

Comments Submitted by Form

F-0001

REVISED DRAFT HANFORD SOLID WASTE EIS PUBLIC MEETING FORMAL WRITTEN COMMENT

1 I was shocked to hear that the Dept of
Energy was planning on shipping nuclear
waste to Hanford, endangering the lives of
all the people who live along the
transportation routes. We have already seen
2 that the DOE cannot be trusted to clean up
the Hanford site, in a timely manner, and
that known leaks are going unattended. If we
can't trust DOE to store waste safely, there
is no reason to think that it can be
3 trusted to transport the waste safely. I
believe the waste that's at Hanford should
be handled properly, before we allow any
further waste to come in and be added to it.
My heartfelt desire is that this country
stop producing nuclear weapons so that no
waste would be created in the first place.
Since that is not the reality, I believe that
nuclear waste should not be transported
from the place where it is created. When
people finally figure out that they can't get rid
of it, perhaps they will stop creating it.

Written comments may be submitted to:

Michael Collins
NEPA Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
P. O. Box 550 MSIN A6-38
Richland, WA 99352
Fax: 509-372-1926
e-mail: hsweis@rl.gov
<http://www.hanford.gov/eis/eis-0286D2/>

Name LINDA GREENE
(Please Print)

Address 15313 E JACOBS RD
SPOKANE WA 99217

Public Comment Period Ends May 27, 2003



PEACH

People for Environmental Action and Children's Health

35 West Main Avenue, Suite 240

Spokane, WA 99201

509-455-2552

Comment on the Revised Draft Hanford Site Solid Waste Program Environmental Impact Statement.

According to current regulatory standards hundreds of individual toxic contaminants are found at "acceptable" levels in the body yet hundreds of different chemicals together produce a cumulative and interactive effect that can be neither measured nor understood by current science. EPA scientists estimate that the fatty tissues of the U.S. general population contain at least 700 additional contaminants that have not been chemically characterized (Onstot et al. 1987). It is not clearly understood how radioactive waste is compounding an already burdened body system. What is understood is that our children's health is in crisis. All one has to do is pick up the daily paper or listen to the news to know that asthma, diabetes, learning disabilities, obesity, cancer and birth defects are on the rise—just to name a few. Our local district 81 school system says that they had 11 cases of autistic children four years ago and this year the number is 75. In 1988 there were 4 cases of pediatric brain cancer here in Spokane in 2000 there were 13 cases.

Real organisms, such as humans, are simultaneously exposed to thousands of chemicals that interact in additive, inhibitory or synergistic ways, so an evaluation of the toxicity of a substance in isolation does not accurately predict the hazard it poses in the context of a myriad of other chemicals. Nor can epidemiology, toxicology and ecology retrospectively link injury to individual substances; the tools available to these sciences can seldom untangle the complex webs of real world cause and effect, and health damage is caused by exposure to complex environmental mixtures which also interact with other causes of disease. We can never fully comprehend environmental injury, or take adequate action to prevent more of it, by looking through a lens that sees only singular substances acting in isolation. To expose the natural environment or the human species to anymore radioactive chemical waste is an unacceptable this and future generations. Current science supplies mounting evidence that small amounts of toxic exposure during delicate stages of fetal development can lead to diminished health in a myriad of ways.

What is Health? How do we know when the health of a child has been harmed by chemical exposure? The Environmental Impact Statement adopts a negative definition of health that classifies only severe, clinically recognized forms of injury as health damage. This is derived from the current medical perspective that defines health as the absence of diagnosed disease. If disease or damage has not been identified by a qualified physician then a person is considered healthy. By this definition subtle impacts, like reduced functional capacity or increased susceptibility to disease are not a form of health damage because they do not reach the clinical severity that defines disease.

The Environmental Impact Statement conclusion, and therefore the document itself, does the community injustice because it does not accurately represent the health implications of the community's toxic exposure.

1

F-0002 (contd)

The chemical trespass on our bodies and those of our children is criminal and should not be minimized by long-winded Environmental Impact Statements that cannot address real world impacts on our families. Shipping, dumping and creating radioactive has been a decisive mistake in our twentieth century world caught up in industrial development. Today we have the knowledge we lacked then and we must act on it.

BrightSpirit
brightspirit@peachearth.org
executive director

May 7, 2003

- 2 | - TRU waste - if truck is in accident on I-90
what will happen to MS family a few blocks
from the HWY?
- 3 | - how lined trenches of waste at Hanford
- 4 | - Must have ground water monitoring in all Hanford disposal areas
- 5 | - Stop creating radioactive + Hazardous waste

brightspirit@peachearth.org

www.brightspirit.org

This paper is 100% post-consumer waste and processed chlorine free.

REVISED DRAFT HANFORD SOLID WASTE EIS
PUBLIC MEETING
FORMAL WRITTEN COMMENT

1
2
3
4

We have been promised clean-up of the existing waste for years. Now you want to add uncounted tons more waste from other sites, without finishing what you have already started.

This is a shell game, DOE is trying to show the public by revising the document. But so much of the document is based on assumptions.

No comprehensive analysis of existing Transuranic waste situation and documentation of what is there, including leakage in groundwater + in soils.

When is the vitrification plant going to be finished? How about getting it up and running correctly before we start dragging more radioactive garbage in to Hanford.

Written comments may be submitted to:

Michael Collins
NEPA Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
P. O. Box 550 MSIN A6-38
Richland, WA 99352
Fax: 509-372-1926
e-mail: hsweis@rl.gov
<http://www.hanford.gov/eis/eis-0286D2/>

Name Robin Bee
(Please Print)

Address Box 3991, Portland, OR,
97208

Public Comment Period Ends May 27, 2003

REVISED DRAFT HANFORD SOLID WASTE EIS
PUBLIC MEETING
FORMAL WRITTEN COMMENT

Dear Mr. Collins, 13-May-03
Having lived in the greater Columbia River region all my life (Idaho, Washington, Oregon) I am now a resident of Portland, Oregon.

I have worked for many years in fisheries resource management + remediation + I would like to point out that:

* The Columbia River waterway is, I believe, the most valuable natural resource in the region. It is the lifeline of the Pacific Northwest. Any action that could even potentially result in the contamination of this river at Hanford - would be a mistake to undertake. Most certainly, this EIS, given the large amounts of proposed waste and the known + proposed storage methods are not adequate to maintain the health of the Columbia River.

* The insidious nature of this waste makes transit routes proposed too dangerous given the proximity to populated areas. I therefore stand opposed to the transit + storage of these wastes at the Hanford reservation.

1
2

Written comments may be submitted to:

Michael Collins
NEPA Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
P. O. Box 550 MSIN A6-38
Richland, WA 99352
Fax: 509-372-1926
e-mail: hsweis@rl.gov
<http://www.hanford.gov/eis/eis-0286D2/>

Name James R Longwill
(Please Print)

Address P.O. Box 9283
PORTLAND, OR 97207

Public Comment Period Ends May 27, 2003

**REVISED DRAFT HANFORD SOLID WASTE EIS
PUBLIC MEETING
FORMAL WRITTEN COMMENT**

- 1 | 1. I do not support any additional nuclear waste shipments from anywhere to the Hanford site!
- 2 | 2. I urge DOE to focus on effective clean-up efforts NOW!
- 3 | 3. I feel great outrage that DOE wants to add to the waste load at Hanford by trucking waste through our communities - what are you (DOE) thinking??

Written comments may be submitted to:

Michael Collins
NEPA Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
P. O. Box 550 MSIN A6-38
Richland, WA 99352
Fax: 509-372-1926
e-mail: hsweis@rl.gov
<http://www.hanford.gov/eis/eis-0286D2/>

Name Randall E. Streets
(Please Print)

Address 3226 Dee Hwy.
Hood River, Oregon (97031)

Public Comment Period Ends May 27, 2003

REVISED DRAFT HANFORD SOLID WASTE EIS
PUBLIC MEETING
FORMAL WRITTEN COMMENT

We the citizens,

1 ~~We~~ demand full accountability of clean-up @ Hanford before
bringing more waste onto the Hanford Site
It will undoubtedly slow the clean-up process
and will add more environmental burden on our
groundwater & the Columbia River. ~~the~~

you accept
any
dangerous
waste
material!

Until these issues have been fully evaluated and
shared with the public, additional off-site
waste should be rejected.

2 No trucking of any kind no matter how much
satellite/computer surveillance ~~is~~ overseeing
can offset the inevitable probability
of nuclear waste highway accidents all around
the country on these routes.
These trucks make a perfect target for terrorists
to wreak havoc on our own country from
within by use of a minimal amount of effort on
their part to cause massive destruction on our ^{public} highways.

transmission
the trucks

Moving Transuranic Waste around the country by
any means is insane, ~~is~~ unconscionable & irresponsible!

Written comments may be submitted to:

Michael Collins
NEPA Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
P. O. Box 550 MSIN A6-38
Richland, WA 99352
Fax: 509-372-1926
e-mail: hsweis@rl.gov
<http://www.hanford.gov/eis/eis-0286D2/>

Name Chandra Radance
(Please Print)

Address 3226 Dee Hwy
Hood River, OR

97031

Public Comment Period Ends May 27, 2003

REVISED DRAFT HANFORD SOLID WASTE EIS
PUBLIC MEETING
FORMAL WRITTEN COMMENT

Hood River
5/14/03

1

Why does the DOE want to ship
radioactive waste from ~~the~~ facilities
to Hanford ~~and then~~ and then
let it sit for (?) years and then ship
it to New Mexico?

Written comments may be submitted to:

Michael Collins
NEPA Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
P. O. Box 550 MSIN A6-38
Richland, WA 99332
Fax: 509-372-1926
e-mail: hsweis@rl.gov
<http://www.hanford.gov/eis/eis-0286D2/>

Name Autumn S. Vanderkloof Address P.O. Box 253
(Please Print) Ringier WA 99605

Public Comment Period Ends May 27, 2003