

## Letter/Attachment for GTCC EIS Scoping Comment #107

---

**Karen Enns, M.P.H.**  
3960 Belmont Drive, Hood River, Oregon 97031  
541-386-6304

James L. Joyce, Document Manager  
Office of Regulatory Compliance, U.S. Dept of Energy  
1000 Independence Ave, SW  
Washington, DC 20585-0119

Mr. Joyce,

10 September, 2007

I am writing to convey my comments in regards to a Greater-Than-Class C Low-Level Radioactive Waste environmental impact statement Public Scoping Meeting I attended here in Oregon in August. While I wish the toxic waste never existed in the first place, I understand the need to find ways to safely dispose of it and appreciate the opportunity for comment.

First and foremost, I feel it is absolutely unacceptable to consider the proposal that it be shipped to the Hanford site for any of the proposed disposal methods. As we all know, the Hanford site is unable to handle the waste it currently has. Over one million gallons of radioactive waste have already reached the Columbia River. I understand that the types of waste that you propose dumping at Hanford area currently barred from being shipped to Hanford. Reversing this, is clearly a contradiction to the supposed clean-up effort. The current priority for Hanford should be clean-up and nothing other than a singular focus on clean-up should be considered for this site.

Secondly, I am concerned about all 3 of the proposed "disposal methods" for any of the possible sites. I am not convinced that deep geologic repositories are proven safe. I am also concerned that intermediate depth boreholes and enhanced near surface disposal pose both immediate and long-term threats to human life and the environment. I will be opposed to all 3 of these disposal methods until they are scientifically proven safe.

I would like to urge the DOE to consider "Hardened On-Site Storage (HOSS) as the safest alternative we have available to us at this time. I believe that the DOE needs to find a better solution (scientifically sound, safe, and publicly acceptable) before we commit to permanent, irretrievable disposal. HOSS seems to be a realistic option in the meantime.

Ultimately I would like the DOE and our policy makers to invest in two things: 1) heavily fund research into finding a safe way to neutralize and dispose of all the types of radioactive waste that currently exists; and 2) a shift in-focus, dollars and mentality that considers it acceptable to continue generating nuclear energy and producing nuclear waste. There are many alternatives to nuclear energy that we as a nation and world need to turn toward. We must reject nuclear energy, as we cannot ignore the significance of our inability to safely handle the waste. Thank you again for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,



Karen Enns, M.P.H.

---

[Return to GTCC EIS Scoping Comments](#)