

E-0055 (contd)

ⁱ US EPA: "Analysis of What Radiation Dose Limit is Protective of Human Health at CERCLA Sites"; US Environmental Protection Agency, August 20, 1997.

ⁱⁱ See "Analysis of what Radiation Dose Limit is Protective of Human Health at CERCLA Sites (Including Review of dose Limits in NRC Decommissioning rule); U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, August 20, 1997; and, See NRC's Radiological Criteria for License Termination (see 62 FR 39058, July 21, 1997).

ⁱⁱⁱ "Systematic Radiological Assessment of Exemptions for Source and Byproduct Materials," NUREG-1717, June 2001, Advanced Technologies and Laboratories International, Inc. ("Options Paper: Exemption in 10 CFR 40 for <0.05% Source Material").

^{iv} 40 CFR 300; The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, 42 USCA 9601 et seq.

^v SEE Washington Model Toxics Control Act, and implementing regulations at Chapter 173-340 Washington Administrative Code.

^{vi} WMPEIS Section 8.2.1.1, page 8-10.

E-0056

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Jeremy Hale [jchalebop@msn.com]

Sent: Thursday, June 12, 2003 4:45 AM

To: hsweis@rl.gov

Mister Collins

- 1 | Please accept my lack of timlieness. As a member of our local community I would like to offer my full support of the Department of Energy's decision to repackage complex wide radioactive wastes including transuranic wastes. If there is anything I can do to further DOE's efforts either locally or statewide please don't hesitate to call on me. Have a very good day.

Sincerely

Jeremy C Hale

EM-0001 through EM-0214 corresponded to a mass e-mail submitted by separate addresses. EM-0001 is the representative e-mail presented for the group in this document. See Volume III Section 4 for all individuals who submitted EM-0002 through EM-0214.

EM-0001

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Christa de Lap [christa_de_lap@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2003 7:05 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford

Sample Letter:

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. You, the U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE), are proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination. Once again, you have failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your *Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS)*. I urge you to choose not to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this problem.

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS still fails in several ways:

1

- You do not include in your cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radio-nuclides, such as iodine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford. You must complete the inventory and classification of these wastes before you can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford.
- Dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for “thousands of years.” In your impact analysis, you have placed the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Allowing the groundwater to become contaminated destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.
- Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous “transuranic wastes.”
- The SW EIS contains several alternatives to line and monitor the burial trenches for radioactive waste. You do not provide any timeline for achieving this. I want these burial grounds to be lined by the end of 2003!
- Finally, you still do not provide an alternative in your EIS that would only assess burial of onsite Hanford cleanup waste. Your current “no action” alternative considers stopping all cleanup at Hanford – this is unacceptable!

We are spending billions of dollars cleanup up the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater?

EM-0001

1 | I ask again that you reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis. The *Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement* is still not responsive to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives. **I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches by the end of 2003.**

I would appreciate a complete response to my comments.

Sincerely,

EM-0001 through EM-0214 corresponded to a mass e-mail submitted by separate addresses. EM-0001 is the representative e-mail presented for the group in this document. See Volume III Section 4 for all individuals who submitted EM-0002 through EM-0214.

EM-0215

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE
From: andreaa@drizzle.com
Sent: Thursday, June 05, 2003 7:50 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Stop Waste Shipments to Hanford

Dear Michael Collins—

1 | We're writing to urge you to stop shipments of dangerous radioactive waste to Hanford. The focus needs to be on the cleanup of the dangerous nuclear waste stored there; the safety and security and the future of our state depend on it.

Sincerely,

Andrea Avni & Bart Arenson
8208 39th Avenue NE
Seattle, WA 98115
206.522.1291

EM-0216

This document was signed by two addressees.
See EM-0215 for the original e-mail that was submitted.

EM-0217 and EM-0218

These document numbers were assigned to an e-mail that was signed by three addressees.
See E-0043 for the original e-mail that was submitted.

EMM-0001

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE
From: cwstucki@attbi.com
Sent: Monday, May 05, 2003 4:53 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford SW EIS comments

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

Dear Mr. Michael Collins,

1

I am writing you as a citizen concerned with the cleanup of Hanford, one of the most contaminated places in the world. The U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) is proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination. I urge you to choose not to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this problem.

I would appreciate a response to my comments.

Sincerely,

Curtis W. Stucki
517 Carlyon Ave
Olympia, Washington 98501-3412

EMM-0002

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: lbubala@ingrouponline.com
Sent: Monday, May 05, 2003 7:13 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Clean up Hanford; my SW EIS comments

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

Dear Mr. Michael Collins,

As a Northwestern resident who knows people who have been working on cleaning up Hanford, I want to encourage you to further the cleanup operations. The U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) is proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination. Once again, you have failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS). I urge you to choose not to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this problem.

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS still fails in several ways:

- You do not include in your cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radionuclides, such as iodine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford. You must complete the inventory and classification of these wastes before you can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford.
- Dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for "thousands of years." In your impact analysis, you have placed the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Allowing the groundwater to become contaminated destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.
- Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous "transuranic wastes." * The SW EIS contains several alternatives to line and monitor the burial trenches for radioactive waste. You do not provide any timeline for achieving this, yet these burial grounds should be lined by the end of 2003.
- Finally, you still do not provide an alternative in your EIS that would only assess burial of onsite Hanford cleanup waste. Your current "no action" alternative considers something which is unacceptable—stopping all cleanup at Hanford.

We are spending billions of dollars to clean up the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater? I ask again that you reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive enough to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives.

I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches by the end of 2003.

I would appreciate a response to my comments.

Sincerely,

Jill Strawder-Bubala
1728 Columbia St.
Eugene, Oregon 97403-1903

EMM-0003

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE
From: kdhart5@juno.com
Sent: Monday, May 05, 2003 7:19 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford SW EIS comments

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

Dear Mr. Michael Collins,

Please think of the future of our children, when making such long term decisions!

I am writing you as a citizen concerned with the cleanup of Hanford, one of the most contaminated places in the world. The U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) is proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination. Once again, you have failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS). I URGE you to choose not to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, NOT to add more contamination to this problem.

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS still fails in several ways:

- You do not include in your cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radionuclides, such as iodine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford. You must complete the inventory and classification of these wastes before you can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford.
- Dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for "thousands of years." In your impact analysis, you have placed the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Allowing the groundwater to become contaminated destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.
- Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous "transuranic wastes." * The SW EIS contains several alternatives to line and monitor the burial trenches for radioactive waste. You do not provide any timeline for achieving this, yet these burial grounds should be lined by the end of 2003.
- Finally, you still do not provide an alternative in your EIS that would only assess burial of onsite Hanford cleanup waste. Your current "no action" alternative considers something which is unacceptable—stopping all cleanup at Hanford.

We are spending billions of dollars to cleanup up the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater? I ask again that you reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive enough to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives. I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches by the end of 2003.

PLEASE consider future consequences in making your decisions.

I would appreciate a response to my comments.

Sincerely,

karen hart
1616 S. 15th St
Mount Vernon, Washington 98274

EMM-0004

ASolid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Marett@Olympus.net
Sent: Monday, May 05, 2003 8:13 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford SW EIS comments

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

Dear Mr. Michael Collins,

1

I am writing you as a citizen concerned with the cleanup of Hanford, one of the most contaminated places in the world. The U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) is proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination. Once again, you have failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS). I urge you to choose not to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this problem.

We are spending billions of dollars to cleanup up the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater? I ask again that you reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive enough to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives. I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches by the end of 2003.

I would appreciate a response to my comments.

Sincerely,

Susan & Robert Marett
92 N. Rhododendron Dr.
Port Townsend, Washington 98368

EMM-0005

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: rochejustin@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, May 06, 2003 10:01 AM
To: hsweis@RL.gov
Subject: Sustainability In The Context Of Nuclear Energy And Hanford

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

Dear Mr. Michael Collins,

Sustainability. Sustainability is essential to every decision we make in this interconnected world we live in. Nuclear energy is the antithesis of sustainability. It generates radioactive wastes with half lives that run hundreds of generations. Is this the legacy we want to leave our children? And their children hundreds of generations removed? The human race will be dealing with the fallout from our collective decisions regarding nuclear waste for a very long time. Understanding this, it is vitally important that our decisions are made with both eyes focused intently on the future. Half assed fixes will be dealt with again. And again. And again. Over and over again. Until we get it right. So let's make every effort to do it right this time.

Right now.

I am writing you as a citizen concerned with the cleanup of Hanford, one of the most contaminated places in the world. The U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) is proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination. Once again, you have failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS). I urge you to choose not to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this problem.

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS still fails in several ways:

- You do not include in your cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radionuclides, such as iodine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford. You must complete the inventory and classification of these wastes before you can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford.
- Dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for "thousands of years." In your impact analysis, you have placed the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Allowing the groundwater to become contaminated destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.
- Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous "transuranic wastes." * The SW EIS contains several alternatives to line and monitor the burial trenches for radioactive waste. You do not provide any timeline for achieving this, yet these burial grounds should be lined by the end of 2003.
- Finally, you still do not provide an alternative in your EIS that would only assess burial of onsite Hanford cleanup waste. Your current "no action" alternative considers something which is unacceptable—stopping all cleanup at Hanford.

We are spending billions of dollars to cleanup up the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater? I ask again that you reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive enough to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives. I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches by the end of 2003.

I would appreciate a response to my comments.

Sincerely,

Justin Roche
3195 Racine Street Apt #204
Bellingham, Washington 98226

EMM-0006

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: joelcoons@hotmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, May 06, 2003 3:25 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford SW EIS comments

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

Dear Mr. Michael Collins,

I use to live in Richland, WA. All of my grandparents worked at Hanford. I am well aware of the problems associated with Hanford, the risks imposed upon the citizens of Washington, and the risk nuclear waste represents to the Columbia river ecosystem and the everything downstream to the Pacific Ocean. I urge the USDOE to cleanup the superfund site of Hanford, one of the most contaminated places in the world.

The U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) is proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination. We have not even fixed the problem of contaminated ground 20 feet away from the Columbia River. Why would we add to the problem before fixing it. I plead with you to first resolve the issue before adding to it.

Once again, The USDOE has failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS). I urge you to choose to NOT import any off site waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this problem. Fix the Super Fund site now. Don't freakin add to the problem. Who runs this show anyways?

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS still fails in several ways:

- You do not include in your cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radionuclides, such as idonine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford. You must complete the inventory and classification of these wastes before you can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford.
- Dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for "thousands of years." In your impact analysis, you have placed the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Allowing the groundwater to become contaminated destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.
- Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous "transuranic wastes." * Your current "no action" alternative in your EIS considers something which is unacceptable – stopping all cleanup at Hanford.

We are spending billions of dollars to cleanup up the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater? I ask again that you reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive enough to citizen concerns

1

EMM-0006 (contd)

1

and does not effectively analyze all alternatives. I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches by the end of 2003.

Remember, you are a government agency that works for the people. Not the Bush Administration's flawed Energy Policy created with the help of Enron. You don't work for Corporations. You work for the people, the citizens. Please do not consider the opinions of Corporations, as they do not have the right to vote and should not have any right to have an opinion at all in politics. As that would be anti-democracy. Please respect the peoples' comments and address each concern. I also urge you to accept all comments, whether they are unique comments or part of a mass mailing.

I expect a full and complete response to my comments.

Thanks.

Sincerely,

Joel Coons
18553 NE 57th ST
Redmond, Washington 98052

EMM-0007

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: lmystic7@yahoo.com
Sent: Wednesday, May 07, 2003 2:51 PM
To: hswets@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford SW EIS comments

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

Dear Mr. Michael Collins,

I am writing to you as a citizen concerned with the cleanup of Hanford, one of the most contaminated places in the world. The U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) is proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination. Once again, you have failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS).

I urge you to not import any off site waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the ground, and potentially the Columbia River, at Hanford, not to add more contamination. Clean-up has been delayed many times and the cost has risen substantially. Washington citizens have already been harmed by radioactive releases from Hanford, and radioactive material has been detected in groundwater which will soon reach the Columbia River, if it has not already done so.

If a successful process for consolidating waste for permanent disposal, such as vitrification, can be developed, and the existing mess is cleaned up, that will be the time to consider importing new waste for processing, but not storage, at Hanford. However, I am also concerned about the risk to citizens that would occur by having trucks or trains transporting radioactive materials through Washington state. I have seen no evidence that this issue has been adequately addressed. Each load may increase the risk only slightly, but transporting many loads increases the risk of accident or terrorism substantially.

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS still fails in several ways:

- You do not include in your cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radionuclides, such as iodine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford. You need to complete the inventory and classification of these wastes before you can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford.
- Dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for "thousands of years." In your impact analysis, you have placed the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Allowing the groundwater to become contaminated destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.
- Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous "transuranic wastes." * The SW EIS contains several alternatives to line and monitor the burial trenches for radioactive waste. You do not provide any timeline for achieving this, yet these burial grounds should be lined by the end of 2003.
- Finally, you still do not provide an alternative in your EIS that would only assess burial of onsite Hanford cleanup waste. Your current "no action" alternative considers something which is unacceptable—stopping all cleanup at Hanford.

We are spending billions of dollars to cleanup up the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater? I ask again that you reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive enough to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives. I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial, and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches now.

I would appreciate a response to my comments.

Sincerely,

Larry Lawton
18 Aberdeen Gardens Road
Aberdeen, Washington 98520-9639

1

EMM-0008

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Craig Webster [craigw@pacifier.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 07, 2003 7:03 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Continuing Hanford debacle

I recently received notice that the DOE is proposing to double the amount of waste buried in unlined trenches. I cannot believe that any additional waste is being allowed in unlined trenches. Even standard municipal solid waste dumps must be lined.

I live downstream from Hanford, one of the most contaminated places in the world. As a sailboat racer on the Columbia river, I have a vested interest in keeping radionuclides out of the water. The Columbia river has enough problems without the DOE ignoring it's responsibility to the health of the river.

Once again, you have failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS).

I urge you to choose not to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this problem.

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS still fails in several ways:

1

- You do not include in your cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radionuclides, such as iodine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford. You must complete the inventory and classification of these wastes before you can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford.
- Dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for "thousands of years." In your impact analysis, you have placed the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Allowing the groundwater to become contaminated destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.
- Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous "transuranic wastes."
- The SW EIS contains several alternatives to line and monitor the burial trenches for radioactive waste. You do not provide any timeline for achieving this, yet these burial grounds should be lined by the end of 2003.
- Finally, you still do not provide an alternative in your EIS that would only assess burial of onsite Hanford cleanup waste. Your current "no action" alternative considers something which is unacceptable stopping all cleanup at Hanford.

We are spending billions of dollars to cleanup up the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater? I ask again that you reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive enough to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives. I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches by the end of 2003.

I would appreciate a response to my comments.

EMM-0009

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: rrmunoz@att.net
Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2003 9:55 AM
To: hsweis@RL.gov
Subject: Hanford SW EIS comments

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

Dear Mr. Michael Collins,

I am writing to you as a citizen concerned with the cleanup of Hanford. The U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) is proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, effectively doubling the risk of soil and groundwater contamination. The Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS) on Hanford fails to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste. I urge you to choose not to import any additional offsite waste to Hanford. Our mission should be to clean up the radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River, not to add more contamination to this problem.

1

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS is inadequate in the following ways:

1. The cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radionuclides, such as iodine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford is not included. An inventory and classification of these wastes must be performed before we can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford.
2. New radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for "thousands of years." The analysis places the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Contaminating the groundwater at Hanford destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.
3. Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous "transuranic wastes."
4. The SW EIS contains several alternatives to line and monitor the burial trenches for radioactive waste. However, it does not provide any timeline for achieving this.
5. Finally, the EIS does not specify an alternative to burial of onsite Hanford cleanup waste. Your current "no action" alternative considers something which is unacceptable—stopping all cleanup at Hanford.
6. We are spending billions of dollars to clean up the Hanford radioactive mess. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater? Please reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Robert Munoz
1913 Bigelow Ave. North
Seattle, Washington 98109

EMM-0010

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Sharri LaPierre [Barebonesart@attbi.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2003 7:18 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford Dumping

Dear Mr. Collins,

1 I am writing you as a citizen concerned with the cleanup of Hanford, one of the most contaminated places in the world. You, the U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE), are proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination. Once again, you have failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS). I urge you to choose not to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this problem. **I am particularly concerned because I, and millions of other Washington and Oregon residents live downstream from Hanford and are subject to the contamination of the entire Columbia Basin ground water supply. This is serious business. Once the water supply is contaminated, we may never be able to clean it successfully.**

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS still fails in several ways:

You do not include in your cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radio-nuclides, such as iodine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford. You must complete the inventory and classification of these wastes before you can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford.

Dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for "thousands of years." In your impact analysis, you have placed the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Allowing the groundwater to become contaminated destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.

Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous "transuranic wastes."

The SW EIS contains several alternatives to line and monitor the burial trenches for radioactive waste. You do not provide any timeline for achieving this. I want these burial grounds to be

lined by the end of 2003!

Finally, you still do not provide an alternative in your EIS that would only assess burial of onsite Hanford cleanup waste. Your current "no action" alternative considers stopping all cleanup at Hanford – this is unacceptable!

1 We are spending billions of dollars cleanup up the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater?

I ask again that you reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives. I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches by the end of 2003.

I would appreciate a complete response to my comments. I would also be interested in knowing if you personally would consider living downstream from the Hanford facility. If the answer is yes, when can we expect you to move in?

Sincerely,

Sharri LaPierre

17002 NE 50th Avenue

Vancouver, WA 98686

360 574-3730

5/15/2003