do a more complete analysis and publicise the results.

The alternative of leaving waste materials where they are and doing local disposal case by case should be a much safer solution.

Please respond to this post.

Gail Owens
130 S.E. Whitney St.
Camas, WA 98607

E052