

**Greater-Than-Class C Low-Level Radioactive Waste EIS Scoping Comments
Comments Provided Via Website Comment Form**

#	Name/ Address	Affiliation When Provided	Comment Date	Comment
1	Daphne E. Hyde 415 118 Ave SE Bellevue, WA 98005		7/24/07	<p>It was agreed that when the toxic waster at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation was cleaned up, then it might be considered to allow some "light" nuclear waste to be deposited in suitable containment at the site.</p> <p>Until the leaching tanks are cleared of sludge and the spent rods vitrified, no further waste should ever be deposited at the Hanford site. Get the vitrification plant back on schedule. No more lunacy of building without adequate protection in a seismic area. Keep your promises so that voters can TRUST their Government!</p>
2	Janine M. VanSanden Seattle, WA 98125-7803		7/24/07	<p>At present there is leakage from the radioactive waste materials stored at Hanford. The citizens of the Pacific Northwest are adamant that no more radioactive waste be sent to Hanford, at least until the current situation is completely remedied. The proximity to the Columbia River, one of the largest rivers in the US, makes Hanford a completely unsuitable location for storage of such materials.</p>
3	Sylvia Haven Seattle, WA 98125-7514		7/24/07	<p>You are honor bound to clean up the dangerous conditions threatening our Columbia River region BEFORE you bring in more polluting waste. Labeling something with a euphemistic phrase does not make it any the less harmful. "Greater than low level class C" sounds benign. Bur it appears that USDOE has renamed highly radioactive Plutonium wastes, previously called "Remote-Handled Transuranic Waste" (TRU), to be included in this category of "Greater than Class C-like wastes."</p> <p>You who make these decisions probably live far away from this area and do not seem to have any concern for those of us who live in the area. Your children will not be poisoned by a contaminated river. Your family members will not suffer increased incidence of cancer.</p> <p>Show that you have the intelligence and the empathy to make the right decision for people and for the environment. Do not dump more harmful wastes at Hanford.</p>
4	Marlin L. Gimel 4101 SW 107 th St. Seattle, WA 98146		7/25/07	<p>I think it would be criminal to bring additional radioactive waste to Hanford, WA. The waste that's there needs to be cleaned up before anything else is deposited there, and then it needs to be underground far enough and contained well enough so it won't leak or be accessible to terrorists. I can't believe our country would take a chance on these dangerous substances leaking into our groundwater or the Columbia River. What are we going to leave to our grandchildren? I used to swim in the Columbia River every year, but I would hesitate to do that now.</p> <p>We are the stewards of this earth. How can we be so irresponsible with it? It really worries me.</p> <p>Please, please reconsider this!!! It's so important to do it right the first time!!</p>
5	Bruce Dobson 4056 Welcome Road Langley, WA 98260		7/25/07	<p>USDOE and the Bush Administration should be cleaning up the existing waste and contamination that is already flowing into the Columbia River, and should not truck more radioactive wastes to Hanford for burial.</p> <p>Highly radioactive wastes, which include GTCC and remote-handled TRU, belong in a deep geologic repository, in geologically stable formations below the depth of usable groundwater. TRU and GTCC remain highly radioactive for hundreds of thousands of years and are attractive targets for terrorists or to dig up for malicious purposes.</p>

#	Name/ Address	Affiliation When Provided	Comment Date	Comment
6	Robert L. Tice 515 West 21 Street Vancouver, WA 98660		7/25/07	Transporting wastes, as you propose, puts those people along the route at hazard to accidents, terrorist attack and other reasons. The site where you plan on storing the materials has a terrible record and is currently leaking materials into our environment. I'm adamantly opposed to this action.
7	Richard M. Belfoy 40 th St. Ct. NW Gig Harbor, WA 98335		7/25/07	As a resident of Washington I must strongly object to using Hanford for the disposal of any more hazardous waste. There have been too many problems, i.e., Hanford clean up costs, to allow any additional waste. We cannot allow our state to be the big dumping ground for the rest of the country. I vote no.
8	S. Gould USA		7/26/07	Please clean Hanford up before considering adding more deadly waste!
9	George B. Hutchinson 44 SW Brook Street Newport, OR 97365		7/26/07	<p>I understand that the USDOE proposes to Use Hanford as a National Radioactive and Toxic Waste Dump by trucking extremely radioactive wastes to Hanford for burial. I thoroughly oppose this proposal. It is NOT in the public interest, nor is it safe, economically smart, nor supported by American citizens and voters.</p> <p>I understand that USDOE refers to these wastes as "Greater than Class C" or "Greater than Class C-like wastes" in a notice being published in the Federal Register on Monday, June 23. These extremely radioactive wastes would be dumped in shallow landfills or relatively shallow boreholes above groundwater flowing to the Columbia River.</p> <p>Additionally, this proposal comes on top of USDOE continuing to seek to dump radioactive and mixed radioactive toxic chemical wastes from other nuclear weapons plants in shallow landfills at Hanford for the next forty years.</p> <p>Greater than Class C (GTCC) waste is extremely radioactive and is often as radioactive as High-Level Nuclear Waste. USDOE has renamed highly radioactive Plutonium wastes, previously called "Remote-Handled Transuranic Waste" (TRU), to be included in this category of "Greater than Class C-like wastes." Essentially, USDOE is attempting to ship the same highly radioactive wastes it was twice barred from shipping because there is no storage or treatment for such wastes at Hanford.</p> <p>It is clear to me that Gerry Pollet is correct when he stated: "USDOE and the Bush Administration view using Hanford as a national radioactive and chemical waste dump as more important than cleaning up the existing waste and contamination that is already flowing into the Columbia River."</p> <p>Both common sense and good science indicate that highly radioactive wastes, which include GTCC and remote-handled TRU, belong in a deep geologic repository, in geologically stable formations below the depth of usable groundwater. TRU and GTCC remain highly radioactive for hundreds of thousands of years and are attractive targets for terrorists or to dig up for malicious purposes.</p> <p>In the Notice of Intent, USDOE proposes Yucca Mountain (Nevada) as a deep geologic repository site and the New Mexico WIPP facility as a disposal site. But even a DOE study found that at least one storage canister of the more than 10,000 canisters envisioned at Yucca Mountain will fail within the next thousand years. And the New Mexico WIPP facility is legally barred from taking many of these wastes and is not big enough to accept the Transuranic wastes from USDOE sites.</p> <p>Hanford should not be used as a National Radioactive and Toxic Waste Dump for more highly radioactive waste such as GTCC. Let's get Hanford cleaned up before DOE comes up with more radioactive uses for Hanford!</p>

#	Name/ Address	Affiliation When Provided	Comment Date	Comment
10	Eldon Ball USA		7/26/07	Until all present waste at Hanford is cleaned up, don't bring any more! I don't want the Columbia River polluted. There are over 1 million people living downriver from Hanford!
11	Janet E. Johnson Newport, OR 97365		7/26/07	It is dangerous, indeed idiotic, to ship and store more radioactive waste at Hanford. Do not store waste above groundwater that flows to the Columbia River. Clean up Hanford. Stop producing nuclear waste.
12	Joanne L. Cvar USA		7/26/07	I am adamantly opposed to the proposed plan to use Hanford as a national radioactive and toxic waste dump. The dangers of trucking this highly toxic material across thousands of miles are obvious, as are the danger of storing these materials in shallow landfills, where they would be too easily accessible to terrorists. Also, it is not clear but what the containers might eventually leak and reach the groudwaters which feed into the Columbia River, as has already happened with the older dumps. There is no known safe method of storage for these wastes for the hundreds of thousands of yeas necessary. Our current generations have no right to expose the future of life on this planet to such risk. This is a moral as well as a technical issue. We need to renew a moratorium on building further nuclear weapons, as well as nuclear power plants. The risks are unacceptable.
13	Edwin Schlapfer P.O. Box 647 Ophir, CO 81426		7/27/07	I oppose in the strongest terms! The citizen of the State of Washington voted by the highest petition margin ever to have Hanford cleaned up first before more waste is brought out. This is the second most polluted site on the planet next to a Soviet Union site. This is the shame of this country! It is completely unconservative to not clean up before adding more waste. Totally non conservative. Hanford has a terrible history for these wastes and we need to clean up ALL of it before we even consider adding to the mess.
14	Ruth L. Lorenz P.O. Box 25862 Seattle, WA 98165		8/5/07	No more nuclear waste at Hanford or anywhere else. Radioactive nuclear waste is insane. It is destructive for all life forms.
15	Susan R. Hartford 3580 Thomsen Rd. Hood River, OR 97031		8/8/07	We are greatly concerned over the USDOE proposal to truck extremely radioactive wastes to Hanford for burial. GTCC and TRU belong in deep geologically stable repositories below the depth of usable groundwater. Hanford should NOT be used in this situation. PLEASE protect the safety of our Northwest communities and our future generations...we beg of you.
16	Stanley J. Sypien 4285B Seago Rd, Lot 3 Hephzibah, GA 30815		8/8/07	My biggest concern with the proposal to store more nuclear waste at the SRS site is that the only real watchdog, the SRS Ecology Lab, is being forced out of business by the DOE. This lab is essential to the impartial study of any possible impact on the environment and the people in the surrounding communities. Radioactivity doesn't cease to be a threat overnight, but for centuries and the lifetimes of many generations living in this area. I firmly believe this matter needs to be addressed in a positive manner.
17	Christopher M. Timm Albuquerque, NM 87192		8/9/07	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will the EIS cover both GTCC radioactive waste and GTCC radioactive/mixed waste? 2. Please clarify the differences in the curie content limits between TRU waste and GTCC waste. 3. TRU waste is further classified as contact-handled or remote-handled. Is there a similar classification for GTCC? If so, what are the volumes of GTCC is each classification. 4. Please provide a comparison of the current and projected amounts of GTCC with the amounts of TRU waste projected for disposal in the WIPP and the amount of high-level/spend nuclear fuel waste projected for disposal in Yucca Mountain. 5. Why was WIPP precluded from disposing non-defense TRU waste in the first place? If there was a scientific or technical reason, what has changed?

#	Name/ Address	Affiliation When Provided	Comment Date	Comment
				6. What is the period of time that will be analyzed with respect to the risk of release? 7. Would new shipping containers be required to move this waste to the disposal point or are the existing NRC approved containers, such as the TRUPACT II, going to be sufficient?
18	Phillip C. Barr NM 88240		8/9/07	If one of the sites is in Lea county, NM, you might read this file from the NM state engineers office that predicts water shortages in the next 40 years. I believe this storage facility would pose a risk to the existing water supply See Letter/Attachment
19	Phillip C. Barr Hobbs, NM 88240-1708		8/10/07	I believe any sites (GNEP or any place else) in Lea county should be disqualified for this waste dump because there is evidence of an earthquake zone in this area. I enclose this website address to back this up. This waste dump should not be located in this area because the water table is in decline and earthquake activity could release radioactive byproduct into the water table. Ive also sent this to members of the farming and ranching communities in this area; and insurance companies that do business in this area. http://www.ig.utexas.edu/research/projects/eq/compendium/earthquakes.htm
20	Phillip Barr Hobbs, NM 88240-1708		8/11/07	If youre looking at Lea county's GNEP sites for the GTCC waste dump, then you will be dealing with the Eddy Lea energy alliance. The city of hobbs part of that alliance was formed without discussion from the public. See clippings in file. This violates environmental justice because it cuts the public out of the decision making process of this alliance. This alliance doesnt like to answer questions from the public. I sent this file to the other GNEP site owners a long time ago. thought they might be interested, See Letter/Attachment
21	Phillip Barr Hobbs, NM 88240-1708		8/11/07	I think this gtcc waste should be put in very strong hardened containers and left where it is located now.
22	Gerry Glass 17 Concession Oak Dr. Bluffton, SC 29909		8/12/07	Please do not allow South Carolina become the waste dump for the rest of the country. There is enough nuclear material here. South Carolina is becoming populated with many residents from other states now. It is not an empty non populated state any longer. We have many retirees living her. Not only on the coast but in Aiken and the surrounding areas. It is unconcionable to allow any more nuclear dumping her. Take it to a state like Washington.. Please no more ..
23	Douglas C. Lynn 505 North Main Carlsbad, NM 88220	Center of Excellence for Hazardous Materials Management	8/14/07	The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in Southeast New Mexico represents the only true solution for long term disposal of nuclear waste, both defense related and commercial. The geologic nature of bedded salts has been scientifically proven to be the perfect medium for this kind of disposal profile. Besides the proven scientific aspects, WIPP has overwhelming political and community support. There is no evidence to suggest that directing nuclear waste streams anywhere else makes sense. WIPP remains the scientific, political, and environmental answer to permanent geologic disposal for all forms of nuclear waste including greater than class C.
24	Michael A. Dempsey 300 Connie Ave. Los Alamos, NM 87544		8/14/07	Nuclear powered generation of electricity is set to make huge advances in the United States. The United States needs many more of these types of facilities.

#	Name/ Address	Affiliation When Provided	Comment Date	Comment
				<p>Los Alamos is the ideal location for such a site, containing all the necessary requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Federal Land. 2) A willing and highly educated work force. 3) Waste management experts with a developed waste site and extensive experience operating such a facility. 4) Minimal, if any LOCAL opposition to such a site. <p>The use of nuclear power for electricity generation actually protects the Earth's environment as the total CO2 and other greenhouse gases emitted is significantly reduced compared to the use of coal, natural gas, ethanol, or when the emissions from the production and the inefficiencies of solar or wind using components are counted.</p> <p>Los Alamos was here for the beginning of the nuclear age, we are happy to participate in all stages, cradle to grave. At Los Alamos we can ship, measure, analyze, store, dispose and monitor the waste. We have tremendous experience in all the technologies already, having developed many of them. We will have to monitor much of our county for a long period already. We can do this with the current infrastructure. We already run such a facility.</p> <p>In this matter am speaking from experience:</p> <p>Non-Destructive Analysis Technician 2 years LANL/NTS Radiological Control Technician 14 years LANL-WIPP Uranium Ore Control Technician 4 years Underground Miner 6 years Truck Driver 3 years</p> <p>Los Alamos welcomes this work.</p>
25	Ron Reeves 1208 Landsun Drive Calrsbad, NM 88220		8/15/07	<p>My initial thoughts are that the WIPP geologic repository in New Mexico is the best option of those being proposed – as long as GTCC doesn't interfere with WIPP's current mission. WIPP has an operational history that demonstrates its ability to successfully dispose of similar waste. Additionally, I believe the community would support an expanded mission.</p> <p>My concern with Yucca Mountain is that it has anything but a successful history and public support in that area appears non-existent.</p> <p>I am not familiar with intermediate depth boreholes, but it seems site selection that would protect the waste from surface water and ground water intrusion would be difficult.</p> <p>I am somewhat familiar with the Saltstone disposal vaults at the Savannah River Site which seem to be similar to what you describe as "enhanced near-surface disposal." I know that these facilities have had some issues with rain water intrusion.</p> <p>In short, why reinvent the wheel when there is an acceptable and proven alternative with existing infrastructure that can fill the need and probably accomplish the mission in the shortest time. That is WIPP.</p>
26	Anita H. Wood Lexington, SC 29073		8/15/07	<p>Hasn't SC had enough radioactive dumping?? I say "no more." I don't want my home state to continue to be a trash can for the rest of the country's excesses.</p>
27	Elizabeth Byrd USA		8/15/07	<p>I have worked in federal gov't on Capitol Hill for 25 years and involved in state gov. as well. The only SC Gov. who had the guts to stand up and say "no more" waste to be buried in SC was Dick Riley (former Sec. of Education). Other states can do their parts, for a change. Heavens only knows what isn't disclosed in the ground water reports from the Savannah River and Barnwell sites. I have toured both and live 20 miles or so from both - don't trust any "official" to tell the "whole truth." Please do not use our state again</p>

#	Name/ Address	Affiliation When Provided	Comment Date	Comment
				as a nuclear dumpsite.
28	Jim W. Kenney Carlsbad, NM 88220		8/15/07	I am a citizen of Carlsbad and own property in this city. I fully support the introduction of greater than Class C waste into the WIPP facility.
29	Roger D. Simmons P.O. Box 484 Carlsbad, NM 88221		8/15/07	It will benefit the country in the disposal of radioactive waste plus it will be beneficial to the Southeast New Mexico are. I am 100% FOR allowing the greater than Class C waste project.
30	Alice M. Gunter 15784 Whitby Street Livonia, MI 48154		8/16/07	I believe that it is too risky to transport Greater-Than-Class-C wastes. Therefore, I'd like the DOE to look into the feasibility of hardened on-site storage. I'd also like the DOE to seriously consider whether nuclear power plants now in existence should be decommissioned and proposed future reactors put on hold unless/until the waste problems can be solved.
31	Samdra Joos Portland, OR		8/17/07	I oppose any proposal to use Hanford as a national radioactive or toxic waste dump.
32	Rachel E. Hampton Portland, OR 97206- 5883		8/17/07	Please do not store your nuclear waste at Hanford. Please put it in your own backyard. We have enough.
33	Judith W. Boothby 1841 SE 20 th Ave. Portland, OR 97214		8/18/07	I do not want any more waste shipped to Hanford.
34	Christopher M. Timm Albuquerque, NM 87192		8/20/07	1. While the list provided on page 14 of the NOI for the GTCC EIS is comprehensive, it is suggested that DOE use a tiered approach to determine whether sites might be suitable. For example, sites that are located over or in public water supply aquifers should be eliminated early both from a public health aspect and the concern about irretrievable and irreversible commitment of resources (once contaminated, aquifers are difficult to restore). 2. It is difficult to accept the premise stated on page 11 that SRS, ORR, INL, LANL, and Hanford have compatible missions since their waste disposal operations are limited to solid waste and low-level radioactive wastes. They may have high level and TRU waste management operations, but not disposal and that is a significant enough difference to eliminate those sites from serious consideration. 3. The inclusion of a generic commercial facility is unnecessary. The EIS will essentially determine the physical conditions for the acceptable disposal of GTCC wastes and once those are established, it will become fairly obvious that there are either non-DOE sites (whether on private or public land) that meet the requirements or not. As to whether they are better suited for GTCC disposal than the DOE sites, that will require a site-specific NEPA review of 'real' sites, which is beyond the scope of this EIS.
35	Ernest Broughon USA		8/22/07	As someone who has worked at Chem-Nuclear when it was supposedly burying 80% of the United States nuclear waste, I saw Class A,AU,B and C waste put into the ground. This was long after the proposed site in North Carolina had to start their low level waste program where they had to use concrete vaults while we were still using dirt trenches. I worked at Carolina Metals whose purpose was making the stock materials for depleted uranium armor piercing rounds for the military and all the DHEC nightmares that went with that venture. Ronald Reagan was suppose to open Yucca Mountain during his term for the opening of the only high-level waste repository in this country and that is still on hold. Recently we have allowed the grouting of high level waste sludge in

#	Name/ Address	Affiliation When Provided	Comment Date	Comment
				the tank farms at the Savannah River Site. Where will this waste come from that is to be buried at SRS? I have always felt that the state of South Carolina has done its share when it comes to the handling of some the nations' worst items: ie, medical incinerator in Hampton, 5 reactors, canyons, tank farms, and DWPF at SRS, Chem-Nuclear and Carolina Metals, Naval base and weapons in Charleston, and all the clothing mills and their chemicals. I remember when the last governor threatened to lay down in the road to boycott shipments of Pu from Rocky Flats. For material that was only to be here for 10 years, it has been here for probably half of that already. If we take more of this hazardous content from other states, the least we can do is tell the residents of South Carolina of everything that is buried under its ground.
36	Elizabeth M. Lawrence 3917 NE 109 th Street Seattle, WA 98125-7931		8/22/07	This message is to urge you NOT to bring a bunch of GTCC waste into Hanford. Hanford is not equipped to protect this waste. Neither is the Columbia River, that receives the runoff. Please remember what you do impacts every living thing in the State. I cannot and will not support this action. This action is contrary to supporting life as we know it. Thank you for your consideration of my message.
37	Patricia and Andrew Beyer Portland, OR 97239		8/22/07	I do not believe that storing additional waste at the Hanford reserve is in the best interest of the public's health and safety. Further, transporting low and moderate level radioactive material over the rail and road systems is both dangerous and ill advised. The government has not yet adequately addressed the transport, much less the long-term storage of these wastes. Enough harm has already occurred to the ecosystem, and without a clearly defined long-term plan to manage these hazardous chemicals, it makes NO sense to transport and temporarily store these long-term hazards and thereby create a motivation to create additional waste at local sites. Please do NOT approve transportation and storage of these radioactive materials at the Hanford site, or other sites for that matter, until the long-term safe disposal protocols are clearly defined and implemented. Thank you for your consideration of these comments. If you cannot find a suitable temporary location, perhaps you should consider Crawford, Texas.
38	Phoebe C. Warren Seattle, WA		8/23/07	I am opposed to shipping Greater-Than-Class C Low-Level Radioactive Waste (GTCC LLW) to Hanford. The cleanup of high level radioactive waste at Hanford is already significantly behind schedule and over budget. Neither the designs of the vitrification plant nor the track record of the contractors over the years allows us to feel optimism about the future of that effort. A safe job requires more money and more skill than are being made available. In this context, it makes no sense to increase the scope of work being undertaken at the same location, particularly when you consider the risks and costs of transporting new wastes to the site. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
39	Linda Sebring Corvallis, OR 97330-5255		8/23/07	Please don't store any more nuclear waste at Hanford. The proximity of the Columbia River makes this site particularly unsuitable for long term storage. We need to move the radioactive waste OUT of the river basin of the Columbia. This proposal is the reverse of what needs to be done in this area.
40	Ann C. Bates 30 Domingo Road Santa Fe, NM 87508		8/23/07	Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS), storing radioactive waste in robust, secure, facilities at, or near, the site of generation is a safer method for dealing with GTCC radioactive waste. HOSS is an idea that has been around for years and offers advantages in environmental safety, retrievability, and flexibility over DOE's plans to bury the waste.

#	Name/ Address	Affiliation When Provided	Comment Date	Comment
41	Louise Gilman Portland, OR 97219		8/23/07	<p>USDOE should not be trucking nuclear power plant wastes or "Greater than Class C" or "Greater than Class C-like wastes" to Hanford to be dumped in shallow landfills or relatively shallow boreholes above groundwater flowing to the Columbia River. Hanford is already extremely polluted and the pollution has contaminated the water table and is already flowing into the Columbia River.</p> <p>This latest proposal comes on top of USDOE continuing to seek to dump radioactive and mixed radioactive toxic chemical wastes from other nuclear weapons plants in shallow landfills at Hanford for the next forty years.</p> <p>Essentially, USDOE is attempting to ship the same highly radioactive wastes it was twice barred from shipping because there is no storage or treatment for such wastes at Hanford.</p> <p>Highly radioactive wastes, which include GTCC and remote-handled TRU, belong in a deep geologic repository, in geologically stable formations below the depth of usable groundwater, not at Hanford. TRU and GTCC remain highly radioactive for hundreds of thousands of years and are attractive targets for terrorists or to dig up for malicious purposes.</p>
42	Edward Anderson Portland, OR 97219		8/23/07	<p>USDOE should not be trucking nuclear power plant wastes or "Greater than Class C" or "Greater than Class C-like wastes" to Hanford to be dumped in shallow landfills or relatively shallow boreholes above groundwater flowing to the Columbia River. Hanford is already extremely polluted and the pollution has contaminated the water table and is already flowing into the Columbia River.</p> <p>This latest proposal comes on top of USDOE continuing to seek to dump radioactive and mixed radioactive toxic chemical wastes from other nuclear weapons plants in shallow landfills at Hanford for the next forty years.</p> <p>Essentially, USDOE is attempting to ship the same highly radioactive wastes it was twice barred from shipping because there is no storage or treatment for such wastes at Hanford.</p> <p>Highly radioactive wastes, which include GTCC and remote-handled TRU, belong in a deep geologic repository, in geologically stable formations below the depth of usable groundwater, not at Hanford. TRU and GTCC remain highly radioactive for hundreds of thousands of years and are attractive targets for terrorists or to dig up for malicious purposes.</p>
43	Barbara Pikus OR 97206		8/23/07	<p>Your proposal to ship and store this wastes at Hanford are insane and moronic! Why don't you just go ahead and "nuke" the Northwest. That's essentially the situation that you will be setting up. What you are planning should be declared blatantly illegal.</p>
44	Eric M. Swagerty Spokane, WA 99205- 1754		8/24/07	<p>I strongly oppose the storage of radioactive waste at Hanford. The proximity to the Columbia River and the inability to get Hanford cleaned up both show a risk of contamination to our enviroment that is not acceptable. We in the Pacific NW have endured enough radioactive pollution. Please do not send more.</p>
45	Barbara Miller Portland, OR 97212		8/24/07	<p>I join with Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility and strongly oppose the Department of Energy's recent proposal to use Hanford as a National Radioactive and Toxic Waste Dump, in particular, its proposal to truck extremely radioactive wastes to Hanford for burial.</p> <p>The DOE has already been barred twice from shipping highly radioactive waste to Hanford, because there is no storage or treatment for such wastes at Hanford.</p> <p>Such wastes belong in a deep geologic repository, in geologically stable formations below the depth of usable groundwater -- not at Hanford, along the Columbia River!</p>

#	Name/ Address	Affiliation When Provided	Comment Date	Comment
46	Melinda C. McComb P.O. Box 1954 Newport, OR 97365		8/24/07	I strongly object to the proposed addition of GTCC materials to the Hanford nuclear site. Both past and present radioactive materials have greatly impaired water quality and are already a threat to human and environmental health. The government needs to keep up the site waste, not add more, particularly not more highly radioactive materials.
47	Leslie L. Root 501 N. Graham Suite #100 Portland, OR 97227		8/25/07	Please reconsider the shipment of radioactive waste to the Hanford Nuclear Reservation located near Richland, WA. This site continues to under cleanup. It seems absurd to add more waste to a site that is working on cleaning up and getting rid of it's current waste. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.
48	Mike Judd 4300 NW 23rd Ave. #23 Gainesville, FL 32606		8/25/07	As a former Portland resident and current visitor I must object in the strongest possible manner to this dangerous and ill-conceived plan. The Hanford site is in need of extensive and very expensive remediation of its extant considerable radioactive waste which as you know is positioned dangerously close to the Columbia River. It is absurd to consider adding to this untenable burden by using Hanford as a site for additional storage and disposal of contamination. Please do not follow through with this plan.
49	Joshua Berger P.O. Box 2863 Portland, OR 97214		8/27/07	The addition of Hanford as a possible site for storage of GTCC LLW is ludicrous. The number of leaking tanks at the facility currently has been well documented. I am absolutely and completely opposed to bringing additional waste here until the DOE can demonstrate that is able to responsibly handle the waste that is currently on the site.
50	Phyllis Weih USA		8/28/07	To put more nuclear waste at Hanford does not make sense when one can't contain and hasn't cleaned up what is already there and leaking into the Columbia River watershed. Unless the administration seeks to punish Portland, Oregon, and Washington State, I don't understand the motive for trucking nuclear waste across the country (given the threat of terrorism and accident) to a geographic "corner" that happens to be relatively highly populated. I oppose more nuclear waste at Hanford. Thank you for your consideration.
51	Jane R. Samuels 9335 N. Syracuse St. Portland, OR 97203		8/29/07	I appreciate that the process for handling nuclear waste requires that the public be involved and have the opportunity to express our views and concerns. At the same time, I recognize the difficulty on the DOE's behalf in trying to generate a EIS that responds to all relevant concerns while simultaneously attempting to get the project completed in a timely manner. This is waste that needs to be dealt with properly, safely and relatively quickly, without compromising the process. With that in mind, I think the process needs to include some information directly addressing the public's responsibility in assisting with the safe storage and removal of nuclear waste. While the DOE is a Federally funded agency, and taxpayers play their part in its operation, the DOE can likewise be clear on its costs and processes to a further extent. Imagine the DOE pounding the pavement with initiatives for collective fundraising to deal with waste, or taking out informational advertising to pique the public's awareness of the various considerations. Imagine generating tax breaks for those who find ways to use only renewable energy sources or contribute to the management of our present nuclear operations. In my opinion, encouraged active involvement from the public, with awareness of our part to play in handling this global concern, would bring forth more beneficial feedback at these DOE public meetings. Thank you for allowing us to give our comments.
52	Jason Vest Vancouver, WA		8/29/07	I am writing to request that you not add any more radioactive waste to the Hanford site until the current contamination problem is COMPLETELY resolved. Given the site's proximity to the Columbia River, I feel that adding additional radioactive waste to this already troubled site would be a recipe for disaster. The environment and the people of the Northwest have suffered enough from the Hanford site - please don't make this situation any worse than it already is. Thank you for your consideration.

#	Name/ Address	Affiliation When Provided	Comment Date	Comment
53	John F. Christensen 39825 Gordon Creek Rd. Corbett, OR 97019		8/30/07	I am opposed to your proposal to ship radioactive waste to Hanford. The Columbia River Gorge and its greater environment is not the place for this. The risk to human health and the natural environment is too great.
54	George B. Hutchinson 44 SW Brook Street Newport, OR 97365		8/30/07	<p>Hanford should not be used as a National Radioactive and Toxic Waste Dump for radioactive waste such as GTCC.</p> <p>Hanford is behind schedule and over budget for cleaning up the waste currently at Hanford. No new waste should be allowed on the site until current waste is cleaned up.</p> <p>Transporting waste is dangerous. All waste should be kept at the site it resides at (if feasible) in secure and safe storage (hardened on-site storage or HOSS). This would keep new waste from coming down Oregon's highways.</p> <p>The proposal failed to take into account waste that may come to Hanford through the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP). This waste should be included in the Environmental Impact Statement</p>
55	Jeanne Raymond Corvallis, OR 97330		8/30/07	Citizens of Oregon and Washington joined together to protest, work, and clean up the nuclear wastes at Hanford. The health of the Columbia River, the river life and people living in both states would be endangered if new nuclear wastes were to be buried in trenches at Hanford. It is not being respectful of the people of Oregon and Washington, nor the Columbia River habitat. In fact it is toxic.
56	Patricia C. May 7712 SE Morrison St. Portland, OR 97215		8/30/07	Please do not accept a higher level of Radioactive material to be sent to Hanford. The reasons are too many to list here, but I want responsibility to our area to be upmost, and the laying out of a true plan for the storage of these materials with public input. Thank you for your consideration.
57	Robert D. Shinney, Jr. 1722 NE 47th Ave. Portland, OR 97213		8/30/07	Please do not accept a higher level of Radioactive material to be sent to Hanford. The reasons are too many to list here, but I want responsibility to our area to be upmost, and the laying out of a true plan for the storage of these materials with public input. Thank you for your consideration.
58	Jessica D. Rojas 4721 NE 27th Portland, OR		9/1/07	get some common sense and work on cleaning hanford up unstead of continuing to abuse that area, which is environmentally and culturally sensitive area that has been polluted enough
59	Donald L. Isaacson USA		9/2/07	Cleaning up Hanford is already an enormous task. Nothing must be done that would prolong the project.
60	Catherine Dahnoun 10 Warbler Land Hilton Head Island, SC 29926		9/2/07	I am against the disposal of radioactive waste, including the "Greater Than Class C" waste, at the Savannah River Site. South Carolina should not become the nation's dumping ground for nuclear waste. Many towns downriver from this plant depend on the Savannah River for their water supply.
61	Norbert T. Rempe 1403 N. Country Club Circle Carlsbad, NM 88220		9/2/07	My previous comments presented orally at the Carlsbad public hearing emphasized the need to carefully evaluate and publicly document the lessons (good and not so good) that can be derived from the experience of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). While WIPP is successful, it also is overregulated and much too expensive. The recent retrieval of an "errant" drum from WIPP was a lamentable triumph of regulatory compliance over risk minimization, sanity, and common sense. Other lessons may not be

#	Name/ Address	Affiliation When Provided	Comment Date	Comment
				<p>as clear cut but have the potential to avoid unnecessary work and expense while ensuring exemplary safety and health.</p> <p>Aside from domestic experience such as at WIPP, experience from foreign repositories that have been managing and disposing of low-and intermediate-level radioactive waste for many years may be very valuable. My recently published paper on deep geologic repositories (attached) offers a first introduction to the wealth of available experience. A little money spent on literature study and a few benchmarking visits to select projects abroad could save a lot of effort and money down the road. If any help is needed, I am glad to discuss ways and means of assistance.</p> <p>See Letter/Attachment</p>
62	John Marks 0668 SW Palatine Hill Rd. Portland, OR 97219		9/2/07	Already we are worried about leaky containment tanks at Hanford and levels of radioactivity in the Columbia. As persons living downstream from Hanford we don't want to risk things growing worse. No more nuclear waste at Hanford. Don't let things get worse than they already are.
63	Tracie Hornung P.O. Box 613 Mosier, OR		9/3/07	<p>Enough is enough. DOE has not shown competency in cleaning up Hanford so why should we allow them to add more nuclear materials to this site? These materials remain highly radioactive for hundreds of thousands of years and are attractive targets for terrorists.</p> <p>Moreover, there is already an underground radioactive plume making its way toward the Columbia River. So why on earth should we allow more radioactive waste to be sent to Hanford?</p>
64	Sally M. Hollemon 3335 Crestview Dr. S Salem, Or 97302		9/3/07	Please do not send any more radioactive waste to Hanford. Some of the waste stored there from World War II weapons programs has leaked into the ground and migrated to the Columbia River. Hanford is in the process of being cleaned up, but it seems to be an excruciatingly long process and a permanent, safe storage method has not yet been developed. Therefore, no additional radioactive waste should go to Hanford until the current mess is cleaned up.
65	William E. Dodds P.O. Box 849 Boring, OR 97009		9/3/07	<p>I've grown up on the banks of the Columbia River, and I have a picture of the Indians fishing from Celilo Falls on my livingroom wall.</p> <p>It is the origin of the Salmon Nation, that Lewis and Clark recorded, during their epic journey.</p> <p>To allow the poisoning of the Columbia with radioactive waste is the worst possible outcome for the region and for the country.</p> <p>The Columbia is still swimmable, unlike the Mississippi which is no more than a cancer ally that pollutes the Gulf of Mexico.</p> <p>Do not poison this national treasure by allowing nuclear waste to be transported or stored anywhere near the Columbia.</p> <p>Safe clean storage of such waste is not possible in Hanford Reservation. This has already been proven. Clean up Hanford, Punish those who defiled it! Treat public land with respect as if it belonged to the citizens of this country! Close down the dangerous and filthy nuclear industry and invest tax dollars in Solar and Wind and other renewable sources of energy like those in Europe and others around the rest of the world have already done.</p>
66	William E. Dodds P.O. Box 849 Boring, OR 97009		9/3/07	<p>I've grown up on the banks of the Columbia River, and I have a picture of the Indians fishing from Celilo Falls on my livingroom wall.</p> <p>It is the origin of the Salmon Nation, that Lewis and Clark recorded, during their epic journey.</p> <p>To allow the poisoning of the Columbia with radioactive waste is the worst possible outcome for the region and for the country.</p> <p>The Columbia is still swimmable, unlike the Mississippi which is no more than a cancer ally that pollutes the Gulf of Mexico.</p> <p>Do not poison this national treasure by allowing nuclear waste to be transported or stored anywhere near the Columbia.</p> <p>Safe clean storage of such waste is not possible in Hanford Reservation. This has already been proven. Clean up Hanford, Punish those who defiled it! Treat public land with respect as if it belonged to the citizens of this country! Close down the dangerous and filthy nuclear industry and invest tax dollars in Solar and Wind and other renewable sources of energy like those in Europe and</p>

#	Name/ Address	Affiliation When Provided	Comment Date	Comment
				others around the rest of the world have already done.
67	William E. Dodds P.O. Box 849 Boring, OR 97009		9/3/07	<p>I've grown up on the banks of the Columbia River, and I have a picture of the Indians fishing from Celilo Falls on my livingroom wall.</p> <p>It is the origin of the Salmon Nation, that Lewis and Clark recorded, during their epic journey.</p> <p>To allow the poisoning of the Columbia with radioactive waste is the worst possible outcome for the region and for the country.</p> <p>The Columbia is still swimmable, unlike the Mississippi which is no more than a cancer ally that pollutes the Gulf of Mexico.</p> <p>Do not poison this national treasure by allowing nuclear waste to be transported or stored anywhere near the Columbia.</p> <p>Safe clean storage of such waste is not possible in Hanford Reservation. This has already been proven. Clean up Hanford, Punish those who defiled it! Treat public land with respect as if it belonged to the citizens of this country! Close down the dangerous and filthy nuclear industry and invest tax dollars in Solar and Wind and other renewable sources of energy like those in Europe and others around the rest of the world have already done.</p>
68	Archer A. Haskins 5096 Boonsboro Road Lynchburg, Va 24503-1843	A.A. Haskins Associates, Inc.	9/5/07	<p>I am a representative to Global Matrechs, Inc. We offer NuCap, a silicone polymer composite that was originally developed to cover the fuel mass and plant surface at Chernobyl. We have applied this material at DOE sites, most recently for macroencapsulation of radioactive and mixed waste in Oak Ridge for BJC. This GTCC material has no path for disposal related to treatment at a secured facility or packaging in accordance with DOT/NRC. NuCap can be used to encapsulate this material...full containment, which will eliminate or significantly reduce treatment and packaging requirements will change as well. I am attaching some basic material properties and will be available to meet and discuss in more detail.</p> <p>See Letter/Attachment</p>
69	Michelle D. Bienick 1881 Humbug Creek Rd. Applegate, OR 97530		9/5/07	<p>I want to live a long life on a healthy planet. As a parent, I am driven to protect the life on Earth for our future generations. Nuclear waste has no place--stop producing it NOW!!!</p>
70	Richard DeKlever 2628 Desert Sands Drive Las Vegas, NV 89134		9/5/07	<p>After attending the public meeting on 9-4-07 in Las Vegas I was favorably impressed with the manner in which the overall scoping requirements for the proposed DOE GTCC EIS were presented by Ms. Gelles. I have the following comments for possible consideration and incorporation into the final EIS.</p> <p>1) Recommend making reference to the types of Greater Than Class C Low Level Radioactive Waste as; DOE and Non-DOE Greater Than Class C Radioactive Waste; note that the title no longer identifies with the terms "commercial," or "Low Level." Definitions for these terms should also be provided, so as not to conflict with terms and definitions presented in NWPA, NEPA. 10 CFR 61, etc.</p> <p>2) The premise for consolidation of this Greater Than Class C Radioactive Waste should be noted as via the high temperature vitrification process and similar to the proposed Hanford or Savannah River processes. The logistics of which waste stream to process this waste should be left with the contractor for determination and scheduling, along with the canister identification and segregation.</p> <p>3) Since this radioactive waste maybe considered low level it could be deposited at the WIPP or if determined as high level it would require emplacement at Yucca Mountain, although this facility may not be ready to accept high level waste for another 10 - 20 years, based on NRC acceptance of the Yucca Mountain operational license application. As an alternative burial location deep sea sediment burial should also be considered and presented to congress for their potential selection, which for this valueless material no retrievability would be necessary. Sandia published results of a study they conducted regarding a feasibility study conducted circa 1990 of deep sea sediment disposal with conclusions presented therein.</p>

#	Name/ Address	Affiliation When Provided	Comment Date	Comment
71	Richard DeKlever 2628 Desert Sands Drive Las Vegas, NV 89134		9/5/07	<p>After attending the public meeting on 9-4-07 in Las Vegas I was favorably impressed with the manner in which the overall scoping requirements for the proposed DOE GTCC EIS were presented by Ms. Gelles. I have the following comments for possible consideration and incorporation into the final EIS.</p> <p>1) Recommend making reference to the types of Greater Than Class C Low Level Radioactive Waste as; DOE and Non-Doe Greater Than Class C Radioactive Waste; note that the title no longer identifies with the terms "commercial," or "Low Level." Definitions for these terms should also be provided, so as not to conflict with terms and definitions presented in NWPA, NEPA. 10 CFR 61, etc.</p> <p>2) The premise for consolodation of this Greater Than Class C Radioactive Waste should be noted as via the high temperature vitrification process and similiar to the proposed Hanford or Savanaha River processes. The logistics of which waste stream to process this waste should be left with the contractor for determination and scheduling, along with the canister identification and segregation.</p> <p>3) Since this radioactive waste maybe considered low level it could be deposited at the WIPP or if determined as high level it would require emplacement at Yucca Mountain, although this facility may not be ready to accept high level waste for another 10 - 20 years, based on NRC acceptance of the Yucca Mountain operational license application. As an alternative burrial location deep sea sediment burrial should also be considered and presented to congress for their potential selection, which for this valuess material no retrievability would be necessary. Sandia published results of a study they conducted regarding a feasibility study conducted circa 1990 of deep sea sediment disposal with conclusions presented therein.</p>
72	Richard DeKlever 2628 Desert Sands Drive Las Vegas, NV 89134		9/5/07	<p>After attending the public meeting on 9-4-07 in Las Vegas I was favorably impressed with the manner in which the overall scopping requirements for the proposed DOE GTCC EIS were presented by Ms. Gelles. I have the following comments for possible consideration and incorporation into the final EIS.</p> <p>1) Recommend making reference to the types of Greater Than Class C Low Level Radioactive Waste as; DOE and Non-Doe Greater Than Class C Radioactive Waste; note that the title no longer identifies with the terms "commercial," or "Low Level." Definitions for these terms should also be provided, so as not to conflict with terms and definitions presented in NWPA, NEPA. 10 CFR 61, etc.</p> <p>2) The premise for consolodation of this Greater Than Class C Radioactive Waste should be noted as via the high temperature vitrification process and similiar to the proposed Hanford or Savanaha River processes. The logistics of which waste stream to process this waste should be left with the contractor for determination and scheduling, along with the canister identification and segregation.</p> <p>3) Since this radioactive waste maybe considered low level it could be deposited at the WIPP or if determined as high level it would require emplacement at Yucca Mountain, although this facility may not be ready to accept high level waste for another 10 - 20 years, based on NRC acceptance of the Yucca Mountain operational license application. As an alternative burrial location deep sea sediment burrial should also be considered and presented to congress for their potential selection, which for this valuess material no retrievability would be necessary. Sandia published results of a study they conducted regarding feasibility of deep sea sediment disposal circa 1990 with conclusions presented therein.</p>
73	Brian H. Smith 5426 SE 70th Ave. Portland, OR 97206		9/5/07	<p>I oppose the dumping of more highly radioactive waste at Hanford Nuclear Facility, which is just up the Columbia River from us and threatens our health and safety, and the legacy we as humans leave behind. We must protect the sacred Northwest not bring more hazardous waste.</p>

#	Name/ Address	Affiliation When Provided	Comment Date	Comment
74	Jerry Golden Carlsbad, NM 88221		9/8/07	1. Relative to the WIPP Project, GTCC waste appears to be inconsequential, particularly in the short-term. 2. Impacts of delay or not moving forward with the proposed disposal of CTCC waste should be considered in the hearing process. This would likely include decreased nuclear power production, which will result in increased emission from combustion.
75	Sally Shaw 100 River Rd. Gill, MA 01354		9/9/07	I would like to comment on the DOE's analysis of alternatives for disposal of GTCC nuclear wastes. In light of the National Academy of Sciences BEIR VII report and other recent scientific papers on the dangers of any exposure to low-level radiation, I find your alternatives for GTCC waste disposal terribly limited. Internal exposure is understood to be far more dangerous than whole body exposure to low level radiation. Internal alpha and beta radiation can cause enormous cell damage and initiate cancers and autoimmune disorders, depending on where particles lodge. Their decay chains can cause repeated and prolonged exposure of tissues to damaging radiation. This is understood to cause cancers. Given that some of the isotopes contained in GTCC waste, activated metals, "hot particles" and other so called low level waste can last for hundreds if not thousands of years, and recent studies have shown that isotopes like plutonium travel through the soil and into ground water much faster than previously supposed, (Brice Smith and Alexandra Amonette, The Environmental Transport of Radium and Plutonium: A Review, Takoma Park, MD: Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, June 23, 2006. Available on the Web at www.ieer.org/reports/envtransport/ .) it is irresponsible not to analyze alternatives that isolate the waste from the environment as long as robust containment materials may perform, and in a manner that allows retrieval and repackaging to keep the waste from entering the environment indefinitely. Such a method as HOSS, Hardened on-site storage, would be such a monitorable, accessible isolation method, and seems more appropriate for this type of waste than all of the alternatives you have set forth in the EIS. I urge you to revise your alternatives and investigate HOSS as the safest solution to GTCC waste disposal. Thank you for your diligent consideration.
76	Elena Day 151 Buckingham Circle Charlottesville, VA 22903		9/11/07	I support the Alliance for Nuclear Accountability proposal that for GTCC waste - secure, hardened, retrievable storage of the waste as close to the site of generation as is safe.
77	Victoria E. Green 539 N. Hayden Bay Drive Portland, OR		9/12/07	I am commenting on the idea to store radioactive waste from more than 100 U.S. nuclear plants at Hanford in Washington. Hanford is already a Super Fund Site where taxpayers have spent thousands of dollars to clean. To put more waste on top of the leaking mess there already is like rubbing salt in our wound. I live down river from it. I recreate on the Columbia River, and I know families who eat the fish. You would defeat the purpose of the clean-up effort. If Pres. Bush wants more nuclear power plants, we could store the waste in his home state of Texas. Please do not bring this waste through Portland, either.
78	Dan J. Silver USA		9/13/07	Can't low level nuclear waste be recycled to extract the uranium and plutonium out of it.
79	John Abbotts 4554 12th Ave. NE Seattle, WA 98105	Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility , Hanford Task Force	9/14/07	See Letter/Attachment
80	MEDVED489 New York		9/15/07	3374t6100HI4848sMEDV EDVER YNICE SITE 496583374t6100

#	Name/ Address	Affiliation When Provided	Comment Date	Comment
81	Scot D. Rutledge Las Vegas, NV 89128	Nevada Conservation League	9/18/07	See Letter/Attachment
82	Pamela M. Harpootlian 1721 Enoree Ave. Columbia, SC 29205		9/18/07	As a member of the public, living in South Carolina, I wish to comment on my State's continuing acceptance of radioactive waste of any kind. Given the circumstances that containment in this state is not working and that seepage into ground water and nearby creeks is already occurring, it is time for the people of South Carolina to stop taking radioactive waste of any kind from anywhere. The seepage into the ground and water near the storage facilities is effectively poisoning our earth and our waterways. Our state has been taking this poison for long enough. Other states continue to refuse the waste, leaving South Carolina to take it because of existing facilities, but the existing facilities are no longer adequate. I vote "no" for continuing to take this waste. No number of jobs can compensate South Carolina for poisoning our earth and our water.
83	Nancy Lee Trihey 158 Davenport Road Newberry, SC 29108		9/18/07	I want South Carolina to stop accepting nuclear waste. Period. I certainly don't want the level of the waste to be higher! I know of retired people who chose not to retire to the SC coast simply because of their feared threat from the nuclear waste facility. We are a small state, and tourism is one of our biggest industries. This, too, will be threatened by our "nuclear dumping ground" reputation.
84	Christina Alexander USA		9/18/07	As a longterm resident of Nevada, I am appalled that Yucca Mountain is once again being considered as a repository for yet more dangerous waste. It is a scientifically unsuitable site with a myriad of technical and legal problems. Nevada has a rapidly growing population and is not a garbage dump! In the interest of human life, the site at Yucca Mountain should never open for GTCC waste or any type of waste.
85	Gary C. Vesperman 3133 La Mesa Drive Henderson, NV 89014- 3649	Blue Energy Corporation	9/18/07	Before digging a hole in Nevada in which to bury "Greater-Than-Level C Radioactive Waste", it makes more sense to me to first intensively and honestly research methods of neutralizing radioactivity. Attached is a document I have written titled "Comparison of My List of 27 Methods of Neutralizing or Disposing of Radioactive Waste with PACE's 9 Methods". It is also available at http://iic.de/docs/GVComparison.htm . I suggest examining these methods as a start. See Letter/Attachment
86	Dr. Harold L. Fox Salt Lake City, UT 84109	EEMF. Inc.	9/19/07	I am president of a Utah corporation that has the full-rights to several patents and we are using that patented technology for the on-site stabilization of high-level, radioactive wastes. This technology is being funded so that the technology can be commercialized and used.
87	Rodney A. Baltzer 5430 LBJ Frwy, Suite 1700 Dallas, TX 75240	Waste Control Specialists LLC	9/20/07	See Letter/Attachment
88	Janet Ingle 11111 dnlen vbmry pjniabr, NV 45612		9/20/07	All I know is that there are 24 proven ways to neutralize Atomic waste and our government doesn't want that to be known to the public. The only reason I can see is because we the American people are doomed to be wiped out for political reasons. Eliminate the majority of the population and start over. Right? Its for better control of the world so that the people who are now in power will

#	Name/ Address	Affiliation When Provided	Comment Date	Comment
				<p>stay in power.</p> <p>Have a nice day.</p>
89	<p>Joe Whetstone 10 Hamilton Dr. Bluffton, SC 29909</p>		9/20/07	<p>Two of the "activated metals" cause great concern: Half life for Nb94 is 20,300 years Half life for Ni59 is 76,000 years Rule of thumb; ten half-lives are required for a substance to decay to "safe" levels.</p> <p>The Savannah River Site(SRS) is located in the Savannah River water shed.</p> <p>The water table at SRS is too close to the surface to safely bury GTCC LLW.</p> <p>Beaufort Jasper Water and Sewer Authority as well as part of Savannah, Georgia use water from the Savannah River to supply their customers with drinking water.</p> <p>Placing GTCC LLW at SRS would add to existing health risks we deal with daily from SRS and should not even be considered. We already receive on average over 500 pCi/L of tritium in our drinking water from the Savannah River. Enough already.</p>
90	<p>Michael McCally 1875 Connecticut Ave, NW Suite 1012 Washington, DC 20007</p>	Physicians for Social Responsibility	9/20/07	<p>See Letter/Attachment</p>
91	<p>Ken Niles Oregon Dept. of Energy 625 Marion St., NE Salem, OR 97301</p>	State of Oregon, Dept. of Energy	9/20/07	<p>See Letter/Attachment</p>
92	<p>Billie J. Kickey Detroit, MI 48221</p>		9/22/07	<p>I strongly encourage DOE to consider Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS), storing radioactive waste in robust, secure, facilities at, or near, the site of generation for dealing with GTCC radioactive waste.</p> <p>HOSS offers advantages in environmental safety, retrievability, and flexibility over your current plans to simply and irretrievably bury the waste.</p>
93	<p>Deborah S. Scott 4731 SW Admiral St. Portland, OR 97221</p>		9/21/07	<p>I am opposed to adding (any additional type of) nuclear waste to Hanford. The present waste containment issues--not solved, and over-schedule & budget--must eliminate Hanford from the list of possible sites.</p>
94	<p>Sara Barczak Savannah, GA 31401</p>	Southern Alliance for Clean Energy	9/21/07	<p>See Letter/Attachment</p>

#	Name/ Address	Affiliation When Provided	Comment Date	Comment
95	Sara Barczak Savannah, GA 31401	Southern Alliance for Clean Energy	9/21/07	See Letter/Attachment
96	William P. Mead Portland, OR 97230	Public Safety Resources Agency	9/21/07	File attached, please include it in the official record. See Letter/Attachment
97	Gerald Pollet 1314 NE 56th St. #100 Seattle, WA 98105	Heart of America Northwest	9/21/07	Comments of Heart of America Northwest are attached. See Letter/Attachment
98	Alan D. Pasternak P.O. Box 1638 4 Middle Road Lafayette, CA 94549- 1638	California Radioactive Materials Management Forum	9/21/07	See Letter/Attachment
99	Dona Hippert 11723 SW 47th Ave. Portland, OR 97219	Northwest Environmental Defense Center, Oregon Toxics Alliance	9/21/07	See Letter/Attachment
100	Kevin J. Kamps 6930 Carroll Avenue Suite 400 Takoma Park, MD 20912	Beyond Nuclear	9/21/07	See Letter/Attachment