THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Final Environmental
Impact Statement for the

Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375)

Volume 5: Appendix J,
Comment Response Document (Cont.)
(Sections J.3.3 through J.4)

January 2016

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY



Final Environmental
Impact Statement for the

Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375)

Volume 5: Appendix J, Comment Response Document (Cont.) (Sections J.3.3 through J.4)

January 2016

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

CONTENTS
VOLUME 5
APPENDIX J, COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT
SECTIONS J.3.3 THROUGH J.4
(CAMPAIGN COMMENTS)

NOTATION v

APPENDIX J: Comment Response Document Cont.: Campaign Comments

J.3.3 CREDO Campaign Form Letter J-1765
J.3.4 Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign Form Letter J-1829
J.3.5 Snake River Alliance Campaign Form Letters J-1889
J.3.6 Nuclear Watch Campaign Form Letters J-1955
J.3.7 Friends of the Gorge Campaign Form Letter J-2075
J.3.8 Brookdale Senior Living Petition J-2465
J.4 References J-2473

TABLES

J.3-3 Individuals Who Submitted Comments via the CREDO Campaign Form Letter J-1765

J.3-4 Individuals Who Submitted Written Comments via the Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign Form Letter J-1829

J.3-5 Individuals Who Submitted Letters via the Snake River Alliance Campaign Form Letters J-1889

J.3-6 Individuals Who Submitted Comments via the Nuclear Watch Campaign Form Letters J-1955

J.3-7 Individuals Who Submitted Comments via the Friends of the Gorge Campaign Form Letter J-2075

J.3-8 Individuals Who Signed the Brookdale Senior Living Petition, Comment Document ID No. L85 ..... J-2465

NOTATION

(The following list of acronyms and abbreviations and units of measure is a duplication of the list in the main portion of the GTCC EIS and is provided here for the convenience of the reader.)

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
AEA	Atomic Energy Act of 1954
AEC	U.S. Atomic Energy Commission
AIP	Agreement in Principle
AIRFA	American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978
ALARA	as low as reasonably achievable
AMC	activated metal canister
AMWTP	Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project
ANOI	Advanced Notice of Intent
AQRV	air-quality-related value
ARP	Actinide Removal Process
ATR	Advanced Test Reactor (INL)
bgs	below ground surface
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BLS	Bureau of Labor Statistics
BNSF	Burlington Northern Santa Fe
BRC	Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future
BSL	Biosafety Level
BWR	boiling water reactor
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAA	Clean Air Act Amendments
CAP88-PC	Clean Air Act Assessment Package 1988-Personal Computer (code)
CCDF	complementary cumulative distribution function
CEDE	committed effective dose equivalent
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFA	Central Facilities Area (INL)
CFR	*Code of Federal Regulations*
CGTO	Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations
CH	contact-handled
CRMD	Cultural Resource Management Office
CTUIR	Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
CWA	Clean Water Act
CX	Categorical Exclusion

DCF	dose conversion factor
DCG	derived concentration guide
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
DOE-EM	DOE-Office of Environmental Management
DOE-ID	DOE-Idaho Operations Office
DOE-NV	DOE-Nevada Operations Office
DOE-RL	DOE-Richland Operations Office
DOI	U.S. Department of the Interior
DOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
DRZ	disturbed rock zone
DTRA	Defense Threat Reduction Agency
DWPF	Defense Waste Processing Facility
EAC	Early Action Area
EDE	effective dose equivalent
EDNA	Environmental Designation for Noise Abatement
EIS	environmental impact statement
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ERDF	Environmental Restoration Dispersal Facility
ESA	Endangered Species Act of 1973
ESRP	Eastern Snake River Plain (INL)
FFTF	Fast Flux Test Facility (Hanford)
FGR	Federal Guidance Report
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FR	*Federal Register*
FTE	full-time equivalent
FY	fiscal year
GAO	U.S. Government Accountability (formerly General Accounting) Office
GMS/OSRP	Office of Global Material Security/Off-Site Source Recovery Project
GSA	General Separations Area (SRS)
GTCC	greater-than-Class C
HAP	hazardous air pollutant
HC	Hazard Category
HEPA	high-efficiency particulate air
HEU	highly enriched uranium
HF	hydrogen fluoride
HFIR	High Flux Isotope Reactor (ORNL)
HMS	Hanford Meteorology Station
HOSS	hardened on-site storage
h-SAMC	half-shielded activated metal canister
HSW EIS	Final Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Program Environmental Impact Statement

ICRP	International Commission on Radiological Protection
IDA	intentional destructive act
IDAPA	Idaho Administrative Procedures Act
IDEQ	Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
IDF	Integrated Disposal Facility
INL	Idaho National Laboratory
INTEC	Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center (INL)
ISFSI	independent spent fuel storage installation
LANL	Los Alamos National Laboratory
LCF	latent cancer fatality
L_{dn}	day-night sound level
L_{eq}	equivalent-continuous sound level
LEU	low-enriched uranium
LLRW	low-level radioactive waste
LLRWPAA	Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1985
LMP	Land Management Plan (WIPP)
LWA	Land Withdrawal Act (WIPP)
LWB	Land Withdrawal Boundary (WIPP)
MCL	maximum contaminant level
MCU	modular caustic side solvent extraction unit
MDA	material disposal area (LANL)
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MOX	mixed oxides
MPSSZ	Middleton Place-Summerville Seismic Zone
MSL	mean sea level
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standard(s)
NAGPRA	Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NCRP	National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements
NDA	NRC-licensed disposal area (West Valley Site)
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
NERP	National Environmental Research Park
NESHAP	National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NI PEIS	Nuclear Isotope PEIS
NLVF	North Las Vegas Facility
NMAC	*New Mexico Administrative Code*
NMED	New Mexico Environment Department
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Services
NNHP	Nevada Natural Heritage Program
NNSA	National Nuclear Security Administration (DOE)
NNSA/NSO	NNSA/Nevada Site Office

NNSS	Nevada National Security Site (formerly Nevada Test Site or NTS)
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPS	National Park Service
NRC	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NRHP	*National Register of Historic Places*
NTS SA	Nevada Test Site Supplemental Analysis
NTTR	Nevada Test and Training Range
ORNL	Oak Ridge National Laboratory
ORR	Oak Ridge Reservation
PA	programmatic agreement
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyl
PCS	primary constituent standard
PEIS	programmatic environmental impact statement
P.L.	Public Law
PM	particulate matter
$PM_{2.5}$	particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 μm or less
PM_{10}	particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 μm or less
PPV	Peak Particle Velocity
PSD	Prevention of Significant Deterioration
PSHA	Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Assessment
PWR	pressurized water reactor
R&D	research and development
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RDD	radiological dispersal device
RH	remote-handled
RH LLW EA	Remote-Handled Low-Level Waste Environmental Assessment (INL)
RLWTF-UP	Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility-Upgrade (LANL)
ROD	Record of Decision
ROI	region of influence
ROW	right-of-way
RPS	Radioisotopic Power Systems
RSL	Remote Sensing Laboratory
RWMC	Radioactive Waste Management Complex (INL)
RWMS	Radioactive Waste Management Site (NNSS)
SA	Supplemental Analysis
SAAQS	State Ambient Air Quality Standards
SALDS	State-Approved Land Disposal Site
SCDHEC	South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control
SCE&G	South Carolina Electric Gas
SDA	state-licensed disposal area (West Valley Site)

SDWA	Safe Drinking Water Act
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office(r)
SNF	spent nuclear fuel
SR	State Route
SRS	Savannah River Site
SWB	standard waste box
SWEIS	Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement
TA	Technical Area (LANL)
TC&WM EIS	Tank Closure and Waste Management EIS (Hanford)
TEDE	total effective dose equivalent
TEDF	Treated Effluent Disposal Facility
TEF	Tritium Extraction Facility
TLD	thermoluminescent dosimeter
TRU	transuranic
TRUPACT-II	Transuranic Package Transporter-II
TSCA	Toxic Substances Control Act
TSP	total suspended particulates
TTR	Tonapah Test Range
TVA	Tennessee Valley Authority
US	United States
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USC	*United States Code*
USFS	U.S. Forest Service
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
VOC	volatile organic compound
WAC	waste acceptance criteria or *Washington Administrative Code*
WHB	Waste Handling Building (WIPP)
WIPP	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
WSRC	Westinghouse Savannah River Company
WTP	Waste Treatment Plant (Hanford)
WVDP	West Valley Demonstration Project

UNITS OF MEASURE

ac	acre(s)
ac-ft	acre-foot (feet)
°C	degree(s) Celsius
cfs	cubic foot (feet) per second
Ci	curie(s)
cm	centimeter(s)
cms	cubic meter(s) per second
d	day(s)
dB	decibel(s)
dBA	A-weighted decibel(s)
°F	degree(s) Fahrenheit
ft	foot (feet)
ft^2	square foot (feet)
ft^3	cubic foot (feet)
g	gram(s) or acceleration of gravity (9.8 m/s/s)
gal	gallon(s)
gpd	gallon(s) per day
gpm	gallon(s) per minute
h	hour(s)
ha	hectare(s)
hp	horsepower
in.	inch(es)
kg	kilogram(s)
km	kilometer(s)
km^2	square kilometer(s)
kph	kilometer(s) per hour
kV	kilovolt(s)
L	liter(s)
lb	pound(s)
m	meter(s)
m^2	square meter(s)
m^3	cubic meter(s)
MCi	megacurie(s)
mg	milligram(s)
mi	mile(s)
mi^2	square mile(s)
min	minute(s)
mL	milliliter(s)
mm	millimeter(s)
mph	mile(s) per hour
mR	milliroentgen(s)
mrem	millirem
mSv	millisievert(s)
MW	megawatt(s)
MWh	megawatt-hour(s)
nCi	nanocurie(s)
oz	ounce(s)
pCi	picocurie(s)
ppb	part(s) per billion
ppm	part(s) per million
R	roentgen(s)
rad	radiation absorbed dose
rem	roentgen equivalent man
s	second(s)
t	metric ton(s)
VdB	vibration velocity decibel(s)
yd	yard(s)
yd^2	square yard(s)
yd^3	cubic yard(s)
yr	year(s)
µg	microgram(s)
µm	micrometer(s)

J.3.3 CREDO Campaign Form Letter

Table J.3-3 tabulates all individuals who submitted comments via the CREDO Campaign form letter along with the comment document identifiers assigned to each. One representative letter (Barber, Kristen, Comment Document ID No. L213) was used to identify the comment. The comment is identified in brackets on the left side of the page, and the corresponding response is shown on the right side of the same page. All other comment letters resemble the representative letter. The representative letter, comment identified in that letter, response, and all the other comment documents received for this campaign are presented here in Section J.3.3 on pages J-1767 through J-1827, as indicated in the table. It may be helpful for readers to review Section J.2 for an overview of the 10 Topics of Interest of this CRD.

TABLE J.3-3 Individuals Who Submitted Comments via the CREDO Campaign Form Letter

Last Name, First Name	Comment Document ID No.	Starting Page No.
Barber, Kristin*	L213	J-1767
Bartholomew, Gabriele	L214	J-1768
Batts, Katherine	L215	J-1769
Bekker, Rhonda	L216	J-1770
Bering, Stacie	L217	J-1771
Borden, Phyllis	L218	J-1772
Boynton, Llory	L219	J-1773
Burns, Carl	L220	J-1774
Chastain, Jody	L221	J-1775
Chroman, J.	L222	J-1776
Davis, Galen	L223	J-1777
Dewell, Alice	L224	J-1778
Downing, Michelle	L225	J-1779
Fairchild, Jane	L226	J-1780
Frothingham, Dianne	L227	J-1781
Gray, Lee	L228	J-1782
Hansen, Heidi	L229	J-1783
Harkness, Linda	L230	J-1784
Hauer, Valerie	L231	J-1785
Herron, Andria	L232	J-1786
Hodapp, Paul	L233	J-1787
Houghton, Richard	L234	J-1788
Howard, Gary	L235	J-1789
Howe, Cheri	L236	J-1790
Iverson, Luanna	L237	J-1791
Kee, Marion	L238	J-1792
Ketchum, Deann	L239	J-1793
Knutson, Maureen	L240	J-1794
Leyrer, Sarah	L241	J-1795
Lovett, Wendell	L242	J-1796
Magnuson, John	L243	J-1797
Mattson, Dana	L244	J-1798

TABLE J.3-3 (Cont.)

Last Name, First Name	Comment Document ID No.	Starting Page No.
Mccracken, Philip	L245	J-1799
Mckay, Barbara	L246	J-1800
Meinz, Vern	L247	J-1801
Methe, Leslie	L248	J-1802
Mikkelsen, Susan	L249	J-1803
Morey, Barbara	L250	J-1804
Morgan, Donald	L251	J-1805
Parish, Dave	L252	J-1806
Paul, Hollis	L253	J-1807
Pearson, Sharon	L254	J-1808
Rabinowitz, Alan	L255	J-1809
Ray, Beth	L256	J-1810
Rosen, Susan	L257	J-1811
Rosenthal, Elizabeth	L258	J-1812
Rozenbaum, Scott	L259	J-1813
Sanders, Aurelia	L260	J-1814
Seymore, Lee Roy	L261	J-1815
Sheldon, Sue	L262	J-1816
Siverts, Linda	L263	J-1817
Swalla, Billie	L264	J-1818
Todd, Therald	L265	J-1819
Trowbridge, Cynthia	L266	J-1820
Twisdale, March	L267	J-1821
Verschuyl, Sharon	L268	J-1822
Walsh, Terry	L269	J-1823
Webster, Theresa	L270	J-1824
Winsor, Robert	L271	J-1825
Woods, Paul	L272	J-1826
Zeiler, Telle	L273	J-1827

* Barber, Kristin (Comment Document No. L213) is the representative letter.

CREDO Campaign
Barber, Kristin, Commenter ID No. L213
(Representative Letter)

Letter - 2116

Kristin Barber
2306 Henry St
Bellingham, WA 98225-2209

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River. L213-1

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Kristin Barber

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO more than a network, a movement.

2928 02/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO

L213-1 DOE's ROD 78 FR 75913 dated December 13, 2013, stated that DOE has deferred a decision on importing waste from other DOE sites (with limited exceptions as described in the Settlement Agreement with Ecology) for disposal at Hanford at least until WTP is operational. For information on DOE's preferred alternative see GTCC EIS Chapter 2.

Barber, Kristin – L213

CREDO Campaign
Bartholomew, Gabriele, Commenter ID No. L214

Gabriele Bartholomew
711 Linden St
Everett, WA 98201-1222

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Gabriele Bartholomew

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

2928 03/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO

CREDO | more than a network, a movement.

Bartholomew, Gabriele – L214

CREDO Campaign
Batts, Katherine, Commenter ID No. L215

Katherine Batts
21815 State Route 9 SE
Woodinville, WA 98072-9794

CitizenLetter

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Katherine Batts

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

3926 02/11 Printed on chlorine free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO

CREDO more than a network, a movement.

Batts, Katherine – L215

CREDO Campaign
Bekker, Rhonda, Commenter ID No. L216

Rhonda Bekker
1704 Skyline Dr
Wenatchee, WA 98801-3238

CitizenLetter

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Rhonda Bekker

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO more than a network, a movement.

2928 03/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO

Bekker, Rhonda – L216

CREDO Campaign
Bering, Stacie, Commenter ID No. L217

Stacie Bering
421 W Shoshone Pl
Spokane, WA 99203-2050

CitizenLetter

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Stacie Bering

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.
CREDO more than a network. a movement.
2928 02/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO

Bering, Stacie – L217

CREDO Campaign
Borden, Phyllis, Commenter ID No. L218

Phyllis Borden
220 Cozy Ln
Sequim, WA 98382-6843

CitizenLetter

May 17, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Borden

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.
CREDO. More than a network, a movement.

Borden, Phyllis – L218

CREDO Campaign
Boynton, Llory, Commenter ID No. L219

Llory Boynton
73 Enchantment Way
Sequim, WA 98382-9038

CitizenLetter

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Llory Boynton

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO more than a network. a movement.

Boynton, Llory – L219

CREDO Campaign
Burns, Carl, Commenter ID No. L220

Carl Burns
213 NW 6TH St
Renton, WA 98057-3408

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Carl Burns

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.
2928 02/11 • Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO
CREDO more than a network, a movement.

Burns, Carl – L220

CREDO Campaign
Chastain, Jody, Commenter ID No. L221

Jody Chastain
PO Box 2994
Longview, WA 98632-8971

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Jody Chastain

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

2508 02/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO

CREDO more than a network. a movement.

Chastain, Jody – L221

CREDO Campaign
Chroman, J., Commenter ID No. L222

Abintra Wellness Center
J Chroman
7114 5TH Ave NE Unit 2
Seattle, WA 98115-5423

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Abintra Wellness Center
J Chroman

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

2936 03/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO

CREDO more than a network, a movement.

Chroman, J. – L222

CREDO Campaign
Davis, Galen, Commenter ID No. L223

Galen Davis
9114 8TH Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115-2811

CitizenLetter
A Green Message from a Concept Citizen

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Galen Davis

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.
CREDO more than a network, a movement.
2026 02/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO

Davis, Galen – L223

CREDO Campaign
Dewell, Alice, Commenter ID No. L224

Alice Dewell
2425 33RD Ave W Unit 402
Seattle, WA 98199-3259

CitizenLetter
A letter or message from a concerned citizen

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Alice Dewell

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO more than a network. a movement.

2008 0311 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO

Dewell, Alice – L224

CREDO Campaign
Downing, Michelle, Commenter ID No. L225

Michelle Downing
3103 NW River Ln
Poulsbo, WA 98370-7267

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Michelle Downing

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO | more than a network. a movement.

Downing, Michelle – L225

CREDO Campaign
Fairchild, Jane, Commenter ID No. L226

Jane Fairchild
9437 58TH Ave S
Seattle, WA 98118-5526

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Jane Fairchild

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO more than a network. a movement.

2925 03/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO

Fairchild, Jane – L226

CREDO Campaign
Frothingham, Dianne, Commenter ID No. L227

Dianne Frothingham
1105A N 5TH St
Tacoma, WA 98403-1610

CitizenLetter

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Dianne Frothingham

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO | more than a network, a movement.

Frothingham, Dianne – L227

CREDO Campaign
Gray, Lee, Commenter ID No. L228

Lee P Gray
801 Pine St Apt 21B
Seattle, WA 98101-1809

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from concerned citizens

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Lee P Gray

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO | more than a network, a movement.

2938 03/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO

Gray, Lee – L228

CREDO Campaign
Hansen, Heidi, Commenter ID No. L229

Heidi Hansen
610 W Church St
Palouse, WA 99161-8761

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Heidi Hansen

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.
2928 02/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO
CREDO more than a network. a movement.

Hansen, Heidi – L229

CREDO Campaign
Harkness, Linda, Commenter ID No. L230

Linda Harkness
14903 Linden Ave N
Shoreline, WA 98133-6516

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Linda Harkness

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

credo.com Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO

CREDO | more than a network. a movement.

Harkness, Linda – L230

CREDO Campaign
Hauer, Valerie, Commenter ID No. L231

Valerie L Hauer
8900 S Mullen Hill Rd Lot 606
Spokane, WA 99224-7402

CitizenLetter

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Valerie L Hauer

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO more than a network, a movement.

©2011 CREDO

Hauer, Valerie – L231

CREDO Campaign
Herron, Andria, Commenter ID No. L232

Andria Herron
2012 E 11TH St
Vancouver, WA 98661-4110

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Andria Herron

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO more than a network. a movement.

Herron, Andria – L232

CREDO Campaign
Hodapp, Paul, Commenter ID No. L233

Paul W Hodapp
8523 N Shiloh Hills Ct
Spokane, WA 99208-5815

CitizenLetter

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Paul W Hodapp

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO more than a network. a movement.

Hodapp, Paul – L233

CREDO Campaign
Houghton, Richard, Commenter ID No. L234

Richard Houghton
7538 Guemes Island Rd
Anacortes, WA 98221-9570

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 17, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Richard Houghton

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO more than a network. a movement.

2928 03/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO

Houghton, Richard – L234

CREDO Campaign
Howard, Gary, Commenter ID No. L235

Gary R Howard
512 N Bowdoin Pl
Seattle, WA 98103-7704

CitizenLetter
An citizen message from concerned citizens

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Gary R Howard

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO | more than a network. a movement.

2008 02/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO

Howard, Gary – L235

CREDO Campaign
Howe, Cheri, Commenter ID No. L236

Cheri Howe
3300 Carpenter Rd SE # C76
Lacey, WA 98503-4072

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Cheri Howe

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO more than a network, a movement.

Howe, Cheri – L236

CREDO Campaign
Iverson, Luanna, Commenter ID No. L237

Luanna Iverson
3609 72ND Pl SE
Mercer Island, WA 98040-3343

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Luanna Iverson

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO | more than a network, a movement.

Iverson, Luanna – L237

CREDO Campaign
Kee, Marion, Commenter ID No. L238

Marion R Kee
5618 162ND Ave NE
Redmond, WA 98052-5217

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Marion R Kee

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO | more than a network. a movement.

Kee, Marion – L238

CREDO Campaign
Ketchum, Deann, Commenter ID No. L239

Deann Ketchum
903 Bellevue Pl E Apt 202
Seattle, WA 98102-4403

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Deann Ketchum

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.
2929 03/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO
CREDO more than a network. a movement.

Ketchum, Deann – L239

CREDO Campaign
Knutson, Maureen, Commenter ID No. L240

Maureen F Knutson
9119 NE 316TH St
La Center, WA 98629-2869

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Maureen F Knutson

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO | more than a network. a movement.

Knutson, Maureen – L240

CREDO Campaign
Leyrer, Sarah, Commenter ID No. L241

Sarah Leyrer
1030 W Columbia Ave Apt A
Moses Lake, WA 98837-2033

CitizenLetter®
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Sarah Leyrer

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.
2928 03/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO
CREDO more than a network, a movement.

Leyrer, Sarah – L241

CREDO Campaign
Lovett, Wendell, Commenter ID No. L242

Wendell H Lovett
420 34TH Ave
Seattle, WA 98122-6408

CitizenLetter

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Wendell H Lovett

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO more than a network. a movement.

Lovett, Wendell – L242

CREDO Campaign
Magnuson, John, Commenter ID No. L243

John Magnuson
13772 NE 60TH St Apt 187
Redmond, WA 98052-4533

CitizenLetter

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

John Magnuson

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO | more than a network. a movement.

Magnuson, John – L243

CREDO Campaign
Mattson, Dana, Commenter ID No. L244

Dana L Mattson
PO Box 4031
Bellingham, WA 98227-4031

CitizenLetter

May 17, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Dana L Mattson

CitizenLetter's are a service of CREDO.
CREDO more than a network. a movement.
2028 02/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO

Mattson, Dana – L244

CREDO Campaign
Mccracken, Philip, Commenter ID No. L245

Philip Mccracken
5029 Guemes Island Rd # B
Anacortes, WA 98221-9039

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Philip Mccracken

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO | more than a network, a movement.

Mccracken, Philip – L245

CREDO Campaign
Mckay, Barbara, Commenter ID No. L246

Barbara J Mckay
2521 W Summit Blvd
Spokane, WA 99201-2973

CitizenLetter
A powerful message from concerned citizens

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Barbara J Mckay

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.
CREDO more than a network. a movement.
©2011 CREDO

Mckay, Barbara – L246

CREDO Campaign
Meinz, Vern, Commenter ID No. L247

Vern Meinz
3504 107TH Ave SW
Olympia, WA 98512-9105

CitizenLetter

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Vern Meinz

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO more than a network. a movement.

©2011 CREDO

Meinz, Vern – L247

CREDO Campaign
Methe, Leslie, Commenter ID No. L248

Leslie A Methe
1600 121ST St SE Apt H103
Everett, WA 98208-7907

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Leslie A Methe

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO | more than a network. a movement.

Methe, Leslie – L248

CREDO Campaign
Mikkelsen, Susan, Commenter ID No. L249

Susan Mikkelsen
4710 Burke Ave N
Seattle, WA 98103-6820

CitizenLetter

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Susan Mikkelsen

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.
CREDO | more than a network. a movement.

Mikkelsen, Susan – L249

CREDO Campaign
Morey, Barbara, Commenter ID No. L250

Barbara E Morey
707 O St
Port Townsend, WA 98368-4111

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Barbara E Morey

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO more than a network. a movement.

Morey, Barbara – L250

CREDO Campaign
Morgan, Donald, Commenter ID No. L251

Donald A Morgan
3008 N Hogan St
Spokane, WA 99207-4728

CitizenLetter
An independent message from concerned citizens

May 17, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Donald A Morgan

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO more than a network, a movement.

Morgan, Donald – L251

CREDO Campaign
Parish, Dave, Commenter ID No. L252

Dave Parish
2403 N 75TH St
Seattle, WA 98103-4959

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Dave Parish

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO | more than a network. a movement.

Parish, Dave – L252

CREDO Campaign
Hollis, Paul, Commenter ID No. L253

Hollis Paul
5112 88TH St SW
Mukilteo, WA 98275-3415

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Hollis Paul

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO | more than a network. a movement.

Hollis, Paul – L253

CREDO Campaign
Pearson, Sharon, Commenter ID No. L254

Sharon Pearson
1210 E 5TH St Apt 14
Arlington, WA 98223-1157

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Sharon Pearson

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.
2928 03/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO
CREDO more than a network. a movement.

Pearson, Sharon – L254

CREDO Campaign
Rabinowitz, Alan, Commenter ID No. L255

Alan Rabinowitz
3400 E Laurelhurst Dr NE
Seattle, WA 98105-5337

CitizenLetter

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Alan Rabinowitz

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO more than a network. a movement.

Rabinowitz, Alan – L255

CREDO Campaign
Ray, Beth, Commenter ID No. L256

Beth L Ray
28611 N River Estates Dr
Chattaroy, WA 99003-8848

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Beth L Ray

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.
2928 0211 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO
CREDO more than a network. a movement.

Ray, Beth – L256

CREDO Campaign
Rosen, Susan, Commenter ID No. L257

Susan Rosen
3912 Martin Way E Ste B
Olympia, WA 98506-5220

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Susan Rosen

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO | more than a network. a movement.

Rosen, Susan – L257

CREDO Campaign
Rosenthal, Elizabeth, Commenter ID No. L258

Elizabeth E Rosenthal
18808 Ashworth Ave N
Shoreline, WA 98133-4026

CitizenLetter

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth E Rosenthal

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO

CREDO more than a network. a movement.

Rosenthal, Elizabeth – L258

CREDO Campaign
Rozenbaum, Scott, Commenter ID No. L259

Scott J Rozenbaum
PO Box 238
Lopez Island, WA 98261-0238

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Scott J Rozenbaum

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.
2328 02/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO
CREDO more than a network. a movement.

Rozenbaum, Scott – L259

CREDO Campaign
Sanders, Aurelia, Commenter ID No. L260

Aurelia Sanders
603 N 60TH St
Seattle, WA 98103-5603

CitizenLetter
A PROJECT OF CREDO

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Aurelia Sanders

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO | more than a network. a movement.

Sanders, Aurelia – L260

CREDO Campaign
Seymore, Lee Roy, Commenter ID No. L261

Lee Roy Seymore
PO Box 163
Ellensburg, WA 98926-1911

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Lee Roy Seymore

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO more than a network, a movement.

Seymore, Lee Roy – L261

CREDO Campaign
Sheldon, Sue, Commenter ID No. L262

Sue Sheldon
PO Box 1575
Shelton, WA 98584-0983

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from concerned citizens

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,
Sue Sheldon

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO | more than a network, a movement.

Sheldon, Sue – L262

CREDO Campaign
Siverts, Linda, Commenter ID No. L263

Linda Siverts
6804 N Post St
Spokane, WA 99208-4138

CitizenLetter

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Linda Siverts

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO | more than a network, a movement.

Siverts, Linda – L263

CREDO Campaign
Swalla, Billie, Commenter ID No. L264

Billie J Swalla
620 University Rd
Friday Harbor, WA 98250-9299

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Billie J Swalla

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.
2529 02/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO
CREDO more than a network, a movement.

Swalla, Billie – L264

CREDO Campaign
Todd, Therald, Commenter ID No. L265

Therald Todd
4505 Holcomb St
Port Townsend, WA 98368-2120

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 17, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Therald Todd

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO | more than a network. a movement.

Todd, Therald – L265

CREDO Campaign
Trowbridge, Cynthia, Commenter ID No. L266

Cynthia Powell Trowbridge
3537 Gylany Way
Greenbank, WA 98253-9758

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Powell Trowbridge

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.
2926 02/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO
CREDO more than a network, a movement.

Trowbridge, Cynthia – L266

CREDO Campaign
Twisdale, March, Commenter ID No. L267

March Twisdale
11933 SW Cove Rd
Vashon, WA 98070-4008

CitizenLetter

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

March Twisdale

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO | more than a network. a movement.

Twisdale, March – L267

CREDO Campaign
Verschuyl, Sharon, Commenter ID No. L268

Sharon Verschuyl
2604 Capitol Way S
Olympia, WA 98501-3327

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Sharon Verschuyl

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO more than a network. a movement.

2526 02/11 · Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO

Verschuyl, Sharon – L268

CREDO Campaign
Walsh, Terry, Commenter ID No. L269

Terry Hyman Walsh
348 NW 112TH St
Seattle, WA 98177-4841

CitizenLetter

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Terry Hyman Walsh

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO more than a network, a movement.

2939 03/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO

Walsh, Terry – L269

CREDO Campaign
Webster, Theresa, Commenter ID No. L270

Theresa P Webster
5503 47TH Ave E
Tacoma, WA 98443-2521

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from concerned citizens

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Theresa P Webster

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO more than a network, a movement.

2828 02/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO

Webster, Theresa – L270

CREDO Campaign
Winsor, Robert, Commenter ID No. L271

Robert Winsor
2821 2ND Ave Apt 1802
Seattle, WA 98121-1250

CitizenLetter

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Robert Winsor

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.
2926 03/15 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO
CREDO more than a network. a movement.

Winsor, Robert – L271

CREDO Campaign
Woods, Paul, Commenter ID No. L272

Paul Woods
PO Box 907
Graham, WA 98338-0907

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from a concerned citizen.

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Paul Woods

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.
2823 03/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO
CREDO more than a network, a movement.

Woods, Paul – L272

CREDO Campaign
Zeiler, Telle, Commenter ID No. L273

Telle Zeiler
214 13TH Ave E Apt 9
Seattle, WA 98102-5891

CitizenLetter
An urgent message from concerned citizens

May 14, 2011

DOE Secretary Steven Chu
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear DOE Secretary Steven Chu,

The earthquake and tsunami in Japan -- and subsequent meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant -- are a worrying reminder of the threat posed by all nuclear facilities.

One of the most dangerous in the U.S. is Hanford, which a former Hanford engineer called "a ticking time bomb."

I'm writing to demand that you halt Dept. of Energy plans to truck more nuclear waste to Hanford, clean up what's there, and take action to ensure the site does not threaten the Columbia River and the people who live nearby.

As you know, Hanford is the most contaminated nuclear site in the Western hemisphere. It has 58 million gallons of radioactive sludge stored in leaky underground tanks within dangerous proximity of the Columbia River.

The promised cleanup at Hanford has still not begun in earnest and yet your department proposes to dump even more waste here. The people of Washington have had enough.

Please let me know how you intend to address this issue.

Sincerely,

Telle Zeiler

CitizenLetters are a service of CREDO.

CREDO | more than a network, a movement.

2928 02/11 Printed on chlorine-free, 100% post-consumer recycled paper. ©2011 CREDO

Zeiler, Telle – L273

This page is intentionally left blank.

J.3.4 Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign Form Letter

Table J.3-4 tabulates all individuals who submitted comments via the Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign form letter along with the comment document identifiers assigned to each. One representative letter (Abrahamsen, Chris, Comment Document ID No. L13) was used to identify the comments. The comments are identified in brackets on the left side of the page, and the corresponding responses are shown on the right side of the same page. All other comment letters resemble the representative letter. The representative letter, comments identified in that letter, responses, and all other comment documents received for this campaign are presented here in Section J.3.4 on pages J-1831 through J-1887, as indicated in the table.

TABLE J.3-4 Individuals Who Submitted Written Comments via the Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign Form Letter

Last Name, First Name	Comment Document ID No.	Starting Page No.
Abrahamsen, Chris*	L13	J-1831
Allen, Sabrina	L14	J-1832
Bliven, Rachel	L26	J-1833
Boyer, Jan	L40	J-1834
Brenden, Robert	L88	J-1835
Buono, Gail	L29	J-1837
Cate, Mary Ray	L23	J-1838
Chiltan, Maria	L10	J-1839
Conway, Patty	L25	J-1840
Corliss, Roy	L11	J-1841
Donahue, Lisa	L47	J-1842
Dryden, Robert	L27	J-1843
Duggan, Jaime	L33	J-1844
Fair, Linda	L206	J-1845
Fairmont, Lorraine	L42	J-1846
Finney, Dee	L88	J-1847
Giles, Gail	L41	J-1849
Gregory, Michael	L36	J-1850
Hayden, Hallie	L88	J-1851
Hayden, Kimberly	L88	J-1853
Hemprling, Joe	L16	J-1855
Humason, Scott	L43	J-1856
Johnson, Jan	L38	J-1857
Kennedy, Bridgette	L39	J-1858
Keppel, Roberta	L21	J-1859
Klukkort, Jim	L15	J-1860
Koffman, Arkee	L12	J-1861
Koponen, Emmy	L45	J-1862
Kotowski, Sheri	E97	J-1863
Krysl, Marilyn	L44	J-1864
Lapalwe, Monica	L49	J-1865

TABLE J.3-4 (Cont.)

Last Name, First Name	Comment Document ID No.	Starting Page No.
Lawless, Jessica	L32	J-1866
Martin, Bruce	E40	J-1867
Murphy, Pat	L48	J-1868
Orozco, Martha	L20	J-1869
Paulette, Robert	L88	J-1870
Phillip, Sheridan	L28	J-1872
Quintana, Marlene	L57	J-1873
Redondo, Petry	L31	J-1874
Robinson, Windell	L22	J-1875
Romero-Oak, Judy	L18	J-1876
Ruark, Ramona	L24	J-1877
Scarbrough, Jarrod	L19	J-1878
Seaton, Paula	L88	J-1879
Sinha, Barbara	L9	J-1881
Stangarone, Richard	L35	J-1882
Suellentrop, Ann	L46	J-1883
Unknown, Unknown	L30	J-1884
Unknown, Unknown	L321	J-1885
Unknown, Ed	L17	J-1886
Wilson, Marguerite	L37	J-1887

* Abrahamsen, Chris (Comment Document ID No. L13) is the representative letter.

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Abrahamsen, Chris, Commenter ID No. L13
(Representative Letter)

received JUN 27 2011

~~May~~ June 25, 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste. L13-1

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites. L13-2

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Chris Abrahamsen

Address: 1710 W. Mission San Diego
92120, CA, San Diego

Email:

L13-1 DOE acknowledges that only defense-generated TRU waste is currently authorized for disposal at the WIPP geologic repository under the WIPP LWA as amended (P.L. 102-579 as amended by P.L. 240) and that legislation would be required to allow disposal of waste other than TRU waste generated by atomic energy defense activities at WIPP and/or for siting a new facility within the land withdrawal area. However, NEPA does not limit an EIS to proposing and evaluating alternatives that are currently authorized. The Agreement for Consultation and Cooperation between Department of Energy and the State of New Mexico for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant recognizes that the mission of WIPP may change and provides provisions to modify the agreement. For example, the Agreement states: "The parties to this Agreement recognize that future developments including changes to applicable laws (e.g., Public Law [P.L.] 96-164) may make it desirable or necessary for one or both parties to seek to modify this Agreement. Either party to this Agreement may request a review of the terms and conditions."

DOE acknowledges the TRU waste disposal limitations for WIPP specified in the WIPP LWA as amended (P.L. 102-579 as amended by P.L. 240) and in the Agreement for Consultation and Cooperation between Department of Energy and the State of New Mexico for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. Information on these limitations is provided in this EIS (see Section 4.1.1) and was considered in developing the preferred alternative. Based on the GTCC EIS evaluation, disposal of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes at WIPP would result in minimal environmental impacts for all resource areas evaluated, including human health and transportation. Both the annual dose and the latent cancer fatality (LCF) risk would be zero because there would be no releases to the accessible environment and therefore no radiation doses and LCFs during the first 10,000 years following closure of the WIPP repository. In addition to legislative changes, DOE recognizes that the use of WIPP for the disposal of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes would require and site-specific NEPA reviews, including further characterization of the waste (e.g., radionuclide inventory and heat loads), as well as the proposed packaging for disposal.

The disposal methods and sites evaluated in the EIS represent the range of reasonable alternatives for the disposal of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like waste. This range is consistent with NEPA implementing regulations given in Parts 1500–1508 of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508). In this GTCC EIS, DOE analyzed a range of disposal methods (i.e., geologic repository, near-surface trench, intermediate-depth borehole, and above-grade vault) and federally owned sites (i.e., Hanford Site, INL, LANL, NNSS, SRS, and WIPP Vicinity for which two reference locations, one within and one outside the WIPP Land Withdrawal Boundary, were considered). DOE has determined that it was reasonable to analyze only these six sites because they currently have operating radioactive waste disposal facilities, except for the WIPP Vicinity, which is near an operating geologic repository. Although some commenters stated that this range of disposal sites is too narrow, they did not offer specific locations for analysis. It would not be reasonable to analyze in detail an essentially unlimited number of additional non-DOE or nonfederal sites. Nevertheless, DOE also conducted a generic evaluation of commercial disposal facilities on nonfederal lands in the EIS to order to provide, to the extent possible, information regarding the potential long-term performance of other (nonfederal) locations for siting a GTCC waste land disposal facility.

L13-2 The use of HOSS and other approaches for long-term storage of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes are outside the scope of this EIS because they do not meet the purpose and need for agency action. Consistent with Congressional direction in Section 631 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-58), DOE plans to complete an EIS and a ROD for a permanent disposal facility for this waste, not for long-term storage options. The GTCC EIS evaluates the range of reasonable disposal alternatives and, as also required under NEPA, a No Action Alternative. Under the No Action Alternative, current practices for storing GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes would continue in accordance with current requirements.

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Allen, Sabrina, Commenter ID No. L14

~~May~~ June 25, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Sabrina Allen

Address: 1550 Calle Oso Feliz

Email: artistsabrina@hotmail.com

Allen, Sabrina – L14

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Bliven, Rachel, Commenter ID No. L26

received JUN 27 2011

June 25
~~May~~ _____, 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Rachel Bliven

Address: 120 A Lawrencia Rd. Santa Fe NM 87505

Email: rachelbliven@gmail

Bliven, Rachel – L26

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Boyer, Jan, Commenter ID No. L40

May 25, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly, Jan Boyer

Name: Jan Boyer

Address: 815 Rio Vista
Sfe NM 87501

Email:

Boyer, Jan – L40

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Brenden, Robert, Commenter ID No. L88

May 27, 2011

received JUN 2 7 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly, Paula Seaton Robert L Pavlette

Name: Paula Seaton Robert L Pavlette

Address: P.O Box 144 (same)
Embudo, NM 87531

Email: pinta.seaton46@gmail.com

More Signatures over →

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Brenden, Robert, Commenter ID No. L88 (cont'd)

Emmy Koponen
P.O. Box 456
Dixon, N.M. 87527

Maria Chilton
Dixon, NM

ROBERT BRENDEN
BOX 175
DIXON, NM 87527

Dee Finney
P.O. Box 327
Dixon, NM 87527

Hallie Hayden
PO # 592
Dixon, NM 87527
(Hallie Hayden)

Kimberly M. Hayden
Kimberly M. Hayden
PO Box 592
Dixon, NM 87527

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Buono, Gail, Commenter ID No. L29

~~May~~ June 25, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: GAIL BUONO

Address: 19 Copper Trl.
Santa Fe, NM 87508

Email:

Buono, Gail – L29

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Cate, Mary Ray, Commenter ID No. L23

received
JUN 27 2011

May 24, 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Mary Ray Cate

Address: 167 Cerro gordo
Santa Fe NM 87501

Email:

Cate, Mary Ray – L23

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Chiltan, Maria, Commenter ID No. L10

June 25
May _____, 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

received
JUN 27 2011

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Maria Chiltan

Address: PO Box 572
Dixon, NM 87527

Email: mariachiltan@hotmail.com

Chiltan, Maria – L10

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Conway, Patty, Commenter ID No. L25

May 24, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Patty Conway
Address: 1205 Sandoval Ave
Santa Fe 87505
Email: conway-patty@yahoo.com

Conway, Patty – L25

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Corliss, Roy, Commenter ID No. L11

June 25
~~May~~ ____, 2011

received
JUN 27 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Roy Corliss

Address: 1370 CERRO GORDO

Email: raycorliss@yahoo.com

Corliss, Roy – L11

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Donahue, Lisa, Commenter ID No. L47

June 25
May _____, 2011

received
JUN 27

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Lisa Donahue

Address: 1807 Second St.
Santa Fe, NM 87505

Email:

Donahue, Lisa – L47

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Dryden, Robert, Commenter ID No. L27

received
JUN 27 2011

May 24, 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Robert Dryden
Address: 8 Alcalde Rd
Santa Fe NM 87508
Email: hotguyx102002@yahoo.com

Dryden, Robert – L27

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Duggan, Jaime, Commenter ID No. L33

June ~~May~~ 25, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Jaime Duggan

Address: 3660 Catalpa Way
Boulder, Co 80304

Email: —

Duggan, Jaime – L33

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Fair, Linda, Commenter ID No. L206

JUN - 9 2011

received

May 31, 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Linda K. Fair (Fair)

Address: P O Box 156
El Prado NM 87529

Email:

Fair, Linda – L206

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Fairmont, Lorraine, Commenter ID No. L42

June ~~May~~ 12, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Lorraine H. Fairmont

Address: 2115 Poplar Ave
Boulder Co 80304

Email:

Fairmont, Lorraine – L42

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Finney, Dee, Commenter ID No. L88

May 27, 2011

received JUN 2 7 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly, Paula Seaton Robert L Pavlette

Name: Paula Seaton Robert L Pavlette

Address: P.O Box 144 (same)
Embudo, NM 87531

Email: pinta.seaton46@gmail.com

More Signatures over →

Finney, Dee – L88

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Finney, Dee, Commenter ID No. L88 (cont'd)

Emmy Koponen
P.O. Box 456
Dixon, N.M. 87527

Maria Chilton
Dixon, NM

Robert Brenden
BOX 175
DIXON, NM 87527

Dee Finney
P.O. Box 327
Dixon, NM 87527
Dee Finney

Hallie Hayden
PO # 592
Dixon, NM 87527
(Hallie Hayden)

Kimberly M. Hayden
Kimberly M. Hayden
PO Box 592
Dixon, NM 87527

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Giles, Gail, Commenter ID No. L41

~~May~~ June 25, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: GAIL GILES
Address: 2450 Calle Contessa
SF 87505
Email: gilesgail@sbcglobal.net

Giles, Gail – L41

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Gregory, Michael, Commenter ID No. L36

~~May~~ June 25, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Michael Gregory

Address: 107 Paseo Del Pinon
SF, NM 87508

Email:

Gregory, Michael – L36

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Hayden, Hallie, Commenter ID No. L88

May 27, 2011

received JUN 2 7 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly, Paula Seaton Robert L Pavlette

Name: Paula Seaton Robert L Pavlette

Address: P.O Box 144 (same)
Embudo, NM 87531

Email: pinta.seaton46@gmail.com

More Signatures over →

Hayden, Hallie – L88

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Hayden, Hallie, Commenter ID No. L88 (cont'd)

Emmy Koponen
P.O. Box 456
Dixon, N.M. 87527

Maria Chilton
Dixon, NM

ROBERT BRENDEN
BOX 175
DIXON, NM 87527

Dee Finney
P.O. Box 327
Dixon, NM 87527
Dee Finney

Hallie Hayden
PO # 592
Dixon, NM 87527
(Hallie Hayden)

Kimberly M. Hayden
Kimberly M. Hayden
PO Box 592
Dixon, NM 87527

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Hayden, Kimberly, Commenter ID No. L88

May 27, 2011

received JUN 2 7 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly, Paula Seaton Robert L Pavlette

Name: Paula Seaton Robert L Pavlette

Address: P.O Box 144 (same)
Embudo, NM 87531

Email: pinta.seaton46@gmail.com

More Signatures over →

Hayden, Kimberlye – L88

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Hayden, Kimberly, Commenter ID No. L88 (cont'd)

Emmy Koponen
P.O. Box 456
Dixon, N.M. 87527

Maria Chitten
Dixon, NM

ROBERT BRENDEN
BOX 175
DIXON, NM 87527

Dee Finney
P.O. Box 327
Dixon, NM 87527

Hallie Hayden
PO # 592
Dixon, NM 87527
(Hallie Hayden)

Kimberly M. Hayden
Kimberly M. Hayden
PO Box 592
Dixon, NM 87527

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Hemprling, Joe, Commenter ID No. L16

~~May~~ June 25, 2011

received JUN 27 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Joe Hemprling
Address: 1824 Kim Rd
Santa Fe, NM
Email: Joseph_hemprling@Gmail.com

Hemprling, Joe – L16

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Humason, Scott, Commenter ID No. L43

June 25, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Scott Humason
Address: P.O. Box 5494
Santa Fe, NM 87502
Email: Humason@gmail.com

Humason, Scott – L43

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Johnson, Jan, Commenter ID No. L38

June 25
~~May~~ _____, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Jan Hills Johnson
Address: PO Box 31864
Santa Fe, NM 87594
Email: hillsister54@gmail.com

Johnson, Jan – L38

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Kennedy, Bridgette, Commenter ID No. L39

May 25, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Bridgette Kennedy
Address: 2125 Paseo Primero
Santa Fe NM 87501
Email:

Kennedy, Bridgette – L39

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Keppel, Roberta, Commenter ID No. L21

received

May 25, 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Roberta P. Keppel
Address: 829 W Manhattan Ave
Santa Fe NM 87501
Email: bokeppel@netzero.net

Keppel, Roberta – L21

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Klukkort, Jim, Commenter ID No. L15

June 25 May ____, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Jim Klukkort Jim KLUKKORT

Address: 11 N. GUTIERREZ UNIT 363
SF, NM 87506

Email: twohouses@aol.com

Klukkort, Jim – L15

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Koffman, Arkee, Commenter ID No. L12

June 25 ~~May~~ ____, 2011

received JUN 27 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Arkee Koffman

Address: 712 galisteo rd.
santa fe nm 87505

Email:

Koffman, Arkee – L12

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Koponen, Emmy, Commenter ID No. L45

received
JUN 27 2011

May 25, 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Emmy Koponen

Address: Po Box 456 Dixon NM 87527

Email: emmykoponen@gmail.com

Koponen, Emmy – L45

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Kotowski, Sheri, Commenter ID No. E97

June 27, 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Sheri Kotowski
PO Box 291
Dixon, New Mexico 87527

Kotowski, Sheri – E97

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Krysl, Marilyn, Commenter ID No. L44

received

May 25, 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: MARILYN KRYSL

Address: 2003 MESA DR. #4, Bldr, CO

Email:

Krysl, Marilyn – L44

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Lapalwe, Monica, Commenter ID No. L49

~~May~~ June 25, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Monica LaPalwe

Address: 2751 Via Caballero del Sur
Santa Fe NM 87505

Email:

Lapalwe, Monica – L49

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Lawless, Jessica, Commenter ID No. L32

~~May~~ June 25, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Jessica Lawless

Address: 2405 Agua Fria St.
Santa Fe, NM 87505

Email:

Lawless, Jessica – L32

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Martin, Bruce, Commenter ID No. E40

June 27, 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Bruce Martin

Address: 408 Taylor Ranch Road

Alamogordo, New Mexico 88310

Email: dbmartin@zianet.com

Martin, Bruce – E40

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Murphy, Pat, Commenter ID No. L48

received

June 25
~~May~~ ____, 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: PAT MURPHY
Address: 100 RIO VISTA PLC
S. FE, NM
Email: sisterspirit45@yahoo.com

Murphy, Pat – L48

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Orozco, Martha, Commenter ID No. L20

received
JUN 27 2011

May 25, 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Martha A Orozco
Address: 1115 Ocate RD #18
Santa Fe, N.M. 87507
Email: wasnt me 69@Gmail.Com

Orozco, Martha – L20

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Paulette, Robert, Commenter ID No. L88

May 27, 2011

received JUN 2 7 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly, Paula Seaton Robert L Paulette

Name: Paula Seaton Robert L Paulette

Address: P.O Box 144 (same)
Embudo, NM 87531

Email: pinta.seaton46@gmail.com

More Signatures over →

Paulette, Robert – L88

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Paulette, Robert, Commenter ID No. L88 (cont'd)

Emmy Koponen
P.O. Box 456
Dixon, N.M. 87527

Maria Chilton
Dixon, NM

Robert Brenden
BOX 175
DIXON, NM 87527

Dee Finney
P.O. Box 327
Dixon, NM 87527

Hallie Hayden
PO # 592
Dixon, NM 87527
(Hallie Hayden)

Kimberly M. Hayden
Kimberly M. Hayden
PO Box 592
Dixon, NM 87527

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Phillip, Sheridan, Commenter ID No. L28

June 25
~~May~~ _____, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Sheridan Phillips

Address: 3224 Casa Rencurada
Santa Fe NM 87507

Email: _____

Phillip, Sheridan – L28

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Quintana, Marlene, Commenter ID No. L57

received
JUN 27 2011

June 20, 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Marlene Quintana
Address: 210 Rencher Ave, SE,
Albuq. N.M. 87105
Email: MQ1986@cardnm.org

Quintana, Marlene – L57

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Redondo, Petry, Commenter ID No. L31

June 25
May _____, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: PETRY L. REDONDO
Address: P.O. BOX 26
TESUQUE, NM 87574
Email: PETRYLREDONDO@HOTMAIL.COM

Redondo, Petry – L31

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Robinson, Windell, Commenter ID No. L22

May 25, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Windell Robinson

Address: 526 1/2 Alvarado Dr. SE
ABQ., NM 87108-3621

Email:

Robinson, Windell – L22

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Romero-Oak, Judy, Commenter ID No. L18

~~May~~ June 25, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Rev. Judy Romero-Oak
Address: 1809 Britt St NE
Alb. 87112
Email: judyroak@yahoo.com

Romero-Oak, Judy – L18

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Ruark, Ramona, Commenter ID No. L24

received

May 24, 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Ramona Ruark

Address: Po Box 32894
Santa Fe NM 87594

Email:

Ruark, Ramona – L24

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Scarbrough, Jarrod, Commenter ID No. L19

May 25, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Jarrod Scarbrough
Address: 35 Apache Plume Rd.
Los Lunas, NM 87031
Email: jaremeister@gmail.com

Scarbrough, Jarrod – L19

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Seaton, Paula, Commenter ID No. L88

May 27, 2011

received JUN 2 7 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly, Paula Seaton Robert L Pavlette

Name: Paula Seaton Robert L Pavlette

Address: P.O Box 144 (same)
Embudo, NM 87531

Email: pinta.seaton46@gmail.com

More Signatures over →

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Seaton, Paula, Commenter ID No. L88 (cont'd)

Emmy Koponen
P.O. Box 456
Dixon, N.M. 87527

Maria Chilton
Dixon, NM

Robert Brenden
BOX 175
DIXON, NM 87527

Dee Finney
P.O. Box 327
Dixon, NM 87527

Hallie Hayden
PO # 592
Dixon, NM 87527
(Hallie Hayden)

Kimberly M. Hayden
Kimberly M. Hayden
PO Box 592
Dixon, NM 87527

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Sinha, Barbara, Commenter ID No. L9

~~May~~ June 25, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Barbara Sinha
Address: 132 Camino Los Abuelos
Santa Fe NM 87508
Email:

Sinha, Barbara – L9

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Stangarone, Richard, Commenter ID No. L35

June 25
~~May~~ _____, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Richard Stangarone
Address: 107 Paseo Del Pinon
Santa Fe, NM 87508
Email: _____

Stangarone, Richard – L35

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Suellentrop, Ann, Commenter ID No. L46

~~May~~ June 10, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Ann Suellentrop
Address: 1865 S. Pyle
KCKS 66103
Email: ann suellen@gmail.com

Suellentrop, Ann – L46

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Unknown, Unknown, Commenter ID No. L30

June 25 ~~May~~ ____, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: [illegible]

Address: 104 Avenida de Velasquez
Taos NM 87571

Email: Hulic95@yahoo.com

Unknown, Unknown – L30

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Unknown, Unknown, Commenter ID No. L321

June 25
~~May~~ ____, 2011

received
JUN 27 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: John Chamberlin

Address: 116 Bob St.
Santa Fe, N.M. 87501

Email:

Unknown, Unknown – L321

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Unknown, Ed, Commenter ID No. L17

~~May~~ June 25, 2011

received JUN 27 2011

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: [signature]

Address: 305 CALLE LEON NW
ABQ., NM 87114

Email:

Unknown, Ed – L17

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety Campaign
Wilson, Marguerite, Commenter ID No. L37

June 25
~~May~~ ____, 2011

received

Mr. Arnold M. Edelman, EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
GTCC EIS
Cloverleaf Building, EM-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

RE: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Dear Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose consideration of any site in New Mexico for the disposal of any of the 160,000,000 curies of commercial GTCC waste. There are not suitable sites in New Mexico for disposal of this waste. Nor is there any need for New Mexico sites to be considered because the wastes should be stored and disposed at sites at or near the commercial reactors that produce approximately 98 percent of the radioactivity in GTCC waste.

The people of New Mexico were promised on numerous occasions that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) would be for defense, not commercial, waste. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act prohibits any commercial waste at WIPP. Any site at or near WIPP also is inappropriate because it would be an attempt to circumvent that prohibition. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has thousands of cubic meters of waste that must be cleaned up, and it is totally inappropriate to bring any commercial waste to LANL for disposal. New Mexico also has millions of tons of waste from uranium mining and milling. Thus, New Mexicans are already burdened with more than our share of the nation's nuclear waste.

I believe that you should stop this flawed process and not issue a final environmental impact statement (EIS). The new EIS should not consider any sites in New Mexico as reasonable alternatives and instead should examine alternative commercial sites. The new EIS also should consider Hardened On-Site Storage as a long-term storage option until there are suitable disposal sites.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours truly,

Name: Marguerite Wilsm
Address: 9 Fido Lane
Santa Fe NM 87508
Email: marguerite@cybermesa.com

Wilson, Marguerite – L37

This page is intentionally left blank.

J.3.5 Snake River Alliance Campaign Form Letters

Table J.3-5 tabulates all individuals who submitted comments via the Snake River Alliance Campaign form letter along with the comment document identifiers assigned to each. There were two versions of the form letter, identified as version "a" and version "b". One representative of each version of the letter (Allen, John, Comment Document ID No. L176 for version a; Aiegel, Jennifer, Comment Document ID No. L130 for version b) was used to identify the comments. The comments are identified in brackets on the left side of the page, and the corresponding response is shown on the right side of the same page. All other comment letters resemble the representative version "a" or "b" letter. The representative letters, comments identified in the letters, responses, and all other comment documents received for this campaign are presented here in Section J.3.5 on pages J-1892 through J-1953, as indicated in the table.

TABLE J.3-5 Individuals Who Submitted Letters via the Snake River Alliance Campaign Form Letters

Last Name, First Name	Version of Letter	Comment Document ID No.	Starting Page No.
Adams, Miranda	a	L123	J-1892
Aiegel, Jennifer*	b	L130	J-1893
Allen, John*	a	L176	J-1892
Ames, Peggy	a	L103	J-1894
Anderson, Vivian	a	L119	J-1893
Avitua, Camille	a	L177	J-1894
Baltes, Julie	a	L165	J-1895
Baltes, Mark	a	L181	J-1895
Barker, Ken	b	L112	J-1896
Bogle, Andrea	b	L192	J-1896
Bolin, Celeste	a	L142	J-1897
Bracht, Edward	a	L114	J-1897
Briggs, E.	a	L139	J-1898
Bryan, Clifford	a	L169	J-1898
Carroll, Susan	a	L111	J-1899
Carter, Richard	a	L122	J-1899
Childers, Dee	a	L196	J-1900
Collins, Bill	a	L146	J-1900
Coney, David	a	L199	J-1901
Costello, Jenne	a	L175	J-1901
Crisp, Travis	a	L148	J-1902
Crisp, Travis	a	L163	J-1902
Crowley, Stephen	a	L200	J-1903
Dadalay, John	a	L137	J-1903
Daley, Katherine	a	L64	J-1904
Davis, Bill	a	L174	J-1904
Davis, Michelle	a	L113	J-1905
Donnelly, Jack	b	L190	J-1905
Emerson, Gen	a	L121	J-1906
Emerson, Steve	a	L197	J-1906
Enno, Christina	a	L183	J-1907

TABLE J.3-5 (Cont.)

Last Name, First Name	Version of Letter	Comment Document ID No.	Starting Page No.
Evans, Scott	a	L154	J-1907
Everett, Victoria	b	L188	J-1908
Farmers, Scott and Linda	a	L107	J-1908
Forrest, Robert	a	L71	J-1909
Franklin, James	a	L157	J-1909
Franklin, Joanne	a	L193	J-1910
Greco, Nancy	a	L135	J-1910
Greenwell, Neesa	a	L178	J-1911
Greer, Dalyn	a	L168	J-1911
Haga, Keith	a	L138	J-1912
Haga, Martha	a	L149	J-1912
Hall, Roy	b	L108	J-1913
Heoethriizzer, Wietebe	a	L109	J-1913
Hesp, Joan	a	L117	J-1914
Hillam, Devin	a	L102	J-1915
Hueftle, Keene	a	L167	J-1915
Hyatt, Larry	a	L126	J-1916
Jacob, Margaret	a	L172	J-1916
Jenks, Vyonne	a	L65	J-1917
Jolly, Linda	a	L134	J-1917
Jones, Diane	a	L195	J-1918
Jones, Kenneth	a	L69	J-1918
Jull, Paula	a	L155	J-1919
Keener, Edwin	b	L129	J-1920
Keener, Martha	a	L201	J-1919
Kelly, Tim	a	L156	J-1920
Kirkpatrick, Unknown	b	L133	J-1921
Landry, Louis	a	L144	J-1921
Leffel, Craig	a	L164	J-1922
Lovell, Brenda	a	L116	J-1922
Maack, Share	a	L110	J-1923
Marshall, Judy	b	L66	J-1923
Masak, Regina	b	L72	J-1924
Maschaer, Kate	a	L101	J-1925
Matthew, Ellen	a	L205	J-1924
McFadden, Marques	a	L203	J-1926
Miller, Ken	a	L147	J-1926
Miller, Samuel	a	L182	J-1927
Miller, Virginia	b	L141	J-1927
P., Ann	a	L106	J-1925
Paquette, Holly	b	L140	J-1928
Parker, George	a	L67	J-1928
Patterson, Kathy	a	L62	J-1929
Patterson, William	a	L73	J-1929
Pollard, Leslie	b	L186	J-1930
Pollard, Stan	a	L162	J-1930
Proksa, Margo and Dennis	a	L170	J-1931
Proksa, Sanni	b	L151	J-1931
Puckett, Bob	a	L179	J-1932

TABLE J.3-5 (Cont.)

Last Name, First Name	Version of Letter	Comment Document ID No.	Starting Page No.
Puckett, Su	a	L166	J-1932
Puopolo, Mia	a	L158	J-1933
Pursley, Ben	a	L136	J-1933
Reid, Heidi	a	L127	J-1934
Reneay, Nava	a	L105	J-1934
Reynolds, Anne	a	L160	J-1935
Ritter, Stephen	b	L153	J-1935
Robinson, Pat	a	L145	J-1936
Rodie, Jan	b	L70	J-1937
Rule, Andrea	a	L191	J-1936
Rush, Irene	a	L132	J-1937
Russell, Brennan	a	L115	J-1938
Rydakh, Amanda	b	L60	J-1938
Schmidt, Eliza	a	L198	J-1939
Scott, Gale Dawn	a	L74	J-1939
Scott, Linda	a	L173	J-1940
Seward, Michelle	b	L68	J-1941
Seward, Peggy	a	L75	J-1940
Seymour, Jan	b	L61	J-1941
Shipley, Andrea	a	L143	J-1942
Smith, E.	a	L189	J-1942
Smith, Gary	a	L171	J-1943
Stewart, Mark	a	L131	J-1943
Swain, Merle	b	L159	J-1944
Swinford, Joseph	b	L187	J-1945
Tate, Karen	a	L128	J-1944
Thompson, Pennee	b	L185	J-1945
Tyson, Andy	a	L118	J-1946
Unknown, John	a	L152	J-1946
Unknown, Ray	b	L120	J-1947
Von, Lori	b	L63	J-1947
Wallace, Eric	a	L125	J-1948
Wattens, Ron	b	L180	J-1949
Weatherly, Joe	a	L124	J-1948
Weatherman, T.	a	L194	J-1949
Weber, John	a	L202	J-1950
Webs, Lori	a	L104	J-1950
Weeq, Susan	b	L76	J-1951
Weston, Andrew	a	L204	J-1951
White, Crystal	a	L150	J-1952
Yeatts, Carole	a	L161	J-1953
Yoshida, Takayaki	a	L184	J-1952

* Allen, John (Comment Document ID No. L176) is representative letter version a; Aiegel, Jennifer (Comment Document ID No. L130) is representative letter version b.

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Adams, Miranda, Commenter ID No. L123
Allen, John, Commenter ID No. L176 (Representative Letter version a)

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites considered in this draft EIS all belong to the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even try to prove they are best for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes hardened -on-site-storage at commercial reactor sites. L176-1 L176-2

From:
John Allen
1310 El Rancho
Pocatello ID 83201

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Miranda Adams
mirandaadams@hotmail.com

L176-1 Consistent with NEPA implementing regulations in Parts 1500–1508 of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508), DOE analyzed a range of disposal methods (i.e., geologic repository, near-surface trench, intermediate-depth borehole, and above-grade vault) and federally owned sites (i.e., Hanford Site, INL, LANL, NNSS, SRS, WIPP, and the WIPP Vicinity) as well as generic commercial locations. DOE determined that it was reasonable to analyze the federal sites because they currently have operating radioactive waste disposal facilities, except for the WIPP Vicinity, which is near an operating geologic repository.

Final siting of a disposal facility for GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes would involve further NEPA review as appropriate and be in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and would include local stakeholder and tribal government involvement.

L176-2 The use of HOSS and other approaches for long-term storage of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes are outside the scope of this EIS because they do not meet the purpose and need for agency action. Consistent with Congressional direction in Section 631 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-58), DOE plans to complete an EIS and a ROD for a permanent disposal facility for this waste, not for long-term storage options. The GTCC EIS evaluates the range of reasonable disposal alternatives and, as also required under NEPA, a No Action Alternative. Under the No Action Alternative, current practices for storing GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes would continue in accordance with current requirements.

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Aiegel, Jennifer, Commenter ID No. L130 (Representative Letter version b)
Anderson, Vivian, Commenter ID No. L119

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes WIPP in New Mexico. But WIPP was opened with a promise to the people of New Mexico that it would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. Commercial waste is specifically prohibited. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans:"You took the nose, now take the camel."To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. L130-1 The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced and does not consider legally barred disposal. L130-2

From: Jennifer Aiegel
3802 W. Taft St.
Boise, ID, 83703

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: VIVIAN ANDERSON
22655 EEL LN
MIDDLETON, IDAHO
83644

L130-1 DOE acknowledges that only defense-generated TRU waste is currently authorized for disposal at the WIPP geologic repository under the WIPP LWA as amended (P.L. 102-579 as amended by P.L. 240) and that legislation would be required to allow disposal of waste other than TRU waste generated by atomic energy defense activities at WIPP and/or for siting a new facility within the land withdrawal area. However, NEPA does not limit an EIS to proposing and evaluating alternatives that are currently authorized. The Agreement for Consultation and Cooperation between Department of Energy and the State of New Mexico for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant recognizes that the mission of WIPP may change and provides provisions to modify the agreement. For example, the Agreement states: "The parties to this Agreement recognize that future developments including changes to applicable laws (e.g., Public Law [P.L.] 96-164) may make it desirable or necessary for one or both parties to seek to modify this Agreement. Either party to this Agreement may request a review of the terms and conditions."

DOE acknowledges the TRU waste disposal limitations for WIPP specified in the WIPP LWA as amended (P.L. 102-579 as amended by P.L. 240) and in the Agreement for Consultation and Cooperation between Department of Energy and the State of New Mexico for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. Information on these limitations is provided in this EIS (see Section 4.1.1) and was considered in developing the preferred alternative. Based on the GTCC EIS evaluation, disposal of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes at WIPP would result in minimal environmental impacts for all resource areas evaluated, including human health and transportation. Both the annual dose and the latent cancer fatality (LCF) risk would be zero because there would be no releases to the accessible environment and therefore no radiation doses and LCFs during the first 10,000 years following closure of the WIPP repository. In addition to legislative changes, DOE recognizes that the use of WIPP for the disposal of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes would require and site-specific NEPA reviews, including further characterization of the waste (e.g., radionuclide inventory and heat loads), as well as the proposed packaging for disposal.

L130-2 The use of HOSS and other approaches for long-term storage of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes are outside the scope of this EIS because they do not meet the purpose and need for agency action. Consistent with Congressional direction in Section 631 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-58), DOE plans to complete an EIS and a ROD for a permanent disposal facility for this waste, not for long-term storage options. The GTCC EIS evaluates the range of reasonable disposal alternatives and, as also required under NEPA, a No Action Alternative. Under the No Action Alternative, current practices for storing GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes would continue in accordance with current requirements.

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Ames, Peggy, Commenter ID No. L103
Avitua, Camille, Commenter ID No. L177

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes hardened-on-site-storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From:
Peggy S M Ames
764 Grace Dr
Pocatello ID 83201

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From:
Camille Avitua
713 Tyhee Ave
Ammon Idaho Falls, ID 83211

Ames, Peggy – L103
Avitua, Camille – L177

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Baltes, Julie, Commenter ID No. L165
Baltes, Mark, Commenter ID No. L181

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: MARK BALTES
PO Box 7903
Boise ID 83707

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Julie Baltes
P.O. Box 7903
Boise, Id. 83707

Baltes, Julie – L165
Baltes, Mark – L181

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Barker, Ken, Commenter ID No. L112
Bogle, Andrea, Commenter ID No. L192

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes WIPP in New Mexico. But WIPP was opened with a promise to the people of New Mexico that it would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. Commercial waste is specifically prohibited. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans:"You took the nose, now take the camel."To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced and does not consider legally barred disposal.

From: Ken Barker
7249 N Pierce Park Boise ID 83714

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes WIPP in New Mexico. But WIPP was opened with a promise to the people of New Mexico that it would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. Commercial waste is specifically prohibited. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans:"You took the nose, now take the camel."To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced and does not consider legally barred disposal.

From: Andrea Bogle
7312 W. Kingston Dr.
Boise, ID 83704

Barker, Ken – L112
Bogle, Andrea – L192

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Bolin, Celeste, Commenter ID No. L142
Bracht, Edward, Commenter ID No. L114

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Celeste Bolin
4019 N. 36th St.
Boise, ID 83703

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Edward BRACHT MD
642 E. Pennsylvania ST
Boise ID 83706

Bolin, Celeste – L142
Bracht, Edward – L114

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Briggs, E., Commenter ID No. L139
Bryan, Clifford, Commenter ID No. L169

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: E. Manley Briggs, M.D.
1316 Harrison Blvd.
Boise, ID 83702

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Clifford Bryan
Box 8196
Pocatello, ID 83209

Briggs, E. – L139
Bryan, Clifford – L169

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Carroll, Susan, Commenter ID No. L111
Carter, Richard, Commenter ID No. L122

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: Susan Carroll, 700 N. 3RD St #301
BOISE ID 83702

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Richard Carter
2343 S. Ridge Point Way
Boise, Idaho 83712

Carroll, Susan – L111
Carter, Richard – L122

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Childers, Dee, Commenter ID No. L196
Collins, Bill, Commenter ID No. L146

Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Dee Childers
671 N Harvey Ln
Eagle ID 83616
208-830-4455
Dee Childers

To: Documen Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: Bill Collins

Childers, Dee – L196
Collins, Bill – L146

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Coney, David, Commenter ID No. L199
Costello, Jenne, Commenter ID No. L175

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: David C. Coney
407 7th Warren Street
Boise, ID. 83706

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes hardened-on-site-storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: Jenne Costello
904 W. Goving St
Pocatello, ID 83204

Coney, David – L199
Costello, Jenne – L175

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Crisp, Travis, Commenter ID No. L148
Crisp, Travis, Commenter ID No. L163

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: Travis Crisp
601 N. 14th St. Boise, ID ~~83704~~ 83702

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Travis Crisp
4265 Bristol St.
Boise, ID, 83704

Crisp, Travis – L148
Crisp, Travis – L163

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Crowley, Stephen, Commenter ID No. L200
Dadalay, John, Commenter ID No. L137

Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Stephen Crowley
408 E. 51st St
Garden City, ID, 83714

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: John Dadalay
2415 Mt. View Dr.

Crowley, Stephen – L200
Dadalay, John – L137

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Daley, Katherine, Commenter ID No. L64
Davis, Bill, Commenter ID No. L174

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes hardened-on-site-storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From:
Katherine Daley
1135 E. Bonneville
Pocatello, ID. 83201

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes hardened-on-site-storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From:
Bill Davis
910 N. Hayes
Pocatello, ID 83201

Daley, Katherine – L64
Davis, Bill – L174

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Davis, Michelle, Commenter ID No. L113
Donnelly, Jack, Commenter ID No. L190

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Michelle Davis
1916 W. State St
Boise, ID 83702

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes WIPP in New Mexico. But WIPP was opened with a promise to the people of New Mexico that it would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. Commercial waste is specifically prohibited. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans:"You took the nose, now take the camel."To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced and does not consider legally barred disposal.

From: Jack Donnelly
6512 Kirkwood Rd. Boise, 83709

Davis, Michelle – L113
Donnelly, Jack – L190

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Emerson, Gen, Commenter ID No. L121
Emerson, Steve, Commenter ID No. L197

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: Gen Emerson
1975 WILMINGTON DR.
BOISE, ID 83704

Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Steve T. Emerson
1975 N. Wilmington dr.
Boise, ID
83704

Emerson, Gen – L121
Emerson, Steve – L197

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Enno, Christina, Commenter ID No. L183
Evans, Scott, Commenter ID No. L154

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From:
Christina Enno
1386 Hingham Ave B
Pocatello ID 83201

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From:
SCOTT EVANS
8912 W. BARTON RD.
POCATELLO, ID. 83204-7101

Enno, Christina – L183
Evans, Scott – L154

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Everett, Victoria, Commenter ID No. L188
Farmers, Scott and Linda, Commenter ID No. L107

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes WIPP in New Mexico. But WIPP was opened with a promise to the people of New Mexico that it would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. Commercial waste is specifically prohibited. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans:"You took the nose, now take the camel."To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced and does not consider legally barred disposal.

From: Victoria Everett
408 E. 5th #8
Garden City, Id. 83714

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Scott & Linda Farmers
314 Campbell Ave
Meridian ID 83642

Everett, Victoria – L188
Farmers, Scott and Linda – L107

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Forrest, Robert, Commenter ID No. L71
Franklin, James, Commenter ID No. L157

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites considered in this draft EIS all belong to the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even try to prove they are best for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes hardened -on-site-storage at commercial reactor sites.

From:
Robert E. Forrest
950 N. Grant
Pocatello, ID 83204

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: JAMES E. FRANKLIN
2720 N. TURNBERRY WAY
MERIDIAN, ID. 83646

Forrest, Robert – L71
Franklin, James – L157

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Franklin, Joanne, Commenter ID No. L193
Greco, Nancy, Commenter ID No. L135

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Joanne Franklin
2720 N. Turnberry way
Meridian, Id. 83646

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From:
NANCY GRECO
442 S. GARFIELD
POCATELLO, ID. 83204

Franklin, Joanne – L193
Greco, Nancy – L135

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Greenwell, Neesa, Commenter ID No. L178
Greer, Dalyn, Commenter ID No. L168

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Neesa Greenwell
1553 Jensen St.
Pocatello Idaho 83201

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Dalyn Greer
9485 W Kate Dr.
Boise, Id. 83714

Greenwell, Neesa – L178
Greer, Dalyn – L168

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Haga, Keith, Commenter ID No. L138
Haga, Martha, Commenter ID No. L149

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Keith Haga 12614 N. Schicks Ridge Rd. Boise, ID. 83714

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: Martha Haga 12614 N. Schicks Ridge Rd. Boise, ID 83714

Haga, Keith – L138
Haga, Martha – L149

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Hall, Roy, Commenter ID No. L108
Heoethriizzer, Wietebe, Commenter ID No. L109

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes WIPP in New Mexico. But WIPP was opened with a promise to the people of New Mexico that it would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. Commercial waste is specifically prohibited. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans:"You took the nose, now take the camel."To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced and does not consider legally barred disposal.

From: Roy Hall
7513 Wesley Dr. Boise ID 83704

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Wietebe Heoethriizzer

Hall, Roy – L108
Heoethriizzer, Wietebe – L109

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Hesp, Joan, Commenter ID No. L117

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Joan Hesp
8100 Wesley Dr
BOISE, ID 83704

Hesp, Joan – L117

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Hillam, Devin, Commenter ID No. L102
Hueftle, Keene, Commenter ID No. L167

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites considered in this draft EIS all belong to the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even try to prove they are best for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes hardened -on-site-storage at commercial reactor sites.

From:

Devin Hillam
314 S 12th Ave #1A
Pocatello, ID 83201

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites considered in this draft EIS all belong to the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even try to prove they are best for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes hardened -on-site-storage at commercial reactor sites.

From:

M. Keene Hueftle
1630 Monte Vista Dr
PIH 83201

Hillam, Devin – L102
Hueftle, Keene – L167

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Hyatt, Larry, Commenter ID No. L126
Jacob, Margaret, Commenter ID No. L172

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: LARRY HYATT

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From:
Margaret Jacob
345 S. 10th Ave.
Pocatello, ID 83201-4858

Hyatt, Larry – L126
Jacob, Margaret – L172

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Jenks, Vyonne, Commenter ID No. L65
Jolly, Linda, Commenter ID No. L134

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes hardened-on-site-storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From:
Vyonne Jenks
132 Oakland Ave
Pocatello, Idaho

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: Linda Jolly
8415 Mt View Dr.
Boise ID, 83706

Jenks, Vyonne – L65
Jolly, Linda – L134

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Jones, Diane, Commenter ID No. L195
Jones, Kenneth, Commenter ID No. L69

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Diane M. Jones
5218 Castle Drive
Boise, Idaho 83703

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Kenneth S. Jones
5673 Sorrel Dr.
Chubbuck ID. 83202

Jones, Diane – L195
Jones, Kenneth – L69

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Jull, Paula, Commenter ID No. L155
Keener, Martha, Commenter ID No. L201

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From:
PAULA JULL
8911 W BARTON RD
POCATELLO ID 83204

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Martha Keener 3423 N 39 BOISE ID 83703

Jull, Paula – L155
Keener, Martha – L201

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Keener, Edwin, Commenter ID No. L129
Kelly, Tim, Commenter ID No. L156

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes WIPP in New Mexico. But WIPP was opened with a promise to the people of New Mexico that it would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. Commercial waste is specifically prohibited. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans:"You took the nose, now take the camel."To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced and does not consider legally barred disposal.

From: Edwin Keener 3423 N 39 Boise ID

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Tim Kelly
4474 Sarrows Head Way
Boise ID 83709

Keener, Edwin – L129
Kelly, Tim – L156

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Kirkpatrick, Unknown, Commenter ID No. L133
Landry, Louis, Commenter ID No. L144

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes WIPP in New Mexico. But WIPP was opened with a promise to the people of New Mexico that it would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. Commercial waste is specifically prohibited. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans:"You took the nose, now take the camel."To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced and does not consider legally barred disposal.

From: Kirkpatrick
2005 N 17th St
Boi 83702
3/30/16

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Louis LANDRY
211 E. 33rd. St.
Boise, ID. 83714

Kirkpatrick, Unknown – L133
Landry, Louis – L144

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Leffel, Craig, Commenter ID No. L164
Lovell, Brenda, Commenter ID No. L116

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: CRAIG LEFFEL
510 E. 41ST ST.
GARDEN CITY, ID. 83714

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Brenda Lovell
249 S. Winthrop Pl
Boise ID 83709

Leffel, Craig – L164
Lovell, Brenda – L116

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Maack, Share, Commenter ID No. L110
Marshall, Judy, Commenter ID No. L66

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Share Maack
1201 N. 7th St.
Boise 83702

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes is WIPP in New Mexico. But the people of New Mexico were promised that WIPP would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans: "You took the nose, now take the camel." To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Judy Marshall
1783 S. Old Hwy 91
Oakham, ID 83245

Maack, Share – L110
Marshall, Judy – L66

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Masak, Regina, Commenter ID No. L72
Matthew, Ellen, Commenter ID No. L205

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes is WIPP in New Mexico. But the people of New Mexico were promised that WIPP would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans: "You took the nose, now take the camel." To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Regina Masak
456 S. 5th
Pocatello, ID 83201

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Ellen Matthew
1419 S. Colorado Ave.
Boise, ID 83706

Masak, Regina – L72
Matthew, Ellen – L205

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Maschaer, Kate, Commenter ID No. L101
P., Ann, Commenter ID No. L106

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Kate Reedy Maschaer
5933 Hilo Dr
Pocatello ID 83204

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Ann Pritt
18316 Boise ID
Blackfoot ID

Maschaer, Kate – L101
P., Ann – L106

Snake River Alliance Campaign
McFadden, Marques, Commenter ID No. L203
Miller, Ken, Commenter ID No. L147

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: Marques McFadden
316 Camellia Ave
Meridian, ID 83642

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Ken Miller
3832 Sheldon PL
Boise 83704

McFadden, Marques – L203
Miller, Ken – L147

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Miller, Samuel, Commenter ID No. L182
Miller, Virginia, Commenter ID No. L141

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: Samuel Miller

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes WIPP in New Mexico. But WIPP was opened with a promise to the people of New Mexico that it would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. Commercial waste is specifically prohibited. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans:"You took the nose, now take the camel."To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced and does not consider legally barred disposal.

From: Virginia Miller
3832 Sheldon Pl.
Boise, Id 83704

Miller, Samuel – L182
Miller, Virginia – L141

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Paquette, Holly, Commenter ID No. L140
Parker, George, Commenter ID No. L67

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes WIPP in New Mexico. But WIPP was opened with a promise to the people of New Mexico that it would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. Commercial waste is specifically prohibited. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans:"You took the nose, now take the camel."To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced and does not consider legally barred disposal.

From: HOLLY PAQUETTE
607 RESERVE ST.
BOISE, IDAHO 83712

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes hardened-on-site-storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: George Parker
267 Buchman
Pocatello, Idaho 83204

Paquette, Holly – L140
Parker, George – L67

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Patterson, Kathy, Commenter ID No. L62
Patterson, William, Commenter ID No. L73

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From:
Kathy Patterson
5056 W. Old Hy 91
Inkom, ID 83245

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes hardened-on-site-storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From:
WILLIAM A. PATTERSON
5056 W. OLD HWY. 91
INKOM, ID. 83245

Patterson, Kathy – L62
Patterson, William – L73

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Pollard, Leslie, Commenter ID No. L186
Pollard, Stan, Commenter ID No. L162

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes WIPP in New Mexico. But WIPP was opened with a promise to the people of New Mexico that it would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. Commercial waste is specifically prohibited. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans:"You took the nose, now take the camel."To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced and does not consider legally barred disposal.

From: Leslie Pollard
Boise Idaho

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Stan Pollard
Boise, Idaho

Pollard, Leslie – L186
Pollard, Stan – L162

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Proksa, Margo and Dennis, Commenter ID No. L170
Proksa, Sanni, Commenter ID No. L151

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes hardened-on-site-storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From:
Margo & Dennis Proksa
5192 W Old Hwy 91
Pocatello Id 83204

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes is WIPP in New Mexico. But the people of New Mexico were promised that WIPP would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans: "You took the nose, now take the camel." To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Sanni Proksa
PROKSA
5192 W OLD HWY 91
POCATELLO, ID 83204

Proksa, Margo and Dennis – L170
Proksa, Sanni – L151

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Puckett, Bob, Commenter ID No. L179
Puckett, Su, Commenter ID No. L166

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From:
Su Puckett
5025 Mohawk
Pocatello Id 83204

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes hardened-on-site-storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From:
BOB PUCKETT
5025 MOHAWK
POCATELLO ID 83204

Puckett, Bob – L179
Puckett, Su – L166

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Puopolo, Mia, Commenter ID No. L158
Pursley, Ben, Commenter ID No. L136

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Mia Puopolo
1412 W. Hays #1A
Boise, ID 83702

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: Ben Pursley
3312 N. 36th St.
Boise, IDaho, 83703

Puopolo, Mia – L158
Pursley, Ben – L136

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Reid, Heidi, Commenter ID No. L127
Reneay, Nava, Commenter ID No. L105

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Heidi Reid
5531 N. Lynwood Pl.
Boise, ID 83706

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From:
Nava Reneay
193 Randolph Ave
Pocatello, ID 83201

Reid, Heidi – L127
Reneay, Nava – L105

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Reynolds, Anne, Commenter ID No. L160
Ritter, Stephen, Commenter ID No. L153

Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Anne Reynolds
252 E. Front St. #606
Boise, Id.
83702

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes WIPP in New Mexico. But WIPP was opened with a promise to the people of New Mexico that it would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. Commercial waste is specifically prohibited. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans:"You took the nose, now take the camel."To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced and does not consider legally barred disposal.

From: Stephen Ritter
1914 Dwyhee #7
Boise ID 83706

Reynolds, Anne – L160
Ritter, Stephen – L153

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Robinson, Pat, Commenter ID No. L145
Rule, Andrea, Commenter ID No. L191

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

We were promised at one time -- that we would not have more -- before it was completely cleaned up!

From: Pat Robinson
1562 West Storey
Meridian, Idaho
83646

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Andrea Rule
Box 2654
Ketchum, ID 83340

Robinson, Pat – L145
Rule, Andrea – L191

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Rodie, Jan, Commenter ID No. L70
Rush, Irene, Commenter ID No. L132

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes is WIPP in New Mexico. But the people of New Mexico were promised that WIPP would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans: "You took the nose, now take the camel." To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Jan Rodie
3528 MacCabeb Dr
Pocatello ID 83201

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: Irene Rush
1107 N. 8th St.
Boise 83702

Rodie, Jan – L70
Rush, Irene – L132

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Russell, Brennan, Commenter ID No. L115
Rydakh, Amanda, Commenter ID No. L60

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: Brennan Russell
1412 W Hays St Apt A
Boise, ID

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes is WIPP in New Mexico. But the people of New Mexico were promised that WIPP would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans: "You took the nose, now take the camel." To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Amanda Rydakh
823 Linda Ave.
Pocatello ID 83201

Russell, Brennan – L115
Rydakh, Amanda – L60

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Schmidt, Eliza, Commenter ID No. L198
Scott, Gale Dawn, Commenter ID No. L74

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites considered in this draft EIS all belong to the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even try to prove they are best for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes hardened -on-site-storage at commercial reactor sites. * it's over drinking water for many-

From:
Eliza Schmidt
8862 N. Maple Grove Ln
Pocatello, Id 83201

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From:
Gale Dawn Scott
1006 N. 6th Ave.
Pocatello, ID 83201

Schmidt, Eliza – L198
Scott, Gale Dawn – L74

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Scott, Linda, Commenter ID No. L173
Seward, Peggy, Commenter ID No. L75

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes hardened-on-site-storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: Linda Scott
1936 E Clark St
Pocatello Id 83201

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes hardened-on-site-storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: Peggy Seward
130 High Street
Milford, NH 03055

Scott, Linda – L173
Seward, Peggy – L75

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Seward, Michelle, Commenter ID No. L68
Seymour, Jan, Commenter ID No. L61

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes is WIPP in New Mexico. But the people of New Mexico were promised that WIPP would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans: "You took the nose, now take the camel." To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Michelle Seward
~~130~~ ~~High~~ 2409 North Mink Creek Rd
Pocatello, ID 83204

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes is WIPP in New Mexico. But the people of New Mexico were promised that WIPP would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans: "You took the nose, now take the camel." To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Jan Seymour
6064 Fruitwood
Pocatello, ID 83204

Seward, Michelle – L68
Seymour, Jan – L61

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Shipley, Andrea, Commenter ID No. L143
Smith, E. , Commenter ID No. L189

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Andrea Shipley
4702 Castleberr Drive
Boise, ID 83703

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: [illegible]

Shipley, Andrea – L143
Smith, E. – L189

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Smith, Gary, Commenter ID No. L171
Stewart, Mark, Commenter ID No. L131

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites considered in this draft EIS all belong to the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even try to prove they are best for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes hardened -on-site-storage at commercial reactor sites.

From:
Gary Smith
2654 Butte St
Pocatello ID 83201

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: MARK STEWART
Box 2404
KET ID 83340

Smith, Gary – L171
Stewart, Mark – L131

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Swain, Merle, Commenter ID No. L159
Tate, Karen, Commenter ID No. L128

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes WIPP in New Mexico. But WIPP was opened with a promise to the people of New Mexico that it would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. Commercial waste is specifically prohibited. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans:"You took the nose, now take the camel."To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced and does not consider legally barred disposal.

From: Merle Swain
11245 W. Hazelwood
Boise, ID 83709

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

Karen Aelland Tate

From: Karen Aelland Tate
9344 Ziebarth Rd
Pocatello, ID 83204

Swain, Merle – L159
Tate, Karen – L128

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Swinford, Joseph, Commenter ID No. L187
Thompson, Pennee, Commenter ID No. L185

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes WIPP in New Mexico. But WIPP was opened with a promise to the people of New Mexico that it would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. Commercial waste is specifically prohibited. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans:"You took the nose, now take the camel."To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced and does not consider legally barred disposal.

From: JOSEPH SWINFORD
407 RIO VISTA BLVD
McCALL, ID. 83638

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes WIPP in New Mexico. But WIPP was opened with a promise to the people of New Mexico that it would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. Commercial waste is specifically prohibited. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans:"You took the nose, now take the camel."To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced and does not consider legally barred disposal.

From: Pennee Thomson
4298 N Willspring Ave
Boise, Id 83713

Swinford, Joseph – L187
Thompson, Pennee – L185

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Tyson, Andy, Commenter ID No. L118
Unknown, John, Commenter ID No. L152

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from *commercial* sources, current or projected. But the DOE is looking *only* at DOE sites in New Mexico, Washington, Nevada, South Carolina and Idaho. These sites are already seriously contaminated, and bringing in more radioactive waste will only make their problems worse. The DOE should instead write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Andy Tyson
2892 S 500 W
Victor ID 83455

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes hardened-on-site-storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: John [illegible]
8862 Maple Grove Ln
Pocatello ID 83201

Tyson, Andy – L118
Unknown, John – L152

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Unknown, Ray, Commenter ID No. L120
Von, Lori, Commenter ID No. L63

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes WIPP in New Mexico. But WIPP was opened with a promise to the people of New Mexico that it would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. Commercial waste is specifically prohibited. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans:"You took the nose, now take the camel."To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced and does not consider legally barred disposal.

From: Ray Unknown

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes is WIPP in New Mexico. But the people of New Mexico were promised that WIPP would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans: "You took the nose, now take the camel." To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Lori J. Von
247 N 9th #2
Pocatello Id 83201

Unknown, Ray – L120
Von, Lori – L63

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Wallace, Eric, Commenter ID No. L125
Weatherly, Joe, Commenter ID No. L124

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: ERIC WALLACE
3802 W TAFT St
BOISE, ID 83703

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Joe Weatherly

Wallace, Eric – L125
Weatherly, Joe – L124

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Wattens, Ron, Commenter ID No. L180
Weatherman, T., Commenter ID No. L194

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes is WIPP in New Mexico. But the people of New Mexico were promised that WIPP would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans: "You took the nose, now take the camel." To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Ron Wattens
1135 E. Bonneville
Pocatello, ID 83201

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: T. Weatherman
sodance513@yahoo.com

Wattens, Ron – L180
Weatherman, T. – L194

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Weber, John, Commenter ID No. L202
Webs, Lori, Commenter ID No. L104

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: John Weber

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites considered in this draft EIS all belong to the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even try to prove they are best for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes hardened-on-site-storage at commercial reactor sites.

From: Lori M. Webs
1334 Ammon St.
Pocatello, ID.

Weber, John – L202
Webs, Lori – L104

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Weeq, Susan, Commenter ID No. L76
Weston, Andrew, Commenter ID No. L204

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The DOE is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater -than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. The only deep geologic repository the DOE analyzes is WIPP in New Mexico. But the people of New Mexico were promised that WIPP would be used *solely* for waste from nuclear weapons production. The federal government can't now tell New Mexicans: "You took the nose, now take the camel." To do so would show every other community asked to host a permanent repository in the future that they might well get more than they bargained for and make repository siting more difficult. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Susan Weeq
518 S. 6th Ave
Pocatello ID 83201

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: Andrew Weston.
4702 Castle bar dr.
Boise, Id 83703.

Weeq, Susan – L76
Weston, Andrew – L204

Snake River Alliance Campaign
White, Crystal, Commenter ID No. L150
Yoshida, Takayaki, Commenter ID No. L184

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: Crystal White
1715 ½ Bannock Boise, ID.

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has already said that spent reactor fuel can be stored safely at reactor sites for 100 years.

From: 4651 S Trails End Ln Boise ID 83716
Takayuki Yoshida

White, Crystal – L150
Yoshida, Takayaki – L184

Snake River Alliance Campaign
Yeatts, Carole, Commenter ID No. L161

To: Document Manager
Re: Draft EIS on Greater-than-Class-C radioactive waste disposal

The Department of Energy (DOE) is considering how to dispose of 160 million curies of Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) radioactive waste. Nearly all this waste is from current and projected commercial sources. But the six sites specifically considered in this draft EIS are all controlled by the federal government, and the DOE's study does not even attempt to assert that these sites are the best choices for GTCC disposal based on objective criteria. Of all the arid DOE sites, the Idaho National Laboratory would have the highest potential long-term human health impacts because of exposure through radioactively contaminated groundwater. That is *not* acceptable. The DOE should write a new draft EIS that includes con consideration of hardened on-site storage of GTCC waste at the commercial reactor sites where it is produced.

From: Carole C. Yeatts
1674 W. Hill Rd #10 Boise, ID 83702

Yeatts, Carole – L161

This page is intentionally left blank.

J.3.6 Nuclear Watch Campaign Form Letters

Table J.3-6 tabulates all individuals who submitted comments via the Nuclear Watch Campaign form letter along with the comment document identifiers assigned to each. There were three versions of the form letter, identified as version “a”, version “b”, and version “c”. One representative of each version of the letter (Anderson, Mary Lou, Comment Document ID No. E65 for version a; Mills, Lorene, Comment Document ID No. E56 for version b; and Gordon, Susan, Comment Document ID No. E95 for version c) was used to identify the comments. The comments are identified in brackets on the left side of the page, and the corresponding responses are shown on the right side of the page. All other comment letters resemble the representative version “a”, “b”, or “c” letter. The representative letters, comments identified in the letters, responses, and all other comment documents received for this campaign are presented here in Section J.3.6 on pages J-1957 through J-2073, as indicated in the table.

TABLE J.3-6 Individuals Who Submitted Comments via the Nuclear Watch Campaign Form Letters

Last Name, First Name	Version of Letter	Comment Document ID No.	Starting Page No.
Anderson, Mary Lou*	a	E65	J-1957
Baley, Patricia McRae	b	E75	J-1965
Brown, John	a	E17	J-1968
Busch, Dorothy	a	E30	J-1970
Cardwell, Stephanie	a	E18	J-1972
Childers, Dee	a	E25	J-1974
Cole, Corrine	a	E13	J-1976
Colip, Carol	a	E16	J-1978
Crawford, Teresa	a	E91	J-1980
Cronin, Thomas	a	E88	J-1982
Drucker, Linda	a	E98	J-1984
Fanning, Don	a	E86	J-1986
Ford, Peter	a	E78	J-1988
Gordon, Susan*	c	E95	J-1963
Haber, Ruth	a	E79	J-1990
Hall, Frederica	b	E38	J-1992
Halsey-Hoover, Sharon	a	E99	J-1995
Hartsough, David	a	E24	J-1997
Hoffman, Jim	a	E44	J-1999
Intino, Mario	a	E87	J-2001
Jones, Barbara	a	E62	J-2003
Jones, Jeremiah	a	E42	J-2005
Knutsen, Reinard	a	E81	J-2007
Kovac, Scott	c	E101	J-2009
Lai, R	a	E83	J-2011
Larson, David	a	E22	J-2013
Levee, Penny	a	E104	J-2015
Levine, Julie	a	E49	J-2017
Louis, Cynthia	b	E19	J-2019

TABLE J.3-6 (Cont.)

Last Name, First Name	Version of Letter	Comment Document ID No.	Starting Page No.
Lynn, Michele	a	E63	J-2022
Mills, Lorene*	b	E56	J-1960
Model, Betsy	b	E6	J-2024
Moon, Otter C.	a	E74	J-2027
Mullin, Charles	a	E14	J-2029
Pringle, Mark	a	E66	J-2031
Rankin, Douglass	b	E31	J-2033
Rice, Megan	a	E64	J-2036
Riegle, Rosalie	a	E82	J-2038
Rockefeller, Terry Kay	a	E89	J-2040
Schmidt, Laurel Lambert	a	E55	J-2042
Shiroky, Cynthia	a	E20	J-2044
Simon, Madeline	a	E57	J-2046
Sorgen, Phoebe	a	E77	J-2048
Tatro-Medlin, April	a	E37	J-2050
Thawley, Bob	a	E8	J-2052
Thomas, Ellen	a	E36	J-2054
Turk, Lawrence	a	E9	J-2056
Ventura, Maxina	a	E5	J-2058
Wale, Lisa	b	E52	J-2061
Welsh, Anne	a	E85	J-2064
Welsh, Myron	a	E67	J-2066
Yoshida, Takayuki	a	E39	J-2068
Young, Lisa	a	E54	J-2070
Ziglar, Randy	a	E80	J-2072

* Anderson, Mary Lou (Comment Document ID No. E65) is representative letter version a; Mills, Lorene (Comment Document ID No. E56) is representative letter version b; and Gordon, Susan (Comment Document ID No. E95) is representative letter version c.

Nuclear Watch Campaign, Commenter Anderson, Mary Lou, ID No. E65 (Representative Letter version a)

From: mlavegas@yahoo.com
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2011 1:23 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found. E65-1

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste. E65-2 E65-3

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased. E65-4

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been E65-5

1

E65-1 The use of HOSS and other approaches for long-term storage of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes are outside the scope of this EIS because they do not meet the purpose and need for agency action. Consistent with Congressional direction in Section 631 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-58), DOE plans to complete an EIS and a ROD for a permanent disposal facility for this waste, not for long-term storage options. The GTCC EIS evaluates the range of reasonable disposal alternatives and, as also required under NEPA, a No Action Alternative. Under the No Action Alternative, current practices for storing GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes would continue in accordance with current requirements.

E65-2 Stopping the generation of nuclear waste or promoting alternative energy sources is outside the scope of the GTCC EIS, the scope of which is to evaluate disposal alternatives to enable the selection of a safe alternative or alternatives for the disposal of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes.

E65-3 The use of HOSS and other approaches for long-term storage of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes are outside the scope of this EIS because they do not meet the purpose and need for agency action. Consistent with Congressional direction in Section 631 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-58), DOE plans to complete an EIS and a ROD for a permanent disposal facility for this waste, not for long-term storage options. The GTCC EIS evaluates the range of reasonable disposal alternatives and, as also required under NEPA, a No Action Alternative. Under the No Action Alternative, current practices for storing GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes would continue in accordance with current requirements.

The Secretary of Energy determined that a permanent repository for high-level waste and spent nuclear fuel at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, is not a workable option and will not be developed. Therefore, DOE concluded that co-disposal at a Yucca Mountain repository is not a reasonable alternative and has eliminated it from evaluation in this EIS, as described in Section 2.6 of the EIS. DOE did not evaluate developing a repository exclusively for disposal of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes because DOE determined that such an alternative is unreasonable due to the time and cost associated with siting another deep geologic repository and the relatively small volume of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like waste identified in the GTCC EIS. DOE believes that the results presented in this EIS for the WIPP geologic repository alternative are indicative of the high degree of waste isolation that would be provided by the use of this disposal method.

DOE recognizes that the use of WIPP for disposal of GTCC waste would require federal legislation to modify the WIPP LWA as amended (P.L. 102-579 as amended by P.L. 240). In addition, it may be necessary to revise the Agreement for Consultation and Cooperation between Department of Energy and the State of New Mexico for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, the WIPP compliance certification with the EPA, and the WIPP Hazardous Waste Facility Permit.

E65-4 The No Action Alternative is evaluated in Chapter 3 of the EIS, and under this alternative, current practices for storing GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like waste would continue. These practices are described in Sections 3.2 (GTCC LLRW) and 3.3 (GTCC-like wastes) in the Final EIS. It was necessary to make a number of simplifying assumptions to address the long-term impacts of this alternative, and these are described in Section 3.5. As part of this assessment, it was assumed that these wastes would remain in long-term storage indefinitely, and that no maintenance of either the storage facility or waste packages would occur after 100 years. These results indicate that very high radiation doses and cancer risks could occur under this alternative in the long term.

The No Action Alternative is evaluated in sufficient detail in the EIS as required by NEPA. Comparatively high potential radiation doses and cancer risks could occur should this alternative be selected. While a more detailed analysis could reduce the uncertainties associated with estimating these doses and risks, the conclusion of comparatively high impacts would not change for this alternative.

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Anderson, Mary Lou, Commenter ID No. E65 (cont'd)
(Representative Letter version a)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS. E65-5 (Cont.)

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility." E65-6

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site. E65-7

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste. E65-8

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Finally, suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Mary Lou Anderson
4584 CASA MIA CIR
LAS VEGAS, NV 89121-5407
7025727249

2

The No Action Alternative is evaluated in the EIS to provide a baseline for comparison with the action alternatives. This evaluation confirmed the risks posed by these wastes and the need to develop appropriate disposal capability. The potential radiation doses for the No Action Alternative covered a time period of 10,000 years in a manner comparable to that done for the action alternatives. Relatively high impacts could occur shortly after the 100-year institutional control period under this alternative.

E65-5 DOE initiated consultation and communication with the 14 participating American Indian tribes that have cultural or historical ties to the DOE sites analyzed in the EIS. These interactions are summarized in Section 1.8 of the EIS, and they included several meetings, workshops, and the development of tribal narratives that were included in the EIS. In addition to including tribal narratives related to the four sites in the EIS, DOE inquired about tribal interest with regard to the WIPP/WIPP Vicinity and SRS. No tribes came forward in response to the inquiries regarding these two locations. It was not necessary to consult with American Indian tribes with regard to the generic regional locations, since the specific locations of the potential disposal facilities (and the affected tribes) were not known.

E65-6 The Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act (LLRWPAA, P.L. 99-240) assigns DOE responsibility for the disposal of GTCC LLRW generated by NRC and Agreement State licensees. The LLRWPAA (P.L. 99-240) does not limit DOE to using only non-DOE facilities or sites for GTCC LLRW disposal.

The LLRWPAA (P.L. 99-240) specifies that GTCC LLRW is to be disposed of in an NRC-licensed facility that has been determined to be adequate to protect public health and safety. There are currently no NRC-licensed facilities that are authorized to dispose of GTCC LLRW. Unless specifically provided by law, the NRC does not have authority to license and regulate facilities operated by or on behalf of DOE. While DOE does not believe the LLRWPAA (P.L. 99-240) requires DOE to only consider commercial disposal alternatives, DOE does recognize that legislation may be needed to clarify whether a GTCC LLRW disposal facility owned or operated by or on behalf of DOE must be licensed by the NRC, and if so, to authorize the NRC to license such a facility.

E65-7 DOE/NNSA analyzed various radioactive waste shipping routes through and around metropolitan Las Vegas, Nevada, in the Draft NNSS SWEIS. DOE/NNSA continued discussions with the State of Nevada on routing options throughout the preparation of the Final NNSS SWEIS. After taking into consideration the comments and concerns expressed by State, county, and local government officials and the public in general during the review and comment period for the Draft NNSS SWEIS, DOE/NNSA decided to maintain the current highway routing restrictions for shipments of low-level radioactive waste (LLW) and mixed-low level radioactive waste (MLLW), as described in the Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC) for the site. DOE/NNSA explained this decision in the Final NNSS SWEIS. The unchanged WAC restrictions are to avoid (1) crossing the Colorado River near Hoover Dam and (2) the greater metropolitan Las Vegas interstate system. DOE/NNSA is not considering, nor is it making, changes to the NNSS WAC with regard to routing.

E65-8 The scope of this EIS is adequate to inform decision making for the disposal of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like waste. Sufficient information is available to support the current decision-making process to identify (an) appropriate site(s) and method(s) to dispose of the limited amount of GTCC wastes identified in the EIS.

DOE believes that this EIS process is not premature and is in compliance with NEPA. On the basis of an assumed starting date of 2019 for disposal operations, more than half (about 6,700 m^3 [240,000 ft^3] of the total GTCC waste inventory of 12,000 m^3 [420,000 ft^3]) is projected to be available for disposal between 2019 and 2030. An additional 2,000 m^3 (71,000 ft^3) would become available for disposal between 2031 and 2035. This information is

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Anderson, Mary Lou, Commenter ID No. E65 (cont'd)
(Representative Letter version a)

presented in Figure 3.4.2-1. DOE believes this EIS is timely, especially given the length of time necessary to select, design, and build a GTCC waste disposal facility.

DOE developed this EIS to support a decision on selecting a disposal facility or facilities for GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like waste, to address legislative requirements, to address national security concerns (especially for sealed sources), and to protect public health and safety. The purpose and need for the proposed action, as discussed above, is stated in the EIS (Section 1.1). The scope of the EIS is focused on addressing the need for developing a disposal capability for the identified inventory of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like waste. DOE plans a tiered decision-making process in which DOE would conduct further site-specific NEPA reviews before implementing an alternative ultimately selected on the basis of this EIS.

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Mills, Lorene, Commenter ID No. E56
(Representative Letter version b)

From: Lorene Mills <LCarpMills@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2011 11:05 PM
To: Arnold Edelman
Cc: Lorene Mills
Subject: Greater than Class C Comments

June 27, 2011

Arnold Edelman, Document Manager, DOE GTCC EIS, Cloverleaf Bld., EM-43, 1000

Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585

Please do not send all that waste to WIPP. Wipp is only for Low Level waste! Thank you.

General Recommendations

- Do not send GTCC to DOE sites. Nation-wide, DOE sites are still facing 100's of billions of dollars and decades worth of cleanup from the Cold War.
- DOE should develop a national waste management strategy to address these waste types.

o "GTCC-like" waste is not subject to the NRC requirements for geologic disposal. DOE should issue a supplement to its 1997 Final Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement to look at the reasonable alternatives for "GTCC-like" waste and other wastes for which long-term storage and disposal is not determined. E56-1

o Such a strategy is needed to integrate the management of these wastes as opposed to the apparent piecemeal approach that is currently being used by the Department.

o Such a strategy, moreover, should be assessed through a programmatic and site-specific NEPA process that addresses major federal actions that could significantly affect the quality of the human environment. This is particularly important when considering the disposal of long-lived radioactive wastes, which are not suitable for shallow land burial.

- Current regulations say that GTCC wastes should be disposed in a geologic repository. Examine a second repository. The legal requirement for another repository exists, yet the alternative of putting the GTCC waste into that repository is not even mentioned. E56-2

o Rather than an alternative repository, the EIS proposes using near-surface trenches; bore holes, or vaults to dispose of GTCC waste at DOE facilities. All those sites have large amounts of nuclear weapons waste, which will take billions of dollars and decades to clean up, and should not be considered for GTCC waste.

1

Mills, Lorene – E56

E56-1 DOE's ROD 78 FR 75913 dated December 13, 2013, stated that DOE has deferred a decision on importing waste from other DOE sites (with limited exceptions as described in the Settlement Agreement with Ecology) for disposal at Hanford at least until WTP is operational. For information on DOE's preferred alternative see GTCC EIS Chapter 2.

E56-2 The EIS considered the range of reasonable alternatives for the disposal of the GTCC waste inventory identified in the EIS. The Secretary of Energy determined that a permanent repository for high-level waste and spent nuclear fuel at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, is not a workable option and will not be developed. Therefore, DOE concluded that co-disposal at a Yucca Mountain repository is not a reasonable alternative and has eliminated it from evaluation in this EIS, as described in Section 2.6 of the EIS.

DOE did not evaluate developing a geologic repository exclusively for disposal of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes because DOE determined that such an alternative is unreasonable due to the time and cost associated with siting another deep geologic repository and the relatively small volume of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like waste identified in the GTCC EIS. DOE believes that the results presented in this EIS for the WIPP geologic repository alternative are indicative of the high degree of waste isolation that would be provided by the use of this disposal method.

DOE recognizes that the use of WIPP for disposal of GTCC waste would require federal legislation to modify the WIPP LWA as amended (P.L. 102-579 as amended by P.L. 240). In addition, it may be necessary to revise the Agreement for Consultation and Cooperation between Department of Energy and the State of New Mexico for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, the WIPP compliance certification with the EPA, and the WIPP Hazardous Waste Facility Permit.

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Mills, Lorene, Commenter ID No. E56 (cont'd)
(Representative Letter version b)

o Prior to issuance of the GTCC EIS, DOE has failed to comply with the requirement of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, 42 U.S.C. §10101 et seq., for development of one or more other deep geologic repositories. The Yucca Mountain site has failed as a deep geologic repository and Congress has not authorized a second site to be located.

o In addition to ignoring regulatory requirements and public comment, the GTCC EIS also disregards the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, which requires DOE to site and operate at least one geologic repository other than WIPP. Since 1987, the only place considered is Yucca Mountain, Nev. That flawed site, always strongly opposed by Nevadans, has been terminated by the Obama administration, and appropriately has been dropped from consideration in the GTCC EIS. E56-2 (Cont.)

o The legal requirement for another repository still exists, yet the alternative of putting the GTCC waste into that repository is not even mentioned.

• DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS that includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste. E56-3

WIPP Recommendations

• The Waste Isolation Pilot Project (WIPP) must not be considered for GTCC waste disposal.

• The only repository alternative considered is WIPP, even though federal and New Mexico laws clearly prohibit commercial waste, including GTCC. By law, WIPP's mission is limited to 175,564 cubic meters of transuranic waste from nuclear weapons. That's less than 5,000,000 curies of radioactivity. GTCC waste would be 30 times more radioactivity than planned for WIPP and would eliminate the ban on commercial waste.

• Finish the original mission at WIPP. E56-4

o Safely operate WIPP to meet the "start clean, stay clean" standard

o Meet commitments to clean up about 20 DOE nuclear weapons sites

o Safely close, decontaminate, and decommission the WIPP site, beginning in about 2030 or earlier.

Los Alamos Recommendations

• The Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) must not be considered for GTCC waste.

• LANL must focus on existing Consent Order cleanup and not bring any more waste, including Greater-than-Class C (GTCC), to the Lab.

o Technical Area 54 (TA-54) is the specific location at LANL that the EIS proposes borehole, trench or vault. This very location is the subject of extensive remediation in Material Disposal Areas (MDAs) G, L and H and is scheduled for completion in 2015 under an agreement with the New Mexico Environment Department. E56-5

o This legally binding agreement requires DOE and LANL to investigate and clean up decades worth of contamination across the lab's 40-square-mile property. Signed in 2005, the Consent Order lays out cleanup milestones and requires the federal government to pay fines if LANL fails to meet them.

2

E56-3 The use of HOSS and other approaches for long-term storage of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes are outside the scope of this EIS because they do not meet the purpose and need for agency action. Consistent with Congressional direction in Section 631 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-58), DOE plans to complete an EIS and a ROD for a permanent disposal facility for this waste, not for long-term storage options. The GTCC EIS evaluates the range of reasonable disposal alternatives and, as also required under NEPA, a No Action Alternative. Under the No Action Alternative, current practices for storing GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes would continue in accordance with current requirements.

E56-4 DOE acknowledges that only defense-generated TRU waste is currently authorized for disposal at the WIPP geologic repository under the WIPP LWA as amended (P.L. 102-579 as amended by P.L. 240) and legislation would be required to allow disposal of waste other than TRU waste generated by atomic energy defense activities at WIPP and/or for siting a new facility within the land withdrawal area. However, NEPA does not limit an EIS to proposing and evaluating alternatives that are currently authorized. The Agreement for Consultation and Cooperation between Department of Energy and the State of New Mexico for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant recognizes that the mission of WIPP may change and provides provisions to modify the agreement. For example, the Agreement states: "The parties to this Agreement recognize that future developments including changes to applicable laws (e.g., Public Law [P.L.] 96-164) may make it desirable or necessary for one or both parties to seek to modify this Agreement. Either party to this Agreement may request a review of the terms and conditions."

DOE acknowledges the TRU waste disposal limitations for WIPP specified in the WIPP LWA as amended (P.L. 102-579 as amended by P.L. 240) and in the Agreement for Consultation and Cooperation between Department of Energy and the State of New Mexico for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. Information on these limitations is provided in this EIS (see Section 4.1.1) and was considered in developing the preferred alternative. Based on the GTCC EIS evaluation, disposal of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes at WIPP would result in minimal environmental impacts for all resource areas evaluated, including human health and transportation. Both the annual dose and the latent cancer fatality (LCF) risk would be zero because there would be no releases to the accessible environment and therefore no radiation doses and LCFs during the first 10,000 years following closure of the WIPP repository. In addition to legislative changes, DOE recognizes that the use of WIPP for the disposal of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes would require and site-specific NEPA reviews, including further characterization of the waste (e.g., radionuclide inventory and heat loads), as well as the proposed packaging for disposal.

E56-5 Consistent with NEPA implementing regulations in Parts 1500–1508 of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508), DOE analyzed a range of disposal methods (i.e., geologic repository, near-surface trench, intermediate-depth borehole, and above-grade vault) and federally owned sites (i.e., Hanford Site, INL, LANL, NNSS, SRS, WIPP, and the WIPP Vicinity) as well as generic commercial locations. DOE determined that it was reasonable to analyze the federal sites because they currently have operating radioactive waste disposal facilities, except for the WIPP Vicinity, which is near an operating geologic repository.

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Mills, Lorene, Commenter ID No. E56 (cont'd)
(Representative Letter version b)

o The residents of Northern New Mexico expect no less from DOE and LANL than completion of the legacy waste remediation on schedule.

o To reverse this policy and add new waste will severely jeopardize LANL relations with its neighbors both near and far and negate much of the progress accomplished.

E56-5 (Cont.)

• Heed the American Indian Text

o Pueblo people believe that plant roots will eventually penetrate the GTCC facility.

o There is a need for a cultural mineral assessment and study to identify the existence of minerals of cultural significance and use.

E56-6

Lorene Mills
87502

3

E56-6 Text prepared by potentially affected American Indian tribes is included in this EIS. DOE considered this text for Hanford, INL, LANL, and NNSS; however, DOE also needed to ensure consistency in the EIS analyses between the various sites, so that an even comparison could be made between alternatives as required by NEPA. Because of this, it was not possible to fully utilize all of the information provided by the tribal governments in order to perform specific analyses associated with exposure events unique to a given American Indian tribe (such as greater intakes of fish, game, and plants; the use of sweat lodges; and the use of natural pigment paints for traditional ceremonies). Once a decision is made on a specific site location and method, site-specific NEPA reviews would be conducted as needed, including appropriate analysis of exposure events unique to the impacted local American Indian tribes.

However, the information provided in these narratives was considered in the identification of the preferred alternative presented in this EIS. The information provided in the narratives for Hanford, INL, LANL, and NNSS was very useful, and DOE appreciates the time and effort expended by the various tribes in supporting this EIS process.

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Gordon, Susan, Commenter ID No. E95
(Representative Letter version c)

From: Susan Gordon <sgordon@ananuclear.org>
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2011 11:38 AM
To: Arnold Edelman
Cc: Susan Gordon
Subject: Greater than Class C Comments

Letter b

June 10, 2011

Arnold Edelman, Document Manager, DOE GTCC EIS, Cloverleaf Bld., EM-43, 1000

Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585

General Recommendations

- Hardened On-site Storage (HOSS) must be considered as an alternative.

o GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain on-site at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected in hardened storage facilities from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS.

- The DOE rejection of the HOSS alternative is unacceptable because GTCC LLW at present and for decades in the future will be in on-site storage, so the actual status is not outside the scope of alternatives that should be considered for an EIS.

o The DEIS rejected the HOSS alternative that many people from around the country advocated at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007. E95-1

o HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found. Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing the generation of those wastes.

o DOE's reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is "not a permanent disposal facility." Yet, most of the GTCC waste will not be generated for many decades.

o At least 85 percent of existing reactors and any new ones are expected to operate beyond 2030, which means GTCC waste disposal could not begin for years after that.

o Decisions now about disposal sites and technologies are premature. There is time to learn from experience.

o DOE must create a regulatory definition of HOSS.

1

Gordon, Susan – E95

E95-1 The use of HOSS and other approaches for long-term storage of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes are outside the scope of this EIS because they do not meet the purpose and need for agency action. Consistent with Congressional direction in Section 631 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-58), DOE plans to complete an EIS and a ROD for a permanent disposal facility for this waste, not for long-term storage options. The GTCC EIS evaluates the range of reasonable disposal alternatives and, as also required under NEPA, a No Action Alternative. Under the No Action Alternative, current practices for storing GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes would continue in accordance with current requirements.

The development of a regulatory framework for the use of HOSS at commercial nuclear power plants is outside the scope of the GTCC EIS. DOE does not have authority to regulate the storage of radioactive wastes at commercial facilities, including nuclear power plants. Under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 as amended (AEA) (see United States Code: 42 USC § 2011), NRC is responsible for regulating storage of such wastes. Radioactive waste storage requirements can be found in 10 CFR Part 30 (Rule of General Applicability to Domestic Licensing of Byproduct Material), 10 CFR Part 70 (Domestic Licensing of Special Nuclear Material), and 10 CFR Part 72 (Licensing Requirements for the Independent Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel, High-Level Radioactive Waste, and Reactor-Related Greater Than Class C Waste). In addition, NRC has provided guidance for the storage of LLRW in SECY-94-198, Review of Existing Guidance Concerning the Extended Storage of Low-Level Radioactive Waste, which was issued on August 1, 1994.

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Gordon, Susan, Commenter ID No. E95 (cont'd)
(Representative Letter version c)

- o DOE must create a regulatory framework for HOSS.
- o HOSS is not a "no action" alternative.

E95-1 (Cont.)

- Do not send GTCC to DOE sites. Nation-wide, DOE sites are still facing 100's of billions of dollars and decades worth of cleanup from the Cold War.

E95-2

WIPP Recommendations

- The Waste Isolation Pilot Project (WIPP) must not be considered for GTCC waste disposal.
- DOE is considering WIPP for GTCC disposal only because WIPP is currently the only hole in the ground. DOE must expand its horizons.
- o Section 1.4.3 of the EIS states, "For deep geologic disposal, WIPP in New Mexico was included for evaluation in this EIS because of its characteristics as a geologic repository."
- The only repository alternative considered is WIPP, even though federal and New Mexico laws clearly prohibit commercial waste, including GTCC. By law, WIPP's mission is limited to 175,564 cubic meters of transuranic waste from nuclear weapons. That's less than 5,000,000 curies of radioactivity. GTCC waste would be 30 times more radioactivity than planned for WIPP and would eliminate the ban on commercial waste.

E95-3

Los Alamos Recommendations

- The Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) must not be considered for GTCC waste.
- The location of LANL in a seismic fault zone between a rift valley and a dormant volcano is not the place for radioactive waste that is dangerous for tens of thousands of years.

E95-4

Susan Gordon
903 W Alameda St #740
Santa Fe, NM 87501
505-555-5555

2

E95-2 DOE is performing environmental restoration activities at the Hanford Site, INL, LANL, NNSS, and SRS. The ongoing cleanup efforts at these sites will continue. A GTCC waste disposal facility would be located in an area removed from ongoing cleanup activities, so disposal of the GTCC wastes would not affect ongoing cleanup activities at these sites.

E95-3 DOE acknowledges that only defense-generated TRU waste is currently authorized for disposal at the WIPP geologic repository under the WIPP LWA as amended (P.L. 102-579 as amended by P.L. 240) and legislation would be required to allow disposal of waste other than TRU waste generated by atomic energy defense activities at WIPP and/or for siting a new facility within the land withdrawal area. However, NEPA does not limit an EIS to proposing and evaluating alternatives that are currently authorized. The Agreement for Consultation and Cooperation between Department of Energy and the State of New Mexico for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant recognizes that the mission of WIPP may change and provides provisions to modify the agreement. For example, the Agreement states: "The parties to this Agreement recognize that future developments including changes to applicable laws (e.g., Public Law [P.L.] 96-164) may make it desirable or necessary for one or both parties to seek to modify this Agreement. Either party to this Agreement may request a review of the terms and conditions."

DOE acknowledges the TRU waste disposal limitations for WIPP specified in the WIPP LWA as amended (P.L. 102-579 as amended by P.L. 240) and in the Agreement for Consultation and Cooperation between Department of Energy and the State of New Mexico for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. Information on these limitations is provided in this EIS (see Section 4.1.1) and was considered in developing the preferred alternative. Based on the GTCC EIS evaluation, disposal of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes at WIPP would result in minimal environmental impacts for all resource areas evaluated, including human health and transportation. Both the annual dose and the latent cancer fatality (LCF) risk would be zero because there would be no releases to the accessible environment and therefore no radiation doses and LCFs during the first 10,000 years following closure of the WIPP repository. In addition to legislative changes, DOE recognizes that the use of WIPP for the disposal of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes would require and site-specific NEPA reviews, including further characterization of the waste (e.g., radionuclide inventory and heat loads), as well as the proposed packaging for disposal.

E95-4 Consistent with NEPA implementing regulations in Parts 1500–1508 of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508), DOE analyzed a range of disposal methods (i.e., geologic repository, near-surface trench, intermediate-depth borehole, and above-grade vault) and federally owned sites (i.e., Hanford Site, INL, LANL, NNSS, SRS, WIPP, and the WIPP Vicinity) as well as generic commercial locations. DOE determined that it was reasonable to analyze the federal sites because they currently have operating radioactive waste disposal facilities, except for the WIPP Vicinity, which is near an operating geologic repository.

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Baley, Patricia McRae, Commenter ID No. E75

From: Patricia McRae Baley <patricia.mcrae@unlv.edu>
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 2:57 PM
To: Arnold Edelman
Cc: Patricia McRae Baley
Subject: Greater than Class C Comments

6/24/11

Arnold Edelman, Document Manager, DOE GTCC EIS, Cloverleaf Bld., EM-43, 1000

Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585

General Recommendations

- Do not send GTCC to DOE sites. Nation-wide, DOE sites are still facing 100's of billions of dollars and decades worth of cleanup from the Cold War.

- DOE should develop a national waste management strategy to address these waste types.

o "GTCC-like" waste is not subject to the NRC requirements for geologic disposal. DOE should issue a supplement to its 1997 Final Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement to look at the reasonable alternatives for "GTCC-like" waste and other wastes for which long-term storage and disposal is not determined.

o Such a strategy is needed to integrate the management of these wastes as opposed to the apparent piecemeal approach that is currently being used by the Department.

o Such a strategy, moreover, should be assessed through a programmatic and site-specific NEPA process that addresses major federal actions that could significantly affect the quality of the human environment. This is particularly important when considering the disposal of long-lived radioactive wastes, which are not suitable for shallow land burial.

- Current regulations say that GTCC wastes should be disposed in a geologic repository. Examine a second repository. The legal requirement for another repository exists, yet the alternative of putting the GTCC waste into that repository is not even mentioned.

o Rather than an alternative repository, the EIS proposes using near-surface trenches; bore holes, or vaults to dispose of GTCC waste at DOE facilities. All those sites have large amounts of nuclear weapons waste, which will take billions of dollars and decades to clean up, and should not be considered for GTCC waste.

1

Baley, Patricia McRae – E75

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Baley, Patricia McRae, Commenter ID No. E75 (cont'd)

o Prior to issuance of the GTCC EIS, DOE has failed to comply with the requirement of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, 42 U.S.C. §10101 et seq., for development of one or more other deep geologic repositories. The Yucca Mountain site has failed as a deep geologic repository and Congress has not authorized a second site to be located.

o In addition to ignoring regulatory requirements and public comment, the GTCC EIS also disregards the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, which requires DOE to site and operate at least one geologic repository other than WIPP. Since 1987, the only place considered is Yucca Mountain, Nev. That flawed site, always strongly opposed by Nevadans, has been terminated by the Obama administration, and appropriately has been dropped from consideration in the GTCC EIS.

o The legal requirement for another repository still exists, yet the alternative of putting the GTCC waste into that repository is not even mentioned.

• DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS that includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

WIPP Recommendations

• The Waste Isolation Pilot Project (WIPP) must not be considered for GTCC waste disposal.

• The only repository alternative considered is WIPP, even though federal and New Mexico laws clearly prohibit commercial waste, including GTCC. By law, WIPP's mission is limited to 175,564 cubic meters of transuranic waste from nuclear weapons. That's less than 5,000,000 curies of radioactivity. GTCC waste would be 30 times more radioactivity than planned for WIPP and would eliminate the ban on commercial waste.

• Finish the original mission at WIPP.

o Safely operate WIPP to meet the "start clean, stay clean" standard

o Meet commitments to clean up about 20 DOE nuclear weapons sites

o Safely close, decontaminate, and decommission the WIPP site, beginning in about 2030 or earlier.

Los Alamos Recommendations

• The Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) must not be considered for GTCC waste.

• LANL must focus on existing Consent Order cleanup and not bring any more waste, including Greater-than-Class C (GTCC), to the Lab.

o Technical Area 54 (TA-54) is the specific location at LANL that the EIS proposes borehole, trench or vault. This very location is the subject of extensive remediation in Material Disposal Areas (MDAs) G, L and H and is scheduled for completion in 2015 under an agreement with the New Mexico Environment Department.

o This legally binding agreement requires DOE and LANL to investigate and clean up decades worth of contamination across the lab's 40-square-mile property. Signed in 2005, the Consent Order lays out cleanup milestones and requires the federal government to pay fines if LANL fails to meet them.

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Baley, Patricia McRae, Commenter ID No. E75 (cont'd)

o The residents of Northern New Mexico expect no less from DOE and LANL than completion of the legacy waste remediation on schedule.

o To reverse this policy and add new waste will severely jeopardize LANL relations with its neighbors both near and far and negate much of the progress accomplished.

• Heed the American Indian Text

o Pueblo people believe that plant roots will eventually penetrate the GTCC facility.

o There is a need for a cultural mineral assessment and study to identify the existence of minerals of cultural significance and use.

Patricia McRae Baley
Las Vegas, NV 89121

3

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Brown, John, Commenter ID No. E17

From: compostjohn2@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 4:02 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Brown, John – E17

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Brown, John, Commenter ID No. E17 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

John Brown
932 E Edgeware Rd
Los Angeles, CA 90026-5781

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Busch, Dorothy, Commenter ID No. E30

From: dorothybusch@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 6:06 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Busch, Dorothy – E30

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Busch, Dorothy, Commenter ID No. E30 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Busch
POB 16567
Missoula, MT 59808-6567

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Cardwell, Stephanie, Commenter ID No. E18

From: cslcardwell@hotmail.com
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 5:20 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Cardwell, Stephanie – E18

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Cardwell, Stephanie, Commenter ID No. E18 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Cardwell
4621 Merced St
Des moines, IA 50310-2910

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Childers, Dee, Commenter ID No. E25

From:	deechilders@msn.com
Sent:	Tuesday, June 28, 2011 11:32 AM
To:	gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject:	Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)
Importance:	High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Childers, Dee, Commenter ID No. E25 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Dee Childers
671 N Harvey Ln
Eagle, ID 83616
2088304455

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Cole, Corrine, Commenter ID No. E13

From: caronkoreen@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 11:13 AM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Cole, Corrine – E13

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Cole, Corrine, Commenter ID No. E13 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Corrine Cole
P.O. Box 476
Markleeville, CA 96120-0476

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Colip, Carol, Commenter ID No. E16

From: colipso@charter.net
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2011 6:08 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Colip, Carol – E16

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Colip, Carol, Commenter ID No. E16 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Carol Colip
255 Drumm Lane
Fallon, NV 89406-7131

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Crawford, Teresa, Commenter ID No. E91

From: tailspinterry@hotmail.com
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 6:36 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Crawford, Teresa – E91

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Crawford, Teresa, Commenter ID No. E91 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Teresa Crawford
476 Hidden Garden Place
Henderson, NV 89012

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Cronin, Thomas, Commenter ID No. E88

From: tompainecronin@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 12:13 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Cronin, Thomas – E88

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Cronin, Thomas, Commenter ID No. E88 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Thomas Cronin
100 Rochelle Ave.
Phila., PA 19128
215-482-5531

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Drucker, Linda, Commenter ID No. E98

From: shantilin@cox.net
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 5:03 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Drucker, Linda – E98

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Drucker, Linda, Commenter ID No. E98 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Linda Drucker
2832 Summer Lake Dr.
Las Vegas, NV 89128-7706

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Fanning, Don, Commenter ID No. E86

From: uncledon@well.com
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 8:05 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Fanning, Don – E86

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Fanning, Don, Commenter ID No. E86 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Don Fanning
PO Box 128
Flagstaff, AZ 86002-0128

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Ford, Peter, Commenter ID No. E78

From: quartermanjack@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2011 3:17 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Ford, Peter – E78

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Ford, Peter, Commenter ID No. E78 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Peter Ford
2021 Burma Road
Baker, NV 89311-0140
775-234-8808

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Haber, Ruth, Commenter ID No. E79

From: r.haber@sbcglobal.net
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 3:36 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Haber, Ruth – E79

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Haber, Ruth, Commenter ID No. E79 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Ruth Haber
3040 Flora Court
Pleasanton, CA 94588-7706

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Hall, Frederica, Commenter ID No. E38

From: Frederica Hall <rik3@mindspring.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 25, 2011 2:59 PM
To: Arnold Edelman
Cc: Frederica Hall
Subject: Greater than Class C Comments

06/25/2011

Arnold Edelman, Document Manager, DOE GTCC EIS, Cloverleaf Bld., EM-43, 1000

Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585

General Recommendations

- Do not send GTCC to DOE sites. Nation-wide, DOE sites are still facing 100's of billions of dollars and decades worth of cleanup from the Cold War.

- DOE should develop a national waste management strategy to address these waste types.

o "GTCC-like" waste is not subject to the NRC requirements for geologic disposal. DOE should issue a supplement to its 1997 Final Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement to look at the reasonable alternatives for "GTCC-like" waste and other wastes for which long-term storage and disposal is not determined.

o Such a strategy is needed to integrate the management of these wastes as opposed to the apparent piecemeal approach that is currently being used by the Department.

o Such a strategy, moreover, should be assessed through a programmatic and site-specific NEPA process that addresses major federal actions that could significantly affect the quality of the human environment. This is particularly important when considering the disposal of long-lived radioactive wastes, which are not suitable for shallow land burial.

- Current regulations say that GTCC wastes should be disposed in a geologic repository. Examine a second repository. The legal requirement for another repository exists, yet the alternative of putting the GTCC waste into that repository is not even mentioned.

o Rather than an alternative repository, the EIS proposes using near-surface trenches; bore holes, or vaults to dispose of GTCC waste at DOE facilities. All those sites have large amounts of nuclear weapons waste, which will take billions of dollars and decades to clean up, and should not be considered for GTCC waste.

o Prior to issuance of the GTCC EIS, DOE has failed to comply with the requirement of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, 42 U.S.C. §10101 et seq., for development of one or more other deep geologic repositories. The Yucca Mountain site has failed as a deep geologic repository and Congress has not authorized a second site to be located.

1

Hall, Frederica – E38

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Hall, Frederica, Commenter ID No. E38 (cont'd)

o In addition to ignoring regulatory requirements and public comment, the GTCC EIS also disregards the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, which requires DOE to site and operate at least one geologic repository other than WIPP. Since 1987, the only place considered is Yucca Mountain, Nev. That flawed site, always strongly opposed by Nevadans, has been terminated by the Obama administration, and appropriately has been dropped from consideration in the GTCC EIS.

o The legal requirement for another repository still exists, yet the alternative of putting the GTCC waste into that repository is not even mentioned.

• DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS that includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

WIPP Recommendations

• The Waste Isolation Pilot Project (WIPP) must not be considered for GTCC waste disposal.

• The only repository alternative considered is WIPP, even though federal and New Mexico laws clearly prohibit commercial waste, including GTCC. By law, WIPP's mission is limited to 175,564 cubic meters of transuranic waste from nuclear weapons. That's less than 5,000,000 curies of radioactivity. GTCC waste would be 30 times more radioactivity than planned for WIPP and would eliminate the ban on commercial waste.

• Finish the original mission at WIPP.

o Safely operate WIPP to meet the "start clean, stay clean" standard

o Meet commitments to clean up about 20 DOE nuclear weapons sites

o Safely close, decontaminate, and decommission the WIPP site, beginning in about 2030 or earlier.

Los Alamos Recommendations

• The Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) must not be considered for GTCC waste.

• LANL must focus on existing Consent Order cleanup and not bring any more waste, including Greater-than-Class C (GTCC), to the Lab.

o Technical Area 54 (TA-54) is the specific location at LANL that the EIS proposes borehole, trench or vault. This very location is the subject of extensive remediation in Material Disposal Areas (MDAs) G, L and H and is scheduled for completion in 2015 under an agreement with the New Mexico Environment Department.

o This legally binding agreement requires DOE and LANL to investigate and clean up decades worth of contamination across the lab's 40-square-mile property. Signed in 2005, the Consent Order lays out cleanup milestones and requires the federal government to pay fines if LANL fails to meet them.

o The residents of Northern New Mexico expect no less from DOE and LANL than completion of the legacy waste remediation on schedule.

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Hall, Frederica, Commenter ID No. E38 (cont'd)

o To reverse this policy and add new waste will severely jeopardize LANL relations with its neighbors both near and far and negate much of the progress accomplished.

• Heed the American Indian Text

o Pueblo people believe that plant roots will eventually penetrate the GTCC facility.

o There is a need for a cultural mineral assessment and study to identify the existence of minerals of cultural significance and use.

Lastly Do not continue development of new nuclear waste

Stop all new development of Nuclear power .

Frederica Hall
Flagstaff AZ 86002

3

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Halsey-Hoover, Sharon, Commenter ID No. E99

From: shalseyhoover@gmail.com
Sent: Saturday, June 25, 2011 6:13 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Halsey-Hoover, Sharon – E99

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Halsey-Hoover, Sharon, Commenter ID No. E99 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Sharon Halsey-Hoover
2209 Via Marioposa E
Laguna Woods, CA 92637

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Hartsough, David, Commenter ID No. E24

From: davidhartsough@igc.org
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 4:12 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Hartsough, David – E24

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Hartsough, David, Commenter ID No. E24 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

David Hartsough
721 Shrader St.
San Francisco, CA 94117-2721

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Hoffman, Jim, Commenter ID No. E44

From: jimofmhoffman@yahoo.com
Sent: Saturday, June 11, 2011 8:37 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Hoffman, Jim – E44

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Hoffman, Jim, Commenter ID No. E44 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Fr. Jim Hoffman OFM
110 W. Madison St.
Chicago, IL 60602-4102

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Intino, Mario, Commenter ID No. E87

From: trytrytry@netzero.net
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 12:53 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Intino, Mario, Commenter ID No. E87 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Mario Intino
1624 Palm St Unit 78
Las Vegas, NV 89104-4709

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Jones, Barbara, Commenter ID No. E62

From: maya_angelofsorts@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 7:05 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Jones, Barbara – E62

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Jones, Barbara, Commenter ID No. E62 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Barbara Jones
PO Box 26935
Tempe, AZ 85285-6935

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Jones, Jeremiah, Commenter ID No. E42

From: jeremiah.jones20@yahoo.com
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2011 2:06 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Jones, Jeremiah – E42

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Jones, Jeremiah, Commenter ID No. E42 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Jeremiah Jones
1462 Feather Way
Elko, NV 89801
7557380403

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Knutsen, Reinard, Commenter ID No. E81

From: reinardk@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 4:56 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Knutsen, Reinard – E81

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Knutsen, Reinard, Commenter ID No. E81 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Reinard Knutsen
174 A Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84103

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Kovac, Scott, Commenter ID No. E101

From: Scott Kovac <scott@nukewatch.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2011 2:52 PM
To: Arnold Edelman
Cc: Scott Kovac
Subject: Greater than Class C Comments

June 21, 2011

Arnold Edelman, Document Manager, DOE GTCC EIS, Cloverleaf Bld., EM-43, 1000

Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585

General Recommendations

- Hardened On-site Storage (HOSS) must be considered as an alternative.

o GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain on-site at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected in hardened storage facilities from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS.

- The DOE rejection of the HOSS alternative is unacceptable because GTCC LLW at present and for decades in the future will be in on-site storage, so the actual status is not outside the scope of alternatives that should be considered for an EIS.

o The DEIS rejected the HOSS alternative that many people from around the country advocated at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007.

o HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found. Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing the generation of those wastes.

o DOE's reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is "not a permanent disposal facility." Yet, most of the GTCC waste will not be generated for many decades.

o At least 85 percent of existing reactors and any new ones are expected to operate beyond 2030, which means GTCC waste disposal could not begin for years after that.

o Decisions now about disposal sites and technologies are premature. There is time to learn from experience.

o DOE must create a regulatory definition of HOSS.

1

Kovac, Scott – E101

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Kovac, Scott, Commenter ID No. E101 (cont'd)

o DOE must create a regulatory framework for HOSS.

o HOSS is not a "no action" alternative.

• Do not send GTCC to DOE sites. Nation-wide, DOE sites are still facing 100's of billions of dollars and decades worth of cleanup from the Cold War.

WIPP Recommendations

• The Waste Isolation Pilot Project (WIPP) must not be considered for GTCC waste disposal.

• DOE is considering WIPP for GTCC disposal only because WIPP is currently the only hole in the ground. DOE must expand its horizons.

o Section 1.4.3 of the EIS states, "For deep geologic disposal, WIPP in New Mexico was included for evaluation in this EIS because of its characteristics as a geologic repository."

• The only repository alternative considered is WIPP, even though federal and New Mexico laws clearly prohibit commercial waste, including GTCC. By law, WIPP's mission is limited to 175,564 cubic meters of transuranic waste from nuclear weapons. That's less than 5,000,000 curies of radioactivity. GTCC waste would be 30 times more radioactivity than planned for WIPP and would eliminate the ban on commercial waste.

Los Alamos Recommendations

• The Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) must not be considered for GTCC waste.

• The location of LANL in a seismic fault zone between a rift valley and a dormant volcano is not the place for radioactive waste that is dangerous for tens of thousands of years.

Scott Kovac
Santa Fe, NM, 87505

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Lai, R, Commenter ID No. E83

From: rkmlai@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 3:56 AM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Lai, R – E83

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Lai, R, Commenter ID No. E83 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

R Lai RN
1400 Q St.
Sacramento, CA 95811

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Larson, David, Commenter ID No. E22

From: dave@pjep.org
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2011 12:21 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the âAecœNo ActionâAe alternative.. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOEâAe™s GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is âAecœHardened On-Site StorageâAe (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOEâAe™s current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS.. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOEâAe™s stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a âAecœpermanent disposal facilityâAe but just a âAecœlong-term storage option.âAe But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare âAecœEstimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term ImpactsâAe for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make âAecœNo ActionâAe and âAecœVault MethodâAe appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. âAecœNo actionâAe alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Larson, David – E22

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Larson, David, Commenter ID No. E22 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes âAecœrepresentativesâAe from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: âAecœThe draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility.âAe

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand; ensure the leaders of the Western Shoshone Nation are formally engaged with the opportunity to provide an official response. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

David Larson
1140 Marion
Denver, CO 80218

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Levee, Penny, Commenter ID No. E104

From: rplevee@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2011 11:01 AM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Levee, Penny – E104

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Levee, Penny, Commenter ID No. E104 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Penny LeVee
1755 Empire Rd.
Reno, NV 89521

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Levine, Julie, Commenter ID No. E49

From: juliemagic2010@gmail.com
Sent: Sunday, June 12, 2011 12:52 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Levine, Julie – E49

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Levine, Julie, Commenter ID No. E49 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Julie Levine
20569 Cheney Drive
Topanga, CA 90290-3715

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Louis, Cynthia, Commenter ID No. E19

From: Cynthia Louis <ceanna999@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2011 12:21 PM
To: Arnold Edelman
Cc: Cynthia Louis
Subject: Greater than Class C Comments

June 28

Arnold Edelman, Document Manager, DOE GTCC EIS, Cloverleaf Bld., EM-43, 1000

Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585

Just please DO NOT expand radioactive/plutonium activity in Los Alamos. Just because you arrived during WW 11 doesn't mean you have the right to continue forcing this on NM residents.

General Recommendations

- Do not send GTCC to DOE sites. Nation-wide, DOE sites are still facing 100's of billions of dollars and decades worth of cleanup from the Cold War.
- DOE should develop a national waste management strategy to address these waste types.

o "GTCC-like" waste is not subject to the NRC requirements for geologic disposal. DOE should issue a supplement to its 1997 Final Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement to look at the reasonable alternatives for "GTCC-like" waste and other wastes for which long-term storage and disposal is not determined.

o Such a strategy is needed to integrate the management of these wastes as opposed to the apparent piecemeal approach that is currently being used by the Department.

o Such a strategy, moreover, should be assessed through a programmatic and site-specific NEPA process that addresses major federal actions that could significantly affect the quality of the human environment. This is particularly important when considering the disposal of long-lived radioactive wastes, which are not suitable for shallow land burial.

- Current regulations say that GTCC wastes should be disposed in a geologic repository. Examine a second repository. The legal requirement for another repository exists, yet the alternative of putting the GTCC waste into that repository is not even mentioned.

1

Louis, Cynthia – E19

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Louis, Cynthia, Commenter ID No. E19 (cont'd)

o Rather than an alternative repository, the EIS proposes using near-surface trenches; bore holes, or vaults to dispose of GTCC waste at DOE facilities. All those sites have large amounts of nuclear weapons waste, which will take billions of dollars and decades to clean up, and should not be considered for GTCC waste.

o Prior to issuance of the GTCC EIS, DOE has failed to comply with the requirement of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, 42 U.S.C. §10101 et seq., for development of one or more other deep geologic repositories. The Yucca Mountain site has failed as a deep geologic repository and Congress has not authorized a second site to be located.

o In addition to ignoring regulatory requirements and public comment, the GTCC EIS also disregards the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, which requires DOE to site and operate at least one geologic repository other than WIPP. Since 1987, the only place considered is Yucca Mountain, Nev. That flawed site, always strongly opposed by Nevadans, has been terminated by the Obama administration, and appropriately has been dropped from consideration in the GTCC EIS.

o The legal requirement for another repository still exists, yet the alternative of putting the GTCC waste into that repository is not even mentioned.

• DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS that includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

WIPP Recommendations

• The Waste Isolation Pilot Project (WIPP) must not be considered for GTCC waste disposal.

• The only repository alternative considered is WIPP, even though federal and New Mexico laws clearly prohibit commercial waste, including GTCC. By law, WIPP's mission is limited to 175,564 cubic meters of transuranic waste from nuclear weapons. That's less than 5,000,000 curies of radioactivity. GTCC waste would be 30 times more radioactivity than planned for WIPP and would eliminate the ban on commercial waste.

• Finish the original mission at WIPP.

o Safely operate WIPP to meet the "start clean, stay clean" standard

o Meet commitments to clean up about 20 DOE nuclear weapons sites

o Safely close, decontaminate, and decommission the WIPP site, beginning in about 2030 or earlier.

Los Alamos Recommendations

• The Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) must not be considered for GTCC waste.

• LANL must focus on existing Consent Order cleanup and not bring any more waste, including Greater-than-Class C (GTCC), to the Lab.

o Technical Area 54 (TA-54) is the specific location at LANL that the EIS proposes borehole, trench or vault. This very location is the subject of extensive remediation in Material Disposal Areas (MDAs) G, L and H and is scheduled for completion in 2015 under an agreement with the New Mexico Environment Department.

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Louis, Cynthia, Commenter ID No. E19 (cont'd)

o This legally binding agreement requires DOE and LANL to investigate and clean up decades worth of contamination across the lab's 40-square-mile property. Signed in 2005, the Consent Order lays out cleanup milestones and requires the federal government to pay fines if LANL fails to meet them.

o The residents of Northern New Mexico expect no less from DOE and LANL than completion of the legacy waste remediation on schedule.

o To reverse this policy and add new waste will severely jeopardize LANL relations with its neighbors both near and far and negate much of the progress accomplished.

- Heed the American Indian Text

o Pueblo people believe that plant roots will eventually penetrate the GTCC facility.

o There is a need for a cultural mineral assessment and study to identify the existence of minerals of cultural significance and use.

Cynthia Louis
Santa Fe, NM, 87505

3

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Lynn, Michele, Commenter ID No. E63

From: mdl4perfworks@hotmail.com
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 5:03 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Lynn, Michele – E63

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Lynn, Michele, Commenter ID No. E63 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Michele Lynn
1404 Jessica Ave
las Vegas, NV 89104-1712

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Model, Betsy, Commenter ID No. E6

From:	Betsy Model <bmodel@betsymodel.com>
Sent:	Monday, June 27, 2011 11:36 PM
To:	Arnold Edelman
Cc:	Betsy Model
Subject:	Greater than Class C Comments

June 27, 2011

Arnold Edelman, Document Manager, DOE GTCC EIS, Cloverleaf Bld., EM-43, 1000

Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585

General Recommendations

- Do not send GTCC to DOE sites. Nation-wide, DOE sites are still facing 100's of billions of dollars and decades worth of cleanup from the Cold War.

- DOE should develop a national waste management strategy to address these waste types.

o "GTCC-like" waste is not subject to the NRC requirements for geologic disposal. DOE should issue a supplement to its 1997 Final Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement to look at the reasonable alternatives for "GTCC-like" waste and other wastes for which long-term storage and disposal is not determined.

o Such a strategy is needed to integrate the management of these wastes as opposed to the apparent piecemeal approach that is currently being used by the Department.

o Such a strategy, moreover, should be assessed through a programmatic and site-specific NEPA process that addresses major federal actions that could significantly affect the quality of the human environment. This is particularly important when considering the disposal of long-lived radioactive wastes, which are not suitable for shallow land burial.

- Current regulations say that GTCC wastes should be disposed in a geologic repository. Examine a second repository. The legal requirement for another repository exists, yet the alternative of putting the GTCC waste into that repository is not even mentioned.

o Rather than an alternative repository, the EIS proposes using near-surface trenches; bore holes, or vaults to dispose of GTCC waste at DOE facilities. All those sites have large amounts of nuclear weapons waste, which will take billions of dollars and decades to clean up, and should not be considered for GTCC waste.

1

Model, Betsy – E6

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Model, Betsy, Commenter ID No. E6 (cont'd)

o Prior to issuance of the GTCC EIS, DOE has failed to comply with the requirement of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, 42 U.S.C. §10101 et seq., for development of one or more other deep geologic repositories. The Yucca Mountain site has failed as a deep geologic repository and Congress has not authorized a second site to be located.

o In addition to ignoring regulatory requirements and public comment, the GTCC EIS also disregards the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, which requires DOE to site and operate at least one geologic repository other than WIPP. Since 1987, the only place considered is Yucca Mountain, Nev. That flawed site, always strongly opposed by Nevadans, has been terminated by the Obama administration, and appropriately has been dropped from consideration in the GTCC EIS.

o The legal requirement for another repository still exists, yet the alternative of putting the GTCC waste into that repository is not even mentioned.

• DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS that includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

WIPP Recommendations

• The Waste Isolation Pilot Project (WIPP) must not be considered for GTCC waste disposal.

• The only repository alternative considered is WIPP, even though federal and New Mexico laws clearly prohibit commercial waste, including GTCC. By law, WIPP's mission is limited to 175,564 cubic meters of transuranic waste from nuclear weapons. That's less than 5,000,000 curies of radioactivity. GTCC waste would be 30 times more radioactivity than planned for WIPP and would eliminate the ban on commercial waste.

• Finish the original mission at WIPP.

o Safely operate WIPP to meet the "start clean, stay clean" standard

o Meet commitments to clean up about 20 DOE nuclear weapons sites

o Safely close, decontaminate, and decommission the WIPP site, beginning in about 2030 or earlier.

Los Alamos Recommendations

• The Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) must not be considered for GTCC waste.

• LANL must focus on existing Consent Order cleanup and not bring any more waste, including Greater-than-Class C (GTCC), to the Lab.

o Technical Area 54 (TA-54) is the specific location at LANL that the EIS proposes borehole, trench or vault. This very location is the subject of extensive remediation in Material Disposal Areas (MDAs) G, L and H and is scheduled for completion in 2015 under an agreement with the New Mexico Environment Department.

o This legally binding agreement requires DOE and LANL to investigate and clean up decades worth of contamination across the lab's 40-square-mile property. Signed in 2005, the Consent Order lays out cleanup milestones and requires the federal government to pay fines if LANL fails to meet them.

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Model, Betsy, Commenter ID No. E6 (cont'd)

o The residents of Northern New Mexico expect no less from DOE and LANL than completion of the legacy waste remediation on schedule.

o To reverse this policy and add new waste will severely jeopardize LANL relations with its neighbors both near and far and negate much of the progress accomplished.

• Heed the American Indian Text

o Pueblo people believe that plant roots will eventually penetrate the GTCC facility.

o There is a need for a cultural mineral assessment and study to identify the existence of minerals of cultural significance and use.

Betsy Model
Albuquerque, NM 87110

3

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Moon, Otter C., Commenter ID No. E74

From: otterndawater@yahoo.com
Sent: Sunday, June 26, 2011 11:36 AM
To: gtccels@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Moon, Otter C. – E74

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Moon, Otter C., Commenter ID No. E74 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Otter C. Moon
9208 Swinton Ave
North Hills, CA 91343

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Mullin, Charles, Commenter ID No. E14

From: chuck.a.mullin@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 8:46 AM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Mullin, Charles – E14

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Mullin, Charles, Commenter ID No. E14 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Charles Mullin
930 E Evans Ave
Pueblo, CO 81004-2537

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Pringle, Mark, Commenter ID No. E66

From: mpringle@humboldt1.com
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 8:56 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Pringle, Mark – E66

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Pringle, Mark, Commenter ID No. E66 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Mark Pringle
P.O. Box 2085
Trinidad, CA 95570

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Rankin, Douglass, Commenter ID No. E31

From:	Douglass Rankin <scrubjay@rockcreekpottery.com>
Sent:	Monday, June 27, 2011 5:18 PM
To:	Arnold Edelman
Cc:	Douglass Rankin
Subject:	Greater than Class C Comments

June 26 2011

Arnold Edelman, Document Manager, DOE GTCC EIS, Cloverleaf Bld., EM-43, 1000

Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585

General Recommendations

- Do not send GTCC to DOE sites. Nation-wide, DOE sites are still facing 100's of billions of dollars and decades worth of cleanup from the Cold War.

- DOE should develop a national waste management strategy to address these waste types.

o "GTCC-like" waste is not subject to the NRC requirements for geologic disposal. DOE should issue a supplement to its 1997 Final Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement to look at the reasonable alternatives for "GTCC-like" waste and other wastes for which long-term storage and disposal is not determined.

o Such a strategy is needed to integrate the management of these wastes as opposed to the apparent piecemeal approach that is currently being used by the Department.

o Such a strategy, moreover, should be assessed through a programmatic and site-specific NEPA process that addresses major federal actions that could significantly affect the quality of the human environment. This is particularly important when considering the disposal of long-lived radioactive wastes, which are not suitable for shallow land burial.

- Current regulations say that GTCC wastes should be disposed in a geologic repository. Examine a second repository. The legal requirement for another repository exists, yet the alternative of putting the GTCC waste into that repository is not even mentioned.

o Rather than an alternative repository, the EIS proposes using near-surface trenches; bore holes, or vaults to dispose of GTCC waste at DOE facilities. All those sites have large amounts of nuclear weapons waste, which will take billions of dollars and decades to clean up, and should not be considered for GTCC waste.

1

Rankin, Douglass – E31

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Rankin, Douglass, Commenter ID No. E31 (cont'd)

o Prior to issuance of the GTCC EIS, DOE has failed to comply with the requirement of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, 42 U.S.C. §10101 et seq., for development of one or more other deep geologic repositories. The Yucca Mountain site has failed as a deep geologic repository and Congress has not authorized a second site to be located.

o In addition to ignoring regulatory requirements and public comment, the GTCC EIS also disregards the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, which requires DOE to site and operate at least one geologic repository other than WIPP. Since 1987, the only place considered is Yucca Mountain, Nev. That flawed site, always strongly opposed by Nevadans, has been terminated by the Obama administration, and appropriately has been dropped from consideration in the GTCC EIS.

o The legal requirement for another repository still exists, yet the alternative of putting the GTCC waste into that repository is not even mentioned.

• DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS that includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

WIPP Recommendations

• The Waste Isolation Pilot Project (WIPP) must not be considered for GTCC waste disposal.

• The only repository alternative considered is WIPP, even though federal and New Mexico laws clearly prohibit commercial waste, including GTCC. By law, WIPP's mission is limited to 175,564 cubic meters of transuranic waste from nuclear weapons. That's less than 5,000,000 curies of radioactivity. GTCC waste would be 30 times more radioactivity than planned for WIPP and would eliminate the ban on commercial waste.

• Finish the original mission at WIPP.

o Safely operate WIPP to meet the "start clean, stay clean" standard

o Meet commitments to clean up about 20 DOE nuclear weapons sites

o Safely close, decontaminate, and decommission the WIPP site, beginning in about 2030 or earlier.

Los Alamos Recommendations

• The Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) must not be considered for GTCC waste.

• LANL must focus on existing Consent Order cleanup and not bring any more waste, including Greater-than-Class C (GTCC), to the Lab.

o Technical Area 54 (TA-54) is the specific location at LANL that the EIS proposes borehole, trench or vault. This very location is the subject of extensive remediation in Material Disposal Areas (MDAs) G, L and H and is scheduled for completion in 2015 under an agreement with the New Mexico Environment Department.

o This legally binding agreement requires DOE and LANL to investigate and clean up decades worth of contamination across the lab's 40-square-mile property. Signed in 2005, the Consent Order lays out cleanup milestones and requires the federal government to pay fines if LANL fails to meet them.

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Rankin, Douglass, Commenter ID No. E31 (cont'd)

o The residents of Northern New Mexico expect no less from DOE and LANL than completion of the legacy waste remediation on schedule.

o To reverse this policy and add new waste will severely jeopardize LANL relations with its neighbors both near and far and negate much of the progress accomplished.

• Heed the American Indian Text

o Pueblo people believe that plant roots will eventually penetrate the GTCC facility.

o There is a need for a cultural mineral assessment and study to identify the existence of minerals of cultural significance and use.

Today it is particularly disturbing to think about bringing more radioactive waste to LANL as the Las Conchas fire burning there has burned more than 44,000 acres is just over one day. The town of Los Alamos has just been placed under mandatory evacuation orders. This is not a place that is safe for radioactive waste burial due to this one factor if no other.

Please consider this.

Thank you,

Douglass Rankin

Douglass Rankin
Santa Fe, NM 87506

3

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Rice, Megan, Commenter ID No. E64

From: mrice12@gmail.com on behalf of Megan Rice <megan@nevadadesertexperience.org>
Sent: Sunday, June 12, 2011 3:57 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Re: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Rice, Megan – E64

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Rice, Megan, Commenter ID No. E64 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

--
Megan Rice shcj
Nevada Desert Experience
1420 W. Bartlett Ave, Las Vegas, NV 89106-2226 www.NevadaDesertExperience.org
702 646 4814

PHILIP BERRIGAN in 2002 : We (U.S.) are number one in war, and war is our number one business. We're number one in poisoning the planet with radioactive garbage. And I recently received a report from Afghanistan: we have
poisoned that land with 3,000 tons of depleted uranium, —these huge bombs we have manufactured, earth-penetrating and
rock-penetrating, and we (U.S.) have left it as a legacy to that unfortunate land.

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Riegle, Rosalie, Commenter ID No. E82

From: riegle@svsu.edu
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2011 12:55 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D).

The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative.

The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the

1

Riegle, Rosalie – E82

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Riegle, Rosalie, Commenter ID No. E82 (cont'd)

DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand; ensure the leaders of the Western Shoshone Nation are formally engaged with the opportunity to provide an official response. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Rosalie Riegle
1585 Ridge Ave.
Evanston, IL 60201-4157

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Rockefeller, Terry Kay, Commenter ID No. E89

From: terry.rockefeller@rcn.com
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2011 11:51 AM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Rockefeller, Terry Kay, Commenter ID No. E89 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Terry Kay Rockefeller
246 Park Avenue
Arlington, MA 02476-7441

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Schmidt, Laurel Lambert, Commenter ID No. E55

From: llambertschmidt@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, June 09, 2011 11:58 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points (I support HOSS and with that we end the generation of new nuclear waste) concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D).

I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of this EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that many have advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

1

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Schmidt, Laurel Lambert, Commenter ID No. E55 (cont'd)

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most pressing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Laurel Lambert Schmidt
203 Parkview Rd.
Riverside, IL 60546

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Shiroky, Cynthia, Commenter ID No. E20

From: cynthiaks@embarqmail.com
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 7:59 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Shiroky, Cynthia, Commenter ID No. E20 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Shiroky
5025 W. Agate AV
Las Vegas, NV 89139-7527

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Simon, Madeline, Commenter ID No. E57

From: madeline-mpls@msn.com
Sent: Sunday, June 26, 2011 10:57 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Simon, Madeline – E57

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Simon, Madeline, Commenter ID No. E57 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Madeline Simon
8915 River Ridge Rd
Bloomington, MN 55425

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Sorgen, Phoebe, Commenter ID No. E77

From:	phoebeso@earthlink.net
Sent:	Friday, June 24, 2011 12:04 AM
To:	gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject:	Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)
Importance:	High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Re the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D), the public has repeatedly raised serious issues that were excluded from the DEIS. They need to be in the record!

Because there are both broad issues and specific options not included in the DEIS, I urge "No Action." The DEIS excludes the most reasonable option that many advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way to store deadly radioactive waste until an improved, scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found. Meanwhile, HOSS is the only sane solution.

Part of the eventual solution is to drastically minimize, even eliminate, waste generation. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph unrealistically make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear more toxic than other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS is unacceptably biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the

1

Sorgen, Phoebe – E77

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Sorgen, Phoebe, Commenter ID No. E77 (cont'd)

conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

Transportation of the waste to Nevada would be a major problem, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site. Surely you don't want truckloads of this highly toxic waste sent thru a city. What madness!

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Thank you for reading my comment and considering my opinion. I'd appreciate a response.

Sincerely,

Phoebe Sorgen
po box 2
berkeley, CA 94701-1445

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Tatro-Medlin, April, Commenter ID No. E37

From: ezr2c@aol.com
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2011 12:56 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

My comment contains views shared by myself & others. I have not been paid to participate. I am a citizen of NV & these decisions effect my family.

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

1

Tatro-Medlin, April – E37

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Tatro-Medlin, April, Commenter ID No. E37 (cont'd)

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

April Tatro-Medlin
3941 Hudson Bay
Las Vegas, NV 89110-3012

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Thawley, Bob, Commenter ID No. E8

From: bthawley@mindspring.com
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 4:54 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Thawley, Bob – E8

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Thawley, Bob, Commenter ID No. E8 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Bob Thawley
15 Mirabel ave
San Francisco, CA 94110-4614

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Thomas, Ellen, Commenter ID No. E36

From: et@prop1.org
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 5:22 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Thomas, Ellen – E36

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Thomas, Ellen, Commenter ID No. E36 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Ellen Thomas
401 Wilcox Road
Tryon, NC 28782

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Turk, Lawrence, Commenter ID No. E9

From: butch@wildrockies.org
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 12:01 AM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Turk, Lawrence – E9

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Turk, Lawrence, Commenter ID No. E9 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Turk RN
POB 203
Hendersonville, NC 28793

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Ventura, Maxina, Commenter ID No. E5

From: beneficialbug@netzero.net
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2011 12:07 AM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

AS YOU consider what shows up in the dEIR, please consider my family's experience in Beatty, NV, in the summer of 2006. As I had been very involved for years right in Nevada working to stop nuclear testing at the NTS, and to stop plans for dumping at Yucca Mountain, I felt it was important to bring my kids out there to see the beauty of the area, and to consider the desecration of the land Shoshone peoples had stewarded long before the U.S. defiled it.

We stopped at the entrance to Mercury, and I showed them other areas where I had gone backcountry with many activists over the years, then we moved along and reached Beatty. We stopped at a general store on a very hot day to get some cool drinks and to get out of the direct heat. The woman behind the counter asked where we lived and why we had come to the area. When I told her about my history in the area, her eyes welled up with tears and she turned to my kids to tell them how important our community's actions have always been to the people who live out there. She said that when she's washing dishes, she looks out over Yucca Mountain and said that out there it's not a question of whether you'll get cancer, but when. She told us that they all had felt forgotten until we started the organizing in the 80's we were doing to stop the insanity of the nuclear program. She felt such gratitude for us all, and expressed that people in the area knew we cared about them, that we were doing what we were doing to help everyone. So completely true.

Yucca Mountain is a sacred place for the Shoshone and others in the vicinity, and for those of us who have been in its midst.

There is no excuse for a nuclear world. My family has lived in voluntary simplicity and successfully. We rarely have more than 2 lights on in the evenings, often one with a 100-watt bulb but another a 60-watt bulb. Often we have only one light on for 4 of us. We do not need more. Our walls are white to reflect light, and our light fixtures were chosen and placed to maximize the spread of the light. I could of course list many ways we have chosen to live using much less energy than what is common, but the point is that we think about our usage of resources, starting with the home in which we live. Four of us share a bedroom, though there is another bedroom available. In the winter body heat keeps us warm without an added heater more than for an occassional hour on the coldest days. We're in California's Bay Area, for godsakes. When it's hot, we open doors and windows.

The consumer ways of Americans and those who have followed this Capitalist way are devastating the earth. It must stop, and it must stop first with ending our relationship with the nuclear world. DO NOT DUMP MORE ON NEVADANS, or anyone.

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for

1

Ventura, Maxina – E5

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Ventura, Maxina, Commenter ID No. E5 (cont'd)

the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Ventura, Maxina, Commenter ID No. E5 (cont'd)

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Maxina Ventura
2399 East 14th St. #24
San Leandro, CA 94577

3

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Wale, Lisa, Commenter ID No. E52

From: Liisa Wale <l_wale@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 9:58 PM
To: Arnold Edelman
Cc: Liisa Wale
Subject: Greater than Class C Comments

6/24/11

Arnold Edelman, Document Manager, DOE GTCC EIS, Cloverleaf Bld., EM-43, 1000

Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585

General Recommendations

- Do not send GTCC to DOE sites. Nation-wide, DOE sites are still facing 100's of billions of dollars and decades worth of cleanup from the Cold War.

- DOE should develop a national waste management strategy to address these waste types.

o "GTCC-like" waste is not subject to the NRC requirements for geologic disposal. DOE should issue a supplement to its 1997 Final Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement to look at the reasonable alternatives for "GTCC-like" waste and other wastes for which long-term storage and disposal is not determined.

o Such a strategy is needed to integrate the management of these wastes as opposed to the apparent piecemeal approach that is currently being used by the Department.

o Such a strategy, moreover, should be assessed through a programmatic and site-specific NEPA process that addresses major federal actions that could significantly affect the quality of the human environment. This is particularly important when considering the disposal of long-lived radioactive wastes, which are not suitable for shallow land burial.

- Current regulations say that GTCC wastes should be disposed in a geologic repository. Examine a second repository. The legal requirement for another repository exists, yet the alternative of putting the GTCC waste into that repository is not even mentioned.

o Rather than an alternative repository, the EIS proposes using near-surface trenches; bore holes, or vaults to dispose of GTCC waste at DOE facilities. All those sites have large amounts of nuclear weapons waste, which will take billions of dollars and decades to clean up, and should not be considered for GTCC waste.

1

Wale, Lisa – E52

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Wale, Lisa, Commenter ID No. E52 (cont'd)

o Prior to issuance of the GTCC EIS, DOE has failed to comply with the requirement of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, 42 U.S.C. §10101 et seq., for development of one or more other deep geologic repositories. The Yucca Mountain site has failed as a deep geologic repository and Congress has not authorized a second site to be located.

o In addition to ignoring regulatory requirements and public comment, the GTCC EIS also disregards the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, which requires DOE to site and operate at least one geologic repository other than WIPP. Since 1987, the only place considered is Yucca Mountain, Nev. That flawed site, always strongly opposed by Nevadans, has been terminated by the Obama administration, and appropriately has been dropped from consideration in the GTCC EIS.

o The legal requirement for another repository still exists, yet the alternative of putting the GTCC waste into that repository is not even mentioned.

• DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS that includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

WIPP Recommendations

• The Waste Isolation Pilot Project (WIPP) must not be considered for GTCC waste disposal.

• The only repository alternative considered is WIPP, even though federal and New Mexico laws clearly prohibit commercial waste, including GTCC. By law, WIPP's mission is limited to 175,564 cubic meters of transuranic waste from nuclear weapons. That's less than 5,000,000 curies of radioactivity. GTCC waste would be 30 times more radioactivity than planned for WIPP and would eliminate the ban on commercial waste.

• Finish the original mission at WIPP.

o Safely operate WIPP to meet the "start clean, stay clean" standard

o Meet commitments to clean up about 20 DOE nuclear weapons sites

o Safely close, decontaminate, and decommission the WIPP site, beginning in about 2030 or earlier.

Los Alamos Recommendations

• The Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) must not be considered for GTCC waste.

• LANL must focus on existing Consent Order cleanup and not bring any more waste, including Greater-than-Class C (GTCC), to the Lab.

o Technical Area 54 (TA-54) is the specific location at LANL that the EIS proposes borehole, trench or vault. This very location is the subject of extensive remediation in Material Disposal Areas (MDAs) G, L and H and is scheduled for completion in 2015 under an agreement with the New Mexico Environment Department.

o This legally binding agreement requires DOE and LANL to investigate and clean up decades worth of contamination across the lab's 40-square-mile property. Signed in 2005, the Consent Order lays out cleanup milestones and requires the federal government to pay fines if LANL fails to meet them.

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Wale, Lisa, Commenter ID No. E52 (cont'd)

o The residents of Northern New Mexico expect no less from DOE and LANL than completion of the legacy waste remediation on schedule.

o To reverse this policy and add new waste will severely jeopardize LANL relations with its neighbors both near and far and negate much of the progress accomplished.

• Heed the American Indian Text

o Pueblo people believe that plant roots will eventually penetrate the GTCC facility.

o There is a need for a cultural mineral assessment and study to identify the existence of minerals of cultural significance and use.

Liisa Wale
Ashland, Oregon 97520

3

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Welsh, Anne, Commenter ID No. E85

From: vegasranch@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 7:23 PM
To: gtccels@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Welsh, Anne – E85

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Welsh, Anne, Commenter ID No. E85 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Anne Welsh
4405 S SANDHILL RD
Las Vegas, NV 89121-6212

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Welsh, Myron, Commenter ID No. E67

From:	myronreed@gmail.com
Sent:	Friday, June 24, 2011 9:36 PM
To:	gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject:	Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)
Importance:	High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Welsh, Myron – E67

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Welsh, Myron, Commenter ID No. E67 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Myron Welsh
4405 So. Sandhill Rd.
Las Vegas, NV 89121-6212

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Yoshida, Takayuki, Commenter ID No. E39

From: gahanyoshida1@msn.com
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2011 12:33 AM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007.and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Yoshida, Takayuki – E39

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Yoshida, Takayuki, Commenter ID No. E39 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Takayuki Yoshida
4551 S Trails End Ln
Boise, ID 83716

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Young, Lisa, Commenter ID No. E54

From: lisagreenyoung@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2011 6:01 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Young, Lisa – E54

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Young, Lisa, Commenter ID No. E54 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Lisa Young
1601 N. 16th St. Apt. A
Boise, ID 83702

2

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Ziglar, Randy, Commenter ID No. E80

From: randyziglar@hotmail.com
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 4:29 PM
To: gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Comments Re: GTCC LLRW Waste DEIS (DOE/EIS-0375-D)

Importance: High

Document Manager Arnold Edelman,

Please consider the following points concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste (DOE/EIS-0375-D). I hope that if any comments are considered outside the scope of the EIS, they will still be taken into account. The public has repeatedly raised some issues that have been excluded from the DEIS. They need to be spoken to, for the record, in the hopes that enough such comments will point to a flaw in the process that can't be ignored, leading to a suspension of this effort until these additional and broader points are dealt with.

There are both large issues and some specific options not included in the DEIS. I therefore must recommend the "No Action" alternative. The DEIS specifically excludes the option that I and many others advocated for at DOE's GTCC scoping meetings in 2007 and at current public meetings about the DEIS. That alternative is "Hardened On-Site Storage" (HOSS) in which GTCC waste and irradiated spent fuel would remain at commercial nuclear power plants in long-term storage so that they can be monitored and are protected from aircraft crashes or terrorist attacks, eliminating both the threats of transport and disposal. Keeping the waste in HOSS would reduce the risk of accidents or a terrorist attack during transport. While HOSS is not a permanent solution, it would be more protective of human health and the environment than any of DOE's current dumping practices and the alternatives presented in the DEIS. HOSS would be a safe way of storing wastes until a scientifically sound, publicly acceptable solution is found.

Part of that future solution, of course, should be drastically minimizing or eliminating the generation of those wastes. DOE's stated reason for rejecting HOSS is that it is not a "permanent disposal facility" but just a "long-term storage option." But the DEIS also does not include consideration of any geologic disposal facility, except the WIPP site in New Mexico, even though for almost 30 years federal law (Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982) has required development of one or more other repositories. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that spent nuclear fuel can stay at commercial reactors for up to 100 years. GTCC could also remain at those sites for at least that time period. The DOE should not proceed with a final GTCC EIS, but instead should develop a new DEIS which includes HOSS facilities as the best solution for GTCC wastes for decades to come, and for new geologic disposal site(s) to dispose of GTCC waste.

Table S-4 in the DEIS Summary purports to compare "Estimated Potential Maximum Human Health Long-Term Impacts" for the five alternatives being considered. The DEIS also purports not to recommend one alternative over the others. This chart and its related graph make "No Action" and "Vault Method" appear much more toxic than the other options. The problem stems from the inability to extrapolate impacts from future actions that will need to be discussed and taken, reducing long-term toxicity. "No action" alternative doesn't mean no action ever, just none of the ones being reviewed. As it exists currently, the DOE's presentation of the DEIS appears biased.

The entire NNSS proposed location is located within the Western Shoshone Nation established by the Treaty of Ruby Valley in 1863. According to the DEIS, consultation with the Tribal nations near the NNSS has been

1

Ziglar, Randy – E80

Nuclear Watch Campaign
Ziglar, Randy, Commenter ID No. E80 (cont'd)

conducted through the "Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO)", which includes "representatives" from 16 Paiute and Shoshone Tribes. While the CGTO sounds inclusive, it is not clear that its members actually have standing to speak for their tribes. It's strongly recommended that the DOE officially engage the indigenous peoples whose land will be directly affected by the proposed disposal sites, prior to the conclusion of the timeline for response to the draft EIS.

I also want to underscore a point made by Joseph Strolin, Acting Executive Director, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects: "The draft EIS fails to recognize that any facility chosen for disposal of GTCC waste must be licensed and regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission....[N]either NNSS nor any of the specific locations identified for potential GTCC waste disposal has a NRC licensed disposal facility."

There is the problem of transportation of the waste to Nevada, since there is no rail to the site, and routing would need to go through Las Vegas if the NNSS is chosen as the site.

Finally, this EIS process is premature, since the vast majority of the waste will not exist for at least 20 years, and the Blue Ribbon Commission will not have presented its recommendation on the disposal of high level nuclear waste and GTCC waste.

Please re-group and begin conducting a thorough assessment of the most urgent matters at hand. Suspend the current EIS study review, until such time that the most prevailing matters of short and intermediate storage are adequately addressed.

Sincerely,

Randy Ziglar
2046 14th St. #11
Santa Monica, CA 90405-1641

2

This page is intentionally left blank.

J.3.7 Friends of the Gorge Campaign Form Letter

Table J.3-7 tabulates all individuals who submitted comments via the Friends of the Gorge Campaign form letter along with the comment document identifiers assigned to each. One representative letter (Anderson, Barbara, Comment Document ID No. W231) was used to identify the comments. The comments are identified in brackets on the left side of the page, and the corresponding responses are shown on the right side. All other comment letters resemble the representative letter. The representative letter, comments identified in that letter, responses, and all the other comment documents received for this campaign are presented here in Section J.3.7 on pages J-2080 through J-2463, as indicated in the table.

TABLE J.3-7 Individuals Who Submitted Comments via the Friends of the Gorge Campaign Form Letter

Last Name, First Name	Comment Document ID No.	Starting Page No.
Anderson, Barbara*	W231	J-2080
Anderson, Judy	W438	J-2082
Anderson, Lyle	W131	J-2084
Arndt, Natalie	W371	J-2086
Askins, Susanna	W207	J-2087
Askins, Susanna	W373	J-2089
Bagatta, Joanna	W254	J-2091
Baker, Melissa	W308	J-2093
Baker, Nathan	W312	J-2094
Banks, Adrienne	W151	J-2096
Beinlich, Brian	W244	J-2098
Bennett, Henry	W359	J-2100
Berthold, Dana	W440	J-2102
Birch, Stacy	W431	J-2104
Blanke, Sarah	W313	J-2106
Booth, David	W149	J-2108
Bradley, C.	W306	J-2110
Bronson, Charles	W411	J-2112
Brown, Keith	W413	J-2114
Buhl, Carolyn	W135	J-2116
Bushman, Gary	W333	J-2118
Cadwell, Jillian	W291	J-2120
Carroll, Justin	W369	J-2121
Chabot, Jamison	W385	J-2123
Chase, James	W113	J-2125
Clifton, Merle	W93	J-2127
Colasurdo, Christine	W109	J-2129
Coles, Vivian	W186	J-2130
Collins, Alan	W100	J-2132
Combe, Emile	W107	J-2134
Combe, Emile	W361	J-2136
Cooper, Chris	W330	J-2138

TABLE J.3-7 (Cont.)

Last Name, First Name	Comment Document ID No.	Starting Page No.
Craig, Edward	W377	J-2140
Cullen, Kacy	W226	J-2142
De Leon, Brittany	W211	J-2144
Demuth, Lupin	W97	J-2146
Dickson, Michele	W134	J-2148
Dunn, Huelo	W178	J-2150
Dunn-Dixon, Jennie Sue	W161	J-2152
Erickson, Steven	W357	J-2154
Ernst, Susan	W251	J-2156
Fenker, John	W155	J-2158
Gilbert, Anna	W80	J-2160
Gohl, Joy	W91	J-2162
Goodwin, William	W213	J-2163
Graser-Lindsey, Elizabeth	W233	J-2165
Gridley, John	W454	J-2166
Grigsby, Sara	W422	J-2168
Gundersen, Daniel	W218	J-2170
Hafer, Sarah	W216	J-2172
Hellickson, Terry	W202	J-2174
Hermsen, Laurence	W172	J-2176
Hochendoner, Kelly	W405	J-2178
Holzman, Deanne	W260	J-2180
Honeyman, Usha	W286	J-2182
Hopkins, Tom	W304	J-2184
Hornung, Tracie	W158	J-2186
Hubard, Ann	W152	J-2188
Hughes, Eleanor	W147	J-2190
Hulbert, Dawn	W331	J-2192
Jackson, Aria	W146	J-2194
Jackson, Nathan	W105	J-2196
Jacobson, Rich	W263	J-2198
Jeka, Kymberly	W112	J-2200
Jelen, Jonathan	W256	J-2202
Johnson, Stephen	W177	J-2204
Kaminker, Matthew	W176	J-2206
Kay, Joel	W157	J-2208
Kelly, Tim	W566	J-2209
Keys, Thomas	W156	J-2210
Keys, Thomas	W375	J-2212
Kirkland, John	W275	J-2214
Kirkland, John	W83	J-2216
Kofler, Roger	W225	J-2218
Kolberg, Vicki	W200	J-2220
Kramer-Dodd, Gay	W279	J-2223
Kutschera, Ellynne	W269	J-2225
Lamberger, Dan	W329	J-2227
Leggatt, Joyce	W424	J-2229

TABLE J.3-7 (Cont.)

Last Name, First Name	Comment Document ID No.	Starting Page No.
Lief, Charles	W368	J-2231
Lienhard, Judith	W102	J-2233
Lloyd, Darryl	W181	J-2235
Long, Meredith	W332	J-2237
Lovejoy, Patricia	W318	J-2239
Lyda, Mary	W175	J-2241
Maney, Trudy	W295	J-2243
Markey, Jeff	W116	J-2245
Martin Jr, Ron	W148	J-2247
Masin, Susan	W372	J-2249
McClain, Mary	W143	J-2251
McClay, Mauria	W98	J-2253
McComb, Melinda	W423	J-2254
McConnell, Constance	W281	J-2256
McCracken, Gloria	W277	J-2258
McDonald, Cheri	W432	J-2260
McGowan, Wendy	W435	J-2262
McKamey, Will	W235	J-2264
Meyer, Emily	W287	J-2266
Miller, Jacquelyn	W123	J-2268
Miller, Michelle	W442	J-2270
Milne, Laura	W529	J-2272
Minick, David	W268	J-2274
Monial, Sara	W391	J-2276
Morris, Julie	W241	J-2278
Mullis, Lisa	W227	J-2280
Neer, Steven	W230	J-2282
Nettleton, John	W303	J-2283
Neuendorf, Mary	W255	J-2285
Neulist, Susan	W118	J-2287
Oliveri, Christy	W232	J-2289
Palmer, Gayle	W238	J-2291
Pantely, George	W283	J-2293
Parker, John	W167	J-2295
Petersen, Larry	W168	J-2297
Petersen, Larry	W382	J-2298
Peterson, Kathryn	W236	J-2300
Platner, Nancy	W383	J-2301
Polk, Nora	W356	J-2303
Pollock, Nina	W265	J-2305
Popiela, Hank	W114	J-2307
Porch, Delores	W252	J-2309
Porch, Delores	W401	J-2311
Prentiss, Alex	W92	J-2313
Priest, Madeline	W81	J-2315
Provost, Pierre	W201	J-2317
Putnam, Lynn	W125	J-2319

TABLE J.3-7 (Cont.)

Last Name, First Name	Comment Document ID No.	Starting Page No.
Rabin, Michelle	W215	J-2321
Ray, Richard	W259	J-2323
Reedijk, Linda	W187	J-2325
Robbins, Teresa	W412	J-2327
Rossman, Penny	W299	J-2329
Sanda, Clyde	W212	J-2331
Sawaya, Linda	W184	J-2333
Seil, Fredrick	W300	J-2335
Shapiro, David	W242	J-2337
Sharpe, Kathryn	W415	J-2339
Sherer, Janice	W180	J-2341
Simonsen, John	W133	J-2343
Stone, Catherine	W247	J-2345
Stone, Linda	W126	J-2347
Stuart, Kate	W557	J-2349
Summersett, Sophia	W362	J-2351
Till, Richard	W549	J-2353
Till, Rick	W325	J-2356
Vance, Anne	W85	J-2357
Vaughan, Ron	W243	J-2359
Vayu, Satya	W395	J-2361
Vayu, Satya	W292	J-2363
Walicki, Joe	W272	J-2365
Warneke, Lothar & Carole	W162	J-2367
Watters, Ann	W250	J-2369
Watters, Ann	W447	J-2371
Wehrley, Donna	W453	J-2373
Weigel, Richard	W104	J-2375
West, Jack	W326	J-2377
White, William	W398	J-2379
Whitecotton, Robbie	W436	J-2381
Williams, Sandra	W224	J-2383
Wilson, Katrina	W360	J-2385
Wilson, Michael	W120	J-2387
Wood, John & Polly	W103	J-2389
Wood, John & Polly	W163	J-2391
Wood, John & Polly	W410	J-2393
Wood, John & Polly	W84	J-2395
Wood, Polly	W452	J-2397
Wood, John	W87	J-2399
Woolpert, Steven	W343	J-2401
Young, Patricia	W376	J-2403
Zachman, John	W219	J-2406
Zettergren, Judy	W136	J-2408
Zimmerman, Joni	W101	J-2410
Zucker, Marguery	W421	J-2412
Name Withheld	W99	J-2414
Name Withheld	W110	J-2416

TABLE J.3-7 (Cont.)

Last Name, First Name	Comment Document ID No.	Starting Page No.
Name Withheld	W132	J-2418
Name Withheld	W141	J-2420
Name Withheld	W144	J-2422
Name Withheld	W174	J-2424
Name Withheld	W179	J-2426
Name Withheld	W191	J-2428
Name Withheld	W193	J-2430
Name Withheld	W220	J-2432
Name Withheld	W221	J-2433
Name Withheld	W228	J-2435
Name Withheld	W237	J-2436
Name Withheld	W239	J-2438
Name Withheld	W249	J-2439
Name Withheld	W261	J-2441
Name Withheld	W282	J-2443
Name Withheld	W314	J-2445
Name Withheld	W324	J-2447
Name Withheld	W366	J-2449
Name Withheld	W386	J-2451
Name Withheld	W387	J-2453
Name Withheld	W403	J-2455
Name Withheld	W426	J-2456
Name Withheld	W439	J-2458
Name Withheld	W469	J-2460
Name Withheld	W519	J-2462

* Anderson, Barbara (Comment Document ID No. W231) is the representative letter.

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Anderson, Barbara, Commenter ID No. W231
(Representative Letter)

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 10:55 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10231

Thank you for your comment, barbara Anderson.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10231. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 10:54:26AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10231

First Name: barbara
Last Name: Anderson
Address: 1500 SW 5th #2505
City: Portland
State: OR
Zip: 97201
Country: USA
Email: gilpinwood@yahoo.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material. W231-1

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford. W231-2

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack. W231-3

1

Anderson, Barbara – W231

W231-1 Consistent with NEPA implementing regulations in Parts 1500–1508 of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508), DOE analyzed the range of available disposal methods (i.e., geologic repository, near-surface trench, intermediate-depth borehole, and above-grade vault) and federally owned sites (i.e., Hanford Site, INL, LANL, NNSS, SRS, WIPP, and the WIPP Vicinity) as well as generic commercial locations. DOE determined that it was reasonable to analyze the federal sites because they currently have operating radioactive waste disposal facilities, except for the WIPP Vicinity, which is near an operating geologic repository.

W231-2 DOE is performing environmental restoration activities at the Hanford Site and the ongoing cleanup efforts will continue. As stated in the Hanford TC&WM EIS, the receipt of offsite waste streams (including GTCC LLRW) that contain specific amounts of certain isotopes, specifically iodine-129 and technetium-99, could cause an adverse impact on the environment. When the impacts of technetium-99 from past leaks and cribs are combined, DOE believes it may not be prudent to add significant additional technetium-99 to the existing environment. Therefore, one means of mitigating the impact would be for DOE to limit disposal of off-site waste streams containing iodine-129 or technetium-99 at Hanford. DOE's ROD 78 FR 75913 dated December 13, 2013, stated that DOE has deferred a decision on importing waste from other DOE sites (with limited exceptions as described in the Settlement Agreement with Ecology) for disposal at Hanford at least until WTP is operational. These factors were considered in developing DOE's preferred alternative for the disposal of GTCC LLRW and GTCC LLW, as discussed in Chapter 2 of the GTCC EIS.

There is a relatively small amount of waste which could be transported through the Columbia River Gorge regardless of the final decision as to the disposal site selected for GTCC LLRW. The waste would include actinide sealed sources and Cs-137 irradiators from local medical institutions, research facilities, universities, and other NRC and Agreement State licensees.

A number of commenters indicated they believed shipping offsite waste would result in 800 LCFs. This value for transportation risk does not exist in this GTCC EIS. DOE believes that the value of approximately 800 LCFs, cited in the public comments, is from the results provided in the *Draft Global Nuclear Energy Partnership Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (GNEP PEIS)* regarding transportation of spent nuclear fuel (SNF) and HLW. This value represents the maximum impacts associated with 50 years of transportation activities supporting the operations of all existing U.S. commercial light-water reactors if they all were replaced with high-temperature, gas-cooled reactors. The *GNEP PEIS* was canceled by DOE on June 29, 2009 (74 FR 31017).

W231-3 DOE's ROD 78 FR 75913 dated December 13, 2013, stated that DOE has deferred a decision on importing waste from other DOE sites (with limited exceptions as described in the Settlement Agreement with the State of Washington Department of Ecology) for disposal at Hanford at least until WTP is operational.

If DOE decides to implement its preferred alternative for the TC&WM EIS, GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes would not be shipped through the Columbia River Gorge for disposal at the Hanford Site until the waste treatment plant is operational. However, regardless of where the GTCC waste disposal facility is ultimately located, a relatively small amount of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes may be transported through the Columbia River Gorge on their way to the disposal facility. The waste would be generated within the states of Oregon and Washington and would include actinide sealed sources and Cs-137 irradiators from local medical institutions, research facilities, universities, and other NRC and Agreement State licensees.

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Anderson, Barbara, Commenter ID No. W231 (cont'd)
(Representative Letter)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others. W231-3 (Cont.)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

The transportation of radioactive waste will meet or exceed DOT and NRC regulatory requirements that promote the protection of human health and the environment. These regulations include requirements for radioactive materials packaging, marking, labeling, placarding, shipping papers, and highway routing. The waste shipments would be on preferred routes, which are interstate highways or alternative routes designated by a state routing agency in accordance with DOT regulations (49 CFR Part 397, Subpart D). The GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes would be shipped in approved waste packages and transportation casks. The robust nature of these casks limits the potential release of radioactive and chemically hazardous material under the severest of accident conditions. It is unlikely that the transportation of GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes to any of the alternative sites evaluated in the EIS would cause an additional fatality as a result of radiation from either incident-free transportation or postulated transportation accidents.

The EIS evaluated the transportation impacts from the shipments that would be required to dispose of all of the GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes at the various disposal sites. The EIS addressed the collective population risks during routine conditions and accidents, the radiological risks to the highest exposed individuals during routine conditions, and the consequences to individuals and populations as a result of transportation accidents, including those that could release radioactive or hazardous chemical materials. About 12,600 shipments would be required to transport all of the GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes to the Hanford Site for disposal. This would result in about 50 million km (30 million mi) of highway travel, with no expected LCFs. One fatality directly related to an accident might occur (see Section 6.2.9.1).

The EIS also evaluated the impact of intentional destructive acts that could occur during waste handling, transportation, and disposal (see Section 2.7.4.3 of the EIS). The potential for such destructive acts is low. DOE sites considered in the EIS are secured, and the packaging for the GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes would be robust. The GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes are not readily dispersible, and the impacts from any attempts to disperse these materials during transportation (such as the impacts from an explosive blast) would not be greater than the impacts from any potential accidental release of radioactivity. Impacts from severe natural phenomena, such as earthquakes and tornados, would not be expected to be significant, given that the GTCC LLRW and GTCC-like wastes are largely not dispersible and given the robust nature of the waste packages and containers.

DOE's standard operating procedure for transportation of radioactive waste is developed and continually revised to ensure that the utmost protection of public health and the environment is achieved and that the risk of a traffic accident is minimized. For example, DOE has established a comprehensive emergency management program (Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program or TEPP) that provides detailed, hazard specific planning and preparedness measures to minimize the health impacts from accidents involving loss of control over radioactive material or toxic chemicals. DOE's TEPP was established to ensure that its contractors and state, tribal, and local emergency responders are prepared to respond promptly, efficiently, and effectively to accidents involving DOE shipments of radioactive materials

If an accident that involved a release of radioactive material to the environment occurred, it would be remediated promptly in accordance with these procedures. These measures would help DOE minimize and mitigate any impacts on the environment.

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Anderson, Judy, Commenter ID No. W438

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 2:03 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10438

Thank you for your comment, Judy Anderson.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10438. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 24, 2011 02:02:31PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10438

First Name: Judy
Middle Initial: I
Last Name: Anderson
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Anderson, Judy, Commenter ID No. W438 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Anderson, Lyle, Commenter ID No. W131

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 8:10 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10131

Thank you for your comment, Lyle Anderson.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10131. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 08:09:58PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10131

First Name: Lyle
Last Name: Anderson
Address: 3723 Pebble Pl.
City: Bellingham
State: WA
Zip: 98226
Country: USA
Email: lyleand2@comcast.net
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Anderson, Lyle – W131

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Anderson, Lyle, Commenter ID No. W131 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Arndt, Natalie, Commenter ID No. W371

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 3:50 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10371

Thank you for your comment, Natalie Arndt.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10371. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 03:49:58PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10371

First Name: Natalie
Last Name: Arndt
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

1

Arndt, Natalie – W371

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Askins, Susanna, Commenter ID No. W207

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 9:17 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10207

Thank you for your comment, Susanna Askins.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10207. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 09:16:29AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10207

First Name: Susanna
Middle Initial: L
Last Name: Askins
Address:
City:
State:
Zip:
Country: USA
Email: tlknkr@gmail.com
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Askins, Susanna – W207

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Askins, Susanna, Commenter ID No. W207 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Askins, Susanna, Commenter ID No. W373

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 3:58 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10373

Thank you for your comment, Susanna Askins.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10373. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 03:58:03PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10373

First Name: Susanna
Last Name: Askins
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Askins, Susanna – W373

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Askins, Susanna, Commenter ID No. W373 (cont'd)

Sincerely,

Susanna Askins

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Bagatta, Joanna, Commenter ID No. W254

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 1:00 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10254

Thank you for your comment, joanna bagatta.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10254. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 01:00:05PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10254

First Name: joanna
Last Name: bagatta
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman!

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along Interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Bagatta, Joanna – W254

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Bagatta, Joanna, Commenter ID No. W254 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Baker, Melissa, Commenter ID No. W308

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2011 5:41 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10308

Thank you for your comment, Melissa Baker.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10308. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 18, 2011 05:41:16PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10308

First Name: Melissa
Last Name: Baker
State: OR
Zip: 97267
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Baker, Melissa – W308

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Baker, Nathan, Commenter ID No. W312

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2011 7:37 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10312

Thank you for your comment, Nathan Baker.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10312. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 18, 2011 07:37:22PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10312

First Name: Nathan
Middle Initial: J
Last Name: Baker
Organization: Friends of the Columbia Gorge
Address: 522 SW 5th Avenue
Address 2: Suite 720
City: Portland
State: OR
Zip: 97204
Country: USA
Email: nathan@gorgefriends.org
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would

1

Baker, Nathan – W312

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Baker, Nathan, Commenter ID No. W312 (cont'd)

occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Banks, Adrienne, Commenter ID No. W151

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 9:35 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10151

Thank you for your comment, Adrienne Banks.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10151. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 09:35:15PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10151

First Name: Adrienne
Last Name: Banks
Address: 14835 Stagecoach
City: Sisters
State: OR
Zip: 97759
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Banks, Adrienne – W151

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Banks, Adrienne, Commenter ID No. W151 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sitemap / RSS / Donate / info@gorgefriends.org / 503.241.3762 / 522 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 720, Portland Oregon 97204 /

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Beinlich, Brian, Commenter ID No. W244

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 12:01 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10244

Thank you for your comment, Brian Beinlich.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10244. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 12:01:04PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10244

First Name: Brian
Last Name: Beinlich
Country: USA
Email: brian@beinlich.org
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along Interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Beinlich, Brian – W244

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Beinlich, Brian, Commenter ID No. W244 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Bennett, Henry, Commenter ID No. W359

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 3:20 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10359

Thank you for your comment, Henry Bennett.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10359. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 03:19:37PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10359

First Name: Henry
Last Name: Bennett
City: Portland
State: OR
Zip: 97214
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:

Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable. Winter weather in the Columbia River Gorge is notoriously bad with frequent ice storms and snow storms, greatly increasing the accident hazards!

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Bennett, Henry, Commenter ID No. W359 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Jeff Merkley, U.S. Senator Ron Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Berthold, Dana, Commenter ID No. W440

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 3:13 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10440

Thank you for your comment, Dana Berthold.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10440. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 24, 2011 03:12:43PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10440

First Name: Dana
Last Name: Berthold
City: Stevenson
State: WA
Zip: 98648
Country: USA
Email: dana.berthold@gmail.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

I am a resident of the Gorge, and my mother was born at Hanford. That makes my family downstream from the effects of Hanford's toxicity in two ways.

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Berthold, Dana – W440

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Berthold, Dana, Commenter ID No. W440 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Dana Berthold
Stevenson, WA

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Birch, Stacy, Commenter ID No. W431

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 11:25 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10431

Thank you for your comment, Stacy Birch.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10431. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 24, 2011 11:25:12AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10431

First Name: Stacy
Last Name: Birch
Address: 13032 Cook Underwood Rd
City: Underwood
State: WA
Zip: 98651
Country: USA
Email: stacyjbirch@yahoo.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Birch, Stacy – W431

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Birch, Stacy, Commenter ID No. W431 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Blanke, Sarah, Commenter ID No. W313

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2011 11:09 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10313

Thank you for your comment, Sarah Blanke.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10313. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 18, 2011 11:08:32PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10313

First Name: Sarah
Last Name: Blanke
Address: 6436 NE 37th Ave
City: Portland
State: OR
Zip: 97211
Country: USA
Email: sarah.blanke@yahoo.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Blanke, Sarah – W313

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Blanke, Sarah, Commenter ID No. W313 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Please continue to protect the Gorge.
Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Booth, David, Commenter ID No. W149

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 9:18 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10149

Thank you for your comment, David Booth.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10149. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 09:17:43PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10149

First Name: David
Last Name: Booth
City: Rickreall
State: OR
Zip: 97371
Country: USA
Email: dbconsulting@sterling.net
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Below is some text I had help with, but I wanted to say how important it is that we do not commit such a valuable watershed resource to permanent nuclear storage. We should move to safe renewables ASAP and stop creating such a dangerous waste product!

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur

1

Booth, David – W149

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Booth, David, Commenter ID No. W149 (cont'd)

due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Bradley, C., Commenter ID No. W306

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 6:55 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10306

Thank you for your comment, C Bradley.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10306. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 17, 2011 06:54:38PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10306

First Name: C
Last Name: Bradley
State: OR
Zip: 97031
Country: USA
Email: cbradley@bradleyaudio.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Bradley, C. – W306

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Bradley, C., Commenter ID No. W306 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Bronson, Charles, Commenter ID No. W411

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 10:00 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10411

Thank you for your comment, Charles Bronson.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10411. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 10:00:15PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10411

First Name: Charles
Last Name: Bronson
State: WA
Zip: 98332
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Bronson, Charles – W411

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Bronson, Charles, Commenter ID No. W411 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Brown, Keith, Commenter ID No. W413

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 10:12 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10413

Thank you for your comment, Keith Brown.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10413. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 10:12:18PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10413

First Name: Keith
Last Name: Brown
City: Washougal
State: WA
Zip: 98671
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Brown, Keith – W413

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Brown, Keith, Commenter ID No. W413 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Buhl, Carolyn, Commenter ID No. W135

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 8:25 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10135

Thank you for your comment, Carolyn Buhl.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10135. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 08:24:46PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10135

First Name: Carolyn
Last Name: Buhl
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Buhl, Carolyn – W135

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Buhl, Carolyn, Commenter ID No. W135 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Bushman, Gary, Commenter ID No. W333

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2011 12:25 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10333

Thank you for your comment, Gary Bushman.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10333. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 21, 2011 12:24:30PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10333

First Name: Gary
Last Name: Bushman
State: OR
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

As a full time resident of Hood River, Oregon I would greatly appreciate you removing the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Bushman, Gary – W333

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Bushman, Gary, Commenter ID No. W333 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Gary Bushman

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Cadwell, Jillian, Commenter ID No. W291

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 12:58 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10291

Thank you for your comment, Jillian Cadwell.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10291. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 17, 2011 12:57:30AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10291

First Name: Jillian
Last Name: Cadwell
Address: 219 Kranichwood ct
City: Richland
State: WA
Zip: 99352
Country: USA
Email: jhartfor@zagmail.gonzaga.edu
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

1

Cadwell, Jillian – W291

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Carroll, Justin, Commenter ID No. W369

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 3:50 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10369

Thank you for your comment, Justin Carroll.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10369. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 03:49:31PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10369

First Name: Justin
Last Name: Carroll
City: Portland
State: OR
Zip: 97213
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

There has to be another way. Please do not truck radioactive waste through the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area.

The COlumbia Gorge may be the only sea level passage through the Cascade Mountains. However, the National Scenic Area is a unique federal protected area on the order of Yellowstone National Park or the Grand Canyon. I doubt the Department of Energy would consider trucking hazardous waste through or near those national treasures.

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

1

Carroll, Justin – W369

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Carroll, Justin, Commenter ID No. W369 (cont'd)

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Chabot, Jamison, Commenter ID No. W385

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 4:56 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10385

Thank you for your comment, Jamison Chabot.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10385. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 04:55:30PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10385

First Name: Jamison
Middle Initial: P
Last Name: Chabot
State: OR
Zip: 97217
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Chabot, Jamison – W385

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Chabot, Jamison, Commenter ID No. W385 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best, Jamison Chabot

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Chase, James, Commenter ID No. W113

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:24 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10113

Thank you for your comment, James Chase.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10113. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:23:55PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10113

First Name: James
Last Name: Chase
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study yhat estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Chase, James – W113

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Chase, James, Commenter ID No. W113 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

James Chase

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Clifton, Merle, Commenter ID No. W93

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:05 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10093

Thank you for your comment, Merle Clifton.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10093. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:04:30PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10093

First Name: Merle
Last Name: Clifton
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman;

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Clifton, Merle – W93

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Clifton, Merle, Commenter ID No. W93 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Merle Clifton

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Colasurdo, Christine, Commenter ID No. W109

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:20 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10109

Thank you for your comment, Christine Colasurdo.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10109. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:19:44PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10109

First Name: Christine
Last Name: Colasurdo
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

1

Colasurdo, Christine – W109

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Coles, Vivian, Commenter ID No. W186

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 12:01 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10186

Thank you for your comment, Vivian Coles.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10186. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 12:00:27AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10186

First Name: Vivian
Last Name: Coles
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman;

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Coles, Vivian – W186

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Coles, Vivian, Commenter ID No. W186 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Collins, Alan, Commenter ID No. W100

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:07 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10100

Thank you for your comment, Alan Collins.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10100. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:07:00PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10100

First Name: Alan
Last Name: Collins
Country: USA
Email: in_scapes65@hotmail.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:

Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Collins, Alan – W100

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Collins, Alan, Commenter ID No. W100 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Combe, Emile, Commenter ID No. W107

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:19 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10107

Thank you for your comment, emile combe.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10107. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:18:19PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10107

First Name: emile
Middle Initial: h
Last Name: combe
Address: 13002 NE 5th St
City: vancouver
State: WA
Country: USA
Email: emile@worldaccessnet.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Combe, Emile – W107

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Combe, Emile, Commenter ID No. W107 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Emile H. Combe, MA, PhD
13002 NE 5th St.
Vancouver, WA 98684
503-995-9132

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Combe, Emile, Commenter ID No. W361

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 3:26 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10361

Thank you for your comment, emile combe.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10361. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 03:25:54PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10361

First Name: emile
Middle Initial: h
Last Name: combe
Address: 13002 NE 5th St
City: vancouver
State: WA
Zip: 98684
Country: USA
Email: emile@worldaccessnet.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Combe, Emile – W361

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Combe, Emile, Commenter ID No. W361 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Emile H. Combe, PhD
13002 NE 5th St.
Vancouver, WA 98684

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Cooper, Chris, Commenter ID No. W330

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2011 12:39 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10330

Thank you for your comment, Chris Cooper.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10330. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 21, 2011 12:39:13AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10330

First Name: Chris
Last Name: Cooper
City:
State:
Zip:
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Cooper, Chris – W330

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Cooper, Chris, Commenter ID No. W330 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Craig, Edward, Commenter ID No. W377

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 4:26 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10377

Thank you for your comment, Edward Craig.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10377. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 04:26:09PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10377

First Name: Edward
Last Name: Craig
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Craig, Edward – W377

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Craig, Edward, Commenter ID No. W377 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Cullen, Kacy, Commenter ID No. W226

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 10:41 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10226

Thank you for your comment, Kacy Cullen.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10226. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 10:41:15AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10226

First Name: Kacy
Middle Initial: E
Last Name: Cullen
Address: 944 SE Harney St
City: Portland
State: OR
Zip: 97202
Country: USA
Email: kacycullen@gmail.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Cullen, Kacy – W226

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Cullen, Kacy, Commenter ID No. W226 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
De Leon, Brittany, Commenter ID No. W211

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 9:38 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10211

Thank you for your comment, Brittany de Leon.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10211. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 09:37:41AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10211

First Name: Brittany
Last Name: de Leon
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

De Leon, Brittany – W211

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
De Leon, Brittany, Commenter ID No. W211 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Demuth, Lupin, Commenter ID No. W97

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:07 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10097

Thank you for your comment, Lupin DeMuth.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10097. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:06:20PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10097

First Name: Lupin
Middle Initial: C
Last Name: DeMuth
Address: 512 NE 14th Ave
City: Camas
State: WA
Zip: 98607
Country: USA
Email: lupin@inkemail.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Demuth, Lupin, Commenter ID No. W97 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Lupin DeMuth

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Dickson, Michele, Commenter ID No. W134

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 8:19 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10134

Thank you for your comment, michele dickson.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10134. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 08:19:03PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10134

First Name: michele
Last Name: dickson
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Dickson, Michele, Commenter ID No. W134 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Dunn, Huelo, Commenter ID No. W178

le

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 11:26 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10178

Thank you for your comment, HUELO DUNN.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10178. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 11:26:18PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10178

First Name: HUELO
Last Name: DUNN
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Dunn, Huelo – W178

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Dunn, Huelo, Commenter ID No. W178 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Dunn-Dixon, Jennie Sue, Commenter ID No. W161

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 10:03 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10161

Thank you for your comment, Jennie Sue Dunn-Dixon.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10161. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 10:03:14PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10161

First Name: Jennie Sue
Last Name: Dunn-Dixon
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Dunn-Dixon, Jennie Sue, Commenter ID No. W161 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Jennie Sue Dunn-Dixon

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Erickson, Steven, Commenter ID No. W357

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 3:18 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10357

Thank you for your comment, Steven Erickson.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10357. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 03:17:28PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10357

First Name: Steven
Middle Initial: R
Last Name: Erickson
Address:
City:
State:
Zip:
Country: USA
Email: steveerickson720@gmail.com
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Erickson, Steven, Commenter ID No. W357 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Ernst, Susan, Commenter ID No. W251

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 12:40 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10251

Thank you for your comment, Susan Ernst.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10251. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 12:39:32PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10251

First Name: Susan
Last Name: Ernst
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Ernst, Susan, Commenter ID No. W251 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Fenker, John, Commenter ID No. W155

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 9:50 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10155

Thank you for your comment, John Fenker.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10155. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 09:49:40PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10155

First Name: John
Last Name: Fenker
Country: USA
Email: jfenker@comcast.net
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:

Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Fenker, John – W155

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Fenker, John, Commenter ID No. W155 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Gilbert, Anna, Commenter ID No. W80

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 09, 2011 7:04 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10080

Thank you for your comment, Anna Gilbert.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10080. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 9, 2011 07:03:22PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10080

First Name: Anna
Last Name: Gilbert
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a national permanent storage of radioactive waste. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of highly dangerous radioactive material.

First, Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Deptment of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. Plus, the site is located too close to the Columbia River Gorge and Portland metro area with well over one million people living nearby.

Second, those living along the interstate system will be affected much more directly. If Hanford is selected, we will begin to see truckloads of radioactive waste traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and along the Columbia River Gorge. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within feet of homes, schools, and the Columbia River.

Third, the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The EIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the EIS include the unimaginable number of deaths from a truck accident, earthquake or intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge-- not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to converting Hanford into a national nuclear waste dump by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeepers, 17 Oregon Representatives and Senators, U.S. Senator Merkley and U.S. Senator Wyden.

1

Gilbert, Anna – W80

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Gilbert, Anna, Commenter ID No. W80 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Gohl, Joy, Commenter ID No. W91

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2011 3:49 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10091

Thank you for your comment, Joy Gohl.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10091. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 14, 2011 03:48:39PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10091

First Name: Joy
Last Name: Gohl
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States.

Hanford is the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimating 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, earthquake or intentional attack.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

1

Gohl, Joy – W91

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Goodwin, William, Commenter ID No. W213

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 9:51 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10213

Thank you for your comment, William Goodwin.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10213. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 09:51:04AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10213

First Name: William
Last Name: Goodwin
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Goodwin, William – W213

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Goodwin, William, Commenter ID No. W213 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Graser-Lindsey, Elizabeth, Commenter ID No. W233

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 10:56 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10233

Thank you for your comment, Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10233. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 10:55:51AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10233

First Name: Elizabeth
Last Name: Graser-Lindsey
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

1

Graser-Lindsey, Elizabeth – W233

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Gridley, John, Commenter ID No. W454

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 11:59 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10454

Thank you for your comment, John Gridley.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10454. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 24, 2011 11:58:52PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10454

First Name: John
Last Name: Gridley
Address: 21500 N Umpqua Hwy
Address 3: 21500 N Umpqua Hwy
City: Glide
State: OR
Zip: 97443
Country: USA
Email: johng@ehealthlink.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Gridley, John – W454

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Gridley, John, Commenter ID No. W454 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Grigsby, Sara, Commenter ID No. W422

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 9:39 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10422

Thank you for your comment, Sara Grigsby.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10422. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 24, 2011 09:38:39AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10422

First Name: Sara
Last Name: Grigsby
Organization: Columbia River Gorge Commissioner
Country: USA
Email: sara@healthysystems.net
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Grigsby, Sara, Commenter ID No. W422 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Sara Grigsby

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Gundersen, Daniel, Commenter ID No. W218

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 10:12 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10218

Thank you for your comment, daniel gundersen.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10218. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 10:12:18AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10218

First Name: daniel
Last Name: gundersen
Address: 221 indian cabin rd
City: stevenson
State: WA
Zip: 98648
Country: USA
Email: danielg@gorge.net
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Gundersen, Daniel, Commenter ID No. W218 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thanks for listening

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Hafer, Sarah, Commenter ID No. W216

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 9:57 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10216

Thank you for your comment, Sarah Hafer.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10216. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 09:56:20AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10216

First Name: Sarah
Last Name: Hafer
Organization: individual citizen
City: Sacramento
State: CA
Zip: 95864
Country: USA
Email: sarah.hafer@gmail.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Hafer, Sarah – W216

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Hafer, Sarah, Commenter ID No. W216 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sarah Hafer
Sacramento, CA

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Hellickson, Terry, Commenter ID No. W202

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 8:28 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10202

Thank you for your comment, Terry Hellickson.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10202. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 08:28:03AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10202

First Name: Terry
Last Name: Hellickson
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman;

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimating 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Hellickson, Terry, Commenter ID No. W202 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Hermsen, Laurence, Commenter ID No. W172

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 10:59 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10172

Thank you for your comment, Laurence Hermsen.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10172. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 10:58:25PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10172

First Name: Laurence
Last Name: Hermsen
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Hermsen, Laurence, Commenter ID No. W172 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Hochendoner, Kelly, Commenter ID No. W405

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 8:26 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10405

Thank you for your comment, Kelly Hochendoner.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10405. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 08:25:53PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10405

First Name: Kelly
Last Name: Hochendoner
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Hochendoner, Kelly – W405

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Hochendoner, Kelly, Commenter ID No. W405 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Holzman, Deanne, Commenter ID No. W260

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 2:05 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10260

Thank you for your comment, Deanne Holzman.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10260. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 02:04:24PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10260

First Name: Deanne
Middle Initial: M
Last Name: Holzman
Address: P.O. Box 1233
City: Hood River
State: OR
Zip: 97031
Country: USA
Email: deeholzman@gmail.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along Interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Holzman, Deanne – W260

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Holzman, Deanne, Commenter ID No. W260 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Honeyman, Usha, Commenter ID No. W286

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 11:33 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10286

Thank you for your comment, Usha Honeyman.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10286. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 11:33:08PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10286

First Name: Usha
Last Name: Honeyman
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Honeyman, Usha – W286

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Honeyman, Usha, Commenter ID No. W286 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Dr. Usha Honeyman

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Hopkins, Tom, Commenter ID No. W304

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 4:31 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10304

Thank you for your comment, Tom Hopkins.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10304. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 17, 2011 04:30:26PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10304

First Name: Tom
Last Name: Hopkins
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Hopkins, Tom, Commenter ID No. W304 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Hornung, Tracie, Commenter ID No. W158

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 9:59 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10158

Thank you for your comment, Tracie Hornung.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10158. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 09:58:56PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10158

First Name: Tracie
Last Name: Hornung
City: Mosier
State: OR
Zip: 97040
Country: USA
Email: thornung@embarqmail.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Dear Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. I live within one-quarter mile of I-84. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimating 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Hornung, Tracie, Commenter ID No. W158 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Hubard, Ann, Commenter ID No. W152

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 9:36 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10152

Thank you for your comment, Ann Hubard.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10152. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 09:36:06PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10152

First Name: Ann
Last Name: Hubard
Country: USA
Email: amhtw2003@yahoo.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Hubard, Ann – W152

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Hubard, Ann, Commenter ID No. W152 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Hughes, Eleanor, Commenter ID No. W147

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 9:08 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10147

Thank you for your comment, Eleanor Hughes.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10147. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 09:08:04PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10147

First Name: Eleanor
Last Name: Hughes
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Hughes, Eleanor, Commenter ID No. W147 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Hulbert, Dawn, Commenter ID No. W331

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2011 10:28 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10331

Thank you for your comment, Dawn Hulbert.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10331. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 21, 2011 10:27:53AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10331

First Name: Dawn
Last Name: Hulbert
City: White Salmon
State: WA
Zip: 98672
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Hulbert, Dawn, Commenter ID No. W331 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Jackson, Aria, Commenter ID No. W146

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 9:07 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10146

Thank you for your comment, Aria Jackson.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10146. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 09:06:42PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10146

First Name: Aria
Last Name: Jackson
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Jackson, Aria – W146

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Jackson, Aria, Commenter ID No. W146 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Jackson, Nathan, Commenter ID No. W105

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:13 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10105

Thank you for your comment, Nathan Jackson.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10105. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:12:37PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10105

First Name: Nathan
Last Name: Jackson
State: OR
Zip: 97224
Country: USA
Email: nateiman@hotmail.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Jackson, Nathan – W105

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Jackson, Nathan, Commenter ID No. W105 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Jacobson, Rich, Commenter ID No. W263

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 2:26 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10263

Thank you for your comment, Rich Jacobson.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10263. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 02:25:50PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10263

First Name: Rich
Last Name: Jacobson
Address: 2210 SW Broadway Drive
City: Portland
State: OR
Zip: 97201
Country: USA
Email: RichardRJacobson@alm.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Jacobson, Rich – W263

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Jacobson, Rich, Commenter ID No. W263 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Rich and Jeanne Jacobson

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Jeka, Kymberly, Commenter ID No. W112

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:23 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10112

Thank you for your comment, Kymberly Jeka.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10112. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:22:53PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10112

First Name: Kymberly
Last Name: Jeka
Address:
City:
State:
Zip:
Country: USA
Email: kymberlyjeka@gmail.com
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Jeka, Kymberly – W112

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Jeka, Kymberly, Commenter ID No. W112 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Jelen, Jonathan, Commenter ID No. W256

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 1:20 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10256

Thank you for your comment, Jonathan Jelen.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10256. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 01:19:26PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10256

First Name: Jonathan
Last Name: Jelen
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Jelen, Jonathan, Commenter ID No. W256 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Johnson, Stephen, Commenter ID No. W177

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 11:15 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10177

Thank you for your comment, Stephen Johnson.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10177. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 11:14:59PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10177

First Name: Stephen
Middle Initial: M
Last Name: Johnson
Country: USA
Email: stephenjohnson@pol.net
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford, in part due to the proximity to the Colorado River and the water table; it is also near large population centers.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The highway through the Gorge is infamous for very high, shifting winds and icy conditions (in the winter). The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Johnson, Stephen, Commenter ID No. W177 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Kaminker, Matthew, Commenter ID No. W176

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 11:12 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10176

Thank you for your comment, Matthew Kaminker.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10176. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 11:11:58PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10176

First Name: Matthew
Middle Initial: N
Last Name: Kaminker
Address: 10638 SW Capitol Hwy
City: Portland
State: OR
Zip: 97219
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Kaminker, Matthew – W176

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Kaminker, Matthew, Commenter ID No. W176 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Kay, Joel, Commenter ID No. W157

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 9:56 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10157

Thank you for your comment, Joel Kay.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10157. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 09:55:24PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10157

First Name: Joel
Last Name: Kay
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

1

Kay, Joel – W157

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Kelly, Tim, Commenter ID No. W566

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2011 7:55 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10566

Thank you for your comment, tim kelly.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10566. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 28, 2011 07:54:38AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10566

First Name: tim
Last Name: kelly
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Kelly, Tim – W566

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Keys, Thomas, Commenter ID No. W156

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 9:53 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10156

Thank you for your comment, Thomas Keys.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10156. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 09:53:02PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10156

First Name: Thomas
Middle Initial: J
Last Name: Keys
Organization: Referred by "Friends of the Columbia Gorge"
Address: 1103 SE 21st CT
City: Gresham
State: OR
Zip: 97080
Country: USA
Email: tkeyshike@msn.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Keys, Thomas – W156

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Keys, Thomas, Commenter ID No. W156 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Sincerely,

Thomas J Keys

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Keys, Thomas, Commenter ID No. W375

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 4:14 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10375

Thank you for your comment, Thomas Keys.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10375. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 04:13:35PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10375

First Name: Thomas
Last Name: Keys
Organization: Friends of the Columbia Gorge
Address: 1103 SE 21st CT
City: Gresham
State: OR
Zip: 97080
Country: USA
Email: tkeyshike@msn.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Keys, Thomas – W375

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Keys, Thomas, Commenter ID No. W375 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Kirkland, John, Commenter ID No. W275

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 6:56 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10275

Thank you for your comment, John Kirkland.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10275. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 06:55:24PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10275

First Name: John
Middle Initial: L
Last Name: Kirkland
Country: USA
Email: jlkirland3@comcast.net
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Kirkland, John – W275

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Kirkland, John, Commenter ID No. W275 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Kirkland, John, Commenter ID No. W83

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2011 10:09 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10083

Thank you for your comment, John Kirkland.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10083. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 10, 2011 10:09:01PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10083

First Name: John
Middle Initial: L
Last Name: Kirkland
Country: USA
Email: jlkirland3@comcast.net
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Kirkland, John, Commenter ID No. W83 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Kofler, Roger, Commenter ID No. W225

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 10:30 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10225

Thank you for your comment, Roger Kofler.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10225. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 10:29:57AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10225

First Name: Roger
Middle Initial: H
Last Name: Kofler
Country: USA
Email: rkofler@aol.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Kofler, Roger, Commenter ID No. W225 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Kolberg, Vicki, Commenter ID No. W200

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 7:49 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10200

Thank you for your comment, Vicki Kolberg.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10200. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 07:49:00AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10200

First Name: Vicki
Last Name: Kolberg
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Kolberg, Vicki – W200

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Kolberg, Vicki, Commenter ID No. W200 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Kolberg, Vicki, Commenter ID No. W200 (cont'd)

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

3

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Kramer-Dodd, Gay, Commenter ID No. W279

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 8:43 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10279

Thank you for your comment, Gay Kramer-Dodd.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10279. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 08:43:17PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10279

First Name: Gay
Middle Initial: D
Last Name: Kramer-Dodd
Address:
City:
State:
Zip:
Country: USA
Email: dodd7720@comcast.net
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

I am troubled that the Hanford Nuclear Reservation is on the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material. I urge you to reject this.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Kramer-Dodd, Gay – W279

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Kramer-Dodd, Gay, Commenter ID No. W279 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Kutschera, Ellynne, Commenter ID No. W269

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 3:46 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10269

Thank you for your comment, Ellynne Kutschera.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10269. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 03:46:21PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10269

First Name: Ellynne
Last Name: Kutschera
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

I sincerely hope that you will remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Kutschera, Ellynne, Commenter ID No. W269 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Lamberger, Dan, Commenter ID No. W329

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2011 7:36 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10329

Thank you for your comment, Dan Lamberger.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10329. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 20, 2011 07:36:13PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10329

First Name: Dan
Middle Initial: C
Last Name: Lamberger
Address: 1441 SW Clay St. #107
City: Portland
State: OR
Zip: 97201
Country: USA
Email: dlamberger@comcast.net
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Lamberger, Dan – W329

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Lamberger, Dan, Commenter ID No. W329 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Leggatt, Joyce, Commenter ID No. W424

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 10:12 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10424

Thank you for your comment, Joyce Leggatt.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10424. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 24, 2011 10:12:10AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10424

First Name: Joyce
Last Name: Leggatt
State: OR
Zip: 97211
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Leggatt, Joyce – W424

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Leggatt, Joyce, Commenter ID No. W424 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Lief, Charles, Commenter ID No. W368

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 3:45 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10368

Thank you for your comment, Charles Lief.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10368. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 03:44:41PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10368

First Name: Charles
Middle Initial: G
Last Name: Lief
Address:
City:
State:
Zip:
Country: USA
Email: greglief@gmail.com
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Dear Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

I am writing to urge you to please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States.

Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material. For one thing, it is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. It would be counter-productive to store new nuclear waste at that location.

Among other things, this proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is too great and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Lief, Charles – W368

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Lief, Charles, Commenter ID No. W368 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Lienhard, Judith, Commenter ID No. W102

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:08 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10102

Thank you for your comment, Judith Lienhard.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10102. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:07:49PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10102

First Name: Judith
Last Name: Lienhard
Address: 4455 SW 94th Ave
City: Portland
State: OR
Zip: 97225
Country: USA
Email: lienjud@aol.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Lienhard, Judith – W102

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Lienhard, Judith, Commenter ID No. W102 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Lloyd, Darryl, Commenter ID No. W181

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 11:44 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10181

Thank you for your comment, Darryl Lloyd.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10181. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 11:44:18PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10181

First Name: Darryl
Middle Initial: G
Last Name: Lloyd
Address: 1025 State St.
City: Hood River
State: OR
Zip: 97031
Country: USA
Email: longshadow@gorge.net
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

I echo every word of this letter drafted by Friends of the Columbia Gorge

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur

1

Lloyd, Darryl – W181

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Lloyd, Darryl, Commenter ID No. W181 (cont'd)

due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Long, Meredith, Commenter ID No. W332

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2011 12:22 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10332

Thank you for your comment, Meredith Long.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10332. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 21, 2011 12:21:37PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10332

First Name: Meredith
Middle Initial: K
Last Name: Long
City: Placitas
State: NM
Zip: 87043
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Long, Meredith – W332

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Long, Meredith, Commenter ID No. W332 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Lovejoy, Patricia, Commenter ID No. W318

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Sunday, June 19, 2011 7:41 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10318

Thank you for your comment, Patricia Lovejoy.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10318. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 19, 2011 07:41:06PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10318

First Name: Patricia
Last Name: Lovejoy
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Lovejoy, Patricia – W318

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Lovejoy, Patricia, Commenter ID No. W318 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Lyda, Mary, Commenter ID No. W175

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 11:11 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10175

Thank you for your comment, Mary Lyda,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10175. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 11:09:58PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10175

First Name: Mary
Last Name: Lyda
Address: P.O.Box 1928
Address 3: P.O.Box 1928
City: Cave Junction
State: OR
Zip: 97523
Country: USA
Email: artisan7@frontiernet.net
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Lyda, Mary – W175

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Lyda, Mary, Commenter ID No. W175 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Maney, Trudy, Commenter ID No. W295

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 10:17 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10295

Thank you for your comment, Trudy Maney.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10295. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 17, 2011 10:16:37AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10295

First Name: Trudy
Middle Initial: G
Last Name: Maney
State: I
Zip: :
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Maney, Trudy – W295

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Maney, Trudy, Commenter ID No. W295 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Trudy G Maney

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Markey, Jeff, Commenter ID No. W116

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:31 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10116

Thank you for your comment, Jeff Markey.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10116. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:31:07PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10116

First Name: Jeff
Last Name: Markey
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Markey, Jeff – W116

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Markey, Jeff, Commenter ID No. W116 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Martin Jr, Ron, Commenter ID No. W148

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 9:13 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10148

Thank you for your comment, Ron Martin Jr.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10148. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 09:12:43PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10148

First Name: Ron
Middle Initial: W
Last Name: Martin Jr
Address: 1401 Cross Creek Ln
City: hood river
State: OR
Zip: 97031
Country: USA
Email: rwmartin@mtu.edu
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Dear Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

I am writing as both a small business owner and a resident of the Columbia River Gorge. Our livelihoods and that of many others' depend on the Columbia River Gorge.

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur

1

Martin Jr, Ron – W148

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Martin Jr, Ron, Commenter ID No. W148 (cont'd)

due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Masin, Susan, Commenter ID No. W372

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 3:56 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10372

Thank you for your comment, susan masin.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10372. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 03:56:00PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10372

First Name: susan
Last Name: masin
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Masin, Susan – W372

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Masin, Susan, Commenter ID No. W372 (cont'd)

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
McClain, Mary, Commenter ID No. W143

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 8:55 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10143

Thank you for your comment, Mary McClain.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10143. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 08:55:14PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10143

First Name: Mary
Middle Initial: M
Last Name: McClain
Country: USA
Email: marymmcclain@yahoo.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

McClain, Mary – W143

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
McClain, Mary, Commenter ID No. W143 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Mary M. McClain

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
McClay, Mauria, Commenter ID No. W98

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:07 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10098

Thank you for your comment, Mauria McClay.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10098. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:06:36PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10098

First Name: Mauria
Last Name: McClay
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman;

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

1

McClay, Mauria – W98

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
McComb, Melinda, Commenter ID No. W423

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 9:42 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10423

Thank you for your comment, Melinda McComb.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10423. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 24, 2011 09:41:34AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10423

First Name: Melinda
Last Name: McComb
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
McComb, Melinda, Commenter ID No. W423 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Melinda McComb

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
McConnell, Constance, Commenter ID No. W281

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 10:05 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10281

Thank you for your comment, Constance McConnell.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10281. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 10:05:13PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10281

First Name: Constance
Last Name: McConnell
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

This is IMPORTANT!

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
McConnell, Constance, Commenter ID No. W281 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
McCracken, Gloria, Commenter ID No. W277

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 8:02 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10277

Thank you for your comment, Gloria McCracken.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10277. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 08:01:26PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10277

First Name: Gloria
Middle Initial: J
Last Name: McCracken
Address:
City:
State:
Zip:
Country: USA
Email: riversbard@yahoo.com
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
As a permanent nuclear waste dump, Hanford is the wrong. As a place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material Hanford is wrong. Seriously, is there any good place? Still, Hanford has to be the absolute worst choice. I can't believe it's even being considered. Please remove it from the list of candidate sites.

As you should know, Hanford is already the most CONTAMINATED site in the Western Hemisphere, already involving the Department of Energy in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. It should be obvious, no new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

Furthermore, in accordance with this proposal, thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would travel along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat as well as the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an EARTHQUARE (historically occurring within the time frame of every four to six hundred years off the coast of Oregon – much like that which occurred March 11 in Japan) or an intentional attack.

1

McCracken, Gloria – W277

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
McCracken, Gloria, Commenter ID No. W277 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge – not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
McDonald, Cheri, Commenter ID No. W432

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 12:16 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10432

Thank you for your comment, Cheri McDonald.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10432. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 24, 2011 12:16:07PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10432

First Name: Cheri
Middle Initial: M
Last Name: McDonald
Organization: N/A
Address: 2353 - 130th Ave NE
Address 2: Suite 130
City: Bellevue
State: WA
Zip: 98005
Country: USA
Email: cheri@lehmannwood.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
McDonald, Cheri, Commenter ID No. W432 (cont'd)

occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Cheri M. McDonald

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
McGowan, Wendy, Commenter ID No. W435

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 1:39 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10435

Thank you for your comment, Wendy McGowan.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10435. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 24, 2011 01:39:26PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10435

First Name: Wendy
Last Name: McGowan
State: OR
Zip: 97404
Country: USA
Email: ramblin@rosenet.net
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
McGowan, Wendy, Commenter ID No. W435 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
McKamey, Will, Commenter ID No. W235

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 11:08 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10235

Thank you for your comment, Will McKamey.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10235. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 11:07:40AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10235

First Name: Will
Last Name: McKamey
City: Portland
State: OR
Zip: 97209
Country: USA
Email: will_mck@comcast.net
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
McKamey, Will, Commenter ID No. W235 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Meyer, Emily, Commenter ID No. W287

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 11:47 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10287

Thank you for your comment, Emily Meyer.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10287. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 11:46:59PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10287

First Name: Emily
Last Name: Meyer
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Meyer, Emily – W287

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Meyer, Emily, Commenter ID No. W287 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Miller, Jacquelyn, Commenter ID No. W123

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:43 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10123

Thank you for your comment, Jacquelyn Miller.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10123. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:43:02PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10123

First Name: Jacquelyn
Last Name: Miller
Organization: --- Select ---
Address:
City:
State
Zip:
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Miller, Jacquelyn – W123

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Miller, Jacquelyn, Commenter ID No. W123 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Miller, Michelle, Commenter ID No. W442

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 4:18 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10442

Thank you for your comment, michelle miller.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10442. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 24, 2011 04:17:44PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10442

First Name: michelle
Middle Initial: I
Last Name: miller
Address: 2322 n willlams ave #212
City: portland
State: OR
Zip: 97227
Country: USA
Email: magyar6969@hotmail.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Miller, Michelle, Commenter ID No. W442 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Welcome back!
For your convenience, we have filled out your form with the information you provided previously from postal code 97227.
Click to see and manage your information.

Not magyar6969@hotmail.com? Please click here. Thank you!

Email*

Sending your message, please wait ...

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Milne, Laura, Commenter ID No. W529

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2011 10:38 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10529

Thank you for your comment, Laura Milne.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10529. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 27, 2011 10:37:54AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10529

First Name: Laura
Last Name: Milne
Address: 4666 NW Woodside Ter
Address 3: 4666 NW Woodside Ter
City: Portland
State: OR
Zip: 97210
Country: USA
Email: lwmilne@comcast.net
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Milne, Laura – W529

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Milne, Laura, Commenter ID No. W529 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Laura Milne

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Minick, David, Commenter ID No. W268

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 3:34 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10268

Thank you for your comment, David Minick.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10268. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 03:33:53PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10268

First Name: David
Last Name: Minick
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Minick, David – W268

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Minick, David, Commenter ID No. W268 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Monial, Sara, Commenter ID No. W391

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 5:37 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10391

Thank you for your comment, Sara Monial.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10391. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 05:36:50PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10391

First Name: Sara
Middle Initial: E
Last Name: Monial
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Monial, Sara – W391

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Monial, Sara, Commenter ID No. W391 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Morris, Julie, Commenter ID No. W241

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 11:42 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10241

Thank you for your comment, Julie Morris.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10241. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 11:41:49AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10241

First Name: Julie
Last Name: Morris
Address: 1616 N Terry Street
City: Portland
State: OR
Zip: 97217
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States.

Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford.

No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

Many many families and tourists use the I-84 corridor and would be exposed to potential harm.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur

1

Morris, Julie – W241

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Morris, Julie, Commenter ID No. W241 (cont'd)

due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Mullis, Lisa, Commenter ID No. W227

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 10:44 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10227

Thank you for your comment, Lisa Mullis.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10227. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 10:43:39AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10227

First Name: Lisa
Last Name: Mullis
Address:
City:
State:
Zip:
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Mullis, Lisa – W227

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Mullis, Lisa, Commenter ID No. W227 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Neer, Steven, Commenter ID No. W230

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 10:54 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10230

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10230. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 10:54:21AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10230

First Name: Steven
Last Name: Neer
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

1

Neer, Steven – W230

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Nettleton, John, Commenter ID No. W303

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 4:07 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10303

Thank you for your comment, John Nettleton.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10303. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 17, 2011 04:06:59PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10303

First Name: John
Last Name: Nettleton
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Nettleton, John – W303

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Nettleton, John, Commenter ID No. W303 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

First Name*
Last Name*
Email*
Street*
Street 2
City*
State/Province*
Zip/Postal Code*
Sending your message, please wait ...

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Neuendorf, Mary, Commenter ID No. W255

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 1:10 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10255

Thank you for your comment, Mary Neuendorf.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10255. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 01:09:26PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10255

First Name: Mary
Last Name: Neuendorf
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Neuendorf, Mary – W255

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Neuendorf, Mary, Commenter ID No. W255 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Neulist, Susan, Commenter ID No. W118

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:37 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10118

Thank you for your comment, Susan Neulist.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10118. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:36:59PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10118

First Name: Susan
Middle Initial: M
Last Name: Neulist
Address: 643 NW 10th Avenue
Address 3: 643 NW 10th Avenue
City: Camas
State: WA
Zip: 98607
Country: USA
Email: sueneulist@yahoo.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Neulist, Susan, Commenter ID No. W118 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Susan Neulist

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Oliveri, Christy, Commenter ID No. W232

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 10:56 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10232

Thank you for your comment, Christy Oliveri.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10232. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 10:55:30AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10232

First Name: Christy
Middle Initial: N
Last Name: Oliveri
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Oliveri, Christy, Commenter ID No. W232 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Palmer, Gayle, Commenter ID No. W238

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 11:18 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10238

Thank you for your comment, Gayle Palmer.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10238. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 11:17:33AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10238

First Name: Gayle
Middle Initial: C
Last Name: Palmer
Address: 3710 235th Pl SW
City: Brier
State: WA
Zip: 98036
Country: USA
Email: gipalmer@netzero.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Palmer, Gayle, Commenter ID No. W238 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Gayle Palmer

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Pantely, George, Commenter ID No. W283

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 11:21 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10283

Thank you for your comment, George Pantely.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10283. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 11:18:05PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10283

First Name: George
Middle Initial: A
Last Name: Pantely
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Pantely, George – W283

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Pantely, George, Commenter ID No. W283 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Parker, John, Commenter ID No. W167

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 10:22 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10167

Thank you for your comment, John Parker.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10167. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 10:21:58PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10167

First Name: John
Middle Initial: V
Last Name: Parker
City: Beaverton
State: OR
Zip: 97005
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Parker, John – W167

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Parker, John, Commenter ID No. W167 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

John Parker

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Petersen, Larry, Commenter ID No. W168

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 10:26 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10168

Thank you for your comment, Larry Petersen.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10168. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 10:25:25PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10168

First Name: Larry
Last Name: Petersen
Address: 1000 N W 3
City: Gresham
State: OR
Zip: 97030
Country: USA
Email: larry@epetersen.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

1

Petersen, Larry – W168

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Petersen, Larry, Commenter ID No. W382

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 4:47 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10382

Thank you for your comment, Larry Petersen.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10382. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 04:46:32PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10382

First Name: Larry
Last Name: Petersen
Address: 1000 N W 3
City: Gresham
State: OR
Zip: 97030
Country: USA
Email: larry@epetersen.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Petersen, Larry, Commenter ID No. W382 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Peterson, Kathryn, Commenter ID No. W236

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 11:11 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10236

Thank you for your comment, Kathryn Peterson.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10236. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 11:11:10AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10236

First Name: Kathryn
Last Name: Peterson
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study which estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure!!!

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Peterson, Kathryn – W236

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Platner, Nancy, Commenter ID No. W383

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 4:53 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10383

Thank you for your comment, Nancy Platner.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10383. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 04:52:47PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10383

First Name: Nancy
Middle Initial: B
Last Name: Platner
City: Hood River
State: OR
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman,

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Platner, Nancy, Commenter ID No. W383 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others..

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Nancy B. Platner

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Polk, Nora, Commenter ID No. W356

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 3:17 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10356

Thank you for your comment, Nora Polk.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10356. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 03:16:56PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10356

First Name: Nora
Last Name: Polk
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Polk, Nora – W356

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Polk, Nora, Commenter ID No. W356 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Pollock, Nina, Commenter ID No. W265

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 2:55 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10265

Thank you for your comment, Nina Pollock.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10265. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 02:54:42PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10265

First Name: Nina
Last Name: Pollock
Address: 10342 NW Alpenglow
City: Portland
State: OR
Zip: 97229
Country: USA
Email: nina_pollock@yahoo.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area.

We hike in the Colmbia River Gorge on a regular basis and want the area protected for the continued use of the people of Portland and Oregon.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Pollock, Nina, Commenter ID No. W265 (cont'd)

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Popiela, Hank, Commenter ID No. W114

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:25 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10114

Thank you for your comment, Hank Popiela.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10114. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:24:50PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10114

First Name: Hank
Last Name: Popiela
State: OR
Zip: 97212
Country: USA
Email: hapopi@gmail.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Popiela, Hank – W114

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Popiela, Hank, Commenter ID No. W114 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Porch, Delores, Commenter ID No. W252

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 12:46 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10252

Thank you for your comment, Delores Porch.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10252. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 12:46:09PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10252

First Name: Delores
Last Name: Porch
State: OR
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Porch, Delores – W252

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Porch, Delores, Commenter ID No. W252 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Porch, Delores, Commenter ID No. W401

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 7:43 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10401

Thank you for your comment, Delores Porch.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10401. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 07:42:37PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10401

First Name: Delores
Last Name: Porch
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Porch, Delores – W401

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Porch, Delores, Commenter ID No. W401 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Prentiss, Alex, Commenter ID No. W92

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:02 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10092

Thank you for your comment, Alex Prentiss.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10092. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:02:24PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10092

First Name: Alex
Last Name: Prentiss
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Prentiss, Alex – W92

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Prentiss, Alex, Commenter ID No. W92 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Priest, Madeline, Commenter ID No. W81

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2011 7:27 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10081

Thank you for your comment, Madeline Priest.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10081. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 10, 2011 07:27:24PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10081

First Name: Madeline
Last Name: Priest
City: The Dalles
State: OR
Zip: 97058
Country: USA
Email: madpriest86@gmail.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Priest, Madeline – W81

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Priest, Madeline, Commenter ID No. W81 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Provost, Pierre, Commenter ID No. W201

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 8:13 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10201

Thank you for your comment, Pierre Provost.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10201. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 08:13:16AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10201

First Name: Pierre
Last Name: Provost
Country: USA
Email: beavogi7@gmail.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

My family and I use the Columbia River Gorge on a regular basis for hiking and other recreation. It is truly a scenic gem for the entire U.S. In fact I was backpacking there this past week with a new friend from Germany, highlighting the areas beauty.

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Provost, Pierre, Commenter ID No. W201 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Putnam, Lynn, Commenter ID No. W125

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:51 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10125

Thank you for your comment, Lynn Putnam.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10125. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:51:16PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10125

First Name: Lynn
Last Name: Putnam
State:
Zip:
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Putnam, Lynn, Commenter ID No. W125 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Rabin, Michelle, Commenter ID No. W215

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 9:54 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10215

Thank you for your comment, Michelle Rabin.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10215. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 09:53:58AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10215

First Name: Michelle
Middle Initial: B
Last Name: Rabin
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Rabin, Michelle – W215

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Rabin, Michelle, Commenter ID No. W215 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Ray, Richard, Commenter ID No. W259

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 2:02 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10259

Thank you for your comment, Richard Ray.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10259. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 02:01:38PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10259

First Name: Richard
Last Name: Ray
Address: 30649 NE Hurt Rd
City: Troutdale
State: OR
Zip: 97060
Country: USA
Email: democracyinaction@rickray.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Ray, Richard, Commenter ID No. W259 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Reedijk, Linda, Commenter ID No. W187

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 12:08 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10187

Thank you for your comment, Linda Reedijk.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10187. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 12:07:30AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10187

First Name: Linda
Last Name: Reedijk
State:
Zip:
Country: USA
Email: lindareedijk@yahoo.com
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Reedijk, Linda, Commenter ID No. W187 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Linda Reedijk

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Robbins, Teresa, Commenter ID No. W412

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 10:11 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10412

Thank you for your comment, Teresa Robbins.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10412. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 10:10:34PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10412

First Name: Teresa
Last Name: Robbins
City: Washougal
State: WA
Zip: 98671
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Robbins, Teresa, Commenter ID No. W412 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Rossman, Penny, Commenter ID No. W299

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 12:47 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10299

Thank you for your comment, Penny Rossman.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10299. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 17, 2011 12:47:13PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10299

First Name: Penny
Middle Initial: L
Last Name: Rossman
Address: PO Box 69
City: Corbett
State: OR
Zip: 97019
Country: USA
Email: prosswoman@gmail.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Rossman, Penny, Commenter ID No. W299 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Sanda, Clyde, Commenter ID No. W212

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 9:50 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10212

Thank you for your comment, Clyde Sanda.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10212. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 09:50:01AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10212

First Name: Clyde
Last Name: Sanda
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Sanda, Clyde – W212

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Sanda, Clyde, Commenter ID No. W212 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Rev Clyde Sanda

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Sawaya, Linda, Commenter ID No. W184

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 11:58 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10184

Thank you for your comment, linda sawaya.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10184. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 11:58:08PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10184

First Name: linda
Last Name: sawaya
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Sawaya, Linda – W184

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Sawaya, Linda, Commenter ID No. W184 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Seil, Fredrick, Commenter ID No. W300

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 1:48 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10300

Thank you for your comment, Fredrick Seil.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10300. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 17, 2011 01:47:25PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10300

First Name: Fredrick
Middle Initial: J
Last Name: Seil
Address: 1 Twain Avenue
City: Berkeley
State: CA
Zip: 94708
Country: USA
Email: seilf@comcast.net
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Seil, Fredrick – W300

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Seil, Fredrick, Commenter ID No. W300 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Shapiro, David, Commenter ID No. W242

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 11:46 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10242

Thank you for your comment, David Shapiro.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10242. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 11:45:30AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10242

First Name: David
Last Name: Shapiro
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

I fully support the issues raised below concerning using Hanford as a permanent nuclear waste dump site. It is already incredibly contaminated and too near the Columbia River to risk an accident. Trucking waste through the Columbia Gorge also risks a precious natural area.

Thank you

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur

1

Shapiro, David – W242

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Shapiro, David, Commenter ID No. W242 (cont'd)

due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Sharpe, Kathryn, Commenter ID No. W415

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 11:33 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10415

Thank you for your comment, Kathryn Sharpe.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10415. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 11:32:54PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10415

First Name: Kathryn
Last Name: Sharpe
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

We already have a problem on our hands with waste in Hanford. We don't want to make it any worse.

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Sharpe, Kathryn – W415

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Sharpe, Kathryn, Commenter ID No. W415 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Sherer, Janice, Commenter ID No. W180

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 11:42 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10180

Thank you for your comment, Janice Sherer.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10180. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 11:41:21PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10180

First Name: Janice
Middle Initial: J
Last Name: Sherer
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Sherer, Janice – W180

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Sherer, Janice, Commenter ID No. W180 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Simonsen, John, Commenter ID No. W133

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 8:18 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10133

Thank you for your comment, John Simonsen.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10133. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 08:17:48PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10133

First Name: John
Last Name: Simonsen
Address: 1557 NW Forestgreen
City: Corvallis
State: OR
Country: USA
Email: john.simonsen.mail@gmail.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Simonsen, John, Commenter ID No. W133 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Stone, Catherine, Commenter ID No. W247

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 12:19 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10247

Thank you for your comment, Catherine Stone.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10247. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 12:18:49PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10247

First Name: Catherine
Last Name: Stone
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Stone, Catherine – W247

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Stone, Catherine, Commenter ID No. W247 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Stone, Linda, Commenter ID No. W126

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:52 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10126

Thank you for your comment, Linda Stone.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10126. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:51:27PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10126

First Name: Linda
Last Name: Stone
Address: 5525 NW 137th Avenue
City: Portland
State: OR
Zip: 97229
Country: USA
Email: linda.stone@loveable.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Stone, Linda – W126

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Stone, Linda, Commenter ID No. W126 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Stuart, Kate, Commenter ID No. W557

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2011 8:06 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10557

Thank you for your comment, Kate Stuart.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10557. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 27, 2011 08:05:43PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10557

First Name: Kate
Last Name: Stuart
City: Cascade Locks
State: OR
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the last place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through my city and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable. Accidents have already occurred.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. This important to me as a 7-year breast cancer survivor.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Stuart, Kate – W557

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Stuart, Kate, Commenter ID No. W557 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Summersett, Sophia, Commenter ID No. W362

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 3:28 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10362

Thank you for your comment, Sophia Summersett.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10362. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 03:27:49PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10362

First Name: Sophia
Last Name: Summersett
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Summersett, Sophia – W362

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Summersett, Sophia, Commenter ID No. W362 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Till, Richard, Commenter ID No. W549

From:	gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent:	Monday, June 27, 2011 6:29 PM
To:	mail_gtcceisarchives; gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov; gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject:	Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10549
Attachments:	Friends_of_the_Columbia_Gorge_Comment_Low-Level_Waste_DEIS_GTCC10549.pdf

Thank you for your comment, Richard Till.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10549. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 27, 2011 06:28:53PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10549

First Name: Richard
Middle Initial: F
Last Name: Till
Organization: Friends of the Columbia Gorge
Address: 522 SW Fifth, Suite 720
City: Portland
State: OR
Zip: 97206
Country: USA
Email: rick@gorgefriends.org
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record
Attachment: Friends of the Columbia Gorge Comment Low-Level Waste DEIS.pdf

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

1

Till, Richard – W549

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Till, Richard, Commenter ID No. W549 (cont'd)

SUBMITTED VIA ON-LINE COMMENT FORM

June 27, 2011

Re: Comments on the U.S. Department of Energy's Draft Environmental Impact Statement regarding inclusion of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation as a candidate as a permanent Nation-wide radioactive waste dump.

Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Friends of the Columbia Gorge (Friends) has reviewed and would like to comment on the Department of Energy's Draft Environmental Impacts Statement regarding the transport of radioactive waste to the Hanford Nuclear Reservation as a permanent radioactive waste dump for Greater Than Class C radioactive waste. Friends is a non-profit organization with approximately 5,000 members dedicated to protecting and enhancing the resources of the Columbia River Gorge and surrounding lands through the effective implementation of local, state, and federal laws, including the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. Our membership includes hundreds of citizens who reside or recreate within the Columbia River Gorge and Gorge communities.

Friends strongly opposes including the Hanford Nuclear Reservation in the list of candidate sites for a permanent dump site for nuclear waste from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to dispose of radioactive material both because of the risks associated with storing the waste at an already heavily contaminated site and the risks associated with transporting the waste to Hanford through the Columbia River Gorge. Friends strongly encourages the Department of Energy to remove Hanford from the candidate list.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere where the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. Given the Department of Energy's failure to meet existing clean-up timelines, it is completely inappropriate to consider sending more waste to Hanford. Even if the existing contamination is fully cleaned up the harm that has already occurred to the Hanford site and downwind and downstream communities is unacceptable. Piling on additional risks to the site and affected communities is completely unacceptable. Absolutely no new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

522 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 720, Portland, OR 97204 • (503) 241-3762 • www.gorgefriends.org
Printed on recycled, secondarily chlorine-free paper

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Till, Richard, Commenter ID No. W549 (cont'd)

The risk associated with transporting waste to the site is also unacceptable. This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. Interstate 84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat, and the Columbia River. These communities are already subject to risks associated with being downstream of the Hanford site. The additional risk of an accident during transporting waste is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. In particular, the DEIS fails to analyze the risks and potential impacts of transporting radioactive waste through the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake, or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge. We should not be considering the introduction of a major environmental threat to this national treasure.

Friends of the Columbia Gorge joins Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others in strongly opposing the storage of nuclear waste at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Richard Till
Conservation Legal Advocate

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Till, Rick, Commenter ID No. W325

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2011 3:07 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10325

Thank you for your comment, Rick Till.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10325. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 20, 2011 03:06:37PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10325

First Name: Rick
Last Name: Till
Country: USA
Email: ricktill@gmail.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

I strongly oppose including the Hanford Nuclear Reservation on the U.S. Department of Energy's list of potential sites for storing hazardous nuclear waste from across the country.

What has occurred at Hanford over the years is a travesty and must be fixed. Given DOE's poor track record, the existing waste must be cleaned up and the existing threats to human health and the environment must be removed. To consider shipping additional waste to a site that is already a catastrophic waste is an insult to everyone living downstream of Hanford and to everyone that would be exposed to waste as it would be shipped through the Columbia River Gorge.

Shockingly, the DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack. These risks must be added to the existing threat from ongoing hazardous waste leaching into the Columbia River.

The risk is simply too severe. DOE must clean up the existing mess and needs to find alternative solutions for storage of hazardous waste. If safe alternative cannot be found, DOE needs to reconsider the practices that generate the waste in the first place.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Rick Till
Portland, Oregon

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

1

Till, Rick – W325

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Vance, Anne, Commenter ID No. W85

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2011 10:12 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10085

Thank you for your comment, Anne Vance.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10085. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 10, 2011 10:11:23PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10085

First Name: Anne
Middle Initial: R
Last Name: Vance
Address:
City:
State:
Zip:
Country: USA
Email: annevance@hrecn.net
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Vance, Anne, Commenter ID No. W85 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Welcome back!
For your convenience, we have filled out your form with the information you provided previously from postal code 97031.
Click to see and manage your information.

Not annevance@hrecn.net? Please click here. Thank you!
Email* Sending your message, please wait ...

Sitemap / RSS / Donate / info@gorgefriends.org / 503.241.3762 / 522 SW Fifth Avenue,

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Vaughan, Ron, Commenter ID No. W243

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 11:58 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10243

Thank you for your comment, Ron Vaughan.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10243. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 11:58:23AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10243

First Name: Ron
Middle Initial: P
Last Name: Vaughan
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

The Columbia Gorge in Washington State and Oregon has been identified as one of the most beautiful natural sight seeing ares in the world. People from all over the world visit this scenic area annually. A priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Vaughan, Ron – W243

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Vaughan, Ron, Commenter ID No. W243 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Vayu, Satya, Commenter ID No. W395

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 6:33 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10395

Thank you for your comment, Satya Vayu.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10395. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 06:32:55PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10395

First Name: Satya
Last Name: Vayu
Country: USA
Email: satyavayu@gmail.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Vayu, Satya – W395

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Vayu, Satya, Commenter ID No. W395 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Vayu, Satya, Commenter ID No. W292

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 1:01 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10292

Thank you for your comment, Satya Vayu.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10292. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 17, 2011 01:00:54AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10292

First Name: Satya
Last Name: Vayu
State: OR
Zip: 97215
Country: USA
Email: satyavayu@gmail.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Vayu, Satya – W292

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Vayu, Satya, Commenter ID No. W292 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Walicki, Joe, Commenter ID No. W272

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 5:17 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10272

Thank you for your comment, Joe Walicki.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10272. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 05:17:20PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10272

First Name: Joe
Last Name: Walicki
State:
Zip:
Country: USA
Email: joewalicki@comcast.net
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Walicki, Joe – W272

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Walicki, Joe, Commenter ID No. W272 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Warneke, Lothar & Carole, Commenter ID No. W162

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 10:05 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10162

Thank you for your comment, Lothar & Carole Warneke.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10162. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 10:04:29PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10162

First Name: Lothar & Carole
Middle Initial: F
Last Name: Warneke
State: WA
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Warneke, Lothar & Carole, Commenter ID No. W162 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Watters, Ann, Commenter ID No. W250

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 12:39 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10250

Thank you for your comment, Ann Watters.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10250. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 12:38:50PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10250

First Name: Ann
Last Name: Watters
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Watters, Ann – W250

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Watters, Ann, Commenter ID No. W250 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Watters, Ann, Commenter ID No. W447

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 6:59 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10447

Thank you for your comment, Ann Watters.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10447. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 24, 2011 06:59:00PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10447

First Name: Ann
Last Name: Watters
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Watters, Ann – W447

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Watters, Ann, Commenter ID No. W447 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Wehrley, Donna, Commenter ID No. W453

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 11:17 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10453

Thank you for your comment, Donna Wehrley.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10453. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 24, 2011 11:17:17PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10453

First Name: Donna
Last Name: Wehrley
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Wehrley, Donna – W453

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Wehrley, Donna, Commenter ID No. W453 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Donna Wehrley

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Weigel, Richard, Commenter ID No. W104

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:10 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10104

Thank you for your comment, RICHARD WEIGEL.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10104. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:09:46PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10104

First Name: RICHARD
Last Name: WEIGEL
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Weigel, Richard – W104

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Weigel, Richard, Commenter ID No. W104 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
West, Jack, Commenter ID No. W326

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2011 3:25 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10326

Thank you for your comment, Jack West.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10326. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 20, 2011 03:24:22PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10326

First Name: Jack
Last Name: West
Address: 3914 SE Licyntra Lane
City: Milwaukie
State: OR
Zip: 97222
Country: USA
Email: jpwest@teleport.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

West, Jack – W326

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
West, Jack, Commenter ID No. W326 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
White, William, Commenter ID No. W398

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 7:16 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10398

Thank you for your comment, William White.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10398. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 07:15:38PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10398

First Name: William
Last Name: White
Address: 1867 N Tin Strap Trail
Address 3: 1867 N Tin Strap Trail
City: Prescott Valley
State: AZ
Zip: 86314
Country: USA
Email: evermove@cableone.net
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

White, William – W398

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
White, William, Commenter ID No. W398 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Whitecotton, Robbie, Commenter ID No. W436

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 1:46 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10436

Thank you for your comment, Robbie Whitecotton.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10436. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 24, 2011 01:45:29PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10436

First Name: Robbie
Last Name: Whitecotton
State: OR
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Whitecotton, Robbie, Commenter ID No. W436 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Williams, Sandra, Commenter ID No. W224

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 10:28 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10224

Thank you for your comment, Sandra Williams.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10224. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 10:27:22AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10224

First Name: Sandra
Middle Initial: E
Last Name: Williams
Address: 2804 SE 27th
City: Portland
State: OR
Zip: 97202-1397
Country: USA
Email: pdxmws@aol.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Williams, Sandra – W224

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Williams, Sandra, Commenter ID No. W224 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Wilson, Katrina, Commenter ID No. W360

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 3:22 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10360

Thank you for your comment, Katrina Wilson.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10360. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 03:22:20PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10360

First Name: Katrina
Last Name: Wilson
Address: 370 23rd St SE
City: Salem
State: OR
Zip: 97301-6609
Country: USA
Email: katywilson2006@gmail.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Wilson, Katrina – W360

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Wilson, Katrina, Commenter ID No. W360 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Wilson, Michael, Commenter ID No. W120

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:41 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10120

Thank you for your comment, Michael Wilson.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10120. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:40:54PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10120

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Wilson
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimating 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Wilson, Michael – W120

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Wilson, Michael, Commenter ID No. W120 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Wood, John & Polly, Commenter ID No. W103

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:08 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10103

Thank you for your comment, John and Polly Wood.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10103. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:08:15PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10103

First Name: John and Polly
Last Name: Wood
State:
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Wood, John & Polly – W103

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Wood, John & Polly, Commenter ID No. W103 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Wood, John & Polly, Commenter ID No. W163

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 10:06 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10163

Thank you for your comment, John and Polly Wood.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10163. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 10:06:16PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10163

First Name: John and Polly
Last Name: Wood
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Wood, John & Polly – W163

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Wood, John & Polly, Commenter ID No. W163 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Wood, John & Polly, Commenter ID No. W410

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 9:46 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10410

Thank you for your comment, John and Polly Wood.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10410. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 09:45:43PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10410

First Name: John and Polly
Last Name: Wood
State:
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Wood, John & Polly – W410

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Wood, John & Polly, Commenter ID No. W410 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Wood, John & Polly, Commenter ID No. W84

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2011 10:11 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10084

Thank you for your comment, John & Polly Wood.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10084. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 10, 2011 10:10:35PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10084

First Name: John & Polly
Last Name: Wood
State:
Zip:
Country: USA
Email: machjuan@yahoo.com
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Wood, John & Polly – W84

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Wood, John & Polly, Commenter ID No. W84 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Wood, Polly, Commenter ID No. W452

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 10:39 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10452

Thank you for your comment, Polly Wood.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10452. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 24, 2011 10:38:13PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10452

First Name: Polly
Last Name: Wood
Address: P.O. Box 962
City: Hood River
State: OR
Zip: 97031
Country: USA
Email: polly@pollyscakes.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Wood, Polly – W452

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Wood, Polly, Commenter ID No. W452 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Wood, John, Commenter ID No. W87

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Saturday, June 11, 2011 11:23 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10087

Thank you for your comment, john wood.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10087. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 11, 2011 11:23:08PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10087

First Name: john
Last Name: wood
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Wood, John – W87

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Wood, John, Commenter ID No. W87 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Woolpert, Steven, Commenter ID No. W343

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2011 8:43 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10343

Thank you for your comment, Steven Woolpert.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10343. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 22, 2011 08:42:50PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10343

First Name: Steven
Last Name: Woolpert
City: Lyle
State: WA
Zip: 98635
Country: USA
Email: swoolpert@cwcmh.org
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.
The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. The DEIS also ignores the potential environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Woolpert, Steven – W343

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Woolpert, Steven, Commenter ID No. W343 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Steven Woolpert

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Young, Patricia, Commenter ID No. W376

From:	gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent:	Thursday, June 23, 2011 4:26 PM
To:	mail_gtcceisarchives; gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov; gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject:	Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10376
Attachments:	ColumbiaRiverGorge_GTCC10376.pdf

Thank you for your comment, Patricia Young.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10376. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 04:25:21PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10376

First Name: Patricia
Last Name: Young
State: OR
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record
Attachment: ColumbiaRiverGorge.pdf

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure. The beautiful sanctuary of the Columbia River Gorge must be preserved for future generations!

1

Young, Patricia – W376

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Young, Patricia, Commenter ID No. W376 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and deep consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Young, Patricia, Commenter ID No. W376 (cont'd)

Stunning views, towering hemlocks, and waterfalls of the Columbia River Gorge.

Let the beauty of the Pacific Northwest reign forever!

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Zachman, John, Commenter ID No. W219

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 10:15 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10219

Thank you for your comment, John Zachman.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10219. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 10:15:06AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10219

First Name: John
Last Name: Zachman
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Zachman, John – W219

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Zachman, John, Commenter ID No. W219 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

John Zachman

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Zettergren, Judy, Commenter ID No. W136

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 8:29 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10136

Thank you for your comment, Judy Zettergren.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10136. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 08:29:03PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10136

First Name: Judy
Middle Initial: G
Last Name: Zettergren
Country: USA
Email: jgzett@comcast.net
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Zettergren, Judy – W136

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Zettergren, Judy, Commenter ID No. W136 (cont'd)

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Zimmerman, Joni, Commenter ID No. W101

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:08 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10101

Thank you for your comment, Joni Zimmerman.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10101. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:07:19PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10101

First Name: Joni
Last Name: Zimmerman
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Zimmerman, Joni – W101

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Zimmerman, Joni, Commenter ID No. W101 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Zucker, Marguery, Commenter ID No. W421

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 2:00 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10421

Thank you for your comment, Marguery Zucker.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10421. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 24, 2011 02:00:08AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10421

First Name: Marguery
Middle Initial: L
Last Name: Zucker
Address: 1966 Orchard St.
City: Eugene
State: OR
Zip: 97403
Country: USA
Email: lee@thelocomotive.com
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Zucker, Marguery – W421

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Zucker, Marguery, Commenter ID No. W421 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W99

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:07 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10099

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10099. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:06:56PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10099

First Name:
Last Name:
Country:
Email:
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Dear Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

I am writing to urge you to remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Name Withheld – W99

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W99 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W110

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:20 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10110

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10110. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 07:20:00PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10110

First Name:
Last Name:
Country:
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Name Withheld – W110

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W110 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W132

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 8:11 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10132

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10132. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 08:10:48PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10132

First Name:
Last Name:
State:
Country:
Email:
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Name Withheld – W132

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W132 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Amy Rosenthal

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W141

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 8:50 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10141

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10141. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 08:49:33PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10141

First Name:
Last Name:
Address:
City:
State:
Zip:
Country:
Email:
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Name Withheld – W141

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W141 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W144

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 8:56 PM
To: mail_gtcceisarchives; gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov; gtcceis@anl.gov
Subject: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10144
Attachments: Secretary_Chu_6-15-11_GTCC10144.doc

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10144. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 08:55:31PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10144

First Name:
Last Name:
Country:
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record
Attachment: Secretary Chu 6-15-11.doc

Comment Submitted:
See attached Word document/ letter.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

1

Name Withheld – W144

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W144 (cont'd)

June 15, 2011

Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W174

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 11:03 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10174

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10174. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 11:02:32PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10174

First Name:
Last Name:
State:
Country:
Email:
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Name Withheld – W174

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W174 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W179

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 11:32 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10179

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10179. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 15, 2011 11:31:23PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10179

First Name:
Last Name:
Country:
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Name Withheld – W179

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W179 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W191

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 12:41 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10191

Thank you for your comment, I

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10191. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 12:41:02AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10191

First Name:
Last Name:
State:
Country:
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Name Withheld – W191

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W191 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W193

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 1:33 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10193

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10193. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 01:32:52AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10193

First Name:
Last Name: .
Country: I
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Name Withheld – W193

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W193 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W220

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 10:16 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10220

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10220. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 10:15:44AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10220

First Name:
Last Name:
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Name Withheld – W220

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W221

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 10:16 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10221

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10221. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 10:16:18AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10221

First Name:
Last Name:
Country:
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study which estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Name Withheld – W221

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W221 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W228

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 10:44 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10228

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10228. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 10:44:08AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10228

First Name:
Last Name: (
Country:
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please don't add more nucler waste to Hanford Nuclear Reservation. There are already nuclear waste leaks into the Columbia River that are creating a difficult clean up problem. Cleanup should be the top priority at this point.

Bringing more nuclear waste would mean thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

Also, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimating that 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of this matter.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

1

Name Withheld – W228

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W237

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 11:15 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10237

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10237. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 11:14:43AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10237

First Name:
Middle Initial:
Last Name:
Address:
City:
State:
Zip:
Country:
Email:
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Name Withheld – W237

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W237 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W239

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 11:22 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10239

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10239. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 11:21:33AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10239

First Name:
Last Name:
Country
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simple too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Name Withheld – W239

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W249

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 12:27 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10249

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10249. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 12:26:34PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10249

First Name:
Middle Initial:
Last Name: I
City:
State:
Zip:
Country:
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Name Withheld – W249

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W249 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W261

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 2:17 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10261

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10261. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 02:16:48PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10261

First Name:
Last Name:
Address:
City:
State:
Zip:
Country:
Email:
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Name Withheld – W261

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W261 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Colleen Wright

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W282

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 10:18 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10282

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10282. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 16, 2011 10:18:06PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10282

First Name
Last Name
Country:
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Name Withheld – W282

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W282 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Welcome back!
For your convenience, we have filled out your form with the information you provided previously from postal code 97201.
Click to see and manage your information.

Not megzster8@charter.net? Please click here. Thank you!
Email*
Sending your message, please wait ...

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W314

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Sunday, June 19, 2011 2:07 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10314

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10314. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 19, 2011 02:07:27AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10314

First Name:
Last Name:
Address:
City:
State:
Zip:
Country:
Email:
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman;

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Name Withheld – W314

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W314 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W324

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2011 1:33 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10324

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10324. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 20, 2011 01:33:06PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10324

First Name:
Middle Initial:
Last Name:
Address:
City:
State:
Zip
Country:
Email:
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Name Withheld – W324

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W324 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W366

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 3:36 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10366

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10366. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 03:35:30PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10366

First Name:
Last Name: .
Country:
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Name Withheld – W366

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W366 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W386

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 5:16 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10386

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10386. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 05:15:59PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10386

First Name:
Last Name
State:
Country:
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Name Withheld – W386

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W386 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W387

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 5:16 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10387

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10387. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 05:15:59PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10387

First Name:
Last Name: '
State:
Country:
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

1

Name Withheld – W387

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W387 (cont'd)

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W403

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2011 8:10 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10403

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10403. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 23, 2011 08:10:00PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10403

First Name:
Last Name:
Country:
Privacy Preference: Withhold address only from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Name Withheld – W403

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W426

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 10:33 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10426

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10426. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 24, 2011 10:32:35AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10426

First Name:
Middle Initial:
Last Name:
Address:
City:
State:
Zip:
Country:
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

1

Name Withheld – W426

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W426 (cont'd)

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W439

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 2:21 PM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10439

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10439. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 24, 2011 02:20:33PM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10439

First Name:
Middle Initial
Last Name:
Country:
Email:
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Name Withheld – W439

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W439 (cont'd)

nk you for your time and consideration.

estions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-an-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W469

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Saturday, June 25, 2011 11:31 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10469

Thank you for your comment,

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10469. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 25, 2011 11:31:09AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10469

First Name:
Last Name:
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States. Hanford is the wrong place to transport and dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material.

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy is already engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Name Withheld – W469

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W469 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Krista Reynolds

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W519

From: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2011 1:05 AM
To: gtcceiswebmaster@anl.gov
Subject: Receipt: Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Comment GTCC10519

Thank you for your comment

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is GTCC10519. Please refer to the comment tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: June 27, 2011 01:05:00AM CDT

Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Draft Comment: GTCC10519

First Name:
Last Name:
Country
Privacy Preference: Withhold name and address from public record

Comment Submitted:
Secretary Chu and Mr. Edelman:

Hanford Nuclear Reservation is the wrong place to dispose of more highly dangerous radioactive material. Please remove the Hanford Nuclear Reservation from the U.S. Department of Energy's list of candidate sites for a permanent nuclear waste dump site to store radioactive materials coming from across the United States.

Hanford already is the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere and the Department of Energy already is engaged in one of the largest and most complex cleanup projects in U.S. history at Hanford. The number one priority should be to stop waste from leaking into the Columbia River and clean up the existing waste at Hanford. No new nuclear waste should be stored at Hanford.

This proposal means that thousands of trucks with dangerous radioactive waste would be traveling along interstate routes, passing through our cities and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I-84 travels the length of the Gorge and is often within a few feet of homes, schools, critical wildlife habitat and the Columbia River. The risk of an accident is simply too great, and the environmental and human health costs are unacceptable.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) fails to consider the risks involved in transporting these waste materials to Hanford. The DEIS does not include a 2008 USDOE study that estimated 800 adult cancer deaths would occur due to ambient radiation from the transport vehicles alone. Nor does the DEIS include the unimaginable number of deaths and environmental damage resulting from a truck accident, an earthquake or an intentional attack.

Finally, on the 25th Anniversary of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act, we should celebrate the past and future protection of the Columbia Gorge--not propose more dangers to this national treasure.

I am joined in opposition to transporting more nuclear waste to Hanford by Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Heart of America Northwest, Columbia Riverkeeper, 17 Oregon legislators, Congressman Earl Blumenauer, U.S. Senator Merkley, U.S. Senator Wyden and many others.

1

Name Withheld – W519

Friends of the Gorge Campaign
Name Withheld, Commenter ID No. W519 (cont'd)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: gtccelswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Webmaster at (630) 252-5705.

2

This page is intentionally left blank.

J.3.8 Brookdale Senior Living Petition

Table J.3-8 tabulates all individuals who submitted signatures on the Brookdale Senior Living Petition. The comment is identified in brackets on the left side of the page, and the corresponding response is shown on the right side. The comment document with signatures (the first person to sign was Stochosky, Rita Jean; the 62 signatures that followed were attached), comment identified in that document, and response are presented here in Section J.3.8 on pages J-2467 through J-2471, as indicated in the table.

TABLE J.3-8 Individuals Who Signed the Brookdale Senior Living Petition, Comment Document ID No. L85

Last Name, First Name	Page No.
Armstrong, Richard	J-2470
Aust, Leona	J-2470
Bilderain, Deborah	J-2468
Bowman, Patricia	J-2468
Brown, Ethyl	J-2470
Cool, Sue	J-2469
Eng, Margaret	J-2470
Estrella, Veronica	J-2471
Fontanez, Sonia	J-2471
Forshen, Charles	J-2470
Fosskey, Ruby	J-2468
Fox, Gary	J-2468
Fredman, Louise	J-2469
Horton, William	J-2468
Hunter, Kathryn	J-2470
Johnson, Claudia	J-2470
Kasper, Margaret	J-2468
Kirk, Sandra	J-2471
Kramer, Trudy	J-2470
Lechner, Hilary	J-2468
Lewis, Linda	J-2468
Lucero, Ann	J-2470
Lucero, Marsha	J-2470
Marin, Matthew	J-2469
McDaniel, Erma	J-2470
McLaughlin, Margaret	J-2468
Morelli, Erin	J-2469
Morelli, Frank	J-2470
Noah, Rose	J-2469
Petit, Francie	J-2470
Purvee, Alexis	J-2468
Roberts, Barbara	J-2469
Spinker, Sally	J-2469
Slope, Leslie	J-2471

TABLE J.3-8 (Cont.)

Last Name, First Name	Page No.
Stochosky, Rita Jean*	J-2467
Stoy, Ed	J-2470
Tatman, Cozy	J-2468
Unknown	J-2469
Unknown, Trudy	J-2469
Vringman, Marilyn	J-2469
White, Carlo	J-2468
Wilt, Eva	J-2469
Wirick, Stella	J-2469
Name Withheld	J-2468
Name Withheld	J-2468
Name Withheld	J-2468
Name Withheld	J-2468
Name Withheld	J-2468
Name Withheld	J-2468
Name Withheld	J-2470
Name Withheld	J-2470
Name Withheld	J-2470
Name Withheld	J-2470
Name Withheld	J-2471
Name Withheld	J-2471
Name Withheld	J-2471
Name Withheld	J-2471
Name Withheld	J-2471
Name Withheld	J-2471
Name Withheld	J-2471
Name Withheld	J-2471
Name Withheld	J-2471
Name Withheld	J-2471

* Stochosky, Rita Jean signed the letter (Comment Document ID No. L85); the 62 signatures that followed were attached, as shown.

Brookdale Senior Living Petition, Commenter ID No. L85
(Stochosky, Rita Jean, and 62 others)

Letter # 85

Jun. 26. 2011 10:19AM Brookdale senior living No. 2141 P. 3

June 19, 2011

received

Arnold Edelman
Document Manager, Office of Technical & Regulatory Support (EM-43)
US Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585-0119

To Mr. Arnold Edelman

We agree wholeheartedly with the views expressed by Senator Ron Wyden (D-OR) and Sam Adams, Mayor, Portland, Oregon, in their letters presented May 19, 2011 at the DOE's public hearing in Portland, Oregon. We urge the following actions:

- Ending proposals to import off-site waste to Hanford
- Focus on the core mission of "Clean-up First"
- Meet the legally required clean-up schedule
  Clean-up is years behind schedule and more waste dumped at the site will make matters worse.

We would also like to bring the obvious to your attention:

- Hanford is located in a seismically active site and sits on the Pacific Rim of Fire, surrounded by active volcanoes.
- Hanford is located only 50 miles from a major metropolitan area inhabited by 3+ million people
- Hanford sits on the Columbia River, a major international route for the Pacific Northwest
- Hanford straddles spawning grounds and migration routes for salmon, sturgeon and trout
- Trucking the nuclear, radioactive waste across the country and through Oregon puts our citizens at risk.

Along with our elected officials and DOE's own scientists we urge the aforementioned actions. Thank you for your attention in this matter.

L85-1

Rita Jean Stochosky
3110 19th Ave
Forest Grove, OR 97116

see signatures attached

L85-1 DOE's ROD 78 FR 75913 dated December 13, 2013, stated that DOE has deferred a decision on importing waste from other DOE sites (with limited exceptions as described in the Settlement Agreement with Ecology) for disposal at Hanford at least until WTP is operational. For information on DOE's preferred alternative see GTCC EIS Chapter 2.

Brookdale Senior Living Petition, Commenter ID No. L85

We the undersigned oppose DOE's proposal to make Hanford the national dumpsite for radioactive and chemical waste greater than Class C

Name - Print	Address	Record/Do Not Record in Public Record
NAME WITHHELD		Do Not
NAME WITHHELD		DO NOT
NAME WITHHELD		Do Not
GARY L FOX SR.	3110 19th Ave Forest Grove OR 97116	
Carlos J. White	3110 19th Ave Forest Grove, OR 97116	
NAME WITHHELD		Do Not
MARGARET McLAUGHLIN	3110 19th FOREST GROVE OR.	
Alexis Purvis	2524 Gales Way Forest Grove OR 97116	Record*
Ruby Tankey	3110 19th Ave Forest Grove OR 97116	

Name	Address	Record/Do Not Record in Public Record
Hilary Lechner	312 NE Sequoia Ct Hillsboro OR 97124	
Patricia Bowman	16600 NE Hwy 240, Newberg, OR 97132	
Margaret Kasper	3110 19th Ave, Forest Grove, OR. 97116	
NAME WITHHELD		Do not Record
NAME WITHHELD		Do Not Record
Cozy Tatman	3110 19th Ave Forest Grove Or.	
Linda Lewis	3110 19th Ave Forest Grove Or.	
William Hamilton	" "	
Deborah Bilderrain	33035 Meadowbrook Dr Scappoose Or.	

Brookdale Senior Living Petition, Commenter ID No. L85 (cont'd)

Jun. 26. 2011 10:21AM Brookdale senior living No. 2141 P. 9

We the undersigned oppose DOE's proposal to make Hanford the national dumpsite for radioactive and chemical waste

Name	Address	Record/Do Not Record in Public Record
Eva Wilt	4468 SW Stoddard Dr. Aloha OR 97007	Record
Lidly H. Spinks	3110 19 Ave. Forest Grove OR 97116	[illegible]
Stella Wirick	3110 19 AVE. 404 Forest Grove	
[illegible]	3297 SW. Oakview Ct. Cornelius OR 97113	
Barbara Roberts	2119 N.E. 158 ave Portland 97230	
Mathew Marin	2530 Douglas St. Forest Grove, 97116	
Rose Noah	320 Park St Gaston OR 97119	
Marilyn K. Vrieziman	3110 19th Ave #218 Forest Grove OR 97116	(Record)
Sue Cool	2737 Ballad Way. Forest Grove OR 97116	(Record)
Erin Morelli	435 Reuter Ln Forest Grove OR 97116	(record)
Louise Friedman	3110 19th #210 Forest Grove, 97116	
[illegible]	7800 SW Lee Rd Gaston, OR 97119	

Brookdale Senior Living Petition, Commenter ID No. L85 (cont'd)

We the undersigned oppose DOE's proposal to make Hanford the national dumpsite for radioactive and chemical waste greater than Class C

Name - Print	Address	Record/Do Not Record in Public Record
Marsha Lucero	3709 22nd Ave F.G.	
Claudia Johnson	64420 Nehalem Hwy N Vernonia, Or 97064	
Ann Lucero	Forest Grove, OR. 97116	
Kathryn J Hunter	3110 19th Ave apt 229 Forest Grove Or 97116	
Richard C. Grimstrong	3110 19th Ave Apt 325 97116	
Ethel M. Brown	3110 19th Ave #323, Forest Grove, OR 97116	
Emma McDaniel	3110 19th Ave Forest Grove, Or.	
NAME WITHHELD		Do Not Record
CHARLES R Foisley	3110 19th Ave #301 F.G. Oreg. 97116	

We the undersigned oppose DOE's proposal to make Hanford the national dumpsite for radioactive and chemical waste greater than Class C

Name - Print	Address	Record/Do Not Record in Public Record
Leona Aust	3110, 19th Ave Forest Grove OR.	DO
Trudy Kramer	26830 NW Gibson Rd Gaston OR	DO
Ed Stoy	3110 19th Ave.	DO
Frank F Morelli	3110-19th Ave	DO
Francis Pettit	3110 19th Ave.	DO
MARGARET ENG	39125 MEINIG CT SANDY OR 97055	REC.
NAME WITHHELD		Do Not
NAME WITHHELD		NO
NAME WITHHELD		NO

Brookdale Senior Living Petition, Commenter ID No. L85 (cont'd)

We the undersigned oppose DOE's proposal to make Hanford the national dumpsite for radioactive and chemical waste greater than Class C

Name - Print	Address	Record/Do Not Record in Public Record
NAME WITHHELD		Do Not
NAME WITHHELD		NO
NAME WITHHELD		NO
Leslie Sleper	74283 Fern Hill Rd Rainier Oregon	Record
NAME WITHHELD		NO
NAME WITHHELD		No
NAME WITHHELD		No
NAME WITHHELD		Do Not record
NAME WITHHELD		NO

We the undersigned oppose DOE's proposal to make Hanford the national dumpsite for radioactive and chemical waste greater than Class C

Name - Print	Address	Record/Do Not Record in Public Record
NAME WITHHELD		No
Sandra L. Kirk	2705 SE Courtney Rd Milwaukie OR 97222	yes
NAME WITHHELD		NO
Sonia Fontanez	#3110 19th Ave. Forest Grove, OR 97116	Yes
Veronica Estrella	17150 SW Heritage ct Apt 128 Beaverton OR	yes

This page is intentionally left blank.

J.4 REFERENCES

Argonne (Argonne National Laboratory), 2010, *Supplement to Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste Inventory Report*, ANL/EVS/R-10/1, Argonne, Ill., Oct.

DOE (U.S. Department of Energy), 1997, *Final Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Managing Treatment, Storage, and Disposal of Radioactive and Hazardous Waste*, DOE/EIS-0200-F, Office of Environmental Management, Washington, D.C., May.

DOE, 2012, *Final Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (TC & WM EIS)*, DOE/EIS-0391, Office of River Protection, Richland, Wash., Nov.

DOE, 2013, *Strategy for the Management and Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High Level Radioactive Waste*, Jan.

This page is intentionally left blank.