



Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

October 30, 1998

Mr. D. J. Mowatt
Apache Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 1220
Anadarko OK

Subject: *Consultation for Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Analysis Process, Under Executive Memorandum Concerning Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments*

Dear Mr. Mowatt:

The purpose of this letter is to notify you that the United States Department of Energy (DOE) is in the process of conducting an Environmental Impact Analysis concerning the disposition of surplus plutonium.

With this letter we are soliciting specific concerns the Apache Tribe of Oklahoma may have about the proposal. This consultation is in accordance with the Executive Memorandum (29 April 1994) entitled, "Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments", and DOE Order 1230.2. It also follows prior consultation initiated for compliance with the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) (PL 95-341) and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) (PL 101-601).

The *Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Statement* (SPD EIS) is tiered from the *Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Final Programmatic EIS* (DOE/EIS-0229), issued in December 1996, and the associated Record of Decision (62 FR 3014), issued on January 14, 1997. DOE is producing the SPD EIS in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA, DOE's NEPA Implementing Regulations (10 CFR 1021), and other applicable federal and state environmental legislation.

The purpose and need for the proposed action is to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons proliferation worldwide by disposing of surplus plutonium in the United States in an environmentally safe and timely manner. The SPD Draft EIS, a copy of which is attached for your review, examines the potential environmental impacts for 24 alternatives for the proposed siting, construction, and operation of three types of facilities: pit disassembly and conversion; mixed oxide (MOX) fuel fabrication; and plutonium conversion and immobilization.

Mr. D. J. Mowatt
Apache Tribe of Oklahoma
10/30/98
Page 2

If an alternative is selected that includes siting of surplus plutonium disposition facilities at the Pantex plant (e.g., Alternative 9A), a maximum of 16 hectares (39 acres) of land in or near Zone 4 would be impacted. Based on previous consultations, no traditional cultural properties have been identified in Zone 4 or immediately adjacent areas.

If you have any specific concerns about the SPD EIS proposal, we would like to hear from you. Please contact me with your concerns or questions at:

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Fissile Materials Disposition
P.O. Box 23786
Washington, DC 20026-3786
(202) 586-0149.

You may also contact Vicki Battley, Pantex Environmental Protection Team Leader, at (806) 477-3189.

Sincerely,

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager

cc: Vicki Battley, DOE - Amarillo Area Office
Brandt Petrusek, EM-20, DOE HQ

SPD EIS enclosure



Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

October 30, 1998

Mr. Don Wauahdooah
Comanche Tribe of Oklahoma
HC32 P.O. Box 1720
Lawton OK 73502

Subject: *Consultation for Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Analysis Process, Under Executive Memorandum Concerning Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments*

Dear Mr. Wauahdooah:

The purpose of this letter is to notify you that the United States Department of Energy (DOE) is in the process of conducting an Environmental Impact Analysis concerning the disposition of surplus plutonium.

With this letter we are soliciting specific concerns the Comanche Tribe of Oklahoma may have about the proposal. This consultation is in accordance with the Executive Memorandum (29 April 1994) entitled, "Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments", and DOE Order 1230.2. It also follows prior consultation initiated for compliance with the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) (PL 95-341) and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) (PL 101-601).

The *Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Statement* (SPD EIS) is tiered from the *Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Final Programmatic EIS* (DOE/EIS-0229), issued in December 1996, and the associated Record of Decision (62 FR 3014), issued on January 14, 1997. DOE is producing the SPD EIS in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA, DOE's NEPA Implementing Regulations (10 CFR 1021), and other applicable federal and state environmental legislation.

The purpose and need for the proposed action is to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons proliferation worldwide by disposing of surplus plutonium in the United States in an environmentally safe and timely manner. The SPD Draft EIS, a copy of which is attached for your review, examines the potential environmental impacts for 24 alternatives for the proposed siting, construction, and operation of three types of facilities: pit disassembly and conversion; mixed oxide (MOX) fuel fabrication; and plutonium conversion and immobilization.

Mr. Don Wauahdooah
Comanche Tribe of Oklahoma
10/30/98
Page 2

If an alternative is selected that includes siting of surplus plutonium disposition facilities at the Pantex plant (e.g., Alternative 9A), a maximum of 16 hectares (39 acres) of land in or near Zone 4 would be impacted. Based on previous consultations, no traditional cultural properties have been identified in Zone 4 or immediately adjacent areas.

If you have any specific concerns about the SPD EIS proposal, we would like to hear from you. Please contact me with your concerns or questions at:

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Fissile Materials Disposition
P.O. Box 23786
Washington, DC 20026-3786
(202) 586-0149.

You may also contact Vicki Battley, Pantex Environmental Protection Team Leader, at (806) 477-3189.

Sincerely,

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager

cc: Vicki Battley, DOE – Amarillo Area Office
Brandt Petrusek, EM-20, DOE HQ

SPD EIS enclosure



Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

July 28, 1998

Mr. Robert Short
Field Supervisor
U.S. Department of Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service
Ecological Services Field Office
711 Stadium Drive East
Suite 352
Arlington, TX 76001

Dear Mr. Short:

INFORMAL CONSULTATION UNDER SECTION 7 OF THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT FOR SURPLUS PLUTONIUM DISPOSITION

The Department of Energy (DOE) published its Notice of Intent to prepare the *Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Statement* (SPD EIS) in the Federal Register (Vol. 92, No. 99) on May 22, 1997. This SPD EIS is tiered from the *Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Programmatic EIS* (DOE/EIS-0229), issued in December 1996, and the associated Record of Decision (62 FR 3014), issued on January 14, 1997. To summarize, the purpose of the proposed action is to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons proliferation worldwide in an environmentally safe and timely manner by conducting disposition of surplus plutonium in the United States, thus setting a nonproliferation example for other nations.

The SPD Draft EIS, a copy of which is attached for your review, examines twenty-four alternatives and analyzes the potential environmental impacts for the proposed siting, construction, and operation of three types of facilities: pit disassembly and conversion, mixed oxide (MOX) fuel fabrication, and plutonium conversion and immobilization. The Pantex Plant near Amarillo, Texas is a candidate site for receiving the pit conversion and MOX facilities. Alternatives 9A, 9B, and 10 propose locating both the pit conversion and MOX facilities in new construction in Zone 4 at Pantex. Although there are other alternatives that would locate only the pit conversion facility at Pantex, the alternatives that include both facilities have the greater potential for impacts on ecological resources. The candidate sites and alternatives are shown in Table 2-1 of the SPD Draft EIS. Please note that where practical, the modification of existing buildings is being considered.

Preliminary analyses suggest that overall impacts on ecological resources from constructing and operating the proposed surplus plutonium disposition facilities would be limited because the land area required (16 hectares [39 acres]) is relatively small in comparison to regionally available habitat; habitat disturbance would be minimized because construction would take place in previously disturbed or developed areas; and operational impacts would be minimized because



Printed with soy ink on recycled paper

facility releases of airborne and aqueous effluents would be controlled and permitted. Section 4.26.3.3 of the SPD Draft EIS presents the ecological resources analysis for Pantex.

Although sources indicate that no critical habitat for any threatened and endangered species exists at Pantex, three special status species (ferruginous hawk, western burrowing owl, and Texas horned lizard) may potentially be found within the areas surrounding Zone 4. Noise disturbance is probably the most important impact affecting local wildlife populations.

Consistent with the Endangered Species Act, DOE requests that the Fish and Wildlife Service provide any additional information on the presence of threatened and endangered animal and plant species; both listed and proposed, in the vicinity of Zone 4 at Pantex. Information on the habitats of these species would also be appreciated. DOE also requests information on any other species of concern that are known to occur or potentially occur in the vicinity of Zone 4.

As part of DOE's National Environmental Policy Act process, DOE encourages the Fish and Wildlife Service to identify any concerns or issues that it believes should be addressed in the SPD EIS. To facilitate incorporation of your input into the SPD Final EIS, please provide a written response by September 16, 1998.

Please mail your response to:

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Fissile Materials Disposition
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585

If you have any questions, please contact me at (202) 586-0149.

Sincerely,



Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager

cc: Tim Greene, Battelle
Vicky Loucks, DOE



Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

July 28, 1998

Ms. Pat Martin
Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
4200 Smith School Road
Austin, TX 78744

Dear Ms. Martin:

The Department of Energy (DOE) published its Notice of Intent to prepare the *Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Statement* (SPD EIS) in the Federal Register (Vol. 92, No. 99) on May 22, 1997. This SPD EIS is tiered from the *Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Programmatic EIS* (DOE/EIS-0229), issued in December 1996, and the associated Record of Decision (62 FR 3014), issued on January 14, 1997. To summarize, the purpose of the proposed action is to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons proliferation worldwide in an environmentally safe and timely manner by conducting disposition of surplus plutonium in the United States, thus setting a nonproliferation example for other nations.

The SPD Draft EIS, a copy of which is attached for your review, examines twenty-four alternatives and analyzes the potential environmental impacts for the proposed siting, construction, and operation of three types of facilities: pit disassembly and conversion, mixed oxide (MOX) fuel fabrication, and plutonium conversion and immobilization. The Pantex Plant near Amarillo, Texas is a candidate site for receiving the pit conversion and MOX facilities. Alternatives 9A, 9B, and 10 propose locating both the pit conversion and MOX facilities in new construction in Zone 4 at Pantex. Although there are other alternatives that would locate only the pit conversion facility at Pantex, the alternatives that include both facilities have the greater potential for impacts on ecological resources. The candidate sites and alternatives are shown in Table 2-1 of the SPD Draft EIS. Please note that where practical, the modification of existing buildings is being considered.

Preliminary analyses suggest that overall impacts on ecological resources from constructing and operating the proposed surplus plutonium disposition facilities would be limited because the land area required (16 hectares [39 acres]) is relatively small in comparison to regionally available habitat; habitat disturbance would be minimized because construction would take place in previously disturbed or developed areas; and operational impacts would be minimized because facility releases of airborne and aqueous effluents would be controlled and permitted. Section 4.26.3.3 of the SPD Draft EIS presents the ecological resources analysis for Pantex.

Although sources indicate that no critical habitat for any threatened and endangered species exists at Pantex, three special status species (ferruginous hawk, western burrowing owl, and Texas horned lizard) may potentially be found within the areas surrounding Zone 4. Noise disturbance is probably the most important impact affecting local wildlife populations.



Printed with soy ink on recycled paper


As part of DOE's National Environmental Policy Act process, DOE encourages the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department to identify any concerns or issues that it believes should be addressed in the SPD EIS. To facilitate incorporation of your input into the SPD Final EIS, please provide a written response by September 16, 1998.

Please mail your response to:

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Fissile Materials Disposition
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585

If you have any questions, please contact me at (202) 586-0149.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Marcus Jones', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager

cc: Tim Greene, Battelle
Vicky Loucks, DOE



COMMISSIONERS

LEE M. BASS
CHAIRMAN, FT. WORTH

RICHARD (DICK) HEATH
VICE-CHAIRMAN, DALLAS

ERNEST ANGELO, JR.
MIDLAND

JOHN AVILA, JR.
FT. WORTH

MICKEY BURLESON
TEMPLE

RAY CLYMER
WICHITA FALLS

CAROL E. DINKINS
HOUSTON

SUSAN HOWARD-CHRANE
BOERNE

NOLAN RYAN
ALVIN

PERRY R. BASS
CHAIRMAN-EMERITUS
FT. WORTH

ANDREW SANSON
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

*To manage and
conserve the natural
and cultural resources
of Texas for the use and
enjoyment of present
and future generations.*

4200 SMITH SCHOOL ROAD
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78744-3291
512-389-4800
www.tpwd.state.tx.us

March 22, 1999

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of the Interior
Office of Fissile Materials Disposition
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Mr. Jones:

Many, many apologies for the delay, but this letter is in response to your request for information on rare species with regard to the July 1998 Surplus Plutonium Disposition Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Although rare species have been mostly addressed, I am concerned about potential impacts to a few more species than I found indicated in the relevant sections and tables in the SPD EIS. To that end, I have enclosed an annotated list of rare species for Carson County and printouts for known nearby occurrence records. I must stress that protection of playa lake quality in this area is imperative to resident and migratory birds, dependent on these diminishing resources. In addition, please minimize disturbance to the numerous prairie dog towns in the immediate vicinity (see enclosed printouts).

The information included is based on the best data available to the state regarding rare species. However, these data do not provide a definite statement as to the presence or absence of rare species within your project area, nor can these data substitute for an on-site evaluation by qualified biologists. This information is intended to assist you in avoiding harm to species that may occur on your site. **Please do not include species occurrence printouts in your draft or final documents. Because some species are especially sensitive to collection or harassment, these records are for reference only.**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. Again, many apologies for the delay. Please contact me if you have any questions or need additional assistance (512/912-7021 or shannon.breslin@tpwd.state.tx.us).

Sincerely,

Shannon Breslin, Environmental Review Coordinator
Wildlife Diversity Program, Wildlife Division

SLB:sb

enclosures

CELEBRATING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF TEXAS STATE PARKS IN 1980



Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

October 30, 1998

Dr. Rodger Stroup
State Historic Preservation Officer
8301 Parklane Road
Columbia, South Carolina 29223

Subject: *Consultation for Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Analysis Process*

Dear Dr. Stroup:

The purpose of this letter is to notify you that the United States Department of Energy (DOE) is in the process of conducting an Environmental Impact Analysis concerning the disposition of surplus plutonium.

With this letter we are soliciting specific concerns the South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office may have about the proposal. This consultation is in accordance with National Environmental Policy Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The *Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Statement* (SPD EIS) is tiered from the *Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Final Programmatic EIS* (DOE/EIS-0229), issued in December 1996, and the associated Record of Decision (62 FR 3014), issued on January 14, 1997. DOE is producing the SPD EIS in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA, DOE's NEPA Implementing Regulations (10 CFR 1021), and other applicable federal and state environmental legislation.

The purpose and need for the proposed action is to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons proliferation worldwide by disposing of surplus plutonium in the United States in an environmentally safe and timely manner. The SPD Draft EIS, a copy of which is attached for your review, examines the potential environmental impacts for 24 alternatives for the proposed siting, construction, and operation of three types of facilities: pit disassembly and conversion; mixed oxide (MOX) fuel fabrication; and plutonium conversion and immobilization.

If an alternative is selected that includes siting of surplus plutonium disposition facilities at the Savannah River site (e.g., Alternatives 3A or 3B), a maximum of about 31 hectares (77 acres) of land adjacent to the Actinide Packaging and Storage Facility (APSF) in F-Area, would be impacted. Not all areas within the proposed construction



Printed with soy ink on recycled paper

Mr. Rodger Stroup
State Historic Preservation Officer
10/30/98
Page 2

area have been completely surveyed for cultural resources, and this area has a high potential to yield subsurface deposits with cultural material. Based on previous archaeological investigations, four archaeological sites have been recorded in or near the proposed construction areas. One of these sites (38AK546) has been recommended as eligible for nomination to the National Register. All compliance activities, including survey, testing, and impact mitigation would be conducted in accordance with *Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement for the Savannah River Site* (1989).

If you have any specific concerns about the SPD EIS proposal, we would like to hear from you. Please contact me with your concerns or questions at:

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Fissile Materials Disposition
P.O. Box 23786
Washington, DC 20026-3786
(202) 586-0149.

You may also contact Mark Brooks, the Cultural Resources Manager at Savannah River Site, at (803) 725-3724.

Sincerely,

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager

cc: Mark Brooks, Archaeological Program Manager, SRS
Lois Thompson, Federal Preservation Officer, DOE HQ

SPD EIS enclosure



November 12, 1998

Mr. Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager
Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

Re: Consultation for Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact
Analysis Process
Savannah River Site, Aiken County


Dear Mr. Jones:

Thank you for providing the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the disposition of surplus plutonium.

We note that Alternatives 3A and 3B, if selected, will affect the Savannah River Site. If these alternatives are selected, we further note that cultural resources survey, testing, and impact mitigation will be conducted. These measures will be conducted in accordance with the stipulations of the existing Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement for the Savannah River Site.

We look forward to further consultation if Alternatives 3A and 3B are selected. If you have questions, please don't hesitate to call me (803-896-6169) or Staff Archaeologist Bill Green (803/896-6181).

Sincerely,


Nancy Brock, Coordinator
Review and Compliance Programs
State Historic Preservation Office

Cc: Mr. Mark Brooks, Archaeological Program Manager, SRS



Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

October 30, 1998

Mr. Tom Berryhill, Council Member
National Council of the Muskogee Creek
P.O. Box 158
Okmulgee, OK 74447

*Subject: Consultation for Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact
Analysis Process, Under Executive Memorandum Concerning Government-
to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments*

Dear Mr. Berryhill:

The purpose of this letter is to notify you that the United States Department of Energy (DOE) is in the process of conducting an Environmental Impact Analysis concerning the disposition of surplus plutonium.

With this letter we are soliciting specific concerns the National Council of the Muskogee Creek may have about the proposal. This consultation is in accordance with the Executive Memorandum (29 April 1994) entitled, "Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments", and DOE Order 1230.2. It also follows prior consultation initiated for compliance with the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) (PL 95-341) and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) (PL 101-601).

The *Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Statement* (SPD EIS) is tiered from the *Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Final Programmatic EIS* (DOE/EIS-0229), issued in December 1996, and the associated Record of Decision (62 FR 3014), issued on January 14, 1997. DOE is producing the SPD EIS in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA, DOE's NEPA Implementing Regulations (10 CFR 1021), and other applicable federal and state environmental legislation.

The purpose and need for the proposed action is to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons proliferation worldwide by disposing of surplus plutonium in the United States in an environmentally safe and timely manner. The SPD Draft EIS, a copy of which is attached for your review, examines the potential environmental impacts for 24 alternatives for the proposed siting, construction, and operation of three types of facilities: pit disassembly and conversion; mixed oxide (MOX) fuel fabrication; and plutonium conversion and immobilization.



Printed with soy ink on recycled paper

Mr. Tom Berryhill, Council Member
National Council of the Muskogee Creek
10/30/98
Page 2

If an alternative is selected that includes siting of surplus plutonium disposition facilities at the Savannah River Site (e.g., Alternatives 3A or 3B), a maximum of about 31 hectares (77 acres) of land adjacent to the Actinide Packaging and Storage Facility (APSF) in F-Area, would be impacted. No Native American cultural sites are known to exist within the proposed construction area.

If you have any specific concerns about the SPD EIS proposal, we would like to hear from you. Please contact me with your concerns or questions at:

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Fissile Materials Disposition
P.O. Box 23786
Washington, DC 20026-3786
(202) 586-0149

You may also contact A. Ben Gould, Savannah River Site Indian Liaison Officer, at:
(803) 725-3969.

Sincerely,

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager

cc: A. Ben Gould, SRS
Brandt Petrasek, EM-20, DOE HQ

SPD EIS enclosure



Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

October 30, 1998

Ms. Nancy Carnley, Secretary
Ma Chis Lower Alabama Creek Indian Tribe
Route 1
708 S. John Street
New Brockton, Alabama 36351

Subject: Consultation for Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Analysis Process, Under Executive Memorandum Concerning Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments

Dear Ms. Carnley:

The purpose of this letter is to notify you that the United States Department of Energy (DOE) is in the process of conducting an Environmental Impact Analysis concerning the disposition of surplus plutonium.

With this letter we are soliciting specific concerns the Ma Chis Lower Alabama Creek Indian Tribe may have about the proposal. This consultation is in accordance with the Executive Memorandum (29 April 1994) entitled, "Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments", and DOE Order 1230.2. It also follows prior consultation initiated for compliance with the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) (PL 95-341) and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) (PL 101-601).

The *Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Statement* (SPD EIS) is tiered from the *Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Final Programmatic EIS* (DOE/EIS-0229), issued in December 1996, and the associated Record of Decision (62 FR 3014), issued on January 14, 1997. DOE is producing the SPD EIS in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA, DOE's NEPA Implementing Regulations (10 CFR 1021), and other applicable federal and state environmental legislation.

The purpose and need for the proposed action is to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons proliferation worldwide by disposing of surplus plutonium in the United States in an environmentally safe and timely manner. The SPD Draft EIS, a copy of which is attached for your review, examines the potential environmental impacts for 24 alternatives for the proposed siting, construction, and operation of three types of facilities: pit disassembly and conversion; mixed oxide (MOX) fuel fabrication; and plutonium conversion and immobilization.

Ms. Nancy Carnley, Secretary
Ma Chis Lower Alabama Creek Indian Tribe
10/30/98
Page 2

If an alternative is selected that includes siting of surplus plutonium disposition facilities at the Savannah River Site (e.g., Alternatives 3A or 3B), a maximum of about 31 hectares (77 acres) of land adjacent to the Actinide Packaging and Storage Facility (APSF) in F-Area, would be impacted. No Native American cultural sites are known to exist within the proposed construction area.

If you have any specific concerns about the SPD EIS proposal, we would like to hear from you. Please contact me with your concerns or questions at:

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Fissile Materials Disposition
P.O. Box 23786
Washington, DC 20026-3786
(202) 586-0149

You may also contact A. Ben Gould, Savannah River Site Indian Liaison Officer, at: (803) 725-3969.

Sincerely,

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager

cc: A. Ben Gould, SRS
Brandt Petrasek, EM-20, DOE HQ

SPD EIS enclosure



Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

October 30, 1998

Miko Tony Hill
Indian People's Muskogee Tribal Town Confederacy
P.O. Box 14
Okemah, OK 74859

Subject: *Consultation for Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Analysis Process, Under Executive Memorandum Concerning Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments*

Dear Miko Hill:

The purpose of this letter is to notify you that the United States Department of Energy (DOE) is in the process of conducting an Environmental Impact Analysis concerning the disposition of surplus plutonium.

With this letter we are soliciting specific concerns the Indian People's Muskogee Tribal Town Confederacy may have about the proposal. This consultation is in accordance with the Executive Memorandum (29 April 1994) entitled, "Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments", and DOE Order 1230.2. It also follows prior consultation initiated for compliance with the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) (PL 95-341) and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) (PL 101-601).

The *Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Statement* (SPD EIS) is tiered from the *Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Final Programmatic EIS* (DOE/EIS-0229), issued in December 1996, and the associated Record of Decision (62 FR 3014), issued on January 14, 1997. DOE is producing the SPD EIS in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA, DOE's NEPA Implementing Regulations (10 CFR 1021), and other applicable federal and state environmental legislation.

The purpose and need for the proposed action is to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons proliferation worldwide by disposing of surplus plutonium in the United States in an environmentally safe and timely manner. The SPD Draft EIS, a copy of which is attached for your review, examines the potential environmental impacts for 24 alternatives for the proposed siting, construction, and operation of three types of facilities: pit disassembly and conversion; mixed oxide (MOX) fuel fabrication; and plutonium conversion and immobilization.

Miko Tony Hill
Indian People's Muskogee Tribal Town Confederacy
10/30/98
Page 2

If an alternative is selected that includes siting of surplus plutonium disposition facilities at the Savannah River Site (e.g., Alternatives 3A or 3B), a maximum of about 31 hectares (77 acres) of land adjacent to the Actinide Packaging and Storage Facility (APSF) in F-Area, would be impacted. No Native American cultural sites are known to exist within the proposed construction area.

If you have any specific concerns about the SPD EIS proposal, we would like to hear from you. Please contact me with your concerns or questions at:

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Fissile Materials Disposition
P.O. Box 23786
Washington, DC 20026-3786
(202) 586-0149

You may also contact A. Ben Gould, Savannah River Site Indian Liaison Officer, at: (803) 725-3969.

Sincerely,

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager

cc: A. Ben Gould, SRS
Brandt Petrusek, EM-20, DOE HQ

SPD EIS enclosure



Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

October 30, 1998

Ms. Virginia Montoya
Pee Dee Indian Association
101 E. Tatum Avenue
McColl, South Carolina 29570

Subject: *Consultation for Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Analysis Process, Under Executive Memorandum Concerning Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments*

Dear Ms. Montoya:

The purpose of this letter is to notify you that the United States Department of Energy (DOE) is in the process of conducting an Environmental Impact Analysis concerning the disposition of surplus plutonium.

With this letter we are soliciting specific concerns the Pee Dee Indian Association may have about the proposal. This consultation is in accordance with the Executive Memorandum (29 April 1994) entitled, "Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments", and DOE Order 1230.2. It also follows prior consultation initiated for compliance with the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) (PL 95-341) and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) (PL 101-601).

The *Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Statement* (SPD EIS) is tiered from the *Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Final Programmatic EIS* (DOE/EIS-0229), issued in December 1996, and the associated Record of Decision (62 FR 3014), issued on January 14, 1997. DOE is producing the SPD EIS in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA, DOE's NEPA Implementing Regulations (10 CFR 1021), and other applicable federal and state environmental legislation.

The purpose and need for the proposed action is to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons proliferation worldwide by disposing of surplus plutonium in the United States in an environmentally safe and timely manner. The SPD Draft EIS, a copy of which is attached for your review, examines the potential environmental impacts for 24 alternatives for the proposed siting, construction, and operation of three types of facilities: pit disassembly and conversion; mixed oxide (MOX) fuel fabrication; and plutonium conversion and immobilization.



Printed with soy ink on recycled paper

Ms. Virginia Montoya
Pee Dee Indian Association
10/30/98
Page 2

If an alternative is selected that includes siting of surplus plutonium disposition facilities at the Savannah River Site (e.g., Alternatives 3A or 3B), a maximum of about 31 hectares (77 acres) of land adjacent to the Actinide Packaging and Storage Facility (APSF) in F-Area, would be impacted. No Native American cultural sites are known to exist within the proposed construction area.

If you have any specific concerns about the SPD EIS proposal, we would like to hear from you. Please contact me with your concerns or questions at:

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Fissile Materials Disposition
P.O. Box 23786
Washington, DC 20026-3786
(202) 586-0149

You may also contact A. Ben Gould, Savannah River Site Indian Liaison Officer, at: (803) 725-3969.

Sincerely,

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager

cc: A. Ben Gould, SRS
Brandt Petrasek, EM-20, DOE HQ

SPD EIS enclosure



Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

October 30, 1998

Mr. Al Rolland, Project Director
Yuchi Tribal Organization, Inc.
P.O. Box 1990
Sapulpa, OK 74067

Subject: Consultation for Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Analysis Process, Under Executive Memorandum Concerning Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments

Dear Mr. Rolland:

The purpose of this letter is to notify you that the United States Department of Energy (DOE) is in the process of conducting an Environmental Impact Analysis concerning the disposition of surplus plutonium.

With this letter we are soliciting specific concerns the Yuchi Tribal Organization may have about the proposal. This consultation is in accordance with the Executive Memorandum (29 April 1994) entitled, "Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments", and DOE Order 1230.2. It also follows prior consultation initiated for compliance with the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) (PL 95-341) and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) (PL 101-601).

The *Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Statement* (SPD EIS) is tiered from the *Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Final Programmatic EIS* (DOE/EIS-0229), issued in December 1996, and the associated Record of Decision (62 FR 3014), issued on January 14, 1997. DOE is producing the SPD EIS in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA, DOE's NEPA Implementing Regulations (10 CFR 1021), and other applicable federal and state environmental legislation.

The purpose and need for the proposed action is to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons proliferation worldwide by disposing of surplus plutonium in the United States in an environmentally safe and timely manner. The SPD Draft EIS, a copy of which is attached for your review, examines the potential environmental impacts for 24 alternatives for the proposed siting, construction, and operation of three types of facilities: pit disassembly and conversion; mixed oxide (MOX) fuel fabrication; and plutonium conversion and immobilization.



Printed with soy ink on recycled paper

Mr. Al Rolland, Project Director
Yuchi Tribal Organization, Inc.
10/30/98
Page 2

If an alternative is selected that includes siting of surplus plutonium disposition facilities at the Savannah River Site (e.g., Alternatives 3A or 3B), a maximum of about 31 hectares (77 acres) of land adjacent to the Actinide Packaging and Storage Facility (APSF) in F-Area, would be impacted. No Native American cultural sites are known to exist within the proposed construction area.

If you have any specific concerns about the SPD EIS proposal, we would like to hear from you. Please contact me with your concerns or questions at:

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Fissile Materials Disposition
P.O. Box 23786
Washington, DC 20026-3786
(202) 586-0149.

You may also contact A. Ben Gould, Savanna River Site Indian Liaison Officer, at (803) 725-3969.

Sincerely,

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager

cc: A. Ben Gould, SRS
Brandt Petrusek, EM-20, DOE HQ

SPD EIS enclosure



Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

October 30, 1998

Mr. John Ross, Chief Elect
United Keetoowah Band
2450 S. Muskogee
Tahlequah, Oklahoma 74464

Subject: *Consultation for Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Analysis Process, Under Executive Memorandum Concerning Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments*

Dear Mr. Ross:

The purpose of this letter is to notify you that the United States Department of Energy (DOE) is in the process of conducting an Environmental Impact Analysis concerning the disposition of surplus plutonium.

With this letter we are soliciting specific concerns the United Keetoowah Band may have about the proposal. This consultation is in accordance with the Executive Memorandum (29 April 1994) entitled, "Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments", and DOE Order 1230.2. It also follows prior consultation initiated for compliance with the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) (PL 95-341) and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) (PL 101-601).

The *Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Statement* (SPD EIS) is tiered from the *Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Final Programmatic EIS* (DOE/EIS-0229), issued in December 1996, and the associated Record of Decision (62 FR 3014), issued on January 14, 1997. DOE is producing the SPD EIS in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA, DOE's NEPA Implementing Regulations (10 CFR 1021), and other applicable federal and state environmental legislation.

The purpose and need for the proposed action is to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons proliferation worldwide by disposing of surplus plutonium in the United States in an environmentally safe and timely manner. The SPD Draft EIS, a copy of which is attached for your review, examines the potential environmental impacts for 24 alternatives for the proposed siting, construction, and operation of three types of facilities: pit disassembly and conversion; mixed oxide (MOX) fuel fabrication; and plutonium conversion and immobilization.

Mr. John Ross, Chief Elect
United Keetoowah Band
10/30/98
Page 2

If an alternative is selected that includes siting of surplus plutonium disposition facilities at the Savannah River Site (e.g., Alternatives 3A or 3B), a maximum of about 31 hectares (77 acres) of land adjacent to the Actinide Packaging and Storage Facility (APSF) in F-Area, would be impacted. No Native American cultural sites are known to exist within the proposed construction area.

If you have any specific concerns about the SPD EIS proposal, we would like to hear from you. Please contact me with your concerns or questions at:

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Fissile Materials Disposition
P.O. Box 23786
Washington, DC 20026-3786
(202) 586-0149

You may also contact A. Ben Gould, Savannah River Site Indian Liaison Officer, at:
(803) 725-3969.

Sincerely,

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager

cc: A. Ben Gould, SRS
Brandt Petrusek, EM-20, DOE HQ

SPD EIS enclosure



Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

July 28, 1998

Mr. Roger Banks
Field Supervisor
U.S. Department of the Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service
Post Office Box 12559
217 Fort Johnson Road
Charleston, SC 29422-2559

Dear Mr. Banks:

**INFORMAL CONSULTATION UNDER SECTION 7 OF THE ENDANGERED SPECIES
ACT FOR SURPLUS PLUTONIUM DISPOSITION**

The Department of Energy (DOE) published its Notice of Intent to prepare the *Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Statement* (SPD EIS) in the Federal Register (Vol. 92, No. 99) on May 22, 1997. This SPD EIS is tiered from the *Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Programmatic EIS* (DOE/EIS-0229), issued in December 1996, and the associated Record of Decision (62 FR 3014), issued on January 14, 1997. To summarize, the purpose of the proposed action is to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons proliferation worldwide in an environmentally safe and timely manner by conducting disposition of surplus plutonium in the United States, thus setting a nonproliferation example for other nations.

The SPD Draft EIS, a copy of which is attached for your review, examines twenty-four alternatives and analyzes the potential environmental impacts for the proposed siting, construction, and operation of three types of facilities: pit disassembly and conversion, mixed oxide (MOX) fuel fabrication, and plutonium conversion and immobilization. The Savannah River Site (SRS) near Aiken, South Carolina is a candidate site for all three facilities. The candidate sites and alternatives are shown in Table 2-1 of the SPD Draft EIS. Please note that where practical, the modification of existing buildings is being considered.

Alternative 3A proposes locating the three surplus plutonium disposition facilities in new construction adjacent to the Actinide Packaging and Storage Facility in F-Area at SRS. In addition, the canister receipt area at the Defense Waste Processing Facility in S-Area would be modified to accommodate the receipt and processing of the canisters from the plutonium conversion and immobilization facility. Although several alternatives include locating facilities at SRS, Alternative 3A has the greatest potential for impacts on ecological resources.

Preliminary analyses suggest that overall impacts on ecological resources from constructing and operating the proposed surplus plutonium disposition facilities would be limited because the land area required (31 hectares [77 acres]) is relatively small in comparison to regionally available habitat; habitat disturbance would be minimized because construction would take place in



Printed with soy ink on recycled paper

previously disturbed or developed areas; and operational impacts would be minimized because facility releases of airborne and aqueous effluents would be controlled and permitted. Section 4.26.4.3 of the SPD Draft EIS presents the ecological resources analysis for SRS.

Although sources indicate that no critical habitat for any threatened and endangered species exists at SRS, there may be Federal or State-classified special status species in the environs surrounding F-Area. These species include American alligator, bald eagle, Oconee azalea, red-cockaded woodpecker, smooth purple coneflower, and wood stork. Noise disturbance is probably the most important impact affecting local wildlife populations.

Consistent with the Endangered Species Act, DOE requests that the Fish and Wildlife Service provide any additional information on the presence of threatened and endangered animal and plant species, both listed and proposed, in the vicinity of F- and S-Areas at SRS. Information on the habitats of these species would also be appreciated. DOE also requests information on any other species of concern that are known to occur or potentially occur in the vicinity of F- and S-Areas.


As part of DOE's National Environmental Policy Act process, DOE encourages the Fish and Wildlife Service to identify any concerns or issues it believes should be addressed in the SPD EIS. To facilitate incorporation of your input into the SPD Final EIS, please provide a written response by September 16, 1998.

Please mail your response to:

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Fissile Materials Disposition
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585

If you have any questions, please contact me at (202) 586-0149.

Sincerely,



Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager

cc: John B. Gladden, WSRC
David P. Roberts, DOE



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

P.O. Box 12559

217 Fort Johnson Road

Charleston, South Carolina 29422-2559

September 8, 1998

Mr. Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Fissile Materials Disposition
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585

Re: FWS Log No. 4-6-98-364, Surplus Plutonium Disposition, Savannah River Site (SRS),
Aiken County, South Carolina

Dear Mr. Jones:

We have reviewed the information received August 4, 1998 concerning the above-referenced project in Aiken County, South Carolina. The following comments are provided in accordance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 661-667e), and Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531-1543), as well as, general comments from the review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

As indicated in your August 4 letter there is potential habitat for federally protected species within the action area of your proposed project. Therefore, we are providing you with the list of the federally endangered (E) and threatened (T) species which potentially occur in Aiken South Carolina (Table 1) and the habitat information you requested (Table 2). The list also includes species of concern under review by the Service. Species of concern (SC) are not legally protected under the Endangered Species Act, and are not subject to any of its provisions, including Section 7, until they are formally proposed or listed as endangered/threatened. We are including these species in our response for the purpose of giving you advance notification. These species may be listed in the future, at which time they will be protected under the Endangered Species Act. Therefore, it would be prudent for you to consider these species early in project planning to avoid any adverse effects.

TABLE 1. SOUTH CAROLINA COUNTY DISTRIBUTION RECORDS OF ENDANGERED, THREATENED, AND CANDIDATE SPECIES FOR AIKEN COUNTY

Updated July 18, 1996

These lists should be used only as a guideline. The lists include known occurrences and areas where the species has a high possibility of occurring. Records are updated continually and may be different from the following.

Aiken County		
Bald eagle (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>)	T	Known
Wood stork (<i>Mycteria americana</i>)	E	Known
Red-cockaded woodpecker (<i>Picoides borealis</i>)	E	Known
Shortnose sturgeon (<i>Acipenser brevirostrum</i>)*	O	Known
Relict trillium (<i>Trillium reliquum</i>)	E	Known
Piedmont bishop-weed (<i>Ptilimnium nodosum</i>)	E	Known
Smooth coneflower (<i>Echinacea laevigata</i>)	E	Known
Rafinesque's big-eared bat (<i>Corynorhinus rafinesquii</i>)	SC	Possible
Southeastern myotis (<i>Myotis austroriparius</i>)	SC	Possible
Loggerhead shrike (<i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>)	SC	Possible
Painted bunting (<i>Passerina ciris</i>)	SC	Known
Gopher tortoise (<i>Gopherus polyphemus</i>)	SC	Known
Gopher frog (<i>Rana areolata capito</i>)	SC	Known
Aphodius tortoise commensal scarab (<i>Aphodius troglodytes</i>)	SC	Possible
Onthophagus tortoise commensal scarab (<i>Onthophagus polyphemi</i>)	SC	Possible
Georgia aster (<i>Aster georgianus</i>)	SC	Possible
Sandhills milk-vetch (<i>Astragalus michauxii</i>)	SC	Possible
Chapman's sedge (<i>Carex chapmanii</i>)	SC	Possible
Burhead (<i>Echinodorus tenellus</i> var. <i>parvulus</i>)	SC	Known
Stream-bank spider-lily (<i>Hymenocallis coronaria</i>)	SC	Known
Bog spicebush (<i>Lindera subcoriacea</i>)	SC	Known
Boykin's lobelia (<i>Lobelia boykinii</i>)	SC	Possible
Carolina birds-in-a nest (<i>Macbridea caroliniana</i>)	SC	Known
Loose watermilfoil (<i>Myriophyllum laxum</i>)	SC	Known
Pickering's morning-glory (<i>Stylisma pickeringii</i>)	SC	Known
Meadow rue (<i>Thalictrum subrotundum</i>)	SC	Known
American sandfiltering mayfly (<i>Dolania americana</i>)	SC	
Arogos Skipper (<i>Atrytone Arogos Arogos</i>)	SC	Known

E=Endangered; T=Threatened; SC=Service has on file limited evidence to support proposals for listing these species; O=Contact National Marine Fisheries Service.

TABLE 2. HABITAT, FRUITING/FLOWERING PERIOD & COUNTY OCCURRENCES

Scientific Name	Common Name	Federal Status
<u>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</u>	Bald eagle	E
Associated with coasts, rivers, lakes, usually nesting near bodies of water where it feeds. Aiken, Barnwell, Beaufort, Berkeley, Calhoun, Charleston, Chesterfield, Clarendon, Colleton, Dorchester, Fairfield, Georgetown, Jasper, Kershaw, Lexington, Marion, McCormick, Newberry, Oconee, Orangeburg, Pickens, Richland, Sumter, Williamsburg.		
<u>Mycteria americana</u>	Wood stork	E
Freshwater and brackish wetlands, primarily nesting in cypress or mangrove swamps. Feeding in freshwater marshes, flooded pastures, flooded ditches. Aiken, Allendale, Barnwell, Beaufort, Berkeley, Charleston, Colleton, Dorchester, Georgetown, Hampton, Horry, Jasper, Marion, Williamsburg.		
<u>Picoides borealis</u>	Red-cockaded woodpecker	E
Open stands of pines 60+ years old provide roosting/nesting habitat. Foraging habitat is pine and pine/hardwood stands 30+ year old. Aiken, Allendale, Bamberg, Barnwell, Beaufort, Berkeley, Calhoun, Charleston, Chesterfield, Clarendon, Colleton, Darlington, Dillon, Dorchester, Edgefield, Florence, Georgetown, Hampton, Horry, Jasper, Kershaw, Laurens, Lee, Lexington, Marion, Marlboro, McCormick, Orangeburg, Richland, Saluda, Sumter, Williamsburg.		
<u>Alligator mississippiensis</u>	American alligator	T(S/A)
Rivers systems, canals, lakes, swamps.		
<u>Echinacea laevigata</u>	Smooth coneflower	E
Piedmont- mountains. Basic or circumneutral soils (Hayesville, Cecil, Porter, Madison) of meadows and woodlands. Successful colonies are almost always at sites featuring open, bare soil, a fairly high soil pH, and exposures allowing optimal sunshines. Late May-July. Aiken, Allendale, Anderson, Barnwell, Lancaster, Lexington, Oconee, Pickens, Richland.		

From review of the DEIS for this project, it does not appear that the proposed siting or construction of the proposed facilities represent a substantial risk to federally listed or proposed endangered or threatened plant or animal species. In view of this, we believe that the requirements of Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act have been satisfied. However, obligations under Section 7 of the Act must be reconsidered if (1) new information reveals


impacts of this identified action that may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner not previously considered, (2) this action is subsequently modified in a manner which was not considered in this assessment, or (3) a new species is listed or critical habitat determined that may be affected by the identified action.

In addition, the operation of these facilities and the subsequent disposition of large quantities of immobilized plutonium in geologic repositories at the SRS, may impact the future quality of the environment at the site. The DEIS does not fully address the issues associated with geological disposition and therefore they are not a part of this consultation. Once the issue of disposition in geologic repositories is addressed we would be glad to consult with DOE and provide any information necessary for the assessment of potential impacts to the environment.

Also, the DEIS does not present an adequate analysis of potential environmental impacts to the non-human environment. While human health is considered throughout the document, ecological health is rarely discussed. This presumably occurred due to the assumption that environmental receptors are not present within the action area. This assumption does suggest that substantial environmental impacts are improbable in the action area, but does not justify the exclusion of this analysis as a part of the environmental impact assessment. We suggest that the final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) reflect that appropriate consideration was given not only to the human environment, but the ecological environment as well.

Your interest in ensuring the protection of endangered and threatened species and our nation's valuable wetland resources is appreciated. We hope this letter and the accompanying information on endangered and threatened species will be useful in project development. If you require further assistance please contact Mr. Rusty Jeffers of my staff at (803) 727-4707 ext. 20. In future correspondence concerning the project, please reference FWS Log No. 4-6-98-364.

Sincerely yours,


Edwin M. EuDaly
Acting Field Supervisor

EME/RDJ/km



Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

July 28, 1998

Mr. Tom Murphy
South Carolina Department of Natural Resources
Lower Coastal Wildlife Diversity
585 Donnelley Drive
Green Pond, SC 29446

Dear Mr. Murphy:

The Department of Energy (DOE) published its Notice of Intent to prepare the *Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Statement* (SPD EIS) in the Federal Register (Vol. 92, No. 99) on May 22, 1997. This SPD EIS is tiered from the *Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Programmatic EIS* (DOE/EIS-0229), issued in December 1996, and the associated Record of Decision (62 FR 3014), issued on January 14, 1997. To summarize, the purpose of the proposed action is to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons proliferation worldwide in an environmentally safe and timely manner by conducting disposition of surplus plutonium in the United States, thus setting a nonproliferation example for other nations.

The SPD Draft EIS, a copy of which is attached for your review, examines twenty-four alternatives and analyzes the potential environmental impacts for the proposed siting, construction, and operation of three types of facilities: pit disassembly and conversion, mixed oxide (MOX) fuel fabrication, and plutonium conversion and immobilization. The Savannah River Site (SRS) near Aiken, South Carolina is a candidate site for all three facilities. The candidate sites and alternatives are shown in Table 2-1 of the SPD Draft EIS. Please note that where practical, the modification of existing buildings is being considered.

Alternative 3A proposes locating the three surplus plutonium disposition facilities in new construction adjacent to the Actinide Packaging and Storage Facility in F-Area at SRS. In addition, the canister receipt area at the Defense Waste Processing Facility in S-Area would be modified to accommodate the receipt and processing of the canisters from the plutonium conversion and immobilization facility. Although several alternatives include locating facilities at SRS, Alternative 3A has the greatest potential for impacts on ecological resources.

Preliminary analyses suggest that overall impacts on ecological resources from constructing and operating the proposed surplus plutonium disposition facilities would be limited because the land area required (31 hectares [77 acres]) is relatively small in comparison to regionally available habitat; habitat disturbance would be minimized because construction would take place in previously disturbed or developed areas; and operational impacts would be minimized because facility releases of airborne and aqueous effluents would be controlled and permitted. Section 4.26.4.3 of the SPD Draft EIS presents the ecological resources analysis for SRS.



Printed with soy ink on recycled paper

Although sources indicate that no critical habitat for any threatened and endangered species exists at SRS, there may be Federal or State-classified special status species in the environs surrounding F-Area. These species include American alligator, bald eagle, Oconee azalea, red-cockaded woodpecker, smooth purple coneflower, and wood stork. Noise disturbance is probably the most important impact affecting local wildlife populations.

As part of DOE's National Environmental Policy Act process, DOE encourages the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources to identify any concerns or issues it believes should be addressed in the SPD EIS. To facilitate incorporation of your input into the SPD Final EIS, please provide a written response by September 16, 1998.

Please mail your response to:

Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Fissile Materials Disposition
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585

If you have any questions, please contact me at (202) 586-0149.

Sincerely,



Marcus Jones
SPD EIS Document Manager

cc: John B. Gladden, WSRC
David P. Roberts, DOE

Appendix P
Environmental Synopsis

**ENVIRONMENTAL SYNOPSIS
OF INFORMATION PROVIDED IN RESPONSE TO
THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR
MOX FUEL FABRICATION AND REACTOR IRRADIATION SERVICES**

April 1999

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In the aftermath of the Cold War, significant quantities of weapons-usable fissile materials (primarily plutonium and highly enriched uranium) have become surplus to national defense needs both in the United States and Russia. President Clinton announced, on September 27, 1993, the establishment of a framework for United States efforts to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. As key elements of the President's policy, the United States will:

- X Seek to eliminate, where possible, accumulation of stockpiles of highly enriched uranium and plutonium,
- X Ensure that where these materials already exist, they are subject to the highest standards of safety, security, and international accountability, and
- X Initiate a comprehensive review of long-term options for plutonium disposition, taking into account technical, nonproliferation, environmental, budgetary, and economic considerations.

In January 1994, President Clinton and Russian President Yeltsin agreed that the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems represent an acute threat to international security. They declared that both Nations would cooperate actively and closely with each other, and also with other interested nations, for the purpose of preventing and reducing this threat.

The Secretary of Energy and the Congress took action in October 1994 to create a permanent Office of Fissile Materials Disposition (MD) within the Department of Energy (DOE) to focus on the important national security objective of eliminating surplus weapons-usable fissile materials. As one of its major responsibilities, MD is tasked with determining how to disposition surplus weapons-usable plutonium. In January 1997, DOE issued a Record of Decision (ROD) for the *Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (S&D PEIS)*¹. In that decision document, DOE decided to pursue a strategy that would allow for the possibility of both the immobilization of surplus plutonium and the use of surplus plutonium as mixed oxide (MOX) fuel in existing domestic, commercial reactors. In July, 1998, DOE issued the *Draft Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Statement (SPD Draft EIS)*² which analyzes sites for plutonium disposition activities and plutonium disposition technologies to support this strategy.

To support the timely undertaking of the surplus plutonium disposition program, DOE initiated a procurement action to contract for fuel fabrication and reactor irradiation services. On May 19, 1998, DOE issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for these services (Solicitation Number DE-RP02-

¹ DOE/EIS-0229; December 1996

² DOE/EIS-0283D; July 1998

98CH10888). The services requested in this procurement process include design, licensing, construction, operation, and eventual decontamination and decommissioning of a MOX facility as well as irradiation of the MOX fuel in existing domestic, commercial reactors should the decision be made by DOE in the SPD EIS ROD to go forward with the MOX program.

In accordance with DOE's National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations (10 CFR 1021.216), DOE required offerors to submit reasonably available environmental data and analyses as a part of their proposals. DOE independently evaluated and verified the accuracy of the data provided by the offeror in the competitive range, and prepared and considered an Environmental Critique before the procurement selection was made.

As required by Section 216, the Environmental Critique included a discussion of the purpose of the procurement; the salient characteristics of the offeror's proposal; any licenses, permits or approvals needed to support the program; and an evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of the offer. In March 1999, after considering the Environmental Critique, DOE awarded a contract for MOX fuel fabrication and reactor irradiation services. Under this contract, MOX fuel would be fabricated at a DOE site to be selected in the SPD EIS ROD and then irradiated in six domestic commercial nuclear reactors at three commercial reactor sites. Additionally, under the contract only limited activities may be performed prior to issuance of the SPD EIS ROD. These activities include non-site-specific work primarily associated with the development of the initial conceptual design for the fuel fabrication facility, and plans (paper studies) for outreach, long lead-time procurements, regulatory management, facility quality assurance, safeguards, security, fuel qualifications, and deactivation. There would be no construction started on a MOX fuel fabrication facility until the SPD EIS ROD is issued. The MOX facility, if built, would be government-owned, licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), and located at one of four candidate DOE sites.

This Synopsis is based on the Environmental Critique and provides a publicly available assessment of the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposal based on an independent review of the representations and data contained in the proposal. The Synopsis serves as a record that DOE has considered the environmental factors and potential consequences of the reasonable alternatives analyzed during the selection process. The Synopsis will be filed with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and made publicly available. The Synopsis will also be incorporated into a Supplement to the SPD Draft EIS, which is to be issued in the near future.

2.0 ASSESSMENT METHODS

The analyses in this Synopsis (and in the Environmental Critique) were performed using information submitted by the offeror in the competitive range, independently developed information, publicly available information, and standard computer models and techniques.

In order to evaluate the reasonableness of the offeror's projected environmental impacts compared to those projected by DOE, the offeror's data for the MOX facility was compared to information in the SPD Draft EIS; for the use of MOX fuel in domestic commercial reactors, the offeror's data was compared to

information in the S&D PEIS.³

Data developed independently to support these analyses include the projection of populations around the proposed reactor sites⁴ and information related to the topography surrounding the proposed reactor sites for evaluating air dispersal patterns. Information was also provided by Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) on the expected ratio of radionuclide activities in MOX fuel compared to that in low enriched uranium (LEU) fuel for use in reactor accident analyses. Standard models for determining radiation doses from normal operations and accident scenarios, and air pollutant concentrations at the proposed disposition facility sites and reactors were run using data provided by the offeror. Reactor accident analyses assumed a 40 percent MOX core because this is a conservative estimate of the amount of MOX fuel that would be used in each of the reactors. The environmental analyses were prepared using the following computer models: GENII for estimating radiation doses to the public from normal operation of the MOX fuel fabrication facility and the proposed reactors; MACCS2 for design-basis and beyond-design-basis accident analyses at the proposed reactors; and ISC3 and SCREEN3 for estimated air pollutant concentrations as a result of normal MOX facility and reactor operations.

3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE OFFER

The offeror has proposed to build a MOX facility on a DOE site⁵ with subsequent irradiation services being provided in six existing reactors at three commercial nuclear power plants in the Eastern United States.

The proposed MOX facility design, which is based on an existing MOX facility in France, will be modified to meet U.S. regulations. Under the proposed design, plutonium dioxide powder would be received from DOE's proposed pit disassembly and conversion facility. The plutonium dioxide would be aqueously processed (polished) to ensure that it meets the agreed-to fuel specification for MOX fuel. Following the polishing step, the plutonium in solution would then be converted back into plutonium dioxide. At that point, the process proposed by the offeror would be similar to that described in Chapter 2 of the SPD Draft EIS⁶. The plutonium dioxide would be mixed with uranium dioxide and formed into MOX fuel pellets.

³ Such information is also summarized in the SPD Draft EIS.

⁴ Population projections for the area encompassed in a 50-mile radius around the proposed reactor sites were projected to 2015 to approximate the mid-point of the irradiation services program. By 2015, the MOX program would be firmly established at all of the proposed reactor sites and would be expected to remain stable through the end of the program. Using 1990 census data as the base year and state-provided population increase factors for all counties included in this analysis, the population around the sites was projected for 2015. Baseline projections were needed for two of the reactor sites because the population information provided in the proposal was based on 1970 census data. Recent (i.e., 1990) census data were provided for the other proposed site and projected by the offeror to the years 2010 and 2020. From these data points, 2015 projections were interpolated.

⁵ This site would be selected in the SPD EIS ROD. As explained in the SPD Draft EIS, DOE's preference is to locate the MOX fuel fabrication plant at DOE's Savannah River site.

⁶ The SPD Draft EIS also included evaluation of an aqueous processing facility in Appendix N, that could be added to either the pit conversion or the MOX facility. Based on public comments received and information presented by the offeror subsequent to the release of the SPD Draft EIS, DOE is now considering whether to add the aqueous polishing process to the front end of the MOX facility. The environmental impacts associated with this option will be presented in Chapter 4 of the SPD Final EIS.

These pellets would be baked at high temperature, ground to exact dimensions, then loaded into fuel rods. The MOX fuel rods would then be bundled with standard LEU fuel rods to form MOX fuel assemblies. The MOX fuel assemblies would be shipped to the proposed reactor sites in DOE-provided safe, secure transport vehicles on a near just-in-time basis to minimize the amount of time the fresh MOX fuel would be stored at a reactor site prior to loading into the reactor.

Three sites, each with two operating pressurized light water reactors (PWRs), have been proposed for MOX fuel irradiation. The proposed sites are: the Catawba nuclear generation station near York, South Carolina; the McGuire nuclear generation station near Huntersville, North Carolina; and the North Anna nuclear generation station near Mineral, Virginia. All of these sites have been operating safely for a number of years. Table 1 provides some general information about each of the proposed plants.

Table 1. Reactor Plant Operating Information

Plant	Operator	Capacity (net MWe)	Date of First Operation (mo/yr)
Catawba No. 1	Duke Power Co.	1,129	01/85
Catawba No. 2	Duke Power Co.	1,129	05/86
McGuire No. 1	Duke Power Co.	1,129	07/81
McGuire No. 2	Duke Power Co.	1,129	05/83
North Anna No. 1	Virginia Power Co.	900	04/78
North Anna No. 2	Virginia Power Co.	887	08/80

Table 2 shows the results of the most recent Systematic Assessment of Licensee Performance performed by NRC for each of the proposed reactors. As can be seen in this table, all the proposed reactors have been operated and maintained in a safe manner.

Table 2. Systematic Assessment of Licensee Performance Results

	Catawba	McGuire	North Anna
Date of Latest SALP	06/97	04/97	02/97
Operations	Superior	Superior	Superior
Maintenance	Good	Good	Superior
Engineering	Superior	Good	Good
Plant Support	Superior	Superior	Superior

As proposed by the offeror, both MOX and LEU fuel assemblies would be loaded into the reactor. The MOX fuel assemblies are scheduled to remain in the core for two 18-month cycles and the LEU assemblies for either two or three cycles. After completing a normal (full) fuel cycle, the spent MOX fuel assemblies would be removed from the reactor in accordance with the plant's standard refueling procedures and placed in the plant's spent fuel pool for cooling along with other spent fuel. The offeror has stated that no changes are expected in the plant's spent fuel storage plans to accommodate the spent MOX fuel. Eventually, the fuel would be shipped to a potential geologic repository to be developed by DOE for permanent disposal of commercial spent fuel.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Human health risk, waste management, land use, infrastructure requirements, accidents, air quality, water quality, and socioeconomics have been evaluated in this Synopsis. Cultural, paleontological and ecological resources, and transportation requirements are not expected to be impacted other than as discussed in the SPD Draft EIS and were not evaluated in this Synopsis. Although four sites are being considered by DOE for the proposed MOX facility, this Environmental Synopsis focuses primarily on environmental impacts at DOE's Savannah River Site (SRS) for the potential MOX facility because, as stated in Section 1.6 of the SPD Draft EIS, it is DOE's preferred location for the MOX facility. However, this Synopsis also discusses non-radiological impacts at other potential MOX facility sites, where appropriate. Unless otherwise noted, impacts would likely be similar at other sites.

4.1 MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility

4.1.1 Human Health Risk

The annual radiological dose from normal operations to the general population residing within 50 miles of the proposed MOX facility at the preferred site, SRS, was calculated based on radiological emissions estimated by the offeror. The major contributor to this dose would be attributable to the offeror's estimated annual release of 0.25 mg of plutonium.⁷ In contrast to the "atmospheric release only" assumption presented in the SPD Draft EIS, the MOX facility data provided by the offeror includes both liquid and airborne releases because the proposed process includes some aqueous processing. Table 3 shows the projected radiological dose that would be received by the general population as a result of normal operations of the MOX facility proposed by the offeror.

The average individual living within 50 miles of the SRS site would be expected to receive an annual dose of 2.3×10^{-4} mrem/yr from normal operation of the MOX facility. The maximally exposed individual (MEI) would be expected to receive an annual dose of 3.7×10^{-3} mrem/yr from operation of the MOX facility at SRS. This dose is well below regulatory limits, which require doses resulting from DOE operations to be below 10 mrem/yr from airborne pathways, 4 mrem/yr from drinking water pathways, and 100 mrem/yr from all pathways combined. The additional dose to the general population would also be small in comparison with the average dose received from other SRS activities. For example, in 1997, the average individual living within 50 miles of SRS received a dose of 1.4×10^{-2} mrem/yr from site activities. (SPD Draft EIS, pg. 3-141)

⁷The isotopic distribution of the potential plutonium releases were modeled based on the isotopic distribution developed by Los Alamos National Laboratory for use in the SPD Draft EIS.

Table 3. Estimated Radiological Impacts on the Public from Operations of the MOX Facility at SRS

	Maximally Exposed Ind. (mrem/yr)	Latent Fatal Cancer Risk from 10 Year Operating Life	Est. Dose to Pop. within 50 mi. radius (person-rem/yr)	Latent Fatal Cancers from 10 Year Operating Life	Avg. Dose to Ind. within 50 mi. radius (mrem/yr)	Latent Fatal Cancer Risk from 10 Year Operating Life
Offeror	3.7×10^{-3}	1.9×10^{-8}	0.181	9.1×10^{-4}	2.3×10^{-4}	1.2×10^{-9}
SPD Draft EIS*	3.1×10^{-4}	1.6×10^{-9}	0.029	1.5×10^{-4}	3.7×10^{-5}	1.9×10^{-10}
SRS Base**	0.2	1.0×10^{-6}	8.6	4.3×10^{-2}	1.4×10^{-2}	7.0×10^{-8}

* Includes contributions from polishing process discussed in Appendix N in addition to those shown in Chapter 4.

** SPD Draft EIS pg. 3-141

Table 4 shows the potential radiological impacts on involved workers at the proposed MOX facility conservatively calculated from 1997 data from the offeror's European operating facility. As shown in Table 4, the average radiation worker at the offeror's proposed MOX facility would receive an annual dose of 65 mrem/yr from normal operations. The offeror has stated that in 1997 the maximum dose to an individual worker at the offeror's MOX facility was 885 mrem, well below the DOE administrative control level of 2,000 mrem/yr and the Federal regulatory limit of 5,000 mrem/yr. The offeror also estimates that fewer radiation workers would be needed to operate the MOX facility than indicated in the SPD Draft EIS. The offeror estimates that approximately 330 radiation workers would be required, rather than the 410 estimated in the SPD Draft EIS.⁸

Table 4. Potential Radiological Impacts on Involved Workers from Operations of the MOX Facility

	No. of Radiation Workers	Average Worker Dose (mrem/yr)	Latent Fatal Cancer Risk from 10 Years of Operation	Total Dose to Workers (person-rem/yr)	Latent Fatal Cancers from 10 Years of Operations
Offeror	330	65	2.6×10^{-4}	22	0.088
SPD Draft EIS*	410	500	2.0×10^{-3}	205	0.82
SRS Base**	12,500	19	7.6×10^{-5}	237	0.95

* Includes contributions from polishing process discussed in Appendix N in addition to the doses shown in Chapter 4.

** SPD Draft EIS pg. 3-142.

4.1.2 Accidents

Design-basis and beyond-design-basis accidents were evaluated in the SPD Draft EIS for the MOX facility and the aqueous plutonium polishing process. Accidents evaluated for the MOX facility included a criticality, fires, and earthquakes. A spill, an uncontrolled reaction resulting in an explosion, a criticality, and an earthquake were evaluated for the plutonium polishing process. Any of these accidents could occur

⁸ Although it is estimated that about 385 personnel would be required to operate the facility, only about 330 of the 385 would be considered radiation workers.

in the proposed MOX facility since it would use similar processes.

Including the plutonium polishing process in the MOX facility as proposed by the offeror would make a criticality the bounding design-basis accident for the facility. As shown in Table 5, no major radiological impacts to the general population would be expected from design-basis accidents at the proposed MOX facility. The frequency of this accident, a criticality in solution, is estimated to be between 1 in 10,000 and 1 in 1,000,000 per year.

The bounding beyond-design-basis accident would be an earthquake of sufficient magnitude to collapse the MOX facility. An earthquake of this magnitude would be expected to result in major radiological impacts. However, an earthquake of this magnitude would also be expected to result in widespread damage across the site and throughout the surrounding area. The frequency of an earthquake of this magnitude is estimated to be between 1 in 100,000 and 1 in 10,000,000 per year. Table 5 shows the impact of this accident on SRS. At the other candidate sites, the estimated dose to the general population from this accident would range from 2.0×10^3 to 5.7×10^4 with the corresponding number of LCFs expected to range from 1.0 to 28 LCFs. The maximum dose to a person at the site boundary at the time of the accident would be expected to range from 16 to 25 rem with a corresponding risk of latent cancer fatality of 8.0×10^{-3} to 1.2×10^{-2} . A noninvolved worker would be exposed to a dose in the range of 2.2×10^2 to 6.4×10^2 rem with a corresponding risk of latent cancer fatality of 8.8×10^{-2} to 2.3×10^{-1} .

Table 5. Bounding Accidents for the Proposed MOX Facility

	Noninvolved Worker (rem)	Probability of Cancer Fatality per Accident	Estimated Dose at Site Boundary (rem)	Probability of Cancer Fatality per Accident	Estimated Dose to Pop. Within 50 mi. radius (person-rem)	Latent Cancer Fatalities per Accident
Criticality at SRS*	3.0×10^{-1}	1.2×10^{-4}	1.6×10^{-2}	8.0×10^{-6}	1.6×10^1	8.0×10^{-3}
Beyond-design-basis earthquake**	2.2×10^2	8.8×10^{-2}	8.9	4.5×10^{-3}	2.1×10^4	10.6

*SPD Draft EIS pg. N-15

**SPD Draft EIS pgs. K-50 and N-15

No major consequences for the maximally exposed involved worker would be expected from leaks, spills, and smaller fires. These accidents are such that involved workers would be able to evacuate immediately or would not be affected by the events. However, explosions could result in immediate injuries from flying debris, as well as the uptake of plutonium and uranium particulates through inhalation. If a criticality were to occur, workers within tens of meters could receive very high to fatal radiation exposures from the initial neutron burst. The dose would strongly depend on the magnitude of the criticality (number of fissions), the distance from the criticality, and the amount of shielding provided by the structures and equipment between the workers and the criticality. Earthquakes could also result in substantial consequences to workers, ranging from workers being killed by collapsing equipment and structures to high radiation exposures and uptakes of radionuclides. For all but the most severe accidents, immediate emergency response actions should reduce the magnitude of the consequences to workers near the accident.

4.1.3 Waste Management

The MOX facility would be expected to produce TRU waste, low-level radioactive waste (LLW), mixed LLW, hazardous waste and sanitary waste in the course of its normal operations. As shown in Table 6, the offeror's estimated generation rates for radioactive wastes are consistent with those estimated in the SPD Draft EIS. None of these estimates is expected to impact the proposed sites in terms of their ability to handle these wastes. The ability to store, treat, and/or dispose of radioactive waste is limited at Pantex. If Pantex were chosen as the site for the MOX facility, the wastes would presumably be handled as discussed in the SPD Draft EIS. TRU waste would have to be stored in the MOX facility until it could be shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) for permanent disposal. Mixed LLW would be handled in the same manner as current mixed waste that is shipped offsite for treatment and disposal. LLW would be treated and stored onsite until shipped to the Nevada Test Site or a commercial facility for disposal.⁹

Table 6. Estimated Annual Waste Generation Rates

	TRU Waste	Mixed LLW	LLW	Hazardous Waste	Sanitary Waste
Offeror					
Liquid (l/yr)	500	0	300	1,200	11 million
Solid (m ³ /yr)	~67	3	94	0.1	150
SPD Draft EIS*					
Liquid (l/yr)	0.5	0.1 1	0.3	1,740	18 million
Solid (m ³ /yr)	~67	3	94	1.2	440
SRS Generation Rate**					
Liquid (l/yr)	na	na	na	Na	416 million
Solid (m ³ /yr)	431	1,135	10,043	74	6,670

na – not available

*Includes contributions from the polishing process discussed in Appendix N of the SPD Draft EIS, in addition to the wastes shown in Chapter 4.

**SPD Draft EIS pg. 3-130.

4.1.4 Land Use

It is estimated that a total of 6.2 hectares (15.3 acres) would be needed for the MOX facility. This estimate includes 1.0 hectares (2.5 acres) for the process building, 0.2 hectares (0.58 acres) for support facilities, and 5 hectares (12.4 acres) for parking and a security buffer. This is very close to the 6.0 hectares (14.9 acres) estimated in the SPD Draft EIS (pg. E-10). As indicated in the SPD Draft EIS, there is sufficient space available to accommodate the proposed MOX facility at any of the candidate sites.

⁹ DOE would ensure that any such disposal would be consistent with the RODs for the *Final Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Managing Treatment, Storage, and Disposal of Radioactive and Hazardous Waste*, DOE/EIS-0200F, May 1997.

4.1.5 Infrastructure Requirements

The proposed MOX facility would use electricity, natural gas, water, and fuel oil. As shown in Table 7, the offeror's proposed facility would use more of these materials than estimated in the SPD Draft EIS.

Table 7. Estimated MOX Facility Infrastructure Requirements

	Electricity (MWh/yr)	Natural Gas (m ³ /yr)	Water (10 ⁶ l/yr)	Fuel Oil (l/yr)
Offeror	30,000	1,070,000	68	63,000
SPD Draft EIS*	17,520	920,000	44	43,000
SRS F-Area Available Capacity**	482,700	na***	1,216	na****

*Includes contributions from the polishing process as discussed in Appendix N in addition to the infrastructure requirements shown in Chapter 4.

**SPD Draft EIS pg. 3-165.

***Heat in F-Area provided by steam.

****Fuel oil trucked in as needed and stored at MOX facility.

4.1.5 Air Quality

Operation of the proposed MOX facility would result in the release of a small amount of nonradiological air pollutants that would be expected to slightly increase the ambient air pollutant concentrations at the selected site. The majority of these pollutants would be associated with routine maintenance and testing runs of the facility's emergency diesel generator and emissions from facility heating. Table 8 shows the estimated increases in ambient air pollutant concentrations for the proposed facility and the national standards for these pollutants. The projected emissions are a very small fraction of the national standards. Although some small radionuclide discharges are expected from the proposed MOX facility, these discharges are not expected to have a major impact on air quality. As explained in Section 4.1.1, these discharges would result in a very small dose to the general public.

Table 8. Estimated Nonradiological Ambient Air Pollutant Concentrations from the Proposed MOX Facility

	Carbon Monoxide 8 hour 1 hour	Nitrogen Dioxide Annual	PM ₁₀ Annual 24 hour	Sulfur Dioxide Annual 24 hour 3 hour
National Ambient Air Quality Standards ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	10,000 40,000	100	50 150	80 365 1,300
Offeror ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	0.123 0.371	0.011	0.001 0.011	0.039 0.531 1.39
SPD Draft EIS* ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	0.109 0.345	0.011	0.001 0.010	0.031 0.420 1.11
SRS Base** ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	64 279	9.3	4.14 56.4	15.1 219 962

*Includes contributions from the polishing process discussed in Appendix N in addition to the pollutant concentrations shown in Chapter 4.

**SPD Draft EIS pg. 4-6

4.1.6 Water Quality

Table 9 shows a comparison of water resources information described in the SPD Draft EIS to that provided by the offeror. Although the proposed water use is higher than that analyzed in the SPD Draft EIS, the amount of water needed is estimated to be from 0.9 to 6.0 percent of the site's estimated annual water requirements. Therefore, the additional water use is not expected to have a major impact on water resources. Although some small radionuclide discharges are expected from the proposed MOX facility, these discharges are not expected to have a major impact on water quality. As explained in Section 4.1.1, these discharges would result in a very small dose to the general public.

Table 9. Comparison of Water Resources Information for the MOX Facility

	Water Use (10 ⁶ liters/yr)	Sanitary Wastewater Discharged (10 ⁶ liters/yr)	Radionuclide Emissions to Water (Ci)
SPD Draft EIS	44	18	0
Offeror	68	11	0.0025

4.1.7 Socioeconomics

The proposed MOX facility would employ about 385 workers, somewhat fewer than the 435 workers estimated in the SPD Draft EIS. An increase of 385 workers would not be expected to have a major impact on any of the candidate sites. At three of the four candidate sites (i.e., INEEL, Pantex, and SRS), the workforce is projected to be falling at the same time the proposed MOX facility would begin operations. The additional MOX facility workers would help mitigate the negative socioeconomic impacts

associated with such reductions. The SPD Draft EIS concluded that, at Hanford, although the increase in workforce requirements for proposed surplus plutonium disposition facilities (including MOX) would coincide with an increase in the site's overall workforce (as a result of the planned tank waste remediation system), the projected changes would not have a major impact on the level of community services currently offered in the region of influence. (SPD Draft EIS pg. 4-37)

4.2 Proposed Reactor Sites

The offeror is proposing to use a partial MOX core (up to approximately 40 percent of the fuel in the core at equilibrium) in each of the proposed reactors. The S&D PEIS analyzed a full MOX core at a generic reactor site.

4.2.1 Human Health Risk

Risk to human health was assessed for the proposed reactor sites based on information provided by the offeror and compared to the generic reactor information in the S&D PEIS. The offeror stated that there would be no difference in dose to the general public from normal operations based on the use of MOX fuel versus LEU fuel in the proposed reactors. This is consistent with findings in the S&D PEIS that showed a very small range in the expected difference (-1.1×10^{-2} to 2×10^{-2} person-rem, S&D PEIS pg. 4-729). The doses shown in this section reflect the projected dose in the year 2015.

The annual radiological dose from normal operations to the general population residing within 50 miles of the proposed reactor sites was estimated based on radiological emissions estimated by the offeror. As shown in Table 10, the average individual living within 50 miles of one of the proposed reactor sites could expect to receive an annual dose of between 2.7×10^{-3} to 9.9×10^{-3} mrem/yr from normal operation of these reactors regardless of whether the reactors were using MOX fuel or LEU fuel.

Table 10. Estimated Dose to the General Population from Normal Operations of the Proposed Reactors in the Year 2015 (Partial MOX or LEU Core)

	Maximally Exposed Individual (mrem/yr)	Latent Fatal Cancer Risk	Est. Dose to Pop. within 50 mi. radius (person-rem/yr)	Annual Number of Latent Cancer Fatalities	Avg. Dose to Ind. within 50 mi. radius (mrem/yr)
Catawba ^a	0.73	3.7×10^{-7}	6.1	3.1×10^{-3}	2.7×10^{-3}
McGuire ^b	0.31	1.6×10^{-7}	10.7	5.4×10^{-3}	4.2×10^{-3}
North Anna ^c	0.37	1.9×10^{-7}	20.3	1.0×10^{-2}	9.9×10^{-3}
S&D PEIS (high)*	0.17	8.5×10^{-8}	2.0	1.0×10^{-3}	7.8×10^{-4}

*S&D PEIS pg. 4-729

^a The population for the year 2015 is estimated to be 2,265,000.

^b The population for the year 2015 is estimated to be 2,575,000.

^c The population for the year 2015 is estimated to be 2,042,000.

The offeror also stated that the workers at the proposed reactor sites would be expected to receive about the same amount of radiation dose as a result of their job activities regardless of the plant's decision to use

MOX fuel. As shown in Table 11, the average radiation worker at the proposed reactor sites could expect to receive an annual dose of between 46 and 123 mrem/yr from normal operations. This is lower than the worker dose range estimated in the S&D PEIS (281 to 543 mrem/yr). The offeror's statement that the use of MOX fuel would not change the estimated worker dose is consistent with data presented in the S&D PEIS that showed an incremental increase in worker dose of less than 0.1 percent due to the use of MOX fuel. (S&D PEIS pg. 4-730)

Table 11. Estimated Dose to Workers from Normal Operations of the Proposed Reactors with MOX Fuel

	No. of Radiation Workers*	Total Dose to Workers (person-rem/ year)	Annual Number of Latent Cancer Fatalities	Average Worker Dose (mrem/yr)	Annual Latent Fatal Cancer Risk
Catawba	3,400	265	0.11	78	3.1×10^{-5}
McGuire	4,000	492	0.20	123	4.9×10^{-5}
North Anna	2,240	103	0.041	46	1.8×10^{-5}
S&D PEIS (high)**	2,220	1,204	0.48	543	2.2×10^{-4}

*The number of radiation workers at the proposed reactor sites was estimated based on the total dose to workers given by the offeror divided by the average worker dose, also supplied by the offeror.

**S&D PEIS pg. 4-730; adjusted to reflect a two reactor site for comparison to the proposed reactor sites.

4.2.2 Accidents

Two design-basis accidents, a large break loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA) and a fuel handling accident (FHA), were evaluated for the Environmental Critique and are reflected in this Synopsis. These accidents were chosen because they are the limiting reactor and non-reactor design-basis accidents at the proposed facilities. As shown in Tables 12 through 14, only small increases in the estimated impacts would be expected from a LOCA at the proposed reactor sites due to the use of MOX fuel. In a FHA, the consequences (defined as latent cancer fatalities) would decrease as a result of using MOX fuel rather than LEU fuel. This is because the end-of-cycle krypton inventory is less in MOX fuel than in LEU fuel and krypton is one of the greatest contributors to radiation dose from a FHA.

Beyond-design-basis accidents, if they were to occur, would be expected to result in major impacts to workers, the surrounding communities, and the environment regardless of whether the reactor was using a LEU or a partial MOX core. As shown in Tables 15 through 17, the probability of a beyond-design-basis accident happening and the risk to an individual living within 50 miles of the proposed reactors is very low.

The largest estimated risk of a latent cancer fatality for the maximally exposed individual (MEI) at any of the proposed reactors is estimated to be 2.86×10^{-5} for a steam generator tube rupture at one of the North Anna reactors when using a partial MOX core. If this same accident were to happen at the reactor when it was using a LEU core, the estimated risk would be 2.46×10^{-5} . In either case, the risk of a latent cancer fatality is estimated to be less than 3 in 100,000 over the 16 year period the reactors would be using MOX fuel.

For beyond-design-basis accidents, the scenarios that lead to containment bypass or failure were evaluated because these are the accidents with the greatest potential consequences. The public and environmental consequences would be significantly less for accident scenarios that do not lead to containment bypass or failure. A steam generator tube rupture, early containment failure, late containment failure, and an interfacing systems loss-of-coolant accident (ISLOCA) were chosen as the representative set of beyond-design-basis accidents.

Commercial reactors, licensed by the NRC are required to complete Individual Plant Examinations (IPE) to assess plant vulnerabilities to severe accidents. An acceptable method of completing the IPEs is to perform a probabilistic risk assessment (PRA). A PRA analysis evaluates, in full detail (quantitatively), the consequences of all potential events caused by the operating disturbances (known as internal initiating events) within each plant. The PRA uses realistic criteria and assumptions in evaluating the accident progression and the systems required to mitigate each accident. The PRAs for the proposed reactors provided the required data to evaluate beyond-design-basis accidents.

As shown in Table 18, the difference in accident consequences for reactors using MOX fuel versus LEU fuel is generally very small. For beyond-design-basis accidents, the consequences would be expected to be slightly higher, with the largest increase associated with an ISLOCA. This is because the MOX fuel will release a higher actinide inventory in a severe accident. The impacts of an ISLOCA are estimated to be about 10 to 15 percent (an average of about 13 percent) greater to the general population living within 50 miles of the reactor operating with a partial MOX core instead of a LEU core. It should be noted that this accident has a very low estimated frequency of occurrence, an average of 1 in 3.2 million per year of reactor operation for the reactors being proposed.

Table 12. Design-Basis Accident Impacts for Catawba with LEU and Mixed Oxide Fuels

Accident Release Scenario	Accident Scenario Frequency (per year)	LEU or MOX Core	Noninvolved Worker			Maximally Exposed Offsite Individual			Population		
			Dose (rem)	Probability of Latent Cancer Fatality Given Dose to Noninvolved Worker ¹	Risk of Latent Cancer Fatality (over campaign) ²	Dose (rem)	Probability of Latent Cancer Fatality Given Dose at Site Boundary ¹	Risk of Latent Cancer Fatality (over campaign) ²	Dose (person-rem)	Number of Latent Cancer Fatalities in the Population within 80 km ³	Risk of Latent Cancer Fatalities (over campaign) ⁴
Loss-of-Coolant Accident	7.50×10^{-6}	LEU	3.78	1.51×10^{-3}	1.81×10^{-7}	1.44	7.20×10^{-4}	8.64×10^{-8}	$3.64 \times 10^{+3}$	1.82	2.19×10^{-4}
		MOX	3.85	1.54×10^{-3}	1.86×10^{-7}	1.48	7.40×10^{-4}	8.88×10^{-8}	$3.75 \times 10^{+3}$	1.88	2.26×10^{-4}
Spent Fuel Handling Accident ⁵	1.00×10^{-4}	LEU	0.275	1.10×10^{-4}	1.78×10^{-7}	0.138	6.90×10^{-5}	1.10×10^{-7}	$1.12 \times 10^{+2}$	5.61×10^{-2}	8.98×10^{-5}
		MOX	0.262	1.05×10^{-4}	1.68×10^{-7}	0.131	6.55×10^{-5}	1.05×10^{-7}	$1.10 \times 10^{+2}$	5.48×10^{-2}	8.77×10^{-5}

¹ Increased likelihood (probability) of cancer fatality to a hypothetical individual - a noninvolved worker at a distance of 640 meters or the maximally exposed offsite individual located at the site boundary (762 m) - if exposed to the indicated dose.

² Increased likelihood (probability) of cancer fatality over the estimated 16 year campaign (frequency weighted) to a hypothetical individual - a noninvolved worker at a distance of 640 meters or the maximally exposed offsite individual located at the site boundary (762 m).

³ Estimated number of cancer fatalities in the entire offsite population out to a distance of 80 kilometers (50 miles) if exposed to the indicated dose.

⁴ Estimated number of cancer fatalities over the estimated 16 year campaign (frequency weighted) in the entire offsite population out to a distance of 80 kilometers (50 miles).

⁵ Accident scenario frequency estimated in lieu of plant specific data.

Table 13. Design-Basis Accident Impacts for McGuire with LEU and Mixed Oxide Fuels

Accident Release Scenario	Accident Scenario Frequency (per year)	LEU or MOX Core	Noninvolved Worker			Maximally Exposed Offsite Individual			Population		
			Dose (rem)	Probability of Latent Cancer Fatality Given Dose to Noninvolved Worker ¹	Risk of Latent Cancer Fatality (over campaign) ²	Dose (rem)	Probability of Latent Cancer Fatality Given Dose at Site Boundary ¹	Risk of Latent Cancer Fatality (over campaign) ²	Dose (person-rem)	Number of Latent Cancer Fatalities in the Population within 80 km ³	Risk of Latent Cancer Fatalities (over campaign) ⁴
Loss-of-Coolant Accident	1.50×10^{-5}	LEU	5.31	2.12×10^{-3}	5.10×10^{-7}	2.28	1.14×10^{-3}	2.74×10^{-7}	$3.37 \times 10^{+3}$	1.68	4.03×10^{-4}
		MOX	5.46	2.18×10^{-3}	5.25×10^{-7}	2.34	1.17×10^{-3}	2.82×10^{-7}	$3.47 \times 10^{+3}$	1.73	4.16×10^{-4}
Spent Fuel Handling Accident ⁵	1.00×10^{-4}	LEU	0.392	1.57×10^{-4}	2.51×10^{-7}	0.212	1.06×10^{-4}	1.70×10^{-7}	99.1	4.96×10^{-2}	7.94×10^{-5}
		MOX	0.373	1.49×10^{-4}	2.38×10^{-7}	0.201	1.01×10^{-4}	1.62×10^{-7}	97.3	4.87×10^{-2}	7.79×10^{-5}

¹ Increased likelihood (probability) of cancer fatality to a hypothetical individual - a noninvolved worker at a distance of 640 meters or the maximally exposed offsite individual located at the site boundary (762 m) - if exposed to the indicated dose.

² Increased likelihood (probability) of cancer fatality over the estimated 16 year campaign (frequency weighted) to a hypothetical individual - a noninvolved worker at a distance of 640 meters or the maximally exposed offsite individual located at the site boundary (762 m).

³ Estimated number of cancer fatalities in the entire offsite population out to a distance of 80 kilometers (50 miles) if exposed to the indicated dose.

⁴ Estimated number of cancer fatalities over the estimated 16 year campaign (frequency weighted) in the entire offsite population out to a distance of 80 kilometers (50 miles).

⁵ Accident scenario frequency estimated in lieu of plant specific data.

Table 14. Design-Basis Accident Impacts for North Anna with LEU and Mixed Oxide Fuels

Accident Release Scenario	Accident Scenario Frequency (per year)	LEU or MOX Core	Noninvolved Worker			Maximally Exposed Offsite Individual			Population		
			Dose (rem)	Probability of Latent Cancer Fatality Given Dose to Noninvolved Worker ¹	Risk of Latent Cancer Fatality (over campaign) ²	Dose (rem)	Probability of Latent Cancer Fatality Given Dose at Site Boundary ¹	Risk of Latent Cancer Fatality (over campaign) ²	Dose (person-rem)	Number of Latent Cancer Fatalities in the Population within 80 km ³	Risk of Latent Cancer Fatalities (over campaign) ⁴
Loss-of-Coolant Accident	2.10×10^{-5}	LEU	0.114	4.56×10^{-5}	1.53×10^{-8}	3.18×10^{-2}	1.59×10^{-5}	5.34×10^{-9}	39.4	1.97×10^{-2}	6.62×10^{-6}
		MOX	0.115	4.60×10^{-5}	1.55×10^{-8}	3.20×10^{-2}	1.60×10^{-5}	5.38×10^{-9}	40.3	2.02×10^{-2}	6.78×10^{-6}
Spent Fuel Handling Accident ⁵	1.00×10^{-4}	LEU	0.261	1.04×10^{-4}	1.66×10^{-7}	9.54×10^{-2}	4.77×10^{-5}	7.63×10^{-8}	29.4	1.47×10^{-2}	2.35×10^{-5}
		MOX	0.239	9.56×10^{-5}	1.53×10^{-7}	8.61×10^{-2}	4.31×10^{-5}	6.90×10^{-8}	27.5	1.38×10^{-2}	2.21×10^{-5}

¹ Increased likelihood (probability) of cancer fatality to a hypothetical individual - a noninvolved worker at a distance of 640 meters or the maximally exposed offsite individual located at the site boundary (1349 m) - if exposed to the indicated dose.

² Increased likelihood (probability) of cancer fatality over the estimated 16 year campaign (frequency weighted) to a hypothetical individual - a noninvolved worker at a distance of 640 meters or the maximally exposed offsite individual located at the site boundary (1349 m).

³ Estimated number of cancer fatalities in the entire offsite population out to a distance of 80 kilometers (50 miles) if exposed to the indicated dose.

⁴ Estimated number of cancer fatalities over the estimated 16 year campaign (frequency weighted) in the entire offsite population out to a distance of 80 kilometers (50 miles).

⁵ Accident scenario frequency estimated in lieu of plant specific data.

Table 15. Beyond-Design-Basis Accident Impacts for Catawba with LEU and Mixed Oxide Fuels

Accident Release Scenario	Accident Scenario Frequency (per year)	LEU or MOX Core	Maximally Exposed Offsite Individual			Population		
			Dose (rem)	Probability of Latent Cancer Fatality Given Dose at Site Boundary ¹	Risk of Latent Cancer Fatality (over campaign) ²	Dose (person-rem)	Number of Latent Cancer Fatalities in the Population within 80 km ³	Risk of Latent Cancer Fatalities (over campaign) ⁴
Steam Generator Tube Rupture ⁵	6.31×10^{-10}	LEU	$3.46 \times 10^{+2}$	0.346	3.49×10^{-9}	$5.71 \times 10^{+6}$	$2.86 \times 10^{+3}$	2.88×10^{-5}
		MOX	$3.67 \times 10^{+2}$	0.367	3.71×10^{-9}	$5.93 \times 10^{+6}$	$2.96 \times 10^{+3}$	2.99×10^{-5}
Early Containment Failure	3.42×10^{-8}	LEU	5.97	2.99×10^{-3}	1.63×10^{-9}	$7.70 \times 10^{+5}$	$3.85 \times 10^{+2}$	2.11×10^{-4}
		MOX	6.01	3.01×10^{-3}	1.65×10^{-9}	$8.07 \times 10^{+5}$	$4.04 \times 10^{+2}$	2.21×10^{-4}
Late Containment Failure	1.21×10^{-5}	LEU	3.25	1.63×10^{-3}	3.15×10^{-7}	$3.93 \times 10^{+5}$	$1.96 \times 10^{+2}$	3.79×10^{-2}
		MOX	3.48	1.74×10^{-3}	3.38×10^{-7}	$3.78 \times 10^{+5}$	$1.89 \times 10^{+2}$	3.66×10^{-2}
Interfacing System Loss of Cooling Accident	6.90×10^{-8}	LEU	$1.40 \times 10^{+4}$	1	1.10×10^{-6}	$2.64 \times 10^{+7}$	$1.32 \times 10^{+4}$	1.46×10^{-2}
		MOX	$1.60 \times 10^{+4}$	1	1.10×10^{-6}	$2.96 \times 10^{+7}$	$1.48 \times 10^{+4}$	1.63×10^{-2}

¹ Increased likelihood (probability) of cancer fatality to the maximally exposed offsite individual located at the site boundary (762 m) - if exposed to the indicated dose.

² Increased likelihood (probability) of cancer fatality over the estimated 16 year campaign (frequency weighted) to a hypothetical individual - a noninvolved worker at a distance of 640 meters or the maximally exposed offsite individual located at the site boundary (762 m).

³ Estimated number of cancer fatalities in the entire offsite population out to a distance of 80 kilometers (50 miles) if exposed to the indicated dose.

⁴ Estimated number of cancer fatalities over the estimated 16 year campaign (frequency weighted) in the entire offsite population out to a distance of 80 kilometers (50 miles).

⁵ McGuire timing and release fractions were used to compare like scenarios.

Table 16. Beyond-Design-Basis Accident Impacts for McGuire with LEU and Mixed Oxide Fuels

Accident Release Scenario	Accident Scenario Frequency (per year)	LEU or MOX Core	Maximally Exposed Offsite Individual			Population		
			Dose (rem)	Probability of Latent Cancer Fatality Given Dose at Site Boundary ¹	Risk of Latent Cancer Fatality (over campaign) ²	Dose (person-rem)	Number of Latent Cancer Fatalities in the Population within 80 km ³	Risk of Latent Cancer Fatalities (over campaign) ⁴
Steam Generator Tube Rupture	5.81×10^{-9}	LEU	6.10×10^2	0.610	5.66×10^{-8}	5.08×10^6	2.54×10^3	2.37×10^{-4}
		MOX	6.47×10^2	0.647	6.02×10^{-8}	5.28×10^6	2.64×10^3	2.45×10^{-4}
Early Containment Failure	9.89×10^{-8}	LEU	12.2	6.10×10^{-3}	9.65×10^{-9}	7.90×10^5	3.95×10^2	6.26×10^{-4}
		MOX	12.6	6.30×10^{-3}	9.97×10^{-9}	8.04×10^5	4.02×10^2	6.37×10^{-4}
Late Containment Failure	7.21×10^{-6}	LEU	2.18	1.09×10^{-3}	1.26×10^{-7}	3.04×10^5	1.52×10^2	1.76×10^{-2}
		MOX	2.21	1.11×10^{-3}	1.28×10^{-7}	2.96×10^5	1.48×10^2	1.71×10^{-2}
Interfacing System Loss of Cooling Accident	6.35×10^{-7}	LEU	1.95×10^4	1	1.02×10^{-5}	1.79×10^7	8.93×10^3	0.091
		MOX	2.19×10^4	1	1.02×10^{-5}	1.97×10^7	9.85×10^3	0.10

¹ Increased likelihood (probability) of cancer fatality to the maximally exposed offsite individual located at the site boundary (762 m) - if exposed to the indicated dose.

² Increased likelihood (probability) of cancer fatality over the estimated 16 year campaign (frequency weighted) to a hypothetical individual - a noninvolved worker at a distance of 640 meters or the maximally exposed offsite individual located at the site boundary (762 m).

³ Estimated number of cancer fatalities in the entire offsite population out to a distance of 80 kilometers (50 miles) if exposed to the indicated dose.

⁴ Estimated number of cancer fatalities over the estimated 16 year campaign (frequency weighted) in the entire offsite population out to a distance of 80 kilometers (50 miles).

Table 17. Beyond-Design-Basis Accident Impacts for North Anna with LEU and Mixed Oxide Fuels

Accident Release Scenario	Accident Scenario Frequency (per year)	LEU or MOX Core	Maximally Exposed Offsite Individual			Population		
			Dose (rem)	Probability of Latent Cancer Fatality Given Dose at Site Boundary ¹	Risk of Latent Cancer Fatality (over campaign) ²	Dose (person-rem)	Number of Latent Cancer Fatalities in the Population within 80 km ³	Risk of Latent Cancer Fatalities (over campaign) ⁴
Steam Generator Tube Rupture ⁵	7.38×10 ⁻⁶	LEU	2.09×10 ⁺²	0.209	2.46×10 ⁻⁵	1.73×10 ⁺⁶	8.63×10 ⁺²	0.102
		MOX	2.43×10 ⁺²	0.243	2.86×10 ⁻⁵	1.84×10 ⁺⁶	9.20×10 ⁺²	0.109
Early Containment Failure ⁵	1.60×10 ⁻⁷	LEU	19.6	1.96×10 ⁻²	5.02×10 ⁻⁸	8.33×10 ⁺⁵	4.17×10 ⁺²	1.07×10 ⁻³
		MOX	21.6	2.16×10 ⁻²	5.54×10 ⁻⁸	8.42×10 ⁺⁵	4.21×10 ⁺²	1.08×10 ⁻³
Late Containment Failure ⁵	2.46×10 ⁻⁶	LEU	1.12	5.60×10 ⁻⁴	2.21×10 ⁻⁸	4.04×10 ⁺⁴	20.2	7.95×10 ⁻⁴
		MOX	1.15	5.75×10 ⁻⁴	2.26×10 ⁻⁸	4.43×10 ⁺⁴	22.1	8.70×10 ⁻⁴
Interfacing System Loss of Cooling Accident ⁵	2.40×10 ⁻⁷	LEU	1.00×10 ⁺⁴	1	3.84×10 ⁻⁶	4.68×10 ⁺⁶	2.34×10 ⁺³	8.99×10 ⁻³
		MOX	1.22×10 ⁺⁴	1	3.84×10 ⁻⁶	5.41×10 ⁺⁶	2.70×10 ⁺³	1.04×10 ⁻²

¹ Increased likelihood (probability) of cancer fatality to the maximally exposed offsite individual located at the site boundary (1349 m) - if exposed to the indicated dose.

² Increased likelihood (probability) of cancer fatality over the estimated 16 year campaign (frequency weighted) to a hypothetical individual - a noninvolved worker at a distance of 640 meters or the maximally exposed offsite individual located at the site boundary (1349 m).

³ Estimated number of cancer fatalities in the entire offsite population out to a distance of 80 kilometers (50 miles) if exposed to the indicated dose.

⁴ Estimated number of cancer fatalities over the estimated 16 year campaign (frequency weighted) in the entire offsite population out to a distance of 80 kilometers (50 miles).

⁵ McGuire release durations and warning times were used in lieu of site specific data.

Table 18. Ratio of Accident Impacts for Mixed Oxide Fueled and Uranium Fueled Reactors (Mixed Oxide Impacts/LEU Impacts)

	Catawba		McGuire		North Anna		S&D PEIS	
Accident Scenario	MEI	Population	MEI	Population	MEI	Population	MEI	Population
Design-Basis Accidents								
Loss-of-Coolant Accident	1.03	1.03	1.01	1.03	1.03	1.03	NA	NA
Fuel Handling Accident	0.95	0.98	0.90	0.94	0.95	0.98	NA	NA
Beyond-Design-Basis Accidents								
Steam Generator Tube Rupture	1.06	1.04	1.16	1.07	1.06	1.04	0.94	0.94
Early Containment Failure	1.01	1.05	1.10	1.01	1.03	1.02	0.96	0.97
Late Containment Failure	1.07	0.96	1.03	1.09	1.01	0.97	1.07	1.08
Interfacing System Loss of Cooling Accident	1.14	1.12	1.22	1.15	1.12	1.10	0.92	0.93

Key: MEI – Maximally Exposed Individual; NA – not available

Note: The number 1 represents the consequences equal to the accident occurring in the proposed reactors with an LEU core

Table 19 shows the number of prompt fatalities estimated from a postulated ISLOCA and a beyond-design-basis steam generator tube rupture. As shown in this table, the differences due to the use of MOX fuel rather than LEU are small. None of the other accidents evaluated in this Synopsis are expected to result in prompt fatalities.

Table 19. Estimated Prompt Fatalities from Beyond-Design-Basis Reactor Accidents

Reactor Site	LEU Core	MOX Core
Steam Generator Tube Rupture		
Catawba	1	1
McGuire	1	1
North Anna	0	0
Interfacing System Loss of Cooling Accident		
Catawba	815	843
McGuire	398	421
North Anna	54	60

4.2.3 Waste Management

The proposed reactors would be expected to continue to produce mixed LLW, LLW, hazardous waste, and nonhazardous waste as part of their normal operations. According to the offeror, the volume of waste generated is not expected to increase as a result of the reactors using MOX fuel. This is consistent with information presented in the S&D PEIS that stated the use of MOX fuel is not expected to increase the amount or change the content of the waste being generated. (S&D PEIS, pg. 4-734) Table 20 shows the annual waste volume that would be generated during operation of the proposed reactors.

Table 20. Estimated Waste Generation Rates

Reactor Site	Mixed LLW (m ³ /yr)	LLW (m ³ /yr)	Hazardous Waste (m ³ /yr)	Nonhazardous Waste Solid (m ³ /yr)
Catawba (per unit)	0.3	25	15	455
McGuire (per unit)	0.1	21	14	568
North Anna (per unit)	0.0	118	6	5,200
S&D PEIS*	na	178	na	na

na - not available.

*S&D PEIS pg. 4-734.

As shown in Table 20, the estimated LLW generation for each of the proposed reactors is less than the amount estimated in the S&D PEIS. None of these waste estimates are expected to impact the proposed reactor sites in terms of their ability to handle these wastes. The wastes would continue to be handled in the same manner as they are today with no change required due to the use of MOX fuel at the reactors.

4.2.4 Spent Fuel

As shown in Table 21, it is likely that some additional spent fuel would be generated by using a partial MOX core in the proposed reactors. The amount of additional spent nuclear fuel generated is estimated to range from approximately 2 to 16 percent of the total amount of spent fuel that would be generated by the proposed reactors during the time period MOX fuel would be used. The offeror intends to manage the spent MOX fuel the same as its spent LEU fuel, by storing it in the reactor's spent fuel pool or in dry storage. According to the offeror, the amount of additional spent fuel is not expected to impact spent fuel management at the reactor sites.

Table 21. Total Additional Spent Fuel Assemblies Generated for the MOX Fuel Option

	Number of Spent Fuel Assemblies Generated with no MOX Fuel	Number of Additional Spent Fuel Assemblies with MOX Fuel	Percent Increase
<i>S&D PEIS (based on a shorter fuel cycle)</i>			
Typical PWR*	48/yr	32/yr	66.7%
<i>Offeror's Reactors</i>			
Total Over MOX Campaign	3,732	199	5.3%

*S&D PEIS pg. 4-734

For the four units at Catawba and McGuire, all of the additional spent nuclear fuel assemblies would be generated during the transition cycles from LEU to MOX fuel. Additional assemblies help to maintain peaking below design and regulatory limits, and compensate for the greater end-of-cycle reactivity. Once equilibrium is reached in the partial MOX core, additional fuel assemblies would not be required.

Like Catawba and McGuire, the North Anna units are expected to require additional LEU assemblies during the first transition cores. However, additional assemblies will also be required during equilibrium cycles because the smaller North Anna cores (157 fuel assemblies compared to 193 each for the McGuire and Catawba units) are more prone to neutron leakage and provide less flexibility with respect to meeting power peaking limits.

As designs are finalized and optimized for MOX fuel it may be possible to reduce MOX fuel assembly peaking and thereby reduce the number of additional assemblies required (and spent fuel generated) at the proposed reactors. As it currently stands, the North Anna site could generate approximately 16 percent more spent fuel by using MOX fuel than if the plants continued to use LEU fuel. The total amount of additional spent fuel generated by all six proposed reactors is estimated to be approximately 92 metric tons heavy metal. However, such MOX spent fuel is included in the inventory for the potential Nuclear Waste Policy Act geologic repository being studied by DOE. DOE is in the process of completing an environmental impact statement for a geologic repository.

4.2.5 Land Use

The offeror has stated that the proposed reactor sites would not require any additional land to support the use of MOX fuel in their reactors. This statement is consistent with information presented in the S&D PEIS. (S&D PEIS, pg. 4-720)

4.2.6 Infrastructure Requirements

The offeror has stated that the proposed reactor sites would not require any additional infrastructure to support the use of MOX fuel in their reactors. This statement is consistent with information presented in the S&D PEIS. (S&D PEIS, pg. 4-721)

4.2.7 Air Quality

Continued operation of the proposed reactor sites would result in a small amount of nonradiological air pollutants being released to the atmosphere, mainly due to the requirement to periodically test emergency diesel generators. The estimated air pollutants resulting from operation of the proposed reactors would not be expected to increase due to the use of MOX fuel in these reactors. Table 22 shows the estimated air pollutant concentrations and the national standards for these pollutants at the proposed sites. The impact of radiological releases is included in Section 4.2.1.

Table 22. Nonradiological Ambient Air Pollutant Concentrations with or without MOX Fuel from the Continued Operation of the Proposed Reactors

	Carbon Monoxide 8 hour 1 hour	Nitrogen Dioxide Annual	PM ₁₀ Annual 24 hour	Sulfur Dioxide Annual 24 hour 3 hour
National Ambient Air Quality Standards ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	10,000 40,000	100	50 150	80 365 1,300
Catawba ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	978 1400	3.26	0.102 65.4	0.0418 26.9 60.4
McGuire ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	1060 1510	2.6	0.08 71.2	0.03 29.9 67.4
North Anna ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	416 594	0.01	0.004 15.4	0.02 63 142

4.2.8 Water Quality

The offeror stated that there would be no change in water usage or discharge of nonradiological pollutants resulting from use of MOX fuel in the proposed reactors. Each of the reactor sites discharges nonradiological wastewater in accordance with a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

(NPDES) Permit, or an analogous state-issued permit. Permitted outfalls discharge conventional and priority pollutants from the reactor and ancillary processes that are similar to discharges from most reactor sites. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs) for North Anna (May 1994 through April 1998) and Catawba (calendar years 1995 through 1997) showed that for the most part, there were only occasional noncompliances with permit limitations, only one of which occurred at an outfall receiving reactor process discharges. (The offeror did not provide DMRs for McGuire.) During the period reviewed, Catawba experienced four noncompliances, two in 1995 and two in early 1996. North Anna has exceeded the chlorine limitation at its sewage treatment facility, but this would neither affect nor be affected by, the use of MOX fuel. The impact of radiological releases is included in Section 4.2.1.

4.2.9 Socioeconomics

The offeror has stated that the proposed reactor sites would not need to employ any additional workers to support the use of MOX fuel in their reactors so there would not be any expected socioeconomic impacts. This statement is consistent with information presented in the S&D PEIS which concluded that the use of MOX fuel could result in small increases in the worker population at the reactor sites (between 40 and 105), but that any increase would be filled from the area's existing workforce. Therefore, there would be little impact on the local economy and communities (S&D PEIS, pgs. 4-727).

5.0 REQUIRED PERMITS AND LICENSES

Both the MOX fabrication facility and the selected reactors will require permitting and licensing activities to support the proposed fabrication and use of MOX fuel. The MOX fabrication facility will be constructed and operated at an existing DOE-owned site, but will be licensed by the NRC. The selected reactors are all U.S. operating, commercial PWRs, licensed by the NRC. The MOX facility, in particular, has special licensing considerations apart from most facilities that are built and operated in the United States today. This section discusses the particular licensing and permitting requirements of both facilities.

Both DOE and NRC have their origins in the Atomic Energy Act (AEA). The AEA first established their predecessor agency, the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) to promote and regulate the use of atomic energy in the United States. The AEC was subsequently split into two organizations that have since become DOE and NRC. DOE was authorized to manage defense-related nuclear activities, while NRC was given the responsibility of regulating civilian uses of nuclear materials. Both DOE and NRC publish their regulations in Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), with NRC publishing in Parts 0–199, and DOE, Parts 200–1099. DOE supplements its regulations with a series of Orders, while NRC uses Regulatory Guides to further establish specific methods of implementation of its regulations. The proposed actions that are the subject of this Synopsis are unique in that DOE and NRC each have regulatory responsibility for certain parts of the activities.

The AEA authorizes DOE to establish standards to protect health or minimize dangers to life or property for activities under DOE's jurisdiction. Through a series of DOE orders and regulations, an extensive system of standards and requirements has been established to ensure safe operation of facilities. The DOE orders have been revised and reorganized to reduce duplication and eliminate obsolete provisions (though some older orders remain in effect during the transition). For DOE orders, the new organization is by Series and is generally intended to include all DOE policies, manuals, requirements documents, notices,

guides, and orders. For proposed actions involving fuel qualification, relevant DOE regulations include 10 CFR 820, Procedural Rules for DOE Nuclear Activities; 10 CFR 830, Nuclear Safety Management; 10 CFR.834, Radiation Protection of the Public and the Environment (Draft); 10 CFR 835, Occupational Radiation Protection; 10 CFR 1021, Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act; and 10 CFR 1022, Compliance with Floodplains/Wetlands Environmental Review Requirements. DOE orders include those in new Series 400, which deals with Work Process; and within this Series, DOE Order 420.1 addresses Facility Safety; 425.1 addresses Startup and Restart of Nuclear Facilities; 452.1A addresses Nuclear Explosive and Weapons Surety Programs; 452.2A addresses the Safety of Nuclear Explosives Operations; 452.4 addresses the Security and Control of Nuclear Explosives; 460.1A addresses Packaging and Transportation Safety; 470.1 addresses the Safeguards and Security Program; and 474.1 addresses the Control and Accountability of Nuclear Materials. In addition, DOE (older number) Series 5400 addresses environmental, safety, and health programs for DOE operations. Not all of these DOE regulations and orders would apply to operation of the proposed MOX fuel fabrication facility, and most would not apply to use of the proposed reactors.

There are a number of Federal environmental statutes dealing with environmental protection, compliance, or consultation. In addition, certain environmental requirements have been delegated to state authorities for enforcement and implementation. Certain statutes and regulations require DOE to consult with Federal, State, and local agencies and federally recognized Native American groups. Most of these consultations are related to biotic resources, cultural resources, and Native American resources. Biotic resources consultations generally pertain to the potential for activities to disturb sensitive species or habitats. Cultural resources consultations relate to the potential for disruption of important cultural resources and archaeological sites. Finally, Native American consultations are concerned with the potential for disturbance of Native American sites and resources. DOE has conducted appropriate consultations at the candidate sites and will report the results of these consultations in the SPD Final EIS.

It is DOE policy to conduct its operations in an environmentally safe manner in compliance with all applicable statutes, regulations, and standards. Although this chapter does not address pending or future regulations, DOE recognizes that the regulatory environment is subject to change, and that the construction, operation, and decommissioning of any surplus plutonium disposition facility must be conducted in compliance with all applicable regulations and standards.

5.1 Regulatory Activities

It is likely that new or modified permits will be needed before the proposed surplus plutonium disposition facilities may be constructed or operated. Permits regulate many aspects of facility construction and operations, including the quality of construction, treatment and storage of hazardous waste, and discharges of effluents to the environment. These permits will be obtained from appropriate Federal, state, and local agencies. NRC issues operating licenses for major facilities such as commercial nuclear power reactors and fuel fabrication facilities, although the regulations under which these two facilities would be licensed are different.

5.1.1 The MOX Facility

The MOX facility would be licensed to operate by NRC under its regulations at 10 CFR 70, *Domestic Licensing of Special Nuclear Materials*. Because the facility would be located at a DOE site, however,

certain DOE requirements affecting site interfaces and infrastructure will also be applicable. In addition, as would be the case regardless of where the facility were built, Federal or state regulations implementing certain provisions of the Clean Water Act, Clean Air Act, and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act would be applicable. These regulations are implemented through permits. Evaluation would be required to determine whether MOX facility emissions and activities would necessitate modification of any of these permits. Analyses in the SPD Draft EIS have shown that there would be minimal impact from construction and operation of the MOX facility.

MOX facility design and operating parameters will be imposed by requirements of 10 CFR 70. Facility robustness, worker health and safety, and material and personnel security are all specified by 10 CFR 70. This regulation incorporates and refers the licensee to provisions of other NRC regulations such as those found at 10 CFR 20, *Radiation Protection Standards*. Safety and environmental analyses will be required to support the license application for the MOX facility.

Integral to the NEPA process is consideration of how the proposed action might affect biotic, cultural, and Native American resources, and the need for mitigation of any potential impacts. Required consultations with agencies and recognized Native American groups have been conducted.

5.1.2 Reactors

Nuclear power reactors undergo a lengthy licensing process under 10 CFR 50, *Domestic Licensing of Production and Utilization Facilities*, beginning before facility construction commences. This process includes preparation of safety analysis and environmental reports. The safety analysis report remains a living document that serves as the licensing basis for the plant, and is updated throughout the life of the plant. Public hearings before a licensing board are conducted prior to a license being issued. Once issued, operating licenses may be amended only with proper evaluation, review and approval as specified in 10 CFR 50.90. This prescriptive process requires demonstration that a proposed change does not involve an unreviewed environmental or safety question and provides for public notice and opportunity to comment prior to issuance of the license amendment. Minor license amendments can be processed fairly expeditiously, but more involved amendments can require multiple submittals before the NRC is assured that the proposed action will not reduce the margin of safety of the plant. All submittals, except portions that contain proprietary information, are available to the public.

The regulatory process for requesting reactor license amendments to use MOX fuel will be the same as for any 10 CFR 50 Operating License amendment request. The reactor licensee submitting an operating license amendment request in accordance with 10 CFR 50.90 initiates this process. Safety and environmental analyses commensurate with the level of potential impact are submitted in support, and as part, of the amendment request. NRC reviews the submitted information and denies or approves the request. The review process can involve submittal of additional information and face-to-face meetings between the licensee and NRC, and can result in modified license amendment requests. NRC provides notice in the *Federal Register* for certain steps in the process. The notice for the amendment request initially appears in the *Federal Register* with a Notice of Opportunity for Public Hearing. *Federal Register* notices are also required for the Proposed No Significant Hazards Determination, associated environmental documents, Consideration of Issuance of the License Amendment, and issuance of the final amendment. Certain of these notices allow for the opportunity to provide written comments, and for potentially affected parties to petition to intervene or request public hearings.

The six reactors proposed to use MOX fuel have been operating for a number of years. Revisions to each of their operating licenses will be required prior to MOX fuel being brought to the reactor sites and loaded into the reactors. The license amendment request will need to include a discussion of all potential impacts and changes in reactor operation that could be important to safety or the environment. This will include fresh and spent fuel handling, security and operational changes, as well as complete core load analysis and safety analyses, including potential changes to the severe accident analyses. Because the offeror has indicated that no new construction would be required to accommodate the use of MOX fuel, it is unlikely that any biotic, cultural or Native American resources would be impacted by the proposed action. The analyses performed for the Environmental Critique have demonstrated very little difference between the impacts from using a partial MOX core over a LEU core.

The need for modifications to site permits will be evaluated by the individual plants as part of their licensing activities. The offeror has indicated, and the analyses and reviews performed for the Environmental Critique, support the assertion, that there would be minimal or no change in effluents, emissions, and wastes (both radiological and nonradiological). Therefore, it is expected that few, if any, environmental permits or agreements will require modification for use of MOX fuel.

6.0 CONCLUSION

No major impacts to the environment surrounding the proposed MOX facility or reactor sites are expected to result from normal operation of these facilities. Environmental impacts from operation of the proposed reactors are not expected to change appreciably due to the use of MOX fuel. Impacts from construction and operation of the MOX facility are expected to be generally consistent with those presented in the SPD Draft EIS, and impacts at the reactor sites are expected to be generally consistent with those in the S&D PEIS.



Office of Fissile Materials Disposition

United States Department of Energy

Surplus Plutonium Disposition Final Environmental Impact Statement Comment Response Document Volume III - Part A

November 1999

For Further Information Contact:

U.S. Department of Energy

Office of Fissile Materials Disposition, P.O. Box 23786, Washington, DC 20026-3786

Cover Sheet

Responsible Agency: United States Department of Energy (DOE)

Title: *Surplus Plutonium Disposition Final Environmental Impact Statement* (SPD EIS) (DOE/EIS-0283)

Locations of Candidate Sites: California, Idaho, New Mexico, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Washington

Contacts:

For further information on the SPD Final EIS contact: For information on the DOE National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process contact:

Mr. G. Bert Stevenson, NEPA Compliance Officer
Office of Fissile Materials Disposition
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 23786
Washington, DC 20026-3786
Voice: (202) 586-5368

Ms. Carol Borgstrom, Director
Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance
Office of Environment, Safety and Health
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20585
Voice: (202) 586-4600 or (800) 472-2756

Abstract: On May 22, 1997, DOE published a Notice of Intent in the Federal Register (62 Federal Register 28009) announcing its decision to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) that would tier from the analysis and decisions reached in connection with the *Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Final Programmatic EIS*. At that time, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency decided to be a cooperating agency. The *Surplus Plutonium Disposition Draft Environmental Impact Statement* (SPD Draft EIS) (DOE/EIS-0283-D) was prepared in accordance with NEPA and issued in July 1998. It identified the potential environmental impacts of reasonable alternatives for the proposed siting, construction, and operation of three facilities for the disposition of up to 50 metric tons (55 tons) of surplus plutonium, as well as a No Action Alternative. These three facilities would accomplish pit disassembly and conversion, plutonium conversion and immobilization, and mixed oxide (MOX) fuel fabrication.

For the alternatives that included MOX fuel fabrication, the SPD Draft EIS described the potential environmental impacts of using from three to eight commercial nuclear reactors to irradiate MOX fuel. The potential impacts were based on a generic reactor analysis that used actual reactor data and a range of potential site conditions. In May 1998, DOE initiated a procurement process to obtain MOX fuel fabrication and reactor irradiation services. In March 1999, DOE awarded a contract to Duke Engineering & Services, COGEMA Inc., and Stone & Webster (known as DCS) to provide the requested services. A *Supplement to the SPD Draft EIS* was issued in April 1999, which analyzed the potential environmental impacts of using MOX fuel in six specific reactors named in the DCS proposal. Those reactors are Catawba Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2 in South Carolina, McGuire Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2 in North Carolina, and North Anna Power Station Units 1 and 2 in Virginia.

DOE has identified the hybrid approach as its Preferred Alternative for the disposition of surplus plutonium. This approach allows for the immobilization of 17 metric tons (19 tons) of surplus plutonium and the use of 33 metric tons (36 tons) as MOX fuel. DOE has identified the Savannah River Site near Aiken, South Carolina, as the preferred site for all three disposition facilities (Alternative 3). DOE has also identified Los Alamos National

Laboratory in New Mexico as the preferred site for lead assembly fabrication, and Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee as the preferred site for postirradiation examination of lead assemblies.

Public Involvement: In preparing the SPD Final EIS, DOE considered comments on the SPD Draft EIS and the *Supplement to the SPD Draft EIS* received via mail, fax, and email, and comments recorded by phone and transcribed from videotapes. In addition, comments were captured by notetakers during interactive public meetings held on the SPD Draft EIS in August 1998 in Amarillo, Texas; Idaho Falls, Idaho; North Augusta, South Carolina; Portland, Oregon; and Richland, Washington, as well as during a public meeting on the *Supplement to the SPD Draft EIS* held in June 1999 in Washington, D.C. Comments received and DOE's responses to these comments are found in Volume III, the Comment Response Document, of the SPD Final EIS. Information on the surplus plutonium disposition program can be obtained by visiting the Office of Fissile Materials Disposition Web site at <http://www.doe-md.com>.



DOE/EIS-0283

Surplus Plutonium Disposition Final Environmental Impact Statement

Comment Response Document

Volume III - Part A

**United States Department of Energy
Office of Fissile Materials Disposition**

November 1999

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
List of Figures	ii
List of Tables	iii
List of Acronyms	v
Chemicals and Units of Measure	x
Metric Conversion Chart and Metric Prefixes	xi

Volume III - Part A

Chapter 1

Introduction	1-1
1.1 Background	1-1
1.2 Organization	1-3

Chapter 2

Summary of Major Issues Identified During the Comment Periods and Changes to the SPD Draft EIS	2-1
2.1 Summary of Major Issues Raised on the SPD Draft EIS During the Public Comment Period	2-1
2.2 Summary of Major Issues Raised on the <i>Supplement to the SPD Draft EIS</i> During the Public Comment Period	2-3
2.3 Changes to the SPD Draft EIS and the <i>Supplement</i>	2-4

Chapter 3

Comment Documents and Responses on the SPD Draft EIS	3-1
---	-----

Volume III - Part B

Chapter 3

Comment Documents and Responses on the SPD Draft EIS (continued)	3-1027
---	--------

Chapter 4

Comment Documents and Responses on the <i>Supplement</i>	4-1
---	-----

Appendix A

Transcript of Public Meeting on Mixed-Oxide Fuel	A-1
---	-----

List of Figures

VOLUME III - PART A

Figure 1-1. Dates and Locations of Public Hearings	1-2
Figure 1-2. Comment and Response Location Guide	1-4

List of Tables

VOLUME III - PART A

Table 1-1.	Hearing Attendance and Oral Comments	1-2
Table 1-2.	Document Submission Summary	1-2
Table 1-3.	Members of Congress and Federal Agency Commentors by State	1-5
Table 1-4.	State and Local Officials and Agencies and Private Organization Commentors by State	1-6
Table 1-5.	Individual Commentors by State	1-12
Table 1-6.	Multiple-Signatory Document Commentors by State	1-18
Table 1-7.	Public Hearing Attendees by Location	1-22
Table 1-8.	Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign	1-38
Table 1-9.	Issue Categories	1-71
Table 1-10.	Federal Agency Commentors on the <i>Supplement</i>	1-76
Table 1-11.	Foreign Country Commentors on the <i>Supplement</i>	1-77
Table 1-12.	State and Local Officials and Agencies and Private Organization Commentors on the <i>Supplement</i> by State	1-78
Table 1-13.	Individual Commentors on the <i>Supplement</i> by State	1-80
Table 1-14.	Multiple-Signatory Document Commentors on the <i>Supplement</i> by State	1-81
Table 1-15.	Public Hearing Attendees on the <i>Supplement</i>	1-82
Table 1-16.	Issue Categories on the <i>Supplement</i>	1-84

List of Acronyms

AEA	Atomic Energy Act of 1954	CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental
AECL	Atomic Energy of Canada Limited		Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
AED	aerodynamic equivalent diameter	CFA	Central Facilities Area
AIRFA	American Indian Religious Freedom Act	CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
ALARA	as low as is reasonably achievable	CPP	Chemical Processing Plant
		CWA	Clean Water Act of 1972, 1987
AMWTP	Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project	D&D	decontamination and decommissioning
ANL-W	Argonne National Laboratory-West	DBA	design basis accident
APSF	Actinide Packaging and Storage Facility	DCS	Duke Engineering & Services, COGEMA Inc., and Stone & Webster
AQCR	Air Quality Control Region	DNFSB	Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
ARF	airborne release fraction		
ARIES	Advanced Recovery Integrated Extraction System	DOC	U.S. Department of Commerce
		DoD	U.S. Department of Defense
AVLIS	Atomic Vapor Laser Isotope Separation	DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
		DOL	U.S. Department of Labor
		DOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
BEA	Bureau of Economic Analysis		
BEIR V	Report V of the Committee on the Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiations	DR	damage ratio
		DU PEIS	<i>Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Alternative Strategies for Long-Term Management and Use of Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride</i>
BIO	Basis for Interim Operation		
BLM	Bureau of Land Management		
BNFL	British Nuclear Fuels		
BWR	boiling water reactor	DWPF	Defense Waste Processing Facility
CAA	Clean Air Act		
CAB	Citizens Advisory Board		
CANDU	Canadian Deuterium Uranium (reactors)	EA	environmental assessment
		EBR	Experimental Breeder Reactor (I or II)
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality	EIS	environmental impact statement
		EPA	Environmental Protection

	Agency	HFEF	Hot Fuel Examination Facility
ES&H	environment, safety, and health	HHS	Department of Health and
ESTEEM	Education in Science,		Human Services
	Technology, Energy,	HIGHWAY	(computer code for distances and
	Engineering, and Math		populations along
ETB	Engineering Test Bay		U.S. highways)
ETTP	East Tennessee Technology Park	HLW	high-level waste
		HLWVF	high-level-waste vitrification
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration		facility
FDP	fluorinel dissolution process	HMIS	Hazardous Materials Information
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management		System
	Agency	HWTPF	Hazardous Waste Treatment and
FFCA	Federal Facility Compliance		Processing Facility
	Agreement	HYDOX	hydride oxidation
FFF	Uranium Fuel Fabrication		
	Facility	IAEA	International Atomic Energy
FFTF	Fast Flux Test Facility		Agency
FI	field investigation	ICPP	Idaho Chemical Processing Plant
FM	Farm-to-Market (road)	ICRP	International Commission on
FMF	Fuel Manufacturing Facility		Radiological Protection
FMEA	failure modes and effects analysis	ID DHW	Idaho Department of Health and
FMEF	Fuels and Materials Examination		Welfare
	Facility	INEEL	Idaho National Engineering and
FONSI	finding of no significant impact		Environmental Laboratory
FPF	Fuel Processing Facility	INRAD	Intrinsic Radiation
FPPA	Farmland Protection Policy Act	INTEC	Idaho Nuclear Technology and
FR	Federal Register		Engineering Center
		IPE	Individual Plant Examination
GAO	General Accounting Office	ISC	Industrial Source Complex
GDP	gaseous diffusion plant		Model
GE	General Electric Company	ISC3	Industrial Source Complex
GENII	Generation II, Hanford		Model, Version 3
	environmental radiation	ISCST3	Industrial Source Complex
	dosimetry software system		Model, Short-Term, Version 3
GPS	global positioning satellite		
		ISLOCA	interfacing systems
HE	high explosive		loss-of-coolant accident
HEPA	high-efficiency particulate air	ITP	In-Tank Precipitation Process
	(filter)		
HEU	highly enriched uranium	LANL	Los Alamos National Laboratory

LCF	latent cancer fatality	NOI	Notice of Intent
LDR	Land Disposal Restrictions	NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
LEU	low-enriched uranium	NPH	natural phenomena hazard
LLNL	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	NPS	National Park Service
LLW	low-level waste	NRC	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
LOCA	loss-of-coolant accident	NRU	National Research Universal
LPF	leak path factor	NTS	Nevada Test Site
LWR	light water reactor	NWCF	New Waste Calcining Facility
M&H	Mason & Hanger Corporation	NWPA	Nuclear Waste Policy Act
MACCS2	Melcor Accident Consequence Code System (computer code)	NWS	National Weather Service
MAR	material at risk	ORIGEN	ORNL Isotope Generation and Depletion Code
MD	Office of Fissile Materials Disposition	ORNL	Oak Ridge National Laboratory
MEI	maximally exposed individual	ORR	Oak Ridge Reservation
MIMAS	Micronized Master	OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
MMI	Modified Mercalli Intensity		
MOX	mixed oxide	PBF	Power Burst Facility
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards	PEIS	programmatic environmental impact statement
NAGPRA	Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act	PFP	Plutonium Finishing Plant
NAS	National Academy of Science	PIE	postirradiation examination
NCRP	National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements	PM _{2.5}	particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns
NDA	nondestructive analysis	PM ₁₀	particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 10 microns
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act of 1969	PNNL	Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
NESHAPs	National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants		
NIOSH	National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health	PRA	probabilistic risk assessment
NOA	Notice of Availability	PSD	prevention of significant deterioration
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	PUREX	Plutonium-Uranium Extraction (Facility)
		PWR	pressurized water reactor

R&D	research and development		Control
RADTRAN 4	(computer code: risks and consequences of radiological materials transport)	SCE&G	South Carolina Electric & Gas Company
RANT	Radioactive Assay and Nondestructive Test	SCSHPO	South Carolina State Historic Preservation Officer
RAMROD	Radioactive Materials Research, Operations and Demonstration	SDWA	Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended	SEIS	supplemental environmental impact statement
REA	regional economic area	SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
RF	respirable fraction	SI	sealed insert
RfC	reference concentration	SMC	Specific Manufacturing Complex
RfD	reference dose	SNF	spent nuclear fuel
RFETS	Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site	SNM	special nuclear material
RFP	Request for Proposal	SPD	surplus plutonium disposition
RIA	Reactivity Insertion Accidents	SPD EIS	<i>Surplus Plutonium Disposition Environmental Impact Statement</i>
RIMS II	Regional Input-Output Modeling System II (computer code)	SPERT	Special Power Excursion Reactor Test
RISKIND	(computer code: risks and consequences of radiological materials transport)	SRS	Savannah River Site
ROD	Record of Decision	SSM PEIS	<i>Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Stockpile Stewardship and Management</i>
ROI	region of influence		
RMF	Radiation Measurements Facility	SST/SGT	safe, secure trailer/SafeGuards
RWMC	Radioactive Waste Management Complex		Transport
		SWMU	solid waste management unit
		SWP 1	Service Waste Percolation Pond 1
S/A	Similarity of Appearance (provision of Endangered Species Act)	TA	Technical Area
SAR	safety analysis report	TCE	trichloroethylene
SARA	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986	TNRCC	Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission
		TPBAR-LTA	tritium-producing burnable absorber rod lead test assembly
SCDHEC	South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental	TRA	technical risk assessment

TRANSCOM	transportation tracking and communications system	WNP-2	Washington Nuclear Plant-2
TRU	transuranic	WPPSS	Washington Public Power Supply System
TRUPACT	TRU waste package transporter	WROC	Waste Reduction Operations Complex
TSCA	Toxic Substances Control Act	WSRC	Westinghouse Savannah River Company
TSP	total suspended particulates		
TVA	Tennessee Valley Authority		
TWRS	tank waste remediation system		
TWRS EIS	<i>Tank Waste Remediation System Final Environmental Impact Statement</i>	ZPPR	Zero Power Physics Reactor
UC	Regents of the University of California		
UFSAR	updated final safety analysis report		
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers		
USC	United States Code		
USEC	United States Enrichment Corporation		
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service		
UV	ultraviolet		
VOC	volatile organic compounds		
VORTAC	very high frequency omnidirectional range/tactical air navigation (facility)		
VRM	Visual Resource Management		
WAG 3	Waste Area Grouping 3		
WERF	Waste Experimental Reduction Facility		
WIPP	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant		
WM PEIS	<i>Final Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Managing Treatment, Storage, and Disposal of Radioactive and Hazardous Waste</i>		
WNP-1	Washington Nuclear Plant-1		

Chemicals and Units of Measure

°C	degrees Celsius (Centigrade)	min	minute
°F	degrees Fahrenheit	mph	miles per hour
μCi	microcurie	mrem	millirem
μg	microgram	MTHM	metric tons of heavy metal
μm	micrometer (micron)	MVA	megavolt-ampere
46°26'07"	46 degrees, 26 minutes, 7 seconds	MW	megawatt
		MWe	megawatt electric
Ci	curie	MWh	megawatt-hour
cm	centimeter	N ₂	nitrogen
CO	carbon monoxide	nCi	nanocurie
CO ₂	carbon dioxide	NO ₂	nitrogen dioxide
dB	decibel	pCi	picocurie
dBA	decibel, A-weighted	pcm/F	percent mille/per degree Fahrenheit
DUF ₆	depleted uranium hexafluoride		
eH	oxidation reduction potential	pH	hydrogen ion concentration
ft	foot	PM _{2.5}	particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 μm in diameter
ft ²	square foot		
ft ³	cubic foot	PM ₁₀	particulate matter less than or equal to 10 μm in diameter
g	gram		
g	gravitational acceleration	ppm	parts per million
gal	gallon	PuO ₂	plutonium dioxide
GWD/t	gigawatt days (per ton)	rad	radiation absorbed dose
ha	hectare	rem	roentgen equivalent man
hr	hour (in compound units)	s	second
in	inch	SO ₂	sulfur dioxide
kg	kilogram	t	metric ton
km	kilometer	ton	short ton
km ²	square kilometers	UF ₆	uranium hexafluoride
kV	kilovolt	UO ₂	uranium dioxide
l	liter	yd	yard
lb	pound	yd ³	cubic yard
m	meter	yr	year (in compound units)
m ²	square meter	wt %	weight percent
m ³	cubic meter		
mg	milligram		
mi	mile		

Metric Conversion Chart

To Convert Into Metric			To Convert Out of Metric		
If You Know	Multiply By	To Get	If You Know	Multiply By	To Get
Length					
inches	2.54	centimeters	centimeters	0.3937	inches
feet	30.48	centimeters	centimeters	0.0328	feet
feet	0.3048	meters	meters	3.281	feet
yards	0.9144	meters	meters	1.0936	yards
miles	1.60934	kilometers	kilometers	0.6214	miles
Area					
sq. inches	6.4516	sq. centimeters	sq. centimeters	0.155	sq. inches
sq. feet	0.092903	sq. meters	sq. meters	10.7639	sq. feet
sq. yards	0.8361	sq. meters	sq. meters	1.196	sq. yards
acres	0.40469	hectares	hectares	2.471	acres
sq. miles	2.58999	sq. kilometers	sq. kilometers	0.3861	sq. miles
Volume					
fluid ounces	29.574	milliliters	milliliters	0.0338	fluid ounces
gallons	3.7854	liters	liters	0.26417	gallons
cubic feet	0.028317	cubic meters	cubic meters	35.315	cubic feet
cubic yards	0.76455	cubic meters	cubic meters	1.308	cubic yards
Weight					
ounces	28.3495	grams	grams	0.03527	ounces
pounds	0.45360	kilograms	kilograms	2.2046	pounds
short tons	0.90718	metric tons	metric tons	1.1023	short tons
Temperature					
Fahrenheit	Subtract 32 then multiply by 5/9ths	Celsius	Celsius	Multiply by 9/5ths, then add 32	Fahrenheit

Metric Prefixes

Prefix	Symbol	Multiplication Factor
exa-	E	1 000 000 000 000 000 000 = 10 ¹⁸
peta-	P	1 000 000 000 000 000 = 10 ¹⁵
tera-	T	1 000 000 000 000 = 10 ¹²
giga-	G	1 000 000 000 = 10 ⁹
mega-	M	1 000 000 = 10 ⁶
kilo-	k	1 000 = 10 ³
hecto-	h	100 = 10 ²
deka-	da	10 = 10 ¹
deci-	d	0.1 = 10 ⁻¹
centi-	c	0.01 = 10 ⁻²
milli-	m	0.001 = 10 ⁻³
micro-	μ	0.000 001 = 10 ⁻⁶
nano-	n	0.000 000 001 = 10 ⁻⁹
pico-	p	0.000 000 000 001 = 10 ⁻¹²
femto-	f	0.000 000 000 000 001 = 10 ⁻¹⁵
atto-	a	0.000 000 000 000 000 001 = 10 ⁻¹⁸

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 BACKGROUND

In July 1998, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) published the *Surplus Plutonium Disposition Draft Environmental Impact Statement* (SPD Draft EIS) (DOE/EIS-0283-D), which analyzed the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects of reasonable alternatives for siting, constructing, and operating three facilities proposed for surplus plutonium disposition at four candidate DOE sites. In April 1999, DOE also published the *Supplement to the SPD Draft EIS (Supplement)* (DOE/EIS-0283-DS), which describes the potential environmental impacts of using mixed oxide (MOX) fuel in six specific reactors named in the proposal from Duke Engineering & Services, COGEMA Inc., and Stone & Webster (DCS), as well as program changes made since the SPD Draft EIS was published.

In accordance with Under the guidelines set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), DOE established a 60-day period for public review and comment on the SPD Draft EIS. The public comment period began on July 17, 1998, and closed on September 16, 1998. For the *Supplement*, DOE established a 45-day period for public review and comment beginning on May 14, 1999, and closing on June 28, 1999. DOE also considered all comments received after these closing dates.

In August 1998, DOE convened five public hearings, one near each of the candidate sites (Richland, Washington; Amarillo, Texas; North Augusta, South Carolina; and Idaho Falls, Idaho) and one at a regional location (Portland, Oregon) to obtain oral and written comments on the SPD Draft EIS. On June 15, 1999, a public hearing was convened by DOE in Washington, D.C., to obtain written and oral comments on the *Supplement*.

Figure 1-1 reflects the dates and locations of these public hearings. All hearings were moderated by a facilitator, and comments and concerns were recorded by trained notetakers. The public was also encouraged to provide comments on both the SPD Draft EIS and the *Supplement* by mail, on a toll-free telephone and fax line, or by email through the Web site of DOE's Office of Fissile Materials Disposition (MD).

Attendance at the public hearings and the number of unique oral comments recorded at each are presented in Table 1-1. Attendance statistics for the public hearings were based on the number of participants who completed registration forms. A number of the written comments submitted during the public hearings were also presented orally. As these were considered written comments, they were not recorded as part of the hearing minutes. The number of comments collected by the various methods of submission are shown in Table 1-2.

Each comment document received by email, fax, mail, or telephone and each written comment submitted at the public hearings was marked with the date it was processed and assigned a unique identification code consisting of a prefix designating the method of transmission and a sequential number. Oral comments collected at the public hearings were similarly identified: each comment was assigned a unique code comprising a prefix designating the hearing location and a sequential number. Postcards received as part of a campaign were the only exception to this procedure; regardless of how the postcard was submitted, it was automatically given a distinctive postcard designation.




Figure 1-1. Dates and Locations of Public Hearings

Table 1-1. Hearing Attendance and Oral Comments

Public Hearings	Attendance	Oral Comments
Richland, WA	55	76
Amarillo, TX	450	145
North Augusta, SC	963	48
Portland, OR	69	113
Idaho Falls, ID	26	56
Washington, DC	54	82
Total	1,617	520

Table 1-2. Document Submission Summary

Method of Submission	Documents Received
Hand-ins at public hearings	434
Fax	358
Mail	358
Postcards	2,234
Telephone	71
MD Web site (email)	34
Total	3,489

All comment documents and oral comments were then processed through the comment analysis and response system for inclusion in this Comment Response Document. Over 3,400 comment documents were submitted by various individuals and organizations on the SPD Draft EIS and 77 were submitted on the *Supplement*. Analysis of these documents and unique oral comments resulted in the delineation of approximately 4,800 and 340 comments on the SPD Draft EIS and the *Supplement*, respectively. Each comment was then assigned to a

specific issue category. Responses developed for each delineated comment are identified by a response code that corresponds to the coding on the scanned comment document image.

Comments determined to be beyond the scope of the SPD Draft EIS and the *Supplement* were forwarded to the cognizant DOE office for consideration, as appropriate. Comments relating to the costs of the alternatives described in the SPD Draft EIS or specifically to the cost report, *Cost Analysis in Support of Site Selection for Surplus Weapons-Usable Plutonium Disposition* (DOE/MD-0009, July 1998), were forwarded to the MD cost analysis team. The cost report and the *Plutonium Disposition Life-Cycle Costs and Cost-Related Comment Resolution Document* (DOE/MD-0013, November 1999) are available on the MD Web site at <http://www.doe-md.com> and in the public reading rooms at the following locations: Hanford Site (Hanford), Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL), Pantex Plant (Pantex), Savannah River Site (SRS), and Washington, D.C.

1.2 ORGANIZATION

This Comment Response Document is organized into four chapters. Chapter 1 describes the comment analysis and response process, and Chapter 2, the changes made to this SPD Final EIS in response to public input and updated information. Chapters 3 and 4 present the scanned images of original comment documents and transcribed oral comments received during the public comment period for the SPD Draft EIS and the *Supplement*, respectively. The left side of the page is an image of the comment document marked with numbered sidebars to identify specific issues. DOE's response to each issue appears, correspondingly numbered, on the right side of the page.

The accompanying tables (Tables 1-3 through 1-8 and Tables 1-10 through 1-15) are designed to allow commentors to locate their comments regarding the SPD Draft EIS and the *Supplement* and DOE's responses to these comments. Commentors are listed alphabetically by last name or organization and grouped by State, along with the page number on which the comment document image and responses appear. A guide for locating specific comments and DOE's response is presented as Figure 1-2.

Documents identical in content are presented only once. Campaigns likewise are presented and responded to only once. However, campaign documents with additional comments were responded to separately. Commentors wishing to view comments and responses for specific issue categories should refer to Tables 1-9 and 1-16 for the SPD Draft EIS and the *Supplement*, respectively.

Appendix A is a copy of the transcript of an informational public meeting regarding the proposed use of MOX fuel which was sponsored by a South Carolina State Senator. This meeting, which was attended by DOE, was held during the comment period on the *Supplement*.

HOW CAN I FIND MY COMMENT AND DOE's RESPONSE?

Note: Comment documents were assigned to a State based on the address of the commentor, a telephone area code, or the public hearing location.

For comments by members of Congress and Federal agencies:

Refer to Tables 1-3 and 1-10 for the SPD Draft EIS and the *Supplement*, respectively. These tables are organized alphabetically and grouped by State.

For comments by private organizations from foreign countries:

Refer to Table 1-11 for the *Supplement*. The table is organized alphabetically and grouped by country.

For comments by State and local officials and agencies and private organizations:

Refer to Tables 1-4 and 1-12 for the SPD Draft EIS and the *Supplement*, respectively. These tables are organized alphabetically by organization and grouped by State.

For comments by individuals:

Refer to Tables 1-5 and 1-13 for the SPD Draft EIS and the *Supplement*, respectively. These tables are organized alphabetically by the individual's last name and grouped by State.

For comments on multiple-signatory documents:

Refer to Tables 1-6 and 1-14 for the SPD Draft EIS and the *Supplement*, respectively. These tables are organized with individuals and organizations integrated alphabetically and grouped by State. A multiple-signatory document is one that has been signed by at least two individuals with different last names, and et al. is reflected in the image document heading.

For comments made at public hearings:

Refer to Tables 1-7 and 1-15 for the SPD Draft EIS and the *Supplement*, respectively. If you submitted a completed registration form, you can find your name under the appropriate hearing location. If you orally presented your views, then those views were summarized and are presented in this document. Similar views appear only once. These tables are organized by hearing location, with individuals and organizations integrated alphabetically.

For comments submitted as part of a campaign:

Refer to Table 1-8. This table sets forth the campaign subject and is organized alphabetically, integrating individuals and organizations. Every effort was made to decipher signatures, and those portions that were legible are included in the table. Unreadable names are accounted for under an "illegible" heading within the table. If you provided an additional, unique comment on a campaign document, that campaign document was treated as a separate comment and can be located in Tables 1-4 or 1-5. Signatories of the Statement of Nongovernmental Organizations on Plutonium Disposition submitted on the *Supplement* can be found attached to that statement.

Figure 1-2. Comment and Response Location Guide

Table 1–3. Members of Congress and Federal Agency Commentors by State

Commentors	Page
Georgia	
United States Senate, Honorable Max Cleland	3–3
United States Senate, Honorable Paul D. Coverdell	3–4
United States Senate, Honorable Paul D. Coverdell	3–5
United States House of Representatives, Honorable Charlie Norwood	3–6
United States House of Representatives, Honorable Charlie Norwood	3–9
Oregon	
United States House of Representatives, Honorable Peter DeFazio	3–10
United States House of Representatives, Honorable Elizabeth Furse	3–11
South Carolina	
United States Senate, Honorable Strom Thurmond and Honorable Ernest F. Hollings, United States House of Representatives, Honorable James E. Clyburn, Lindsey O. Graham, Bob Inglis, Mark Sanford, Floyd D. Spence, and John M. Spratt, Jr.	3–12
United States Senate, Honorable Strom Thurmond	3–15
United States Senate, Maury Lane for the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings	3–17
United States House of Representatives, Honorable Lindsey O. Graham	3–23
United States House of Representatives, Honorable Lindsey O. Graham	3–24
United States House of Representatives, Honorable Floyd D. Spence	3–25
United States House of Representatives, Honorable Floyd D. Spence	3–26
Texas	
United States Senate, Honorable Kay Bailey Hutchinson and Honorable Phil Gramm	3–29
United States House of Representatives, Honorable Mac Thornberry	3–31
United States House of Representatives, Honorable Mac Thornberry	3–34
Washington	
United States Senate, Honorable Slade Gorton	3–35
United States Senate, Honorable Slade Gorton, United States House of Representatives, Honorable Doc Hastings	3–36
Washington, D.C.	
United States Environmental Protection Agency, Richard E. Sanderson	3–38

**Table 1-4. State and Local Officials and Agencies and Private
Organization Commentors by State**

Commentors	Page
Arizona	
GE Stockholders' Alliance, Patricia T. Birnie	3-54
Arkansas	
Arkansas Department of Finance and Administration, Tracy L. Copeland	3-61
California	
East Bay Peace Action, Dale Nesbitt	3-74
Colorado	
Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center, LeRoy Moore et al.	3-85
The Rocky Flats Local Impacts Initiative, Bob Dyer	3-90
Florida	
J.R. White Consulting, J.R. White	3-91
Florida Coastal Management Program, Chris McCay	3-92
Georgia	
Augusta Commission, Honorable Larry Sconyers	3-102
Augusta-Richmond County Legislative Delegation, Honorable Ben Allen et al.	3-110
Augusta-Richmond County Legislative Delegation, Honorable Jack Connell	3-111
Campaign for a Prosperous Georgia, Rita Kilpatrick	3-116
Citizens for Environmental Justice, Mildred McClain	3-119
Citizens for Environmental Justice, Mildred McClain	3-120
Georgia-Carolina Courier, Patricia C. McCracken	3-130
Georgia-Carolina Courier, Patricia McCracken	3-138
Georgia-Carolina Courier, Patricia McCracken	3-142
Georgia Department of Natural Resources, James L. Setser	3-148
Georgia State Senate, Honorable Charles Walker	3-177
Georgia State Senate, Honorable Charles W. Walker	3-178
Hyde Park and Aragon Park Improvement Committee, Inc., Charles N. Utley	3-189
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, T. S. Yarbrough	3-192
Lower Savannah Council of Governments, Honorable W. H. Burkhalter et al.	3-195
Lower Savannah Council of Governments, Honorable S. J. Robinson et al.	3-196
NSC Discovery Center, Inc, Phyllis H. Hendry	3-204
Sun Trust Bank, Bill Thompson	3-207
Idaho	
Brady's, C.A. Brady II	3-215
Citizens Advisory Board, INEEL, Charles M. Rice	3-216
Coalition 21, Lowell A. Jobe	3-227
Coalition 21, Lowell Jobe	3-229
Coalition 21, Richard Kenney	3-230
Illinois	
Peace Farm, Mary J. Nicholson	3-249

**Table 1–4. State and Local Officials and Agencies and Private
Organization Commentors by State (Continued)**

Commentors	Page
Maryland	
Gary Research Operations Research, Robert Gary	3–257
Gary Research Operations Research, Robert Gary	3–262
Gary Research Operations Research, Robert Gary	3–265
Gary Research Operations Research, Robert Gary	3–268
Gary Research Operations Research, Robert Gary	3–271
Gary Research Operations Research, Robert Gary	3–276
Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, Anita Seth et al.	3–279
Maryland Department of the Environment, Steven Bieber	3–304
Massachusetts	
Massachusetts Citizens for Safe Energy, Mary Elizabeth Lampert	3–305
Michigan	
Algonac, Rose Ann Perricone	3–307
Berlin, Thomas R. Blouslh et al.	3–308
Brockway, Carl Vermeesch et al.	3–310
China, Julie Ann Wallace	3–311
Citizens For a Healthy Planet, Kathryn Cumbow	3–313
Citizens Resistance, Infirmary II, Michael Keagan	3–315
Clay, Jon E. Manos et al.	3–316
Clyde, Rebecca Yarr	3–318
Columbus Township Board of Trustees	3–319
East China, Sandra A. Smith	3–321
Emmett, Owen Kean et al.	3–323
Ira, John F. Jones	3–325
Marine City, Honorable Robert F. Beattie	3–327
Marine City, David Richards	3–328
Marysville, Sharon L. Schess	3–329
Memphis, Mary I. Brusca	3–330
Michigan House of Representatives, Honorable Karen Willard	3–331
Port Huron, Honorable Gerald “Ajax” Ackerman	3–333
Sisters, Servant of the Immaculant Heart of Mary, Martha Rabaut	3–335
St. Clair, Honorable Bernard E. Kuhn	3–336
St. Clair County, Lee Masters et al.	3–338
St. Clair Township, Joyce A. Skonieczny	3–339
Statewide Public Advisory Council, Kathy Evans	3–340
New Jersey	
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Lawrence Schmidt	3–350
New Mexico	
New Mexico Environment Department, Gedi Cibas	3–354
New Mexico Uranium Workers, Paul Hicks	3–356
North Carolina	
Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League, Louis Zeller et al.	3–359
Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League, Louis Zeller	3–362

Table 1-4. State and Local Officials and Agencies and Private Organization Commentors by State (Continued)

Commentors	Page
North Carolina (Continued)	
Duke COGEMA Stone & Webster, Robert H. Ihde	3-366
Duke Power Company, K. S. Canady	3-372
Ohio	
STAND of Amarillo, Inc., Harriet Martin	3-388
Oregon	
Demain Inc. Investment Club, Rian T. Smith	3-402
Don't Waste Oregon Caucus, Lynn Sims	3-408
Don't Waste Oregon Caucus, Lynn Sims	3-420
Hanford Watch, Paige Knight	3-430
Oregon Health Sciences University, Martin Donahoe	3-444
Oregon Office of Energy, Mary Lou Blazek	3-445
Oregon Office of Energy, Michael Grainey	3-459
Public Safety Resources Agency, W.P. Mead	3-465
Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom, Barbara Drageaux	3-496
Pennsylvania	
Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power, Judith Johnsrud	3-501
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Patricia T. Birnie	3-503
South Carolina	
Aiken, Honorable Fred B. Cavanaugh et al.	3-508
Aiken, Honorable Fred B. Cavanaugh	3-509
Aiken Chamber of Commerce, Teresa H. Haas	3-515
Aiken Chamber of Commerce, June Murff et al.	3-517
Aiken Chamber of Commerce, Jeff Spears	3-518
Aiken County Commission for Technical Education, Joe W. DeVore et al.	3-521
Aiken County Commission on Higher Education, Gasper L. Toole, III	3-522
Aiken County Council, Honorable Ronnie Young	3-523
Aiken County, South Carolina Legislative Delegation, Honorable Thomas Beck et al.	3-525
Aiken Regional Medical Centers, Richard H. Satcher	3-526
Allendale County Council, Honorable J.W. Wall, Jr.	3-527
Allendale County Chamber of Commerce	3-528
American Nuclear Society-Savannah River Section, John Dewes	3-529
Bamberg County Council, Honorable Jasper Varn	3-533
Barnwell County Chamber of Commerce, Dennis Hutto	3-535
Barnwell County Council, Honorable Harold Buchman	3-537
Barnwell County Council, Honorable Clyde T. Reed	3-538
Barnwell School District 45, James E. Benson et al.	3-541
Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness, Michael Butler	3-544
Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness, Michael Butler	3-558
Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness, Fred C. Davison	3-562
Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness, William C. Reinig	3-564
Economic Development Partnership, Fred E. Humes	3-573
First Baptist Church of Aiken, Fred W. Andrea, III	3-579
Greater North Augusta Chamber of Commerce, Chuck Smith	3-603
Greater North Augusta Chamber of Commerce, Chuck Smith et al.	3-604

Table 1–4. State and Local Officials and Agencies and Private Organization Commentors by State (Continued)

Commentors	Page
South Carolina (Continued)	
League of Women Voters of South Carolina, Mary T. Kelly	3–611
Lower Savannah Private Industry Council, Leo Cardin	3–616
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, James Gallman, Sr.	3–626
North Augusta , Honorable Thomas W. Greene	3–628
North Augusta , Honorable Lark W. Jones	3–629
Nuclear Information & Resource Service et al.	3–632
R&H Maxxon, Inc., Tim Dangerfield	3–637
RadChemCo, H. Perry Holcomb	3–638
Savannah River Regional Diversification Initiative, Thomas J. Stone et al.	3–647
Savannah River Site Retiree Association, Tom Greene	3–648
Snelling, Honorable Tim Moore	3–649
South Carolina, Office of the Governor, Honorable David M. Beasley	3–651
South Carolina, Office of the Governor, Honorable David M. Beasley	3–653
South Carolina, Office of the Governor, Honorable David M. Beasley	3–654
South Carolina Treasurer, Richard Eckstrom	3–655
South Carolina Department of Commerce, Robert V. Royall	3–660
South Carolina Progressive Network, Bret Bersie	3–661
South Carolina House of Representatives, Honorable T. Scott Beck	3–662
South Carolina House of Representatives, Honorable Rudy Mason	3–666
South Carolina Senate, Honorable Brad Hutto	3–668
South Carolina Senate, Honorable W. Greg Ryberg	3–672
South Carolina Senate, Honorable W. Greg Ryberg	3–674
South Carolina Universities Research and Education Foundation, Constantine Curris et al.	3–676
Southeast Environmental Management Association, Carl A. Mazzola	3–678
SRS Citizens Advisory Board	3–680
The Pritchard Group, Constance J. Pritchard	3–681
Tri-County Economic Development Alliance, J. Calvin Melton	3–682
Tri-County Economic Development Alliance, Calvin Melton	3–683
United Way of CSRA, Keith Benson	3–685
Westinghouse Savannah River Company, Donald L. Speed	3–689
Westinghouse Savannah River Company, Richard Tansky	3–690
Westinghouse Savannah River Company, Fran Williams	3–692
Tennessee	
Tennessee Governor’s Office, Justin P. Wilson	3–699
Texas	
Amarillo, Honorable Dianne Bosch	3–713
Amarillo, Honorable Robert Keys	3–715
Amarillo, Honorable Kevin Knapp	3–717
Amarillo, Honorable Kel Seliger	3–719
Amarillo, Honorable Trent Sisemore	3–723
Amarillo Association of Realtors, Inc., Randy Jeffers	3–725
Amarillo Chamber of Commerce, David Wilks et al.	3–726
Amarillo College, M. Karen Ruddy	3–727
Amarillo College, M. Karen Ruddy	3–728
Amarillo Economic Development Corporation, Debra Ballou	3–730

Table 1-4. State and Local Officials and Agencies and Private Organization Commentors by State (Continued)

Commentors	Page
Texas (Continued)	
Amarillo Economic Development Corporation, Michael R. Bourn	3-731
Amarillo Economic Development Corporation, Gilbert Guzman	3-733
Amarillo Economic Development Corporation, Glenn McMennamy	3-734
Amarillo Economic Development Corporation, George Raffkind	3-736
Amarillo Globe-News, Garet von Netzer	3-738
Amarillo Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, Gilbert Guzman et al.	3-741
Amarillo National Resource Center for Plutonium, Richard Hartley	3-742
Amarillo National Resource Center for Plutonium, K. L. Peddicord	3-743
Amarillo National Resource Center for Plutonium, Angela L. Woods	3-745
Battelle Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Kimberly Baker	3-755
C&B Printing, Dennis Clouch	3-760
Carpenters Union Local 665, James N. Brookes	3-763
Cattle Company, Jay O'Brien	3-764
General Services Commission, Roger Mulder	3-774
General Services Commission, Roger Mulder	3-781
International Guards Union of America, Local 38, Randall Skinner	3-836
Jefferson Street Family Practice, PA, Elliot J. Trester	3-837
Maryknoll Education Center, Patricia Ridgley	3-849
Mason & Hanger-Silas Mason Company, Inc., Charles Elsea	3-850
Mason & Hanger-Silas Mason Company, Inc., William R. Henry	3-851
Mason & Hanger-Silas Mason Company, Inc., Scott	3-854
Mason & Hanger-Silas Mason Company, Inc., Leon E. Tomlinson	3-855
MRD Investments, L.L.C., D. Edward and Melva M. Davis	3-862
NUNN Electric Supply Corporation, Joe D. Brewton	3-864
Panhandle 2000, Jerome W. Johnson et al.	3-867
Panhandle Area Neighbors and Landowners, Doris and Phillip Smith	3-870
Pantex, Tim Flowers	3-874
Pantex, Jim Harbin	3-875
Potter County, Honorable Arthur Ware et al.	3-880
STAND of Amarillo, Inc., Don Moniak	3-908
STAND of Amarillo, Inc., Don Moniak	3-926
STAND of Amarillo, Inc., Don Moniak	3-929
STAND of Amarillo, Inc., Don Moniak	3-930
STAND of Amarillo, Inc., Don Moniak	3-932
STAND of Amarillo, Inc., Don Moniak	3-935
STAND of Amarillo, Inc., Don Moniak	3-938
STAND of Amarillo, Inc., Don Moniak	3-941
STAND of Amarillo, Inc., Don Moniak	3-942
STAND of Amarillo, Inc., Don Moniak	3-945
STAND of Amarillo, Inc., Don Moniak	3-947
STAND of Amarillo, Inc., Don Moniak	3-977
Texas, Lieutenant Governor, Honorable Bob Bullock	3-991
Texas A&M University, John M. Sweeten	3-992
Texas AFL-CIO, Joe D. Gunn et al.	3-997
Texas Building and Construction Trades Council, Gale Van Hoy	3-1000
Texas House of Representatives, Honorable John Smithee	3-1002
Texas House of Representatives, Honorable David Swinford	3-1004
Texas Radiation Advisory Board, Michael S. Ford	3-1005

**Table 1-4. State and Local Officials and Agencies and Private
Organization Commentors by State (Continued)**

Commentors	Page
Texas (Continued)	
Texas Senate, Honorable Tom Haywood	3-1008
Texas Senate, Honorable John Hirschi	3-1010
Texas State Republican Party Platform, Richard L. Geddes	3-1011
The Center for Legal and Social Justice, Tadeo Spike Zywiski	3-1014
The Metal Trades Council of Amarillo, Texas and Vicinity, Ronald W. Zerm	3-1017
U.S. Army, Stacy R. Rusk	3-1020
Underwood, Wilson, Berry, Stein & Johnson, P.C., James W. Wester	3-1021
Wonderland Amusements, Inc, Paul D. Borchardt	3-1025
Virginia	
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Michael P. Murphy	3-1027
Washington	
Benton County	3-1034
Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council, Keith A. Smith, Jr.	3-1052
Hanford Communities, Honorable Larry Haler	3-1055
Hanford Communities Governing Board, Honorable Larry Haler	3-1059
Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Walt Apley	3-1079
Richland, Pam Brown	3-1084
STMC Sisu Technical and Management Consulting, Ronald C. Liikala	3-1089
Tri-City Industrial Development Council	3-1095
Tri-City Industrial Development Council, Sam Volpentest	3-1101
WA Mfg. Services, WSU-TriCities, William T. Sellers	3-1105
Washington, Office of the Governor, Honorable Gary Locke	3-1106
West Richland, Honorable Ken Dobbin	3-1107
West Richland, Honorable Jerry A. Peltier	3-1108
Washington, D.C.	
Natural Resources Defense Council, Thomas B. Cochran	3-1119
Nuclear Control Institute, Steven Dolley	3-1129
Nuclear Energy Institute, Felix M. Killar	3-1135
Nuclear Information and Resource Service, Mary Olson	3-1139
Nuclear Information and Resource Service, Mary Olson	3-1147

Table 1-5. Individual Commentors by State

Commentors	Page
Arizona	
Birnie, Patricia	3-53
California	
Coops, Melvin S.	3-69
Ferrigno, James	3-77
R., P.A.	3-78
Colorado	
Anonymous	3-79
Hatfield, Scott	3-80
Lockhart, Wade	3-84
Smith, Frank W.	3-89
Georgia	
Arnold, Ed	3-101
Booker, Sam	3-112
Buss, Nancy	3-114
Calhoun, Emily	3-115
Gilkison, Joseph	3-179
Hardeman, James C., Jr.	3-180
Harrison, J. Larry	3-185
Ingham, Robert	3-191
King, Joan	3-193
King, Joan O.	3-194
Lowry, Greg	3-197
Lowry, Nancy J.	3-198
Milton, Larry	3-199
Noah, Christopher	3-200
Seward, Blake	3-205
Sherer, Cameron	3-206
Wilcox, Robert H.	3-208
Idaho	
Anonymous	3-211
Bonner, Scott	3-213
Freund, George A.	3-239
Fritzen, Mary Jane	3-241
Hampson, Walter L.	3-242
Rickards, Peter	3-245
Sutter, Thomas J.	3-246
Watanabe, Theodore	3-247
Indiana	
O'Neill, John	3-253
Louisiana	
Hummert, Vic	3-255

Table 1–5. Individual Commentors by State (Continued)

Commentors	Page
Michigan	
Biernot, Marilyn	3–309
Dudus, Mat	3–320
Gunter, Keith	3–324
Zolae, Greg	3–341
Missouri	
Hobbs, Amy	3–343
Nevada	
Bush, Michele	3–345
Devlin Sally	3–347
New Jersey	
Goodman, Sidney J.	3–349
New Mexico	
Albrecht, Kathryn	3–351
Albrecht, Kathryn	3–353
New York	
Bradford, Krista	3–357
North Carolina	
Hamill, Lisa	3–378
Ohio	
Cahall, Diana I.	3–381
Cahall, Diana I.	3–384
Oregon	
Anonymous	3–391
Anonymous	3–393
Anonymous	3–395
Anttila, Everett	3–396
Black, Gloria	3–398
Bryant, Sylvia	3–399
Butts, Nathan	3–400
Butz, Andrew D.	3–401
Demaria, Gregg	3–404
Ennis, Sara	3–422
Fallingstead, Joyce	3–424
Fennell, Loren	3–425
Frazier, Bruce	3–427
Gerould, Steven	3–428
Hamilton, Jessica	3–429

Table 1-5. Individual Commentors by State (Continued)

Commentors	Page
Oregon (Continued)	
Janzon, Gretchen	3-434
Joslin, Rose Mary	3-437
Juergens, Kathleen	3-440
McLoughlin, Maura	3-441
Metrick, Nancy	3-443
Peck, Geri	3-463
Peterson, Don	3-464
Reif, David	3-480
Scott, Courtney	3-484
Spurgeon, Nick	3-485
Tracy, Nancy Lou	3-486
Tracy, Nancy Lou	3-487
Ward, Lee Ann	3-491
Ward, Rayner	3-492
Warner, Mona	3-493
Whitney, Holly	3-494
Wood, Jane	3-497
Yazzolino, Brad	3-498
Pennsylvania	
Lewis, Marvin	3-502
South Carolina	
Adams, W. Barry	3-507
Anonymous	3-530
Anonymous	3-531
Balser, Richard	3-537
Burt, Charles	3-543
Corbett, Susan	3-566
Corbett, Susan	3-569
Corbett, Susan	3-572
Fidds, W. Glenn	3-578
Geddes, Richard L.	3-580
Gilbert, Claude, Jr.	3-597
Goergen, Charles R.	3-599
Goetzman, Rudy	3-601
Goldman, James	3-602
Hardison, Karen G.	3-605
Helms, Lois	3-608
Johnson, Stephen A.	3-609
Jordal, Jim	3-610
Martin, William H.	3-617
Mason, Corry E.	3-618
Matthews, R. S.	3-619
Matthews, Suzanne	3-621
McWhorter, Don	3-622
Minerd, Leslie	3-623
Murray, Alice M.	3-624
Randall, Bill	3-642

Table 1-5. Individual Commentors by State (Continued)

Commentors	Page
South Carolina (Continued)	
Rapy, R. E.	3-643
Ridgeway, Robert G.	3-644
Rodrigues, George C.	3-646
Warshauer, Meira (Maxine)	3-687
Williams, David	3-696
Zachman, George	3-697
Tennessee	
Walton, Barbara A.	3-710
Texas	
Andrew, Michael	3-746
Anonymous	3-747
Anonymous	3-749
Anonymous	3-750
Anonymous	3-751
Anonymous	3-752
Anonymous	3-753
Baker, Robert D.	3-754
Benzinger, Danielle	3-756
Buckenal, George	3-758
Buckenal, Patty	3-759
Campbell, Charles A.	3-761
Campbell, Helen	3-762
Chavez, Robert	3-765
Clemens, Carlton	3-766
Conklin	3-768
Daniel, Louise	3-769
Day, Helen C. and Joe R.	3-771
Day, Helen Charlene	3-772
Day, Rick	3-773
Dodson, Don	3-775
Dworzack, Sarah	3-776
Emery, Mary	3-777
Erwin, Inez	3-778
Graves, Dorothy	3-828
Green, Charles E.	3-829
Hemphill, David H.	3-830
Hernon, Donald	3-831
Hickman, Joyce	3-832
Hopps, Harvey B.	3-833
Hughes, Tommy and Dad	3-834
Johnson, J. P.	3-838
Johnson, Mina Fields	3-839
Kaczmarek, Doris K.	3-840
Karrh, Robert	3-842
Keen, Marilyn	3-843

Table 1-5. Individual Commentors by State (Continued)

Commentors	Page
Texas (Continued)	
Kelly, Douglas M.	3-844
Kirkes, Cindy	3-845
Kopke, Mark	3-846
Ladd, Keena	3-847
Martin, Jerome B.	3-848
Maxie, Donald	3-856
McKeen, Sherry	3-857
McMurtry, Leroy	3-858
McWilliams, Steve	3-859
Metcalf, Stacy	3-860
Mills, Robin	3-861
Muna, Darlene	3-863
Osborne, Jeri R.	3-866
Pedigrew, Hal	3-876
Pluhar, Darwin and Jennifer	3-877
Proffitt, Gary	3-882
Ray, Don	3-883
Ream, Joe	3-884
Ream, Oleta	3-885
Rogers, Erin	3-886
Rogers, Erin	3-889
Russell	3-895
Sadesky, Ray	3-896
Schultz, Margaret	3-897
Seewald, William H.	3-898
Shennum, Mary	3-899
Shennum, Mary	3-900
Smith, Carol	3-901
Smith, Chuck	3-902
Smith, Ernestine	3-903
Smith, Jim D.	3-906
Sottile, Sam J.	3-907
Stanford, Claudia	3-988
Steiert, Jim	3-989
Whaley, Jan	3-1022
Wheeler, Carolyn	3-1023
Wolfe, Bill K.	3-1024
Washington	
Anonymous	3-1031
Anonymous	3-1032
Anonymous	3-1033
Briehl, Susan	3-1036
Chantler, Joan	3-1037
Condon, M.B., et al.	3-1041
Davenport, Leslie C.	3-1047
Giddings, Rochelle	3-1049
Haus, Barry	3-1063

Table 1-5. Individual Commentors by State (Continued)

Commentors	Page
Washington (Continued)	
Holtz, Ted	3-1064
Johnson, Leslie	3-1065
Kilbury, Charles D.	3-1066
Low, Ian and Aiko	3-1067
Lumpkin, Charles L.	3-1070
Madison, Jim	3-1072
Merhar, Don	3-1073
Merrill, David M.	3-1074
Merrill, David M.	3-1075
Merrill, David M.	3-1077
Moore, Victor and Roberta	3-1078
Pearson, Christine	3-1080
Rogers, Gordon J.	3-1085
Royal, Steve	3-1087
Seyer, Saul	3-1088
Sundstrom, Glenn	3-1092
Teal, Joseph	3-1093
Venetz, Ted	3-1104
Young, Tim, et al.	3-1109
Zepeda, Barbara	3-1116
Wisconsin	
Shillinglaw, Mrs. John	3-1153
State Unknown	
Anonymous	3-1181
Anonymous	3-1182
Anonymous	3-1183
Anonymous	3-1184
Dueling, C.L.	3-1185
Malesk, Jim	3-1186

Table 1–6. Multiple-Signatory Document Commentors by State

Commentors	Page
Colorado	
Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center.....	3–85
Tom Marshall	
LeRoy Moore	
Georgia	
Augusta-Richmond County Legislative Delegation.....	3–110
Ben Allen	
George F. DeFrach	
Lower Savannah Council of Governments.....	3–195
W. H. Burkhalter	
Elsie P. Thought	
Lower Savannah Council of Governments.....	3–196
S. J. Robinson	
Elsie P. Thought	
Maryland	
Institute for Energy and Environmental Research.....	3–279
Anita Seth	
Hisham Zerriffi	
Michigan	
Berlin Township.....	3–308
Thomas R. Blouslh	
Robert Christor	
Jeannette Powers	
Kathleen Worde	
Illegible	
Brockway.....	3–310
Ruth Krosnicki	
Arthur Laupichler	
Ronald Meharg	
Fred Theel	
Carl Vermeesch	
Emmett.....	3–323
Patricia E. Brozowski	
John Cowhy	
Daniel Greenia	
Owen Kean	
Robert Sturza	

Table 1–6. Multiple-Signatory Document Commentors by State (Continued)

Commentors	Page
Michigan (Continued)	
St. Clair County.....	3–338
Fred M. Bacon	
Elwood L. Brown	
Judith Keegan	
Lee Masters	
Don Wisner	
North Carolina	
Agricultural Resources Center, PESTicide EDucation Project.....	3–359
Allen Spalt	
Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League	
Louis Zeller	
Hamil, Lisa	
Protect All Children’s Environment	
E.M.T. O’Nan	
Southern Appalachian Biodiversity Project and the Green Highlands Project	
Andrew George	
South Carolina	
Aiken.....	3–508
Michael Anacleo	
Fred B. Cavanaugh	
Beverly D. Clyburn	
Karen M. Paponshado	
Robert Perry, Jr.	
Lessie B. Price	
Erin M. Radford	
Aiken Chamber of Commerce.....	3–517
June Murff	
Illegible	
Aiken County Commission for Technical Education.....	3–521
Joe W. DeVore	
Rosemary English	
Aiken County, South Carolina Legislative Delegation.....	3–525
Thomas Beck	
William Clyburn	
Rudolph Mason	
Thomas Moore	
W. Greg Ryberg	
Charles Sharpe	
Roland Smith	

Table 1-6. Multiple-Signatory Document Commentors by State (Continued)

Commentors	Page
South Carolina (Continued)	
Barnwell School District 45	3-541
James E. Benson	
Sue Black	
Valenda D. Black	
Donald Kitt	
James McCormack	
Reed Swann	
John Young	
Global Resource Action Center.....	3-632
Alice Slater	
Nuclear Control Institute	
Edwin Lyman	
Nuclear Information and Resource Service	
Mary Olson	
Physicians for Social Responsibility	
Lisa Ledwidge	
Public Citizen's Critical Mass Energy Project	
James Riccio	
Safe Energy Communication Council	
Linda Pentz	
Savannah River Regional Diversification Initiative	3-647
Robert M. Reich	
Thomas, J. Stone	
South Carolina Universities Research and Education Foundation (SCUREF) and Education, Research and Development Association of Georgia Universities (ERDA), Georgia.....	3-676
William Chace (ERDA)	
Wayne Clough (ERDA)	
Thomas Cole (ERDA)	
Constatine Curris (SCUREF)	
Leroy Davis (SCUREF)	
James Edwards (SCUREF)	
John Palms (SCUREF)	
Carl Patton (ERDA)	
William F. Prokasy (ERDA)	
Francis Tedesco (ERDA)	
Texas	
Amarillo Chamber of Commerce	3-726
Gary Molberg	
David Wilkes	
Amarillo Hispanic Chamber of Commerce	3-741
Gilbert Guzman	
Tony Quezada	
Panhandle 2000	3-867
Jerome W. Johnson	
Wales Madden, Jr.	

Table 1–6. Multiple-Signatory Document Commentors by State (Continued)

Commentors	Page
Texas (Continued)	
Potter County.....	3–880
Manny Perez	
John Stradley	
Arthur Ware	
Strick Watkins	
Texas AFL-CIO.....	3–997
Joe D. Gunn	
Emmett Sheppard	
Washington	
Condon, M. B.....	3–1041
Young, Tim	
Young, Tim.....	3–1109
Condon, M. B.	

Table 1-7. Public Hearing Attendees by Location

Affiliation/Attendees		Page
August 4, 1998—Richland, Washington (Hanford Site)		3-1187
Afternoon Session		
Associated Press	Munn, Wanda	U.S. Department of Energy
Linda Ashton	Nesary, Marlene	Scott Puris
Eckard, Connie	Pasco	U.S. Department of Energy,
FFTF Technical Support	Honorable Charles Kilbury	Richland Operations Office
Stan Scott	Richland	Rodney A. Almquist
Hagan, James	Honorable Larry Haler	Douglas H. Chapin
HGO Enterprises	Siemens Power Corporation	George Dragseth
Gai Oglesbee	Dan Nauman	Paul Dunigan Jr.
Hildreth, Norton	Sisu Technical and Management	U.S. Environmental Protection
ICF Kaiser	Consulting	Agency
Greg Clark	Ronald Liikala	Craig Cameron
Moore, Roberta	Supply System	Dennis Faulk
Moore, Robert	Joe Burn	U.S. House of Representatives,
Moore, Victor	Tri-City Herald	Honorable Doc Hastings' Office
	John Stang	Joyce DeFlice
Evening Session		
B&W Hanford Company	Fies, Carl	Tri-City Industrial Development
George Kulynych	Hoyt, Richard	Council
Jim Steffen	JAI Corpaoration	Harold Heacock
Ballard, Del	Donald Clark	U.S. Department of Energy,
Battelle Pacific Northwest National	Los Alamos National Laboratory	Richland Operations Office
Laboratory	Dennis Padilla	Peter Knollmeyer
Walter J. Apley	Roger Wishau	Shivaji Seth
Jerry Ethridge	Merrill, David	U.S. Senate, Honorable Slade
Bechtel	Oregon Office of Energy	Gorton's Office
Les Davenport	Douglas Huston	Suzanne Heaston
Burk, Linda	Siemens Power Corporation	Venetz, Ted
DE&S	Ronald Heiks	West Richland
Ralph Brackett	Supply System	Honorable Ken Dobbin
DESH, Inc.	Joe Burn	Honorable Jerry Peltier
Jack Kalia	Szempruch, Rich	Williams, Richard
Eastern Washington Section	Talbert, Robert	Wooten, David
American Nuclear Society		
Gerald Woodcock		
August 11, 1998—Amarillo, Texas (Pantex Plant)		3-1213
Afternoon Session		
Alpha Pavement Technology	Amarillo	Honorable Trent Sisemore
Incorporated	Honorable Dianne Bosch	Amarillo Association of Realtors
Glenn Braudt	Honorable Robert Keys	Richard James
Scotty Knutson	Honorable Kel Seliger	Randy Jeffers

Table 1–7. Public Hearing Attendees by Location (Continued)

Affiliation/Attendees	Page
August 11, 1998—Amarillo, Texas (Pantex Plant) <i>Afternoon Session (Continued)</i>	
Amarillo Chamber of Commerce Joanne Brown Belle Gage Jim Henson Stacy Knight Gary Molberg Larry Stalcup Diane Vincent	Battelle Pantex Kimberly Baker Jeff Flowers Robert Foulston J. Gantos Barbara Nava Belisle, Mavis Carnes, Roberta Claughton, J.C. Conklin, Danny H. Crafts, Clarence Rashada Don Harrington Discovery Center Thomas Halliday Exell Cattle Company Lee T. Bivins First Bank Southwest Don Dodson Will Miller Joe M. Stange Tommy Tyler Gray, David H. Lichte and Associates H.W. Lichte Hickman, Joyce Ivy, Deloris Ivy, Gordon Kaczmarek, Doris Keep Amarillo Beautiful Dusty McGuire KFDA Sarah Fisher Kraft, Trudy Lehigh University Kenneth Kraft Machinist Union Local Lodge 1255 John Taylor Mason and Hanger Corporation James Angelo Donnell Asberry Gary Ashlock Larry Backus Curtis Broadus J.R. Buchanan Douglas K. Burton
Amarillo Economic Development Corporation Michael Bourn Gilbert Guzman Bob Juba Glenn McMennamy	Bruce Campbell Linda Cauffman Selina Chaires Joseph Clark Charles Clinton Doug Connally Charles Dodd James Dronigo Randy Enger Gilbert Fajardo Billy D. Faubion Charlene Ferguson Johnny (Rick) Flores Lyle Fussell Pam George Cynthia Gilbreth Kenneth J. Gomez Michael R. Grusson Debra Halliday Phillip Halsted Mike Haywood Perry Hoag J. H. Honea Dennis Huddleston Havon Knighton John F. Lemming Jarrell Long Penny Lucero Wally Moulder Michael O'Connell Jimmy Phillips Fred B. Ramirez Ray Rusk David Smith Sam Sottile April Stotts Paul Teichmann Julie Terry Willie Watson William Weinreich H. Anthony Woltermann Robin Woolsey David Yeager
Amarillo Globe-News Jim McBride Garet von Netzer	
Amarillo National Bank Jud Simmons	
Amarillo National Resource Center for Plutonium Sandy Alvarez David Barnes Carl Beard Lois Cook Cathy Dixon Richard Edmondson Shirley Floyd Debbie Frymoyer Effie Harle Richard Hartley Mark Hendricks Robin Hightower Linda Peirce Beth Perry Leah Dawn Storey Christina Vincent David Watson Yvonne Weeg Angela Woods Elda Zounar	
American Real Estate Services Cristal Robinson	
Ames, John	
Ana-Lab, Keri Brigham	
Angelo, Chris	
Angelo, LaDonna	
Metal Trades Council of Amarillo Frank W. George, Jr. John F. Meese	Metal Trades Department, AFL-CIO Gordon Baxter

Table 1-7. Public Meeting Attendees by Location (Continued)

Affiliation/Attendees	Page
August 11, 1998—Amarillo, Texas (Pantex Plant)	
Afternoon Session (Continued)	
<p>Moore, Donald Nations Bank Steve Brunson Louis Cardwell David Hemphill Shawyna Stump New Century Energies Dean Metcalf Panhandle Chris Coffman Panhandle 2000 Randy Erben Brian Yarbrough Pantex Plant Citizens Advisory Board Sidney D. Blankenship Becky Lopez Parkrut, R.H. Peace Farm Paula Breeding Petraglia, Jeffrey Plains National Bank-Amarillo George Sell PNC Washington Takeo Kitazawa David Kornhauser Potter County Honorable John Stradley Purcell, Charles Rekdal, Sheila Rivas Environmental Consultants, Inc. Charlie Rivas Jr. Ruddy, Karen Southwestern Bell Lew Bradshaw Southwestern Public Service Company Hermilo Martinez Jr. STAND-PANAL Jeri Osborne James Osborne</p>	<p>STAND of Amarillo, Inc. Don Moniak Trish Neusch Texas A&M University Ian Hamilton James Lohaus Kenneth L. Peddicord James C. Rock Texas AFL-CIO Walter Hinojosa Texas Building & Construction Trades Council Gale E. Van Hoy Texas Department of Health Gary L. Froemsdorf Joseph A. Martillotti Texas Department of Public Safety Tom Castleman Texas District Council of Carpenters James N. Brookes Texas House of Representatives Honorable John Smithee Texas House of Representatives, David Swinford's Office Jenette Taylor Texas Senate, Honorable Teel Bivins' Office Sharon Miner Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission Brad Broussard George FitzGerald David W. Hastings Judy Headlee Shawn Hess Joseph Panketh Janet Pichette Texas Radiation Advisory Board Michael S. Ford Texas State Energy Conservation Office Venessa L. Gonzalez Roger Mulder</p> <p>Texas Tech University Kathleen Harris The Metal Trades Council Ronald Zerm TN Tech Kenneth Krieger United Association of Plumbers & Pipefitting Industry Don Green University of Texas at Austin Alan Dutton Michael McNerney University of Texas System Dale Klein U.S. Department of Energy, Amarillo Area Office Vicki Battley Mark Blackburn B. Hollowe Jerry S. Johnson Tom Walton U.S. Department of Energy, Defense Programs Tracey Bishop U.S. Department of Energy, Federal Energy Technology Center Steve Cooke U.S. House of Representatives, Mac Thornberry's Office Clay Sell West Texas A&M University B.A. Stewart Westar Trade Resources Cindy Thyfault Westinghouse Savannah River Company Gerald Hardin Blake R. Seward Wonderland Amusements, Inc. Paul Borchardt</p>

Table 1-7. Public Hearing Attendees by Location (Continued)

Affiliation/Attendees	Page
August 11, 1998—Amarillo, Texas (Pantex Plant)	
Evening Session	
Alvarez, Juan Amarillo Association of Realtors Raymond T. Fajardo Cindy Whitfield Amarillo Claim Service, Inc. Amarillo Globe-News Jim McBride Amarillo High School Matthew Johnson Amarillo Independent School District Helen Campbell Charles A. Campbell Helen Charlene Day Melinda Nakayama Leta Nixon Hanley Reynolds Amarillo National Bank Jayne MiFather Amarillo National Resource Center for Plutonium Sandy Alvarez David Barnes Carl Beard Cathy Dixon Richard Edmondson Bill Harris Richard Hartley Mark Hendricks Angela Woods Elda Zounar Archer, Johnell Battelle Pantex Tony Biggs Mickey Brown Larry Damron Jerome B. Martin Dave McBride Inge O'Brien Gloria Reynolds Lisa Vickers Biddle, John Boy Scouts of America Christopher Carter Darren Haley J. Whiserhurt	Brandon Whiserhurt Britten, Clifton Bull, Cristi Burke, Suzanne Campbell, Betsy Campbell, Carol Ann Castleberry, D. Cizan, Clifford Collins, Bettye Coppinger, Loretta Crall Products, Inc. Daniel R. Walsh Crown of Texas Hospital Brandee Backus Crumley, Martha Dillaha, Bobby Don Harrington Discovery Center Thomas Halliday Duncan, Bob Duncan, Bettie Ann Frying Pan Ranch Hackett, M.E. Harvey's Precision Body Shop Paul Elms Harvey Elms Hatfield, Roger Hatfield, Rusty Hernon, Donald Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Amarillo Demetrio A. Quezada Houser, James M. Houser, Denise Howard Smith Company Realtors Carol Smith Hulquist, Jo Ann International Guards Union of America, Local 38 Roger Lucas Kelly, Carter
	Law, Mike Lemming, Sandy Lockwood, Jeannine Los Alamos National Laboratory John Heneage Mason and Hanger Corporation Sherri Acker Mathe Altman B.J. Anderson Laura Bailey Robert D. Baker Ronald Barker Herbert S. Berman William Bingham Sheila Black Randy Boone Alan Booth Kathy Brack Leigh Bratcher Steven Briley Susan Britten James Brown Nolan Brown Christie Brown Richard Burke Vicky Lynn Caffee Ramon Camarillo Scott Campbell Leonard Castellano Selina Chaires Jesus S. Chavez Roger D. Chumney Glenn Cockrell Gary Cockrell Edgar J. Collier Larry Collins Michael Coppinger Deborah Daniel Marilyn Daves David Daves Rick Day Carolyn Demerson Tammy Denton Carey Dickerman Alan Egoodkin Inez Erwin Maria Fajardo Gilbert Fajardo

Table 1-7. Public Meeting Attendees by Location (Continued)

Affiliation/Attendees	Page
August 11, 1998—Amarillo, Texas (Pantex Plant) Evening Session (Continued)	
Mason and Hanger Corporation (Continued)	Steven Larsen Louie Lincoln
Sarah Fansler	Janelle Loftin
Robert Farley	DeAnn Long
Monte Ferguson	Jarrell Long
Gerald Findley	Brandy Lyles
Michael Foster	Chris Lyles
Jack Francis	Jeff Manspeaker
Michael L. Fureigh	Glenda Martin
James D. Gallagher	Daniel Martin
Frank Garcia	Kay Mask
Jose Garcia	Richard Maxey
Dale Garner	Shane McFather
Pam George	Brian McKnight
Sandy Gilmore	Forrest McLaughlon
Denis Glasscock	David Meyer
Kenneth J. Gomez	Erma Mitchell
Kathryn Griffin	Stephen R. Moore
Steve Hallett	Cathie Nall
Debra Halliday	Roger Nance
Jim Harbin	Darlene Nunn
Cathie Harris	Michael O'Connell
Donna Hatfield	Johnny R. Painter
Chris Herring	Dudley Parker
Charles Hills	Ronnie Payne
J.D. Hinton	Casey Phillips
Walter A. Howard	Jimmy Phillips
Richard Hulquist	Maurice Pierson
Dave Humbert	Jane Pinkston
David Irons	Raul Pompa
Jerry Ithaca	Ruben Pompa
Shirley Jackson	Gary Proffitt
James Jay	Cathy Prosser
Robert Johnson	Paul Ptashne
Connie Johnson	Lola Ptashne
John Johnson	Don Ray
Paul Johnson	Denver Redwine
Bruce Johnston	J. Blair Rhodes
Troy E. Jones	Jeff Rices
Francis R. Jones	Erin Richardson
Robert Karrh	Allen J. Roberts
Scott Kennedy	Rene Rodrigez
George Kenney	Elizabeth Rodrigez
Heidi Kenney	Edward D. Sain
Jerry King	Elvis Sain
Pam Klahr	Ramon Saldana
Michael Knight	Patrick Sanchez
Mark Kopke	Glvira Sanchez
Tyfani Lanier	Lavon Sauage
	Mike Schmidt Daniel Schmitt
	Mark Self
	Joe Sexton
	Randall Skinner
	Mark Smith
	Chester Smith
	Richard Kevin Smith
	Paul Sowle
	Terry Spangler
	Walter Starr
	Susan M. Steen
	James Stevens
	Don Strattin
	Herald Summers
	Annette Teter
	Kevin Teter
	David J. Toledo
	Leon E. Tomlinson
	Dennis Trent
	Lisa Trevino
	Billy Tucker
	Manuel Vallassar
	Clyde J. Vanarsdall
	Linda Vickers
	Patricia Walsh
	Bob Wells
	Jan Whaley
	Lawrence V. Whicker
	Jerry Williams
	Howard Willis
	Wilbur L. Willson
	Gary Winters
	H. Anthony Woltermann
	Jeff Yokum
	Frank S. Zamora
	Darla Zerm
	Maxie, Donald
	Metal Trades Council
	Ronald Zerm
	Metal Trades Council of Amarillo
	Frank W. George Jr.
	Mills, Robin
	Nations Bank
	Dusti Bradstreet
	S. Gearn
	Neusch, Kevin

Table 1-7. Public Hearing Attendees by Location (Continued)

Affiliation/Attendees	Page
August 11, 1998—Amarillo, Texas (Pantex Plant)	
<i>Evening Session (Continued)</i>	
Neusch, Gayle	Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission
Panhandle 2000	Richard Lee
Randy Erben	Joseph Panketh
Brian Yarbrough	Janet Pichette
Papp, A.G.	Texas Radiation Advisory Board Michael S. Ford
Petraglia, Jeffrey	Texas State Energy Conservation Office
Quinto, Albert	Denise Brooks
Revell, Tim	Venessa L. Gonzalez
Revell, Cathy	Roger Mulder
STAND of Amarillo, Inc.	Thompson, L. O'Brien
Allen Finegold	Trovino, Edward
Don Moniak	Tucker, Lynnette
Billie Poteet	U.S. Department of Energy, Albuquerque Operations Office
Stewart Title	Richard Sena
Conny Sain	U.S. Department of Energy, Amarillo Area Office
Texas A&M University	Mark Blackburn
Ian Hamilton	B. Hollowe
Kenneth L. Peddicord	Tom Walton
Texas Department of Health	U.S. Department of Energy, Defense Programs
Gary L. Froemsdorf	Tracey Bishop
Joseph A. Martillotti	U.S. Department of Energy, Federal Energy Technology Center
	Steve Cooke
	U.S. House of Representatives Honorable Bob Inglis
	University of Texas at Austin Alan Dutton
	Westinghouse Savannah River Company
	Gerald Hardin
	Jerry Hardin
	Blake R. Seward
	Winters, Rosemary
	Zamora, Luis
	Zamora, Gilbert
August 13, 1998—North Augusta, South Carolina (Savannah River Site).....3-1261	
<i>Afternoon Session</i>	
Aiken County	American Express Financial Advisors
Linda B. Eldridge	John J. S. Mead
Aiken Standard	American Nuclear Society- Savannah River Section
Craig Gibbs	John Dewes
Aiken Technical College	Asbestos Workers
Don Campbell	Raymond Storey
Howard Lobaugh	Augusta Tomorrow, Inc. Charles A. DeVaney
Dennis C. Rogers	Azzaro, Karen
James A. Schmidt	B&W Savannah River Company Timothy C. Marks
Lynne Weldon	Barnberg City Development Association, Inc.
Carolane Williams	Mary O. Olson
Allendale Chamber of Commerce	Barnberg County Council Isaiah Odom
Joseph Vuknic	Jasper B. Varn Jr.
Allendale County DSS	Barnberg County Department of Social Sciences
Linda H. Brigman	Patricia Williams
Christi Kirkland	Barnard, Jr., Doug
Allendale County, Chamber of	Barnwell
Commerce	Albert Black
Anne Rice	Barnwell City Council Benjamin Duncan
	Barnwell County
	Harold Buckmon
	Inez Collins
	Debra D. Fickling
	Vernon F. Grady
	W. A. Gripp
	Clyde T. Reed
	Barnwell County Chamber of Commerce Dennis Hutto

Table 1-7. Public Meeting Attendees by Location (Continued)

Affiliation/Attendees	Page
August 13, 1998—North Augusta, South Carolina (Savannah River Site)	
<i>Afternoon Session (Continued)</i>	
Richard Lamar Cathie Lynn John H. Mole Barnwell County Council Flowe Trexler Barnwell County Economic Development Commission Trevor Hamilton Barnwell School District 45 Valenda Black Beatty, James N. Bechtel Savannah River, Inc. Thomas Ballweg Douglas Barclay Frank Berry Wayne Buxton Joseph Conway G. P. Crotwell Roger E. Davis Gary Feenstra Craig Hamilton Gordon A. Johnson Robin MadisonBechtel Savannah River, Inc. Zane Madtes Freddie McCrary Richard H. Moore, Sr. Victor Navarro Brenda Reed Isaac L. Rucker Paul Ryan Ronald M. Simpson Scott Valentine Steve Welch Bertsch, Lynn Black, John Blackville, Joan McDonald BNFL, Inc. Brent Daugherty Stuart A. Kidson Richard Seaborn Boettinger, William Booher, Sam W. Brown, Larry Brownawell, Jerry	Buding, Tam Camiser Corporation Bryan Kane Campaign for a Prosperous Georgia Rita Kilpatrick Campbell, Jean Chem-Nuclear Systems Francis Flynn James Latham Cherry, Dorothy Christman, Wayne Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness Michael Butler Arthur S. Greer John Lindsay William C. Reinig Clemson Extension Service Terrell S. Smith Clyburn, William Collins, Bennie Collins, Willie C. CSRA Community Foundation R. Lee Smith Jr. Cude, Bonnie Denmark Technical College Ambrish Lavanic Department of Social Services Wade Delle S. Moody Duane, John Duke Energy Corporation Robert Van Namen Duke Engineering and Services Christy Phillips Robert Sharpe Dukes, Michael DuPont Savannah River Plant Harold M. Kelley E. Blackburn Construction Co., Inc. Ernie Blackburn Ebra, Martha Economic Development Partnership Ernie Chaput Edward Jones & Co. Chuck Smith Ehrhardt, William Edinger EXCESS Facilities Tim Holloway Fenstermacher, David K. Floyd, Greg Food Not Bombs Budd North Foster, William Fowke, James Frontroth, Ronald Geddes, Danny Geddes, Catherine Geddes, Richard L. Gilbert, Lee Gilkison, Joseph M. Goetzman, Rudy Graham, Lindsey Gray, Peter Green's Christian Bookstore Levi Green Grosso, Vincent GSUGANE David McBride Harbour, John Hatcher, Martha Haynes, Benjamin Haynes, Alice A. Hensley, Sr., George A. Herrera, Ruth Herrera, Henry Herrmann, Jack HJG, Inc. Harry Groh Holcomb, Perry Holtzscheiter, Bill

Table 1-7. Public Hearing Attendees by Location (Continued)

Affiliation/Attendees		Page
August 13, 1998—North Augusta, South Carolina (Savannah River Site)		
<i>Afternoon Session (Continued)</i>		
Howard Lumber Company	Moore, Jacqueline	Sadowski, Ed
William Fair	Moore, Ann F.	Savannah River Diversification Initiative
Chuck Renfro	Morin, Annette	Lewis C. Attardo
Ed Selby	Murray, Alice	SCANA
Howell, Lee	NAC International	Keith Coones
Hudspeth, Jan	John Patterson	Schumpert, Marty
IBEW Local Union 1579	Nations Bank	Sconyers, Honorable Larry
Mike Greene	Mark Wills	SDT
International Union of Operating Engineers	Noah, Christopher	Henry Dingfelder
Russell N. Britt	Norris, Jan	Shedrow, Clayton
JHW International Corporation	North Augusta	Silver Leaf Construction
John H. Walker	Deloris Bodie	Dave Zimmerman
Johns, John	Lark Jones	Small Business
Johnston, Dean Campbell	Charles B. Martin	Robert Moody
Jones, John	Ken McDowell	Snelling, Honorable Elbert T. Moore
Jones, Paul B.	North Augusta Chamber of Commerce	Snyder, Terri
Kvartek, Ed	Lisa McElmurray	Software Solutions
Laborers International Union of North America	Briton Williams	John Gravelle
Clayton L. Plemmons	Olson, Charles	Somers, Edward
Law Office of Maria Reichmanis	ORA	Sonnenberg, Les
Maria Reichmanis	John Felak	South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	Overman, Robert F.	Sandra
Thomas Gould	Paisley, Colleen Ackles	South Carolina House of Representatives
League of Woman Voters	Patton, Sonya	Honorable Wilbur Cave
Robert Kelly	People Sentinel	South Carolina Senate
Mary T. Kelly	Victor Hill	Honorable Brad Hutto
Local 283 Carpenter and Millwright	Polar Refrigeration	Honorable W. Greg Ryberg
Thomas H. Jenkins	Shannon Bohanan	Honorable J. Roland Smith
Los Alamos National Laboratory	Power Reactor and Nuclear Fuel Development Corporation	South Carolina State Treasurers Office
Thomas J. Farish	Hironobu	Richard Eckstrom
Madison, Michael	Randall, Bill	Spiker, Dyrke L.
Mason, Rudy	Randall, III, Boyd D.	SRP Federal Credit Union
Metro Augusta Chamber of Commerce	Reda, Louis	Gloria Greer
David Bell	Rice, Maurice	SRS Citizens Advisory Board
James West	Richmond County Health Department	Thomas W. Costikyan
Metropolitan Spirit	Danny Starling	Suzanne Matthews
Brian Neill	Roberts, John	Lane Parker
Milnes, Michael	Rogers, Bernice	
Moliassa, Richard	Rudisill, Tracy	

Table 1-7. Public Meeting Attendees by Location (Continued)

Affiliation/Attendees		Page
August 13, 1998—North Augusta, South Carolina (Savannah River Site)		
Afternoon Session (Continued)		
SRS Retiree Board of Directors	U.S. Senate, Honorable Max	Michael Burch
Dannie F. Walker	Cleland's Office	Paul Burket
Stephens, Kenneth W.	Scott MacGregor	Esther Burnham
Stone, Rick	U.S. Senate, Honorable Paul	Charles Burp
Stone & Webster Engineering	Coverdell's Office	Alan Busby
Corporation	Donald R. Stewart	David Busch
Carl A. Mazzola	Vaneman, Nancy	Sheryl Bush
Street, Gary H.	Vargo, Michael S.	William Busser
Sumner, Wallace	Verenes, John C.	Tom Butcher
Sun Trust Bank	Walter, Steven	Charles Camino
Bill Thompson	Westinghouse Savannah River	Michael Carlson
SWD, Bruce Saxman	Company	Muriel B. Carter
SWM, Ralph Poling	Lance Abbott	Randall Cash
Terrell, George	Gary Abell	Diane Cato
The Advertiser Herald	Frederick Adams	Terry Chalk
Jerry Dugan	Frances Alston	Randolph M. Clarke
Thomas, Steven	Joseph Amari	Dan Clayton
Thomas, Susan	Trent Andes	Carl E. Cliche
Tri-County Alliance	Ken Ashman	Joseph Cohen
Gretchen Birt	Kirsten Aylward	Barry L. Coleman
Donnie Delk	Richard Balser	Mary Coleman
Jim Kears	Jeff Barnes	Robert Collins
Carl L. Kilgus	Dewey E. Barnes	Sally Comer
Calvin McHon	James Barry	Calvin L. Cooks
Clarence Wright	Carol Barry	Barry Cooper
Tritium Maintenance DP	Patricia Baughman	Ed Corley
Stacey Towner	Douglas Bevard	Hank Cormany
Unitarian Universities Fellowship of	Prakash Bhende	George Cox
Columbia, SC	A. Bruce Bieling	Phillip Croll
Susan Corbett	Linda Blackston	Benjamin J. Cross
United Way of the CSRA, Inc.	Richard Blaine	Steve Crossland
Keith Benson	Allen L. Blancett	Andy Cwalina
U.S. Department of Energy, Federal	Lynn Bouknight	James Davis
Energy Technology Center	Keith M. Boyle	Harendra G. Desai
Jason Lewis	Carl Bradford	John Dickenson
U.S. Department of Energy,	Toni Brantley	Pat Dominey
Savannah River Operations Office	Linda Bridgmon	John P. Duane
Jose Blanco	Robert Bromley	Erich Duhn
Sonita Blanco	Brad Brooks	Kenneth M. Dukes
Francis A. Bolton	James Broome	Charles R. Dynarski
Craig Czuchna	Douglas Brown	Eddie Eddins
Dave Hepner	David Brown	Roger Elmgreen
Sherry Southern	Cindy G. Brown	Richard Emerson
Zaddie R. Wilkins	Rodney Brown	Debbie Etheridge
	Wes Bryan	John Fertic
	Willie J. Bryant	Dennis A. Fludd
	James Buchanan	Lynn Forrester
	James Bukovitz	Victor Franklin
		Derriel E. Frazier

Table 1-7. Public Hearing Attendees by Location (Continued)

Affiliation/Attendees	Page
August 13, 1998—North Augusta, South Carolina (Savannah River Site)	
<i>Afternoon Session (Continued)</i>	
Westinghouse Savannah River Company (Continued)	James R. Kramer Ronald Kuhn
Lawrene G. Frelin	Malcolm Kyle
Marsha Furness	James Lander
Jennifer Garvin	Kenneth Lane
Wilbur R. Gay Jr.	Barry Langford
Melanie Gibson	Bruce Lawrence
Brian Givens	Mark Lindholm
John Gladden	Stanley Lipman
Charles R. Goergen	Steve Losgar
Wayne Good	Christopher Lwesi
Talmadge H. Goodwin Jr.	Sharon Lybrand
Susan Grant	E. Paul Maddux
Ashley Griffis	Robert Maher
David Grimes	Jerry O. Marshall
John Gunther	Craig L. Martin
Mary A. Gunther	Kenneth Martin
Steve Haines	Lynn Martin
Jerry C. Hair	William Martin
C.G. Hardin Jr.	Charles Mastromonico
Mike Harrell	Glenn Mathues
Gordon Hart	R.S. Matthews
Charles F. Hatcher	Susan H. Maxwell
Monte Hawkins	Edward Mayo
Ava Hawkins	Walter J. McCain
Dawn Haygood	Dan McCurry
Julianna U. Hearn	David D. McGee
Ellen Heavner	J. Malvyn McKibben
James T. Herrin	Duane McLane
Garth Hewlett	Donald L. McWhorter
Richard Hodson	Robert Meadors
Robert Holler	Jon Meier
Rosemary Holley	Don Miller
Laurie J. Hollick	Larry Milton
Charlotte Holly	Robert Minnick
Robert Hotter	Lani Miyoshi
Mark Hubbard	Rod Mohammadi
Raymond Hunnicutt	Mark A. Moody
Kevin R. Jones	Jackson Moohy
Robert Jones	Pat Morgan
Clay Jones	Richard M. Morris
Timothy M. Jones	Allen J. Morris
Gregory Jones	James Morris
Larry R. Jones	Stephen Mundy
John Jordan	Ted A. Myers
Wanda Joyce	Edie Nicholson
Jim Junker	Charles Nickell
Charles Kearsse	A.W. Nutt
Joseph Kelley	Jerry O'Leary
Phillip Kenhlen	Mike O'Rourke
	Ron Oprea
	Eric Oser
	Constance M. Paino
	Brenda Pearson
	Wayne Peltay, III
	Ted Pennington
	R.S. Peters
	Furman Peters
	John M. Phillips
	Terry Pifer
	Thomas P. Powell
	Timothy H. Pratt
	Lessie B. Price
	Donald A. Pushman
	Bob Rabun
	Margaret Rackliffe
	Terry Rahm
	Cleo Raiford
	Thomas Riedl
	Napoleon Roberson
	Cheryl Robinson
	Anil Rode
	Philip Rodwell
	Michael Roper
	David Rose
	Shamain Rosenberg
	Dennis Rote
	Linda Rudd
	John Runnels
	Rick Runnels
	Ronald M. Schroder
	Austin B. Scott
	Betty Scott
	John R. Sessions
	Thomas F. Severynse
	Blake R. Seward
	Deborah Shedrow
	David Shiplett
	James F. Smith
	Jeffrey A. Smith
	Hugh E. Smith Jr.
	William K. Sokolo
	William Stevens
	Renee Stewart
	Charles Strain
	Eugene Strycula
	Kent Sullivan
	Michael Swain

Table 1-7. Public Meeting Attendees by Location (Continued)

Affiliation/Attendees	Page
August 13, 1998—North Augusta, South Carolina (Savannah River Site)	
Afternoon Session (Continued)	
Westinghouse Savannah River Company (Continued) Richard R. Tansky Dennis Taylor C. W. Thiessen Liz Thomas Perry Thomas Dennis Thompson Donna Tipton Frank Utsch William B. Van Pelt Ike Vaneman John P. Veldman Donna Waddington Robert Walker Don Waters L. C. Watson Don Weathersbee	<div> Donna Moore Wesby Quitman White Valerie Whitehead Thomas L. Williams Fran Williams Dean Williams Robert Williamson Steve Willingham David Wilson Walter Wilson Steve Wilson Calvin D. Wilson III Clinton Wolfe Jerry Wood Gary Zimmerman Weymond, Henry C. Whitmire, Dan </div> <div> Williams Farm & Garden Center, Inc. Frank Williams Williston Michael Benjamin Richard Neely Thomas R. Rivers Windsor Frank Mizell Witters, John M. Wood, Don E. WSMS Jay Thompson Zehr, Carl W. Zigelman, David </div>
Evening Session	
Adkins, Doug Aiken Michael Anaclerio Aiken Chamber of Commerce June Murff Aiken County Council Ronnie Young Aiken County Council District 5 Dale Stephens Aiken County Tax Assessor Ida M. Jenkins Aiken Electric Cooperative, Inc. Barry Glover Aiken International Club George Clare Aiken Regional Medical Centers Richard Satcher Armitage, Charles Asbestos Workers Raymond Storey Ashworth, G. J. Augusta-Richmond Co. Moses Todd Ballweg, Gearin Beaumier, Cynthia	<div> Beaumier, Glenn Beaumier, Katherine Bechtel Savannah River, Inc. Douglas Barclay Cassandra Bayer Gerry Blume John C. Chatten Marie Coleman Willie Dominguez Cecil Faircloth James Fay Randall Forty Mansoor M. Ghassem Tony Green Gregory Grenier Herbert L. Jackson Jr. Louis Jones Jr. Richard E. Lackey Mike Lewis Ed Manning Terry McNew Steve Miller Bill Miller Sheryl Neal Kathryn Norman Babubhai Patel Wilburn C. Sanders James Shaver Charles Smith </div> <div> P. A. Smith Ricky Smith David Sullivan Denis Thomas Keith Thomas Lee Wade George Walden Ronald Walker John Wall Clary Williamson Kevin Wilson, Sr. Ted Wineteer Roger and Darlene Yancey BNFL, Inc. Pamela DelCastilho John Rovanseck Bowman, Tommie Boyd, Robbie Brigham, Patricia Brigham Properties LLLP Lee Brigham Brigham Properties, Inc. William B. Brigham Burns, Dan Burrus, George </div>

Table 1-7. Public Hearing Attendees by Location (Continued)

Affiliation/Attendees	Page
August 13, 1998—North Augusta, South Carolina (Savannah River Site)	
Evening Session (Continued)	
Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness Susan Cathey Vincent C. Minardi John W. Pavaglio	Holmes, Frank W. Howard Lumber Company Donna H. Montgomery Hozey, Melanie
Colclough, Wes	Hyde Park & Aragon Park Improvement Committee, Inc.
Cook, Rich	Charles N. Utley
Coral, Barbara	Demetria Utley
Cordani, Robert	Hyde Park Committee
Dabrowski, Jan	Melvin Stewart
Daniels, Janice	IBEW Local Union 1579
Drown, Wayne	Morris Beard
Duke Energy Corporation	Samuel Blythe
Robert Van Namen	Richard Brown
Duke Engineering and Services	Johnny Drake
Christy Phillips	Edward Dukes
Robert Sharpe	Rodney Dye
Edenfield, Nancy	Danny Fincher
Edward Jones & Co.	Mike Greene
Chuck Smith	Stanley Hampton
Elkins, Bill	Henry A. Hayden
Elkins, Susan	Johnny L. Jones
Eubanks, Carnell	Curtis A. Lockamy Jr.
Fernandez Consulting	Raven V. Mason
LeVerne P. Fernandez	James Rowell
Fields, Betty	Anthony Ruvo
Flora, David	William Shoaf
Flora, Mary	Jay Veal
Geddes, Danny	Annette Veal
General Physics	Thomas S. Yarbrough
David E. Neal	Innen, Menard
Gilkison, Joseph M.	Ingham, Robert
Goldman, Barry M.	International Association of Heat and Frost Insulation
Goldman, James	Dale R. Cullum
Gouker, Larry L.	International Brotherhood of Teamsters
Grefenstette, Paul	Marion Davis
GTS Duratek	International Union of Operating Engineers
James Pope	Russell N. Britt
Hall, Joe	Jenkins, Arthur
Harrington, Cathy	Johnson, Tommie
Heffner, James	Kay, Virginia
	Kellner, Cindy
	Khan, Ibrahim
	King, Henry
	King, Sue
	Knick, Joseph
	Kohl, Marilyn
	Kohl, James A.
	Laborers International Union of North America
	Edward E. Floyd
	Lex, Thomas
	Local Union 1137
	Moses Dumm
	Lillie Mae Jones
	Local Union 1137 (Laborers Training Center)
	Fred V. Truitt
	Local Union 283
	Don Solki
	Los Alamos National Laboratory
	Thomas J. Farish
	Lower Savannah Council of Governments
	Eric P. Thompson
	Lowry, Nancy
	Lowry, Greg
	Maiden City LLC
	Chris Baker
	Malloy, Sondra
	Martinez Elementary School
	Lauren B. Williams
	Matthews, Bob
	McDaniel, Jeanne
	McQuinn, Mary
	McQuinn, R.L.
	Medical University of South Carolina
	Seymour Baron
	Messick, Russ
	Miles, Frankie
	Miller, Ralph S.
	Miller, Judi

Table 1-7. Public Meeting Attendees by Location (Continued)

Affiliation/Attendees	Page
August 13, 1998—North Augusta, South Carolina (Savannah River Site)	
Evening Session (Continued)	
Miller, Charles	South Carolina AFL/CIO
Mitchell, Joyce W.	Donna Dewitt
Murphy, Edward	South Carolina Department of
National Science Center, Fort	Health & Environmental Control
Discovery	Crystal
David L. Keel	Shelly
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Spiker, A. H.
Heather Astwood	SRP Federal Credit Union
Olson, Herbert	Gloria Greer
Patterson, Karen	SRS Citizens Advisory Board
Pedde, Robert A.	Suzanne Matthews
Perrett, Edward	P. K. Smith
Piccolo, Steve	Wade H. Waters
Plyler, Dianna	State of South Carolina
Poe, Jr., William Lee	T. Scott Beck
Power Reactor and Nuclear Fuel	Ed Buzen
Development Corporation	Stejskal, Gerry
Hironobu	Stevens Creek Elementary
Project Control Services	Carla Friel
Marc N. Peel	Tanner, Bobby
Quantum Grafix	Terrell, George
Jeremiah Strack	Tetra-tech NUS
Randall, Bill	William R. McDonell
Randall, Pat	Thomas, Allen
Rankin, D. Thomas	Torreyson, Anne
Ray, Megan	U.S. Department of Energy,
Raytheon	Savannah River Operations Office
William Lenz	Jay Bilyer
Raytheon Engineers & Constructors	Donald N. Bridges
Roger Alley	Christina Edwards
RCS Corporation	Robert E. Edwards
Carlos Garcia	Leonard C. Sjoström
Roberts, Elaine	U.S. House of Representatives
Robertson, Sterling J.	Honorable Bob Inglis
Rueter, Ruth	USCA
SDMS	Maria Chandler
Jane Faircloth	Utley, Anthony
Shaver, Norma	Verenes, John C.
Silverton Apartments	Vest, Bobby L.
Juanita Goldman	Vichare, Raam
Smith, Lorilyn	Villasor, Angel
	Wade, Wanda
	Wade, Lola B.
	Walter, Johnson
	WDQA
	Odus Francis
	Westinghouse Savannah River
	Company
	Dolores (Dee) Adkins
	Denis J. Altman
	Jimmy Angelos
	James Arflin
	Michael Baker
	James Barber
	Donald Barfield
	Robert Bayer
	Dan Becker
	Robert Boatwright
	Terri Bolton
	W. Brent Boore
	Ken Boucher
	David Broaden
	George Brodie
	Helen Brooks
	Marilyn Bryce-Schanhals
	Mel R. Buckner
	William M. Burroughs
	Bruce Cadotte
	Ronald M. Campbell
	Gary Cannell
	Michael Chandler
	Tim Chandler
	Dennis Cheeks
	David P. Chew
	Carl E. Cliche
	John Cook
	Virginia Cordova
	Daniel Cox
	Brent Craft
	Richard Crafton
	Kenneth W. Crase
	Charles Crawford
	Thomas Crouse
	Paul d'Entremont
	Vince Daly
	Jerry R. Daniels
	Paul T. Deason
	R. A. DelCastilho
	William Dill
	Walt Dyke
	James P. Elliot
	Steve Epperson

Table 1–7. Public Hearing Attendees by Location (Continued)

Affiliation/Attendees	Page
August 13, 1998—North Augusta, South Carolina (Savannah River Site)	
<i>Evening Session (Continued)</i>	
Westinghouse Savannah River Company (Continued)	Donald Johnson Edward F. Johnson
William D. Erwin	Michael D. Johnson
J. Stuart Evans	Patricia Johnson
Scott Federman	Stephen A. Johnson
James Ferrell	Todd Jones
Glenn Fields	Robert Jones
Tim Flake	Calvin Jones Jr.
Sam Formby	Jim Jordan
Thomas Foster	Kirit Joshi
Geoffrey Fountain	Michael Kaplan
Kenneth Franklin	Asa Kelley
Thomas J. Friel	Robert Kellner
Richard Frushour	Albert Kennedy
Steve Glover	John Keyes
Charlene Goodman	Stephen King
Susan Goodwin	Paul Korinko
Al Goodwyn	Ki Kwon
Donald Gordon	Edward Kyser
John Greenquist	Charles Lampley
Phillip Griffith	Susan Lance
Freddie Grimm	Larry G. Lawson Jr.
Joel Guilherme	Daniel Leduc
Surendra K. Gupta	Edward Leibfarth
Apjinder Guram	Andrew Lesko
Elizabeth Hackney	Karen Lesko
Donnie Hall	David B. Little
Gary C. Hamm	Susie Littrell
Harvey Handfinger	Carla Loffin
Hextonia Harden	Doug Lowry
James L. Hardin	Chris R. Loyal
C.G. Hardin Jr.	Larry D. MacLean
Archie Hargett	Irwin Magerkurth
Tim Harrington	Gerald Malloy
Robert Harris	Sharon Marra
Larry Harrison	James Marra
Tim Hasty	Hollis L. Martin
Barbara Headrick	William H. Martin
Bruce Hewett	Lynn Martin
James O. Hightower	Matthew Maryak
Carl Hirst	Robert C. Mason
Cynthia Holding-Smith	R.S. Matthews
Charlotte Holly	William Mattocks
Claudette P. Hopkins	Teresa A. Mayfield
Richard Hopkins	James McClard
William Huiet	Martin McCrom
Francis T. Iwuc	Terry McLane
Al R. Jeffront	Dwain G. McMullin
Jerrel Jernigan	Donald L. McWhorter
Alfred T. Johnson	Betty Meadows
	John Mealing Suzanne Messick Larry Milton Mose Mims Jr. William T. Mitchell R. Mike Mobley Andy Mock Tim Moore Jerome Morin Richard M. Morris James D. Moss David M. Mutos Audrey Ogletree Ted Padezanin Patricia Padezanin A. N. Padgett Marvin Peake Steven Pinion C. J. Plummer-Wooley Peggy L. Plyler Carol Polson David Poss Dave Potocik Bill Poulson Ken Powell Chandra Prakash Harriet Priester Richard Proctor Harry Pund Rodney Rabon Kenneth L. Ramsey Brent Rankin Robert & Betty Rapp Alan Reed Donald Reese William Rigot Thomas F. Ritt Jerry D. Roberts Johnny Robertson Thomas C. Robinson George C. Rodrigues Doris Rouse Kenneth Rueter Ed Russell Nader Sadri Charles Sanders Roland W. Sasser III Mark Schmitz Al Scott Patricia Scott

Table 1-7. Public Meeting Attendees by Location (Continued)

Affiliation/Attendees		Page
August 13, 1998—North Augusta, South Carolina (Savannah River Site)		
Evening Session (Continued)		
Westinghouse Savannah River Company (Continued)	Jimmie Stuberfield	Patricia Wiley
Charles Sessions	Kent Sullivan	Lester Wiley Jr.
Blake R. Seward	Randall W. Tatum	Steve Wilkerson
Mike Shah	Gregory D. Teese	Fran Williams
Vinay Sharma	Kevin Tietze	David Williams
David Simpson	Stacey J. Timmerman	Robert Wilson
Ray Skwarek	Leonard L. Trasko	James Wong
Keith Slaughter	Michelle Trill	Keith Wood
Bobby D. Smith	Dave W. Tuttel	Susan Wood
Eric Smith	Tom Varallo	G. Todd Wright
Kevin Smith	Clarence Ward	Henry I. Yamamoto
Paul Smock	Clyde Ward	Reuben Yon
Ron Sprayberry	Woodrow Ware	Robert M. Young
Roger Staten	Marilyn Ware	Robin Young
Pete Stevens	William F. Ware	George Zachmann
August Stopf	John R. Wehr	James Zumwalt
John Strack	Roger M. White	Yarbrough, Helen
	Anatia Whittenburg	
August 18, 1998—Portland, Oregon (Hanford Site).....		3-1279
Afternoon Session		
Anttila, Everett	Don't Waste Oregon	Oregon Office of Energy
Bechtel	Lynn Sims	Michael Grainey
Les Davenport	Germond, Norma Jean	Steven Sautter
Boston University/Portland State University	Gray Panthers	Pierce, Allen
Victor Nguyen	Gerri Peck	Supply System
Broderick, John	Hanford Watch	Joe Burn
Cobo, Ted	William Bires	U.S. Department of Energy,
Crackerjacks Marketing	Heart of America Northwest	Chicago Operations Office
David Milholland	Paige Leven	Bob Selby
	Lodwick, R.	
Evening Session		
Bechtel	Grubmil, Ffej	Hansen, Robert
Les Davenport	Hanford Action of Oregon	Hysko, David
Butz, Andrew	Terry Hammond	Juergens, Kathleen
Butz, Nathan	Chuck Johnson	King, Jame
Currie, Ruth O.	Robin Klein	Laughing Horse Collective
Dean, Alison	Hanford Advisory Board	Rayner Ward
Demaria, Gregg	Dick Belsey	Lichtenwald, Daniel
Dim, Everett	Hanford Watch	Markowitz, Sally
Don't Waste Oregon	James Baldwine	McAdams, Paul
Kathryn "Cherie" Holenstein	Owen Lindsay	McCarty, Mary
Ferguson, Roger	Lynn Porter	
	David Reif	

Table 1-7. Public Hearing Attendees by Location (Continued)

Affiliation/Attendees		Page
August 18, 1998—Portland, Oregon (Hanford Site)		
Evening Session (Continued)		
McLoughlin, Maura	Portland Cable Access TCI	U.S. Department of Energy,
Mitchell, Phil	Carolyn Brunett	Chicago Operations Office
Muller, Patricia	Portland Critical Mass	Bob Selby
Murray-Hanson, Sheryl	Aaron VanDerlip	U.S. House of Representatives,
Nickum, Helen	Catherine Ward	Honorable Elizabeth Furse's Office
Norton, Patrick	Priebe, Millie	Ann Richardson
Oregon Office of Energy	Public Safety Resources Agency	Whitney, Holly
Dirk Dunning	W.P. Mead	Wilkins, David
Douglas Huston	Rainbow Family of Light and Love	Woman's International League for
Oregon Peaceworks	Riggs, Doug	Peace and Freedom
Claire Closmann	Robindottir, Jody	Barbara Drageaux
Peterson, Don	Russell, Robert	Betty June Marsh
Playford, Kristin	Scott, Courtney	
August 20, 1998—Idaho Falls, Idaho (Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory)3-1323		
Afternoon Session		
Argonne National Laboratory-West	Jensen, Aroid	University of Idaho
Roger D. Haga	Jobe, Lowell	Maxine Dakins
Richard Lindsay	Lawrence Livermore National	U.S. Department of Energy,
Grant C. McClellan	Laboratory	Chicago Operations Office
Bacca, J. Paul	Melvin S. Coops	William A. Parmley
Coalition 21	Lockheed Martin Idaho Technology	U.S. Department of Energy, Idaho
George Freund	Company	Operations Office
Richard Kenney	Roger Henry	William H. Thielbahr
Coalition 21 and American Nuclear Society	Julie Merrill	Watanabe, Theodore
John C. Commander	Los Alamos Technical Associates	
Fritz, Mary Jane	Roger Mayes	
Institute for Energy and Environmental Research	Rickards, Peter	
Hisham Zeriffi	Snake River Alliance	
	Beatrice Brailsford	
Evening Session		
Coalition 21	Hampson, Walt	U.S. Department of Energy,
George Freund	Jobe, Lowell	Chicago Operations Office
Darnell, G. Ross	SAIC	William A. Parmley
Duke Engineering and Services,	J. D. Atkinson	Westinghouse Savannah River Co.
Toney Mathews	Jerry Hardin	Jerry Hardin

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign

Commentors		Page
Letter Expressing Support for the Disassembly and Conversion of Nuclear Weapons Plutonium Components at the Pantex Plant		3-1347
PIA Insurance Agency, Inc. R. N. Burks Pat Conley	Al Cunningham Maxey Dodson Gram Smith	
Letter Expressing Reasons for Not Supporting Plutonium Processing at the Pantex Plant.....		3-1349
Abell, Jane Anonymous Artho, Edward and Virginia Atkerson, J. B. Barclay, Gary L. Berg, Ruth Ann Berry, Rick Black, Carla Charless, Jr., Addis Clark, Robert A. Clopton, Jim Cole, Leslie Cook, Jeanne W. Doyle, Christella W. Duncan, Dorothy Egbert, Lawrence Everett, Mike Garcia, Danna and Bennie Gramstorff, Jeanne B. Hajeh, Linda Helms, Pat G. Hoffman, Kirby Hollingsworth, Dale Keevan, Marcia A. Kriedeman, Eddie Jean	Kroeger, Janet Lebow, M. Lebow, Sherri Lippmann, Otto Locke, J. Mathern-Jacobson, Scott Miller, Genevieve O. Miller, Virginia M. Murphrey, David Murphy, J. Neusch, Gayle Newburg, Madonna E. Newell, Virginia M. Office of the Americas Blasé Bonpane Owen, Weslie B. Peace Farm Mary J. Nicholson Pluhar, Darwin and Jennifer Recycled Country Sunshine Penni E. Clark Rireley, Mary Benton Rogers, Erin Rudd, Mysti Schlegel, Norbert	Seewald, Katherine Seewald, William Hughes Shennum, Mary L. Smith, Doris B. Smith, Ernestine Smith, Greg and Michelle Smith, Phillip South Dakota Peace and Justice Center Jeanne Koster Stein, Janie Sull, Mary The Center for Legal and Social Justice Tadeo Spike Zywwski Torczon, Mary Jo Wadley, Robert Burns Wancura, Marianne S. Warden, Dolly Warrick, J. E. White, Jack W. and Betty E. Wiedebush and Company Jeri Wiedebush Williams, Jim I.
Letter Expressing Reasons Why the Fuels and Materials Examination Facility at the Hanford Site Should Be Selected to Disposition U.S. Surplus Plutonium		3-1353
Burk, Linda Burk, Robert	Johnston, Daniel C. Mensing, Debbie L.	
Letter Expressing Support for Immobilizing All Surplus Plutonium and Rejection of the Mixed Oxide Fuel Option		3-1355
Abell, Jane Artho, Edward and Virginia Atkerson, J. B. Barclay, Gary L. Barfield, Ellen	Beardall, Jr., William H. Berg, Ruth Ann Berry, Rick Bieri, Alvenia Black, Carla	Breeding, Paula F. Charless, Jr., Addis Clark, Robert A. Clopton, Jim Cole, Leslie

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Letter Expressing Support for Immobilizing All Surplus Plutonium and Rejection of the Mixed Oxide Fuel Option (Continued)		
Doyle, John	Moran, John	Seewald, William Hughes
Duncan, Dorothy	Murphrey, David	Shennum, Mary L.
Egbert, Lawrence	Neusch, Gayle	Smith, Doris B.
Everett, Mike	Newburg, Madonna E.	Smith, Greg and Michelle
Garcia, Danna and Bennie	Newell, Virginia M.	South Dakota Peace and Justice Center
Gramstorff, Jeanne B.	Office of the Americas	Jeanne Koster
Helms, Pat G.	Blasé Bonpane	Spear, Gale
Hoffman, Rosemarie	Owen, Weslie B.	Stein, Janie
Hollingsworth, Dale	Peace Farm	Torczon, Mary Jo
Keevan, Marcia A.	Mary J. Nicholson	Wadley, Robert Burns
Kroeger, Janet	Pluhar, Darwin and Jennifer	Warden, Dolly
Lebow, M.	Recycled Country Sunshine	Warrick, J. E.
Lebow, Sherri	Penni E. Clark	White, Jack W. and Betty E.
Lippmann, Otto	Rireley, Mary Benton	Wiedebush and Company
Mathern-Jacobson, Reba	Rogers, Erin	Jeri Wiedebush
Micon, Rastz	Rudd, Mysti	Williams, Jim I.
Miller, Dion O.	Schlegel, Norbert	
Miller, Virginia M.	Seewald, Katherine	
Letter Expressing Support for Locating Disassembly and Conversion of Nuclear Weapons Plutonium Components at the Pantex Plant..... 3-1361		
Adams, Dave	Baldwin Distribution Services, Ltd.	Bradshaw, Lew
Adams, Jo	Dudley Baldwin	Bradshaw, Lisa A.
Alend, J. D.	Band, Lawrence	Bret, Joe
Aleroyd, Rita	Bankhead, Herbert	Briarodt, Randy
Alexander, Ray	Barnett, Roger	Brinkley, Tina
Almange, Kathryn	Barrett, Glenda	Brooks, Virginia
Alpha Pavement Technology, Inc.	Bass, Bob	Brooks, William E.
Glen Bards	Bass, Othelia	Brown, Dennis
Jimmy Gonzales	Beasley, Corinne	Brown, Jeanne
Scott Kit	Beasley, Matthew	Brown, Joanne
Amarillo National Resource Center for Plutonium	Beck, E. J.	Brown, Penny
Elda D. Zounar-Harbour	Beldo, Dean	Brown, Samuel
Amus, Joseph	Bend, D.	Bryant, M. D.
Armstrong, Barbara	Bentley, Penni F.	Burd, Alan S.
Arnold, Steven D.	Berner, Steve	Burk, Norman
Austin, Steven J.	Beyers, Kay	Burkham, Todd
Baggett, Tony	Bigler, Christy K.	Burkholz, Janice K.
Bailey, David	Black, Brian	Burnett, Blaine
Bailey, Laura	Bonjour, Gail	Bush, Jr., Billy T.
Baker, Danni Jenkins	Borchardt, Paula	Bylee, John
Baldwin, Kathy	Boyd, Ron	Bythany, Jr., H. R.

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Letter Expressing Support for Locating Disassembly and Conversion of Nuclear Weapons Plutonium Components at the Pantex Plant (Continued)		
C. D. Baldwin Trucking	Davey, Beverly	Gage, Belle
Charles D. Baldwin	David V. Eck and Associates, P.C.	Gaison, Gabe
Campbell, Carl	David V. Eck	Ganeg, Etasi G.
Campbell, Chris	Davis, Karen	Garcia, Lucy
Campbell, Jane	Davis, R. T.	Garrett, Jennifer
Campbell, Lyna R.	Deal, Patricia	Gez, Bruce
Campbell, Shimika	Dockery, Lori	Giles, Jr., Thomas A.
Canmour, Carl	Dunditt, R. L.	Gofertto, Sharon
Cantii, Mike	Duyman, John	Golden, Tommy
Carflell, Samuel H.	Dyer, Richard	Gosulck, Jack
Carrol, Lewis	Dyson, Bettye	Gowery, Elizabeth
Cash, Douglas	Dyson, Hershel	Graham, Jerry
Cash, Linda	Eaton, Paul W.	Grant, David
Casias, Beverly	Edmond Denton and Stephens, Inc.	Gray, Steve
Caulehey, Chris	Leann Cox	Greear, Kenneth E.
Chaires, Sefina	Edmond Denton	Green, Edith
Chapmon, Garland B.	Donald Galbraith	Gross, Don
Chernick, B. M.	Joann O.	Grove, Donald
Chez, Charles E.	Jackie Reeves	Gunnels, Susan
Chieders, Miles	Charissa Young	Hactis, Willie
Childers, G. L.	Edmondson, Ronald	Haddock, James K.
Christain, Chris	Edmondson, Richard	Hain, Joel
Christain, Randy	Elliot, Ronald	Halek, Alice
Coker, Johnny L.	Ellis, Brandi	Hall, James
Collert, Brian	Elm, Paul H.	Harlan, Jane
Collins, Bryan H.	Elms, Harvey	Harmon, Todd
Comer & Fielding Custom Builders and Designers, Inc.	Elms, Mrs. Harvey	Harrington Regional Medical Center
Mickey Comer	Everitt, Stephen	Linda D. Borden
Pebbie Comer	Fansler, Krystal	Bernard Cohen
Rod Fielding	Fasano, Lupe	Stephen Gens
Alison R. Love	Fassa, Helen Jewell	Harris, Lisa
Benona Love	Ferguson, M. Clay	Hartness, J. M.
Cooper, Roberta	Fine, James	Harz, Kelly
Couture, Celeste	Firoff, Stacey	Hather, Jill
Craule, Marcus	Flippo, Cindy	Haws, Stan B.
Crawford, Aundria	Floyd, Shirley	Haynes, Amelia
Creden, Jr., Deward	Foster III, E. R.	Haynes, Carl
Creil, Mitch	Fouphy, Cesar M.	Heidelberg, Jerry
Crook, Tresa A.	Fowler, Jana	Hellberg, Jeffrey W.
Curtis, Don T.	Frislice, Sylvia	Hepoy, Ronald D.
Dalrymple, S.	Frouth, Bob	Hernandez, Tobias A.
Dan, Stuart	Fugett, Neda	Herr, Jim
	Fyfe, Taylor D.	

Table 1–8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Letter Expressing Support for Locating Disassembly and Conversion of Nuclear Weapons Plutonium Components at the Pantex Plant (Continued)		
Herrell, Auther	Latte, Ray	McGuire, Dusty
Hilbert, Christy	Lawdermilk, Rocky	McKee, April
Hines, S. D.	Ledbetter, Clyde	McKeen, Sherry
Hintz, Jacques	Lewis, Chris M.	McNeill, Sharon
Holb, Fontroy	Lewis, D.	McWilliams, Barbara
Holloway, F.	Lindsey, Clifford	Meadows, Sharon
Holloway, Marty	Loeb, Jack	Meer, Karen
Hooker, Vicki	Lomoria, Abel	Meier, Jim
Hotmann, Mark	Lonalo, Brian	Michaels, Anne
Howell, Joe K.	Lopez, Becky	Mille, Rich
Illegible (36)	Lovett, Brock W.	Mitchell, Cray
Imie, Russell	Lyons, Bobby	Mitchell, Stephanie
Inez, Gary E.	Madden, Nita	Molberg, Paula
Ison, Dale	Maddox, Donna E.	Molberg, S.
Jackson, Chris	Maeder, D. R.	Mracley, John
Jackson, Donald E.	Magen, Gina	Mudroch, J.
Jackson, Mike	Magowik, Beverly	Muygu, Dawn
Jagler, Jann	Magowik, Sharon	Myer, Joanne
Jalori, Brian	Mahan, Cindy	Naraneta, John
James, Lendal	Malone, Heather	Navaj, Raymond
Janes, Randy	Malone, Wes	NcNabb, Patrick
Jobe, Alfred	Manning, Susan	Neal, Veronica
Johnson, Jim	Marer, P.	Newton, G.
Jones, Robert	Markus, Jeanine	Nicholson, Brad
K.E.W.	Martin, Devich	Nicholson, Jr., Robert
Kay, John	Martin, Sergio	Nixon, Dolores
Keene, Marilyn	Martin, William B.	Nodogil, Seth
Keene, Richard	Martinez, Brenda J.	Nuikodid, Darko
Keene, Tammy	Martinez, W.	Opitz, Lise Kin
Kidd, Don E.	Massey, Charles	Ortiz, Melisa M.
Kimbell, Iretta	Matheson, Pam	Ortiz, Willie
King, Grady	Mato, Michael L.	Othengren, Karen R.
King, James B.	Mayfield, Todd	Page, Sherry
Kite, David A.	McAfoos, Paula	Palmer, Kelly
Knight, Stacy	McAfoos, Rob	Parker, Rebecca
Kongdan, Seth T.	McCoffree, Robert	Parker, S. F.
Kuking, Matt	McCormick, Wayne	Patrick, Connie L.
Lacer, Lorene	McDawell, Jenn M.	Patrick, Kathleen
Lane, Dennis	McDonald, Lyle	Patrick, Michael H.
Lane, Dot	McElroy, Jimmy	Peters, Therese G.
Lane, Joe	McGee, Charlie	Pinkham, Amy
Lane, Kim	McGregor, Kay	Plates, Mary

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Letter Expressing Support for Locating Disassembly and Conversion of Nuclear Weapons Plutonium Components at the Pantex Plant (Continued)		
Powell, Trish	Salzmann, Christina	Switzer, Mita
Prather, Linda	Sanchez, Louie	Taylor, Mandy
Prather, Pam	Sand, Danyell	Taylor, Nick
Preston, Heronie	Sanders, Don	Terry, Mike
Preston, Kenneth	Sanders, Sherm	Teugh, John W.
Preston, Roberto E.	Sanders, Susan	Thompson, Troy
Price, Sharon	Satterwhite, Chemayne	Thornberry, Jennie
Propes, Mike	Savage, Tim	Tidmore, Jeff
Prudential/Ada Realtors	Schecht, Nancy L.	Tiel, Robert
Sue Lawrence	Schooler, Jim	Todd, Frank
Puryear, Mandy	Scott, E. C.	Tucker, Tersa
Rankin, Elizabeth E.	Scott, Jane	Tyler, Earl
Rascoe, Joe F.	Seales, Ada L.	Ulalf, Lou Ann
Reagh, J. W.	Sechrest, Sabrina	Valdez, John
Reardon, Jane	Selman, Lucille	Vib, C.
Reece, Doyle	Serf, Tricia L.	Vincent, Dianne
Reed, Carrie	Shackelford, Jerry	Vogler, J. Mark
Reed, Peggy	Shafer, Jim	Walker, Charles D.
Reeves, Aileen	Shortell, Kenneth J.	Wallace, Kelly
Reid, Anne	Shumate, Carrie A.	Walsh, Angie
Reid, Don R.	Shwartz, Bruce	Ward, Gary
Reynolds, Amy	Silk, Ron	Ward, Jason
Rhea, Donna	Simmons, Arlene	Ward, Susie
Richardson, Linda	Sims, Sophia D.	Washburn, Melissa
Riechen, L.	Skelton, Ronald	Wath, J. L.
Riley, Karen	Slether, Gary	Watson, Darian
Rinale, Wendell	Smith, James B.	Weatherly, M. L.
Ritox, Steve	Smith, Mary S.	Weatherly, Sharon A.
Rivera, Shannen	Snyder, Sherry	West, Linda
Roads, Alethea	Souels, Mark	White, Teri
Roads, Paul E.	Southern, Leo	Wilfong, Richard R.
Robinson, Kelly	Spiker, Maxine	Wilkinson, Michael D.
Rodriguez, Marsella	Stalcup, Larry	Williams, Tammy
Rogers, David L.	Stanley, Thomas J.	Williamson, Sylvia
Roland, Jennifer L.	Stein, Oliver	Willinghour, C. G.
Ross, Raul	Stephens, Chris	Wilpent, Bobby
Ross, Sam E.	Storage, Joe	Wilson, Betty
Rowell, V. Nadene	Stouseth, Barbara	Wilson, Valerie
Rudder, Anita L.	Strader, Robert S.	Wilson, Wayburn D.
Rudledge, Nellie	Street, Joe	Wjae, Stan
Sabel, Jerry	Stubben, D. J.	Woodruff, Jerry
Sabs, Jane L.	Sunnam, Brenda	Wright, Carol

Table 1–8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Letter Expressing Support for Locating Disassembly and Conversion of Nuclear Weapons Plutonium Components at the Pantex Plant (Continued)		
Wright, Fred	Zachry, Rob D.	
Young, Robert L.	Zenor, Becky	
Petition Expressing Opposition to Mixed Oxide Fuel Transportation Across the United States		3–1363
Abeane, Kathy	Blay, Dorina	Coleman, Allison
Adams, Mary	Blotshy, Kimberly	Coleman, Marsha
Adams, Mary G.	Bohs, Sally T.	Coleman, Melissa
Ady, Linda	Bond, Janice H.	Colo, Joan M.
Ady, Steve	Bostwick, Cynthia	Conner, John
Aiken, Sandee	Boven, Ron	Cook, Barbara
Alison, Thomas	Bradley, Sherry	Cousins, Helen
Allen, J.	Breining, Craig	Cowhy, Jack
Allen, Rex	Brettin, Rhett	Cowhy, James
Allen, Terry	Brickey, Ted	Crimmins, Joan
Ameel, Sally	Bright, Marilyn J.	Cumbow, Kathy F.
Anderson, Jean	Brown, Denise	Curie, Emily
Appleger, Jennifer L.	Brown, Dennis	Dahl, J.
Appleby, Barbara	Brown, Lola	Darezy, Mary
Ardigo, Ann M.	Bryant, Janice	Davis, Kelly L.
Arkins, Rob	Buckhanon, Colleen	Davis, Mary
Arnold, Bernard G.	Bulanda, Catherine	Davis, Sandra L.
Arnold, Tilda	Burg, Dawn	DeBell, Connie
Bachmann, Anne M.	Burg, Thomas	Dei, Patricia M.
Bachus, Jr., Orval	Burke, Genevieve	DePelsmaecker, Kim
Baillod, Jude	Burns, May	DeMaray, Sheri
Baker, Debra P.	Butler, Alice R.	Dennis, John R.
Barbier, Katherine	Cachean, Robert	Dennis, Linda
Barnes, Linda	Campbell, Elizabeth	DeVeicht, Kathryn
Basrai, Mary	Cantlin, Wayne	DeVought, Jerry
Bauer, George	Capanda, Michele	Dickey, Bartlett C.
Bearden, Patrick	Card, Suzen	Dinkel, Ilah
Beebe, Jan	Cargo, Louise	Donaghy, Carolyn
Behnke, Bob	Carmichael, Patricia	Dortman, Mary J.
Beller, Francis	Carreer, Samantha	Downing, Rodney L.
Bendall, Lori	Chapdelaine, Jean	Droesch, Louis
Bennett, Deanna	Charjot, Judy	Duffy, Mary Ann
Berardo, Norma Frances	Chiesa, Charole	Dugowolski, Patricia M.
Biernot, Marilyn	Chiesa, Maria	Duping, Charles R.
Biernot Kinna, Michele	Clark, Gretta M.	Easton, Gerry
Binna, Lee R.	Cline, Louie	Easton, Patricia M.
Bitzinger, Nancy P.	Cluney, Sheila	Eckert, Ben
Blair, Mark	Cochran, Jean	Edgerton, Jeffrey

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Petition Expressing Opposition to Mixed Oxide Fuel Transportation Across the United States (Continued)		
Edgerton, Leah	Hayes, Becky	Kornieck, Rose Marie
Edie, Bob	Hazelman, Elmer	Kotermanski, Chris
Edie, Connie	Heath, Daniel L.	Kovalcik, Christopher
Edwards, Robert	Held, Rose Marie	Kramer, Mino
Ehervier, Margaret	Henricks, Rita	Krammer, Cindy
Ernst, Anne Marie	Hering, Kurt	Lachance, Monique
Evans, Scott	Herlih, Florence	LaPeire, Iva
Eveningred, Steven	Hiehn, Pam	Leonard, Rich
Everhart, Joycelyn	Hildebiand, Arbutus	Lesuer, Sally
Falk, Leou	Hintel, Melissa	Lewinski, Daniel
Feil, Louis	Hock, Gary R.	Lewinski, Michelle
Feil, Sandra W.	Holmstrom, Holly K.	Lieder, Keri
Fisher, Dorothy	Hopper, Mary Elaine	Lieder, Matthew
Fisher, Linda	Horan, Carol	Line, Robert
Fisher, Robert	Hoskey, Phyllis	Litogat, Genevieve
Forest, Carrie	Houghton, C. W.	Lock, Sharron
Fretenborough, Norman R.	Hoyel, Andree Le	Long, Lee
Frumveller, Billie	Hunt, Stacy	Lyon, Steven R.
Gaffey, Chester B.	Huntington, Janice	Machwiski, Constance
Gaffey, Thomas J.	Hurley, Nanon	MacIntyre, Barbara Lee
Ganhs, Rose M.	Illegible (9)	Mackay, Jeanne
Gersky, Deborah L.	Irish, Cindy	Marcellin, Joe
Gilbert, Pam	Israel, Anna M.	Markham, John
Good, Judy	Itsata, Gerald	McCarthy, Michael J.
Graham, Donald	Jamison, Elizabeth	McClelland, Jennifer
Gromek, Felice	Janicki, Jessica	McConnell, Jamie L.
Haar, Lois	Joseph, John	McConnell, Timothy
Hack, Shannon	Jury, Bob	McCormick, Bill
Hall, Janice	Kammer, Cynthia	McDonald, Dave
Hall, Kimberly	Kandler, Patricia M.	McDowell, Ginethea
Hampton, Jason	Karthals, Tammy	McFadden, Gloria
Hancock, Barbara	Kaufman, Lou Anne	McFadden, Wesley
Hannon, Lori	Kean, Owen	McFran, Sharon
Harady, J.	Kercher, Chris	McKeon, John
Harrington, Jeff	Keyworth, Hannah Mary	McKeon, Merisa
Harris, Norma	Keyworth, Howard F.	McLane, Eileen
Hartel, John	King, Lorna	McPharlin, Mary Gale
Hartley, John	Kinish, Jerry	McQuistin, M. E.
Hartley, Ken	Kipp, Deanna	Meier, Shannon
Haviland, Bruce	Kirstine, Lori	Meikle, Lori J.
Hayeden Nixon, Karyn	Klaas, David	Miodowski, Lori
Hayedon, Jeffry D.	Knoll, Sandra	Mitch, Dean

Table 1–8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Petition Expressing Opposition to Mixed Oxide Fuel Transportation Across the United States (Continued)		
Mitchell, Doris M.	Pontack, Suzanne T.	Schef, Nora
Moeller, Eugene	Porrett, Dorothy L.	Schieke, Gerald
Molloy, Thomas	Price, Gary	Schmitt, Amy
Molosky, Carol K.	Prieskorn, Juanita	Schneider, Jeff
Morton, Harold	R., Lorraine	Schott, Paula
Moshrak, Larry	Ragan, David	Schreiber, Sheila
Motte, Nancy	Ralston, Margaret	Schumacher, Ed
Mueller, Deanna	Raludue, Debra H.	Schweihofer, Sue
Murphy, Sr., Jerry	Ramsey, Carl	Schweihofer, Tom
Myron, Harland E.	Rathje, Pat	Scott, David
Noetzel, Emily	Ravin, Val Jean	Scott, Helen
Noetzel, Eric	Rayman, Pam	Seely-Rajnay, Sandy
Noetzel, Kathy	Raziel, Mike	Senart, K.
Norton, Patti	Renno, Marian	Setter, Lillian Jean
Norwicki, Patricia	Retito, Nichole	Sharpe, Diane
Nuernberg, Melody J.	Rick, Sharon	Sharrow, Timothy
Nuezkiewicz, Ruth	Rinker, Elene	Shell, Phyllis
O'Barsky, Staci	Ritter, Jacqueline	Shirkey, Susan
O'Barsky, Thom	Robb, Stacey	Shonk, Paul N.
O'Brien, Beverly J.	Roberson, Diane M.	Shouk, Kim
O'Connor, Kim	Roberts, Beverly	Shovan, Alice I.
O'Mally, Pat	Roberts, Patricia A.	Siewort, Virginia J.
Oden, Laurie Ann	Robertson, Marie	Sigle, Donna
Older, Mark	Robertson, Mary Ann	Skunuce, Chris
Oliver, William	Robinson, Pauline	Smeltzer, Marsha
Olshove, Amy	Rogalski, Dawn S.	Smith, Aurie S.
On, Melissa	Rolls, Robert	Smith, Marcia B.
Osborne, Anne	Rorihe, Johnu	Smith, Robert A.
Parent, Jeff	Roy, Karen	Smith, Ronald W.
Parent, Judy	Ruby, Kathy	Snuggs, Amy
Parker, Jessica Lee	Ruedisuili, James C.	Spezia, Matt
Paterson, Grace F.	Runyer, Penelope	Starkey, Margie
Patnales, Gregg	Ruxey, John	Starkey, Robert E.
Pedigo, Charles	Ryan, Gary D.	Steece, Cheryl
Pedigo, Dorothy	Ryan, Mike	Steece, Kenny
Peltier, Patricia	Sabb, LaDon	Steinhaus, Mary Jane
Pemberton, Patricia L.	Sadlowski, Kelle	Stephenson, Kim
Petit, Mike	Saolowski, Richard	Stocking, Margaret A.
Petz, Nate	Schafer, Heidi	Stocks, Elaine
Phillips, Judy	Schef, Betty	Stump, Clara
Pitts, Roger	Schef, Daniel F.	Sturges, Frances M.
Plant, Sheri	Schef, John	Sutton, Margaret C.

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Petition Expressing Opposition to Mixed Oxide Fuel Transportation Across the United States (Continued)		
Swann, Hildig	Van Damme, Ward	Wiegand, Tim
Swann, J. K.	Vertigan, Kimberly L.	Wille, Rick
Sweeks, Marjorie	Virnocke, Joan	Winzer, Frederick
Sweet, Brenda	Wagenschutz, Susan	Wirth, Kurth
Sweet, Gloria K.	Wajciechowski, Janet	Wiseley, Duane
Swowitz, Arnold	Walker, Beverly J.	Woock, Mary L.
Sylla, Sammye Kaye	Ward, E.	Wood, Dana
Taylor, Eleanor	Ward, Gary	Woycinski, Irene
Taylor, George	Watson, David	Yeashuvich, Joyce
Tenyer, Rosemary	Watza, Charles J.	Young, Pauline M.
Thomas, Frances L.	Watza, M. Noreen	Young, Roberta
Thompson, Amanda	Wegner, Carol	Young, Thomas
Thompson, Dawn	Wenzel, Nancy	Zambelli, Karen
Thompson, Katherine	Wesbrook, Carolyn	Ziegler, Herbert
Thompson, William	Westrick, Nickie	Zimmerman, Stan
Townsend, Wendy	White, Ben	Zwiernik, Julie
Trombley, Denice	White, Chuck	Zwiernik, Susan
Tyson, Gordon	White, Phyllis	
Van Brande, Brenda	Whitesell, Jessie	
Petition Expressing Support for Siting the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility at the Pantex Plant		3-1367
A., Carol K.	Ayold, Karly	Berum, H. S.
A., Dawayne	B., D.	Biddle, John
Acker, Sherri	B., N. J.	Biggs, Tony
Ackin, Judy	B., Rollin	Black, Sheila K.
Ahson, Joe	B., S.	Blum, Mike
Alexander, Brian G.	Backus, Brandee	Boar, Michael
Altman, Douglas	Backus, Larry	Boese, Connie
Altman, Mattie	Bailey, Laura	Boone, Randy
Altschwager, Carl F.	Baker, Kimberly	Booth, Alan
Amos, Martin	Baniente, Juan	Bostick, Debby
Anders, Johnny	Barket, Ronald	Boudreau, Renee
Anderson, Bennie	Barrett, Patti	Bowman, W.A.
Anderson, Fred G.	Barrings, Ernest	Boyn, Larry E.
Anthony, F. W.	Barta, A. S.	Bradstreet, Dustin
Anthony, T.	Bartlett, Ronda J.	Bremer, Carol
Anton, Richard	Barton, Blaine	Briggs, Bettye S.
Arney, Dennis	Baucom, Kaye	Bright, Al
Asbury, Donnell	Bauera, Gloria	Broggley, Jim
Ash, Tom	Bell, Doyle	Brooks, Anthony
Ashlort, Gary	Benner, Helen S.	Brookshire, Doug

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Petition Expressing Support for Siting the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility at the Pantex Plant (Continued)		
Brown, Christie	Cave, Claude	Darnell, M. L.
Brown, David	Chairs, Selina	Darrah, Bill
Brown, George	Charley., John	Daves, Jimmy
Brown, Mickey	Chavez, Jesica	Daves, Marilyn
Brown, Randy	Chavez, Robert	Daves, Marilyn
Buchanan, J.	Chuley, John T.	Davis, Danny
Bull, Cristie	Clark, Clifford	Davis, Dolores F.
Bullington, W. S.	Clark, J.C.	Davis, James N.
Bullock, Robert A.	Clark, Janice	Day, Helen Charlene
Burk, Judith L.	Clark, Joseph	De Los Santos, Sofia
Burows, Doug	Clift, Earl	Deicer, Randy
Butten, Clifton	Clilbers, Jay	Dell, Steve L.
Butten, Susan R.	Clinton, Charles	Demeison, Carolyn
C., Jay	Cochrell, Gary D.	Demerser, Carolyn
C., Jimmy	Cockerell, Jr., Glenn	Dennis, Melina
C., Rick	Cockrell, Glenn C.	Denny, L. O.
Cabello, Lurie	Coffee, Vicky Lynn	Denton, Tammy
Caldwell, K. J.	Collier, Edgar J.	Diaz, Anna R.
Call, John R.	Collins, Bettye	Dickerman, Carey
Callen, Christi	Collins, Larry	Dillaha, Bobby D.
Camaurt, Ramon	Conklin, Woody	Does, Donald
Campbell, Betsy	Conn, Ken	Doreba, J.
Campbell, Bruce	Connally, Doug	Dossett, Bernard
Campbell, Charles A.	Cook, Ken	Dreny, A.
Campbell, Cledele	Cookran, D.	Dresch, Shane
Campbell, Don	Cookroy, A. E.	Dressler, Shane
Campbell, Helen	Coppinger, J. W.	Druilar, Genny R.
Campbell, Scott	Coppinger, Linda	Duggan, James F.
Candera, Johnny	Cotney, B. K.	Duggan, Rowena
Capp, A.	Covell, Carol O.	Duncan, Glenn K.
Carlson, J. R.	Cox, Larry	Durham, Denise
Carnes, Rodney D.	Crosslin, Gracie	Dye, Lisa
Carrillo, R.	Crumley, Martha	E., Jannie
Carrole, R.	Crutchnor, Jim	E., Mark
Carte, Troy	Culwell, K.	E., R.
Cartellason, L.	Curtis, Roy E.	Eddleman, Alvin
Carter, Sharon	D., Allen	Edinert, Michael S.
Cartwright, Pam	D., Ray	Egoodkin, Alan
Cash, Wilham	D., S.	Egoodkin, L.
Cash, William	D., Sarah	Elliott, Shon
Casper, Sid	D., Tracy	Elvin, Paul H.
Castlebury, Duane	Daniel, Deborah	Emery, U.

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Petition Expressing Support for Siting the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility at the Pantex Plant (Continued)		
England, R. G.	Garner, Dale	Helsley, L.
Erven, Inez	Gass, Kathy	Henderson, B.
Eseamilla, Al	George, Jr., F. W.	Herbert, Cliff
Estes, Virgil	Gilbreth, Cynthia	Hernon, Donald M.
Evans, Edwin	Gilmore, Sandy	Herrera, John J.
Evenson, Kim	Glager, Dan	Hicks, Alma A.
Fadlock, Janey	Gooden, Ruthie	Hileman, Beau
Faggan, Zani	Goodin, Glen	Hill, Charles
Fajardo, Maria	Grant, Stacy	Hill, David
Fansler, Sarah	Gray, David	Hill, Randy
Fansley, Tony	Green, E. J.	Hilley, K.
Farley, Robert	Griffin, Kathyrn	Himm, Tedd
Feng, J.	Griffin, Ronald S.	Hintar, Terry
Ferguson, Monte	Griffis, James	Hintar, J. D.
Ferguson, Jr., Warren D.	Grimes, Gary	Holliday, Michael C.
Findley, Gerald	Gritten, Clifton	Holz, Jeb
Fingh, Jerry	Gublere, Van	Hoogson, Lisa
Fjotland, Barbara	H., D.	Hooper, Harvey
Flores, Lias	H., Damian	Houser, Denise L.
Fogg, Karen	H., Dan	Houson, Lorie
Ford, Kim	H., Josi M.	Howry, Jr., Emmitt
Ford, Patrice B.	H., William R.	Huffer, Earl
Ford, Teri A.	Habi, Jim L.	Huffer, Emil
Foreman, Dinh	Hacketz, Margerette	Hulquist, R.
Forseythe, W. H.	Haggard, Randall S.	Hunt, Tim
Foster, Michael	Halford, Larry D.	Hurst, Sleria
Frasier, Sammy	Hall, Beverly	Hutam, R. L.
Freeman, E. Renae	Hall, J. D.	Huxsly, Art
Fry, Dustin	Haller, Fred	Illegible (55)
Fuller, Rodney	Halliday, Debra	Irons, Daniel
Gadiman, Lucille	Halsted, Phillip	Irwin, Joe
Gadman, David	Hancock, Dayton	J., Art
Gage, Belle	Hancock, Jeff	J., Bob
Gaine, Roberto	Hanson, Walter	, James
Galloday, S. E.	Harbin, Ann	Janbrano, Louis
Gamel, Bill	Harrelson, Misti	Janer, Terry G.
Ganor, Annette	Harry, Russell	Jasper, Sid
Ganor, Richard	Hartzer, Charlene	Jergenson, Monte
Gantor, Joseph	Hatfield, Donna	Jigel, Mary
Garcia, Frank	Hatfield, Roger	Jinney, Dennis
Garcia, Josi O.	Hefley, Teresa	Johannsen, Paula
Garett, Donnie	Hefner, M.	Johnny, Furser

Table 1–8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors			Page
Petition Expressing Support for Siting the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility at the Pantex Plant (Continued)			
Johnson, Connie	Lanier, Tylair	Marcin, Jackie	
Johnson, Deborah	Larken, Tully	Mares, Bob	
Johnson, Jack	Larsen, Steve	Mares, Susie	
Johnson, L. H.	Lassiter, Laquita	Marick, Aranelle	
Johnson, Larry J.	Lateem, Eddie	Marin, Glenda	
Johnson, Nicky	Laughten, Elmer	Marsh, Donna	
Johnson, R. C.	Laur, Tommy	Martin, D.	
Johnson, S.	Lawle, Terry	Martin, Daniel	
Johnson, Warren	Leake, Tommy	Martin, Jerome B.	
Jones, Francis	Leasure, Lanette	Mask, Kay	
Jones, Melissa	Leather, Doyle	Massey, Tracy	
Jung, Susie	Lede, Tim	Matlock, Harold	
K., Michael	Lee, Clifton	Matz, L. M.	
K., Rusty	Lemming, Sandy	Maury, Leon	
Kaczmaule, Doug	Letto, Bing	Maxey, A. Kevin	
Kahn, Martin D.	Lewis, Ernest	Maxey, R.	
Kaper, Lomo	Lichte, S.	McAdams, R. M.	
Keating, Michael D.	Lill, Terry	McBride, Dave	
Keenan, R. W.	Limoger, Francis	McBride, Elizabeth	
Kennedy, Scott	Lincoln, Louie	McCleung, Donald	
Kenney, George	Locke, J.	McFather, Jayne	
Kenney, Heidi	Lockwood, Jeannine	McFather, Shane	
Kenyon, Bena	Lofka, Janelle	McLaughlin, Suzie	
Kephe, Mark	Lolet, Larry	McMintz, Ley	
Keths, J.	Long, DeAnn	McNabb, Angela K.	
Kiester, Daniel M.	Lopez, D'Ann	McSelf, M.	
King, Donnie	Lovelady, Curtis	McWilliams, Mark	
Kinnison, Danny	Lowe, Lea	Mern, David	
Kinnison, Don	Lowrey, Michael	Merriweather, Ken	
Klahr, Pam	Lucas, Roger	Mesa, Cindy	
Knight, Alexis	Lucero, Penny	Meyer, David	
Knight, Jess	Lundberg, Janice	Meyer, Kenneth	
Knight, Stacy	Lyles, Brandy	Meyer, Mary M.	
Koply, Mark	Lyles, Chris	Miller, Justin	
Korel, Robert	Lyn, Thomas C.	Miller, Russell	
Krizan, Charles E.	Lyons, Trisha	Mills, L.	
Kuehl, Rick	Lyons, Tristin	Mitchell, Cristal	
L., Jerry	M., C.	Mitchell, Danny	
L., John F.	M., Donald B.	Mitchell, Erma	
Lair, Mike R.	Malone, Robert	Mogart, Kip	
Lan, M. R.	Mann, Johnny	Moglia, Steven P.	
Lanier, Scott	Manning, Ann	Monroe, Willie	

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Petition Expressing Support for Siting the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility at the Pantex Plant (Continued)		
Monson, Scott	Phillips, Cary D.	Richardson, Karen
Montano, Robert	Phillips, Casey	Roberts, Allen J.
Moore, Billy J.	Phillips, Herman	Roberts, Jay C.
Moore, Jerry K.	Phillips, Katrina	Robinson, Johnnie
Moore, Mike	Pickett, Don	Rodriguez, Elizabeth
Moore, Steve	Pickett, Donald	Rodriguez, Roger
Morgan, Mille	Pierce, LaDena	Rogers, Gayle
Moronun, Carolyn	Pierson, Mark	Rogers, Jimmy C.
Morris, Clayton	Pierson, Maurice	Rosalin, Michael
Morrison, John A.	Pinkston, Jane	Rossiter, Len
Moser, Colin	Pollard, Vicky	Roudtof, Robert
Myers, Bill	Polley, Les	Round, Gerald E.
Nakayama, Melinda	Polvado, C. K.	Rowe, Robert
Nall, Cathie	Pompa, Paul	Ruiz, D.
Neeley, Ken	Pope, Linda	Russell, Shelly
Nelson, Pam	Potters, Juan	Ruzi, Bobby
Nixon, Leta	Prathe, Dennis	Ryan, Mike
Nolan, Richard	Pratt, Kay	Ryes, Caroline
Norwood, Bill	Proffitt, Gary	S., David
Nuney, Karen	Prosser, Cathy	S., David C.
Nymeyer, Jr., F.M.	Pryor, Jack	S., Edward Dean
O'Brien, Inge	Ptashine, Leslie	S., Jesse
O., John	Ptashine, Paul	S., L.
O., T.	Quillen, Rodney	S., Mark
Onyaryl, A.W.	Quinta, Al	S., Michael
P., C.	Quyade, Tony	S., Patrick
P., John	Quyulen, Tony	S., Rachelle
Painter, John	R., Artur	Sain, Elvis
Papp, A. G.	R., L. A.	Salazar, Esther
Parker, Don	R., Nadine	Sale, Daniel
Parker, Dudley	Ramirez, F. B.	Salen, Scott
Pate, Rich	Ranch, Melvin	San, Cenny
Pate, Thomas E.	Rank, Kay	Sanchez, Vera
Patterson, Doug	Raum, Margie	Sar, Robert
Patterson, Ed	Redeener, Wanda	Sarah, Lynn
Patterson, Pat	Reever, Leslie	Sarrah, Richard
Patterson, Steve	Renilla, Joseph T.	Savage, L. Faye
Payne, Mike	Reyls, Carol	Schapp, Ellis Dale
Payne, Ronnie	Reynolds, Gloria	Schmidt, Nick
Pearson, Susie	Rhoten, Mark	Scott, Betty
Perea, Norma	Rice, Roma	Scott, Sharon
Perreff, Chris A.	Richardson, Erin B.	Sena, Danny

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Petition Expressing Support for Siting the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility at the Pantex Plant (Continued)		
Serra, Sr., Pat	Thompson, J.	Whilett, Russell
Session, Hugh	Thompson, L. O'Brien	Whitney, Russell C.
Shafer, K. M.	Thompson, Marzella	Willard, Pete
Shaw, Paul A.	Thompson, Prissilla J.	Williams, Dennis
Shelton, David	Tolby, Robert	Williams, Jerry
Shelton, J. S.	Tomlinson, Leon E.	Williams, Ken
Shinah, Dan	Trevino, Edward	Williams, Lee
Shumaker, Donald E.	Trevino, Lisa A.	Williams, Leroy
Sihl, Vickie	Triny, Susie	Williams, Linda
Sims, Carol A.	Tucker, Bill	Williams, Toni
Skinner, Randall	Tucker, Lynette	Winters, Gary E.
Smart, David	Tyler, Chris	Wodson, J.
Smith, Carol M.	Tyler, Ken	Wood, Flint
Soper, Mike	V., Barbara	Woodberry, Lorenza
Sottile, Lucy	V., J.	Woods, Angela
Spands, Darlene	Valdez, Johnny	Woodward, Larry
Spaner, Jon	Vann, Candy	Wooland, Dwayne
Spangler, Mike	Vaughn, Glenn	Y., Dave
Spears, Belinda	Velasquez, Chuck	Yaryl, John
Speck, Paul	Velasquez, Filbert	Yeger, James A.
Srygley, Jeff	Venhaus, Bernard	Yeger, M.
Stallings, Tom	Vereto, David	Yokum, Nell
Stark, Mark	Vickers, L. D.	Young, Kelly
Steen, Susan	Vickers, Lisa	Yuger, Sandy
Stickrod, Anna	Vigil, Nick	Z., Donald
Stoltz, April	Villceeso, M.	Zamora, Frank S.
Stout, J. Dale	Vincent, Russell W.	Zamora, Gilbert
Stratton, Don	Vincent, Tammy	Zamora, Lois
Struckland, Ered	W., M.	Zerm, Darla
Stultz, Bob	W., W. Scott	Zerm, R. W.
Summers, Cynthia	Walsh, Daniel R.	Zuniga, Sal
Summers, Harold	Walsh, Dave	Zuniga, Terri
Surser, Christi	Walsh, Patricia	
Swingle, Anna C.	Ward, Robert M.	
Taylor, Bill	Watkins, Sandra G.	
Taylor, James	Watson, Gary H.	
Taylor, Jeny	Weatherby, Nancy A.	
Taylor, Stacey	Welch, Gregory W.	
Terly, Julie	Welch, Linda	
Teter, Annette	Whalen, David	
Teter, Kevin	Whaley, Jan	
Thaggart, Carol	Whicker, Lawrence	

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors			Page
Petition to Protect the Mission at Pantex.....			3-1369
Allison, Pam	Donelson, Mary Margaret	Pale, John	
Breeding, Paula	Donelson, Rusty	Peck, Karen	
Comb, Cory	Finegold, Allen	N., Trish	
Goucher, Martha	Locke, Joyce C.	Seewald, Carl	
Donelson, Mary	Mills, Robin		
Postcard Citing Savings From Consolidating All of DOE's Plutonium Disposition Missions at the Savannah River Site			3-1371
Adams, Beverly	Bates, Cora	Buenastro, Amy	
Adams, Doris T.	Baugh, Cindy	Buir, Randel A.	
Adams, Monica	Bayles, Pamela	Burdette, David P.	
Addis, Robert	Becker, Dan	Burnett, Pamele	
Aden, Jr., Henry E.	Belie, Mosley B.	Burnham, April L.	
Aiken, Christopher S.	Bell, Gregg L.	Burns, Corey S.	
Aiken School District	Bell, Kathlene M.	Burns, Sandra S.	
Constance K. Fevell	Ben, Alex U.	Busch, Vernon L.	
Aimes, Carol	Benehof, William A.	Busser, Bert H.	
Albrett, Fred	Bergstrom, David	Bustler, Ben	
Allen, Becky	Berry, F. B.	Butter, Pam	
Allen, Bobbie B.	Berry, Judy	Byrd, Earl L.	
Allen, III, Quince	Berry, Marie S.	Calkey, John L.	
Alvin, Stanley	Bishop, Sandra H.	Campbell, Hazel P.	
Ameinam, Joy H.	Blackburn, Ernie M.	Campbell, Jim R.	
Anderson, B. J.	Blake, Benett L.	Campbell, Sarah E.	
Anderson, Robert	Bloom, Richard C.	Carroll, Carol W.	
Anderson, T.	Boggsweil, R. W.	Carter, Helen T.	
Atipp, Randy H.	Bolholz, Stacy	Carter, Lillie W.	
Atkinson, Jr., John T.	Boyd, Jr., Norman	Cayne, Shelds	
Augusta Telephone	Boyds, Earl L.	Chain, Regina O.	
Sharon Martin	Brantley, Sed S.	Chamber of Commerce	
Ayer, Dennis L.	Bresser, Sr., C. W.	Richard Lamar	
Ayers, Hazel Leigh	Brewer, Joseph	Chapman, Michael	
Bacon, Debi	Brimke, Harald P.	Chauwind, Richard	
Bailey, Dwayne E.	Brinkley, Jamie	Chester, Dan	
Bailey, John E.	Brock, Wallace T.	Childer, Wallie	
Bailey, Wendy	Bronze, Deborah B.	Chriswell, Kim	
Baker, Jenena P.	Brosbris, Willie R.	Citizens for Nuclear Technology	
Bamberg, Edna C.	Brown, Gloria	Awareness	
Banks, Jr., Wayne E.	Brown, Sylvia E.	Michael Britte	
Barnes, Rachel K.	Bryant, Jr., Laivtan	Fred L. Davison	
Barry, Carol S.	Buchanan, Brian P.	Illegible	
Bater, Jacqueline C.	Buchholtz, Anthony J.	William H. Martin	
Bates, Alfred	Buchwater, Donald S.	A. Mause	

**Table 1–8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part
of a Campaign (Continued)**

Commentors		Page
Postcard Citing Savings From Consolidating All of DOE's Plutonium Disposition Missions at the Savannah River Site (Continued)		
Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness (Continued)	Eggesman, H.	Goff, Cyrus B.
John W. Pavaglio	Eichen, Mark	Goodwin, Lois
Frank E. Wise	Eigle, Ronald K.	Goodwin, Phefhi
Clark, Dalisa	Esuri, Marl	Goodwin, Sr., Haskell
Clark, Dorothy	Fail, Shelly	Gooker, Laura E.
Clark, Tammy M.	Fay, A.	Grant, T. W.
Clifford, R. Priscilla	Felak, John M.	Graves, Authur J.
Clothing, Ruthie L.	Felder, Alesia D.	Gray, Penny
Coach, Kim	Fell, Rick	Graybeal, Michelle
Cole, Judy	Ferrell, C. A.	Graybill, W. R.
Collins, Monica J.	Ferrell, Ronnie F.	Grayhill, Barbara
Collins, Mozella	Fields, Donald	Green, Daniel W.
Collins, Sara	Fing, Bobby H.	Green, Steven H.
Conway, Dick	Flores, George R.	Green, William
Cooper, Tanya	Floyd, Joe	Greenaway, Paul R.
Corly-Stone, Edie	Foger, Lorie O.	Griffin, Denise
Cortledge, Sara	Forest, Mary Jane	Gromade, R.
Counts, Betty B.	Foster, Edda M.	Grubbs, Richard
Crawford, Beatrice A.	Foster, Stephen G.	Haggard, Rick
Crawford, Rene	Foulks, James F.	Hall, Bill
Cruz, Counne R.	Franklin, Elizabeth	Hall, Julie C.
Curry, Lepone	Franklin, Tony E.	Hall, Sondra A.
Curry, Wanda	Frazie, Pamela	Hallman, R. L.
Dais, Freddie L.	Freeman, Thomas R.	Harkless, Dixie
Darnell, Addie E.	Fritz, Jill	Harris, M. A.
Davis, Rita	Fuhner, Terry	Hart, D. C.
Davis, Sean	Fulghun, Wayne	Harter, F. M.
Denney, Bobby	Fulmer, Glenda T.	Hasty, Donna M.
Dewey, Howard R.	Futner, Betsy C.	Haust, Susan B.
Dion, B. Ralph	Gaffiney, Timothy	Hawkins, Cade E.
Domain, Carol	Gaines, Amanda	Hawkins, Madeline
Dominey, Patricia R.	Gallon, John	Hawkins, Tony
Donava, Neal	Gartrell, Dean D.	Heard, Tammy S.
Dowdy, J. W.	Gay, H. R.	Hechles, Bob
Drefus, Chris	Gay, Mark J.	Heklek, Jonathan
Druig, A. W.	Gaylord, Cathy	Henderson, Kenya
DuBose, Lillie	Gaylord, James F.	Henderson, Patricia
Dunbar, Carl A.	Geay, Peter L.	Henely, Sr., George A.
Dunn, Elizabeth	Geddes, Catherine	Hentger, Regina H.
Ed, Melinda G.	Geldston, W. J.	Hess, Bert
Edwards, II, Robert Allen	Gidson, Jesse	Hett, Dana H.
	Glover, M. B.	Hetzel, Christine L.

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Postcard Citing Savings From Consolidating All of DOE's Plutonium Disposition Missions at the Savannah River Site (Continued)		
Hicks, Brenda	Johnson, Earline	Luton, Merrie L.
Hicks, Rally	Johnson, Larry	Lynn, K. R.
Hicks, Susan	Johnson, Patrick	Lynn, Sharon
Hickson, Kimberly S.	Johnson, R. Charmaine	MacCruny, Cheryl I.
Hickson, Lee T.	Jone, Albert B.	Maddux, E. Paul
Hightowen, Gregory L.	Jones, Debra A.	Malizia, Jennifer E.
Hightower, Willie	Jones, Kevin	Malloy, Sondra R.
Hightown, Barbara H.	Jones, Mary W.	Martin, David
Hill, Donald L.	Jorden, Michael	Martin, Delores
Hillary, Melba L.	Juger, U. S.	Martin, Michael
Holgate, Shirley G.	Keenan, Marie	Martin, Ruth
Holland, Dianne	Kelch, Brenda J.	Martinez, William P.
Holland, Mary R.	Key, Shelley	Mathews, James E.
Holland, Michael K.	Kiernan, John A.	Mathis, Karen J.
Holley, Deborah L.	Kiernan, Pamela S.	Mathis, Leah D.
Holliday, Kim	Kimbrell, Rebecca	Matthews, A. C.
Hollyfield, Ellison	Kingery, Andy	Mayor, Brenda
Holmes, Patricia A.	Kip, Susan M.	McCain, Mary
Holz, Charlotte D.	Kirkpatrick, Scott	McClair, Sharon
Hooper, Ruth H.	Kissice, Stephanie R.	McGee, Garrett
Hophers, Karen A.	Kopeck, Seathe	McKie, Vicki L.
Huff, Stephanie	Krist, Fred	McKinney, S. J.
Hughes, M. B.	Kropp, Charlie W.	Meadows, Vince
Hutto, Jr., Howard J.	Kruel, Richard E.	Meahling, Joyce
Illegible (27)	Lamb, Angela	Mechs, Terry L.
Iye, Sandy R.	Lamb, R. Marshall	Medlin, Ricky
Izlen, Kathy	Landum, Alexis M.	Medlock, Robert
Jackson, M.	Lariseey, David	Merriweather, Tonya F.
Jackson, Oscar	Leaphil, Kathryn	Miller, Kendall E.
Jaller, Mel	Lertz, David W.	Mizzell, Tammy L.
Jamison, William T.	Leutes, Theresa A.	MKR
Jee, Bauer K.	Lewis, Brian K.	Martha K. Register
Jeer, Aaron M.	Lewis, Joseph	Morris, Christie
Jeff, Jerad A.	Linyard, Pam	Morris, R. M.
Jenkins, Linda H.	Long, Anne	Moseley, Edith
Jerard, Mike	Long, Charles C.	Moser, Stephen
Jewell, Erin	Long, Franklin A.	Moth, Gary S.
John, Katherine L.	Long, Karin J.	Moton, Raymond
John, Reginald L.	Long, Sharma R.	Mryline, James D.
Johns, Roxanne	Lord, Teresa	Mullen, Carrie
Johnson, B.	Lows, E. Roger	Munwell, A. H.
Johnson, Brolura	Lupiznek, Kelley	Musolf, Matthew M.

Table 1–8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Postcard Citing Savings From Consolidating All of DOE's Plutonium Disposition Missions at the Savannah River Site (Continued)		
Mye, H. Ashly	Ramsey, Thomas A.	Slone, Willie
Nguyen, J.	Randall, Sallie F.	Smalls, Shakim
Nier, Kristen L.	Reynolds, Amanda C.	Smith, A. J.
Norman, Alixe W.	Reynolds, Linde B.	Smith, B. R.
Norris, Jay	Rhodes, Heather R.	Smith, E.
Novak, Raymond N.	Rich, David H.	Smith, Gisela
Odon, Klayhena K.	Richards, Donnie	Smith, Keshi
Oglesly, Dennis	Rizzenhut, Frank	Smith, Lora
Olson, John	Robert, Julian Wayne	Smith, Mary A.
Owen, III, Manson T.	Robinson, Tiffany	Smith, Peggy
Owens, Chris	Roddy, Ashley	Smith, S.
Owens, Michael K.	Rodgers, Jeremy	Snuter, Constance F.
Padgett, Christal	Rogers, Elaine	Soper, Robert
Palmetto Federal Savings Employee	Rogers, Paula	Spam, T. R.
Jacqueline P. Ramsey	Rogers, Thomas E.	Spiney, Gwen
Parker, Charles L.	Rose, David B.	Stage, Shirley D.
Parker, William Andrew	Ross, Anne B.	Stevenson, Ernestine
Parks, Arthur	Ryder, Alan	Steward, James M.
Patterson, Maurice	Ryder, Bruce	Stewart, J. W.
Pearson, Jennifer	Ryder, Mavis	Stewart, Pamela
Pearson, Mary	Ryder, Wanda	Stewart, Virginia W.
Pension, Maude K.	Ryolff, Pete	Sullivan, Kathy L.
Perella, Chuck R.	Sally, Tyrone G.	Sullivan, Lane A.
Perico, Shannon H.	Salter, Cheryl J.	Sullivan, Linda
Peter, R. S.	Sanders, Nana D.	Swancey, Melissa
Peterson, Fred	Sanders, Richard D.	Swing, Eric L.
Phelip, Donald	Saul, Stephanie	Tarrart, James
Phelps, Robert E.	Savannah River Ecology Lab,	Taubinger, Richard
Pickett, Denise L.	University of Georgia	Taylor, Cindy
Pierce, Willie	Donald R. Mover	Taylor, Clark W.
Piston, Amanda	Scott, Elizabeth	Terenice, Charles E.
Plexico, J. Sam	Scott, Johnny G.	Terry, James
Plouffer, Bonnie	Scott, Tamieke	Teryone, Pam
Pnell, Robert	Segafoes, Ronald E.	Tesenor, Nelinda T.
Powell, Susan	Segler, Peter	Thomas, Charles
Preriucci, M. R.	Shane, Jerome H.	Thomas, James
Prescott, Phillip N.	Sharpe, Samantha Kay	Thomas, P. Shane
Pressley, Francener	Simmons, Billy	Thompson, Derek
Price, Jennine	Sims, Jamie B.	Thompson, Lillian
Prister, Charlene	Sipes, Colette	Thompson, William R.
Pritz, Shirley F.	Sites, Randy	Thurston, David R.
Prothers, Brandon	Skinner, Donald	Tomlin, Laura

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Postcard Citing Savings From Consolidating All of DOE's Plutonium Disposition Missions at the Savannah River Site (Continued)		
Tonce, Michelle	Westinghouse Savannah River Company	Williamson, Daisy G.
Turner, Annie	George E. Bellemy, Jr.	Williamson, Shirley
Tutt, Ida B.	Denise G. Blackwell	Willis, Marlane
Tyler, Linda A.	Gayle S. Bumgarner	Wilson, Marriion C.
Underwood, L. R.	Westover, Betsy L.	Wimmee, J. F.
Usey, F. Michelle	Westover, Justin M.	Wise, Robert A.
Valentine, Lisa	White, Larry	Wolfgamott, M. Lee
Valeti, David T.	Wie, Bobbie J.	Wood, Carol
Vauner, Denny	Wilburn, Tiffany	Wood, Thomas
Veal, Joan Renvo	Wiley, Pat	Woodward, Chad
Voegtlen, JoAnne M.	Williams, April	Woodward, Jr., James E.
Voychak, Deborah	Williams, Brad	Wooley, Charlotte J. Deane
Wade, Jamiel K.	Williams, Clifford	Woodward, Lisa D.
Wader, Kim M.	Williams, Darcy	Wright, Colleen L.
Waters, Amy	Williams, Delinda L.	Wyatt, Roger
Weeks, Clinton M.	Williams, Jeffrey	Young, Barry C.
Welch, Dennis F.	Williams, Robin	Young, Herbert S.
Wenall, Paul	Williams, Tonia	Zieliski, Walter
Wertz, Tim	Williams, W.	Zimmerman, Leo
West, Joe E.	Williams, Jr., Clemon	
Postcard Citing Cost Savings and Support for Consolidating DOE's Plutonium Disposition Missions at the Savannah River Site		3-1373
Aiken Chamber of Commerce	Keisler, H. E.	Simmons, Sharon
Cindy Bolton	Kight, Raquel	Tronier, Patty
Bean, R.W.	Lockridge, F.	Trowel, Natasha S.
Bishopp, Earle C.	Mance, Kurtina	Tyler, Swanzetta
Bripen, Christopher	Moody, Michelle	Warner, Jean L.
Drester, Charmaine L.	Park, Kaley	Witter, Oleen R.
Ethedge, A. Stewart	Peters, Bonnie	Young, Nancy
Illegible (2)	Ridgeway, Hazel S.	
Justice, Jennifer	Sillian, Katrice	
Postcard Expressing Opposition to Plutonium Processing in the Texas Panhandle and Converting Military Plutonium for Use in Mixed Oxide Fuel		3-1375
Abbott, Kathleen	Atkerson, Ann	Barfield, Ellen
Abell, Jane	Atkerson, Jerry B.	Beardall, William
Anderson, L. Marian	Bailey, Susan	Bell, James
Anonymous (3)	Ball, Ysleta	Bell, Mary Lynn
Artho, Edward	Bandy, Bill	Berg, Joe David
Artho, Virginia	Bandy, Mary	Berg, Ruth Ann
	Banks, Arnold	Berry, Rick

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Postcard Expressing Opposition to Plutonium Processing in the Texas Panhandle and Converting Military Plutonium for Use in Mixed Oxide Fuel (Continued)		
Black, Carla	Dolley, John	Hollingsworth, Dale
Blankenship, Sidney	Doyle, Chris	Hollingsworth, Jean
Bonner, Patrick	Doyle, John	Hubbard, James
Boone, Ric	Ducey, Maria	Hummert, Victor
Brackman, Selma	Duderhoeffter, Marilyn	Illegible (12)
Brewer, Bernice	Duderhoeffter, Mike	International Action Center
Brewer, Farris L.	Dunbin, Betty	Anonymous
Brister, Bob	Duran, Geraldine	Keevan, Gordon
Bunten, Erline	Dyer, Bobbe	Keevan, Heath
Bunting, Dorelen	Earl, Lewis H.	Kellam, Shelley
Bush, Jim	Edelson, Elihu	Kemper, William A. and Marcia B.
Bush, Michele	Egbert, Lawrence	King, Carl F.
Caldwell, Harrison and Addie	Elill, W.C.	Kleugensmith, Mary
Campbell, G. G.	Elsik, M.L.	Kleushem, Tonya
Carrnona, Connie	Everett, Mike	Kleuskens, Carl
Cathern, Bonnie M.	Everett, Reyna	Kleuskens, Helen
Ceuale, Ron M.	FDTN MI CASA International	Kluegensmith, William
Christman, Rebecca M.	Manuel Porras	Korwek, Gina
Citizens Alert, M. Lee Davy	Juana M. Rojas	Kroeger, Janet
Clark, Penni E.	Edgard R. Tolentino	Kroeger, Rollie
Clark, Robert A.	Fellowship of Reconciliation	Lewis, Marvin
Clark, Willis N.	Lee Loe	Lhueider, Jawba J.
Clopton, Jim	Finnerty, Anne	Lifshutz, Yvonne S.
Cole, Leslie	Floro, Martha	Lihs, Harriet A.
Cominos, Nicholas H.	Force, Ronald C.	Lippmann, Otto
Cooney, Don and Peggy	Fuller, Jr., H. S.	Locke, J.
Coots, Lou	Garcia, Bennie R.	Loe, Claire
Cox, Jean H.	Garcia, Danna	Lott, Linda
Crawford, Gus and Inez	Golding, Bert	Lott, Marshall
Cummins, Irene	Gramstorff, Jeanne	Lowerr, Richard
Daniel, Stanley M.	Graves, Harold C.	Malduf, Melody
Davis, Lloyd J.	Graves, Kathryn J.	Malech, Christina
Dawson, Ed	Hajeh, Linda	Marsh, Wendy and Stanley
Dawson, Norma C.	Hampton, Kaye	Martin, Ardis
Dawson, Jr., R. B.	Hardt, Brenda	Martindale, Jim
DeLong, Mary and Richard	Harris, Richard S.	Martindale, Julie
Detten, Bernice	Hatfield, Bobby	Maryknoll Fathers & Brothers
Detten, Danny	Hedgocoler, S.	Anonymous
Detten, Tonya D.	Helms, Pat G.	Mathern-Jacobson, Reba
Detton, Evelyn	Hoffel, P. J.	Mathern-Jacobson, Scott
Dixon, Billie M.	Hoffman, Kirby	Matthews, Craig
Dixon, David W.	Hoffman, Rosemarie	McCathern, Gerald

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Postcard Expressing Opposition to Plutonium Processing in the Texas Panhandle and Converting Military Plutonium for Use in Mixed Oxide Fuel (Continued)		
McDaniel, Rita	Phillyn, Thomas J.	Smith, Michelle M.
McKinney, Ethel May	Plubar, Jennifer	Smith, Phillip
McManus, Philip	Podson, Ted	Solomon, Henry L.
Meder, Jodi	Porter, Dana O.	Solomon, Jo
Melsha, Robert	Porter, Penelope	Sould, Randy
Micou, Cassandra	Raizen, Ben	Southurd, Edwin R.
Mier, Joe	Randall-Cash, George	Spear, Gale
Miller, Dion O.	Ratliff, Gail	Spikes-Volz, Fostrene
Miller, Genevieve O.	Ratliff, George	Sprunger-Froese, Peter
Miller, Virginia M.	Recycled Country Sunshine	STAND
Minatra, Sandra	Penni E. Clark	Teresa McFaul
Miner, Robin	Rekdal, Sheila	Stansbury, Linda
Mohr, Nick and Nancy	Ricketts, Cathy	Stein, Janie
Monnot, Connie	Ricketts, Doug	Stein, Jerry
Morrisette, Elizabeth	Ridgley, Patricia	Stein, Paul
Morrisette, Shirlyn B.	Rireley, Mary B.	Stonstun, Fred
Mote, Joe Wood and Mildred	Rivers, Henry V.	Stoy, Mary M.
Moytabin, Ann Grace	Robbin, Dan	Strafuss, Carl
Murphrey, David	Robbins, Paul	Strafuss, Joan
Murphy, J.	Robertson, Pauline D.	Swallow, Shirley
Narzak, Sargita	Robertson, R. L.	Swann, Joe
Neusch, Gayle	Rogers, Erin	Swann, Lila
Neusch, Kevin	Rokobarb, Arline	Syofd, J.
Newburg, Madonna E.	Rossignol, Steve	Syofd, V.
Newell, Virginia M.	Runkle, A.	Taebel, Kay
Nicholson, Mary J.	Schlegel, Norba	Taylor, Donna
Norris, Clarra A.	Schlegel, Norbert	Thomas, Greg
O'Brien, Jay	SD Peace Justice Center	Thomas, Kathy
Office of the Americas	Jeanne Koster	Thomas Merton Center
Blasé Bonpane	Seall, Nancy Y.	Molly Rush
Oliver, Gary	Seewald, Katherine	Thompson, Donald L.
Oppermann, Bobbie J.	Seewald, William Hughes	Thompson, Sally Alice
Osborne, James W.	Shadid, Patrice	Todds, John
Osborne, Jeri R.	Shennum, Mary	Torcson, Mary Jo
Osborne, Mike	Shutt, Jed C.	Townsend, Silas
Oser, Wendy	Shutt, Susan L.	Treichel, Judy
Owen, Maryvida G.	Sierra Club	Treichel, Zean
Owen, Weslie B.	Silas Townsend	Trigg, Elizabeth M.
Palson, Theodore E.	Singleton, Betsy	Ubelocker, Judy
Peace Farm	Sisters, Franciscan	Uier, Kille Louar
Anonymous	Smith, Doris	Underwood, Oiiran Chung
Phillips, Karinia	Smith, Marshall	Uphoff, I. A.

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors			Page
Postcard Expressing Opposition to Plutonium Processing in the Texas Panhandle and Converting Military Plutonium for Use in Mixed Oxide Fuel (Continued)			
Vaughn, Joanna and Larry	Wendel, Jeannine P.	Winner, Fred M.	
Vureih, Jennifer O.	Westerly, Suzanne	Womble, Benny	
Wadley, Robert Burns	White, Betty E.	Womble, Joan	
Walter, P.	White, Jack W.	Woodriz, Ruthy	
Wancura, Marianne S.	Whitfield-Bell, Elmerine Allen	Young, Terri	
Water Information Network,	Wiedebush, Dianne	Younger, Cole	
Anonymous	Wiedebush, Jeri	Zack, W. Meron	
Lila Sust	Williams, Jim I. and Fran	Zoltan, Paul S.	
Weber, Roserita	Wilson, Nancy	Zywicki, Thaddeus S.	
Wendel, David	Winner, Frankie R.		
Postcard Expressing Support for DOE's Plutonium Disposition Missions at the Savannah River Site and View That Excess Plutonium Can Be Converted into Mixed Oxide Fuel to Help Meet U.S. Electrical Energy Needs.....			
			3-1377
A., Tony	Arego, Earlene	Bates, Camilla	
Adams, D. G.	Arlaugh, Shirley	Bates, Jamie	
Adams, Dennis	Arleash, Alisa	Bauer, R. D.	
Adams, Kelly N.	Asbestos Worker Union #92	Baxey, Jacqueline	
Adams, Monique S.	Raymond E. Story	Baxter, Claude	
Adams, Sabrina R.	Ashe, Geraldine B.	Bayer, Cassandra	
Adams, Tempie L.	Atkin, Dion L.	Baynard, Norma	
Aifej, L. Lefand	Atkins, Saminic	Bean, Lemar L.	
Aikron, Jason T.	Atkinson, Linda E.	Beans, Sharon	
Albrite, Oscar	Atkinson, Mary H.	Beard, Kut U.	
Ale, Todd	Auderce, John B.	Bearden, Kim	
Allardice, Judith A.	Austiz, Brian	Beasley, Nell	
Alling, Jamie	Ayer, Richard	Beatty, Jr., James N.	
Alt, S. D.	Bagwell, Martha	Beeland, Kihe	
Anderson, Adam	Bailey, Pame	Begnill, Dale L.	
Anderson, Muyrille	Bailey, Sara	Beinberg, Coleen F.	
Anderson, Rod	Baker, Anthony T.	Belcher, P.	
Anderson, Sue	Baker, Naomi A.	Bell, Allan	
Angelos, Christine C.	Ballard, William	Bell, B.	
Angelos, J. G.	Balodi, Jean	Bell, Brenda J.	
Anonymous (4)	Banke, Jacquel L.	Bell, Brenda T.	
Anrt, Timothie E.	Bantley, Kathy	Bell, Brian K.	
Ansley, Leslie	Bargera, Allison	Bell, Robin	
Antts, Joe S.	Bargerson, Diane	Bell, Sherry	
Aplez, M.	Barnett, Cassandra R.	Beller, Ben H.	
Arbaugh, Donna	Barry, Jim	Belon, Justin	
Arbaugh, Jimmy	Barton, Rosalyn W.	Belton, Elaine W.	
Ardis, Kelly	Baston, Wanda	Benet, John T.	

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Postcard Expressing Support for DOE's Plutonium Disposition Missions at the Savannah River Site and View That Excess Plutonium Can Be Converted into Mixed Oxide Fuel to Help Meet U.S. Electrical Energy Needs (Continued)		
Benjamin, Karen	Bowers, John W.	Bryant, Heather
Bennett, Lori	Boyd, Ann	Buchant, J. E.
Benze, Harold L.	Boyd, Carl D.	Buck, Lemad
Bern, E.	Boyd, Dante	Buck, Jr., Leonard
Berry, Web	Boyd, Joanne	Budentin, L. A.
Berser, Robert T.	Boyd, Roy	Burch, Barry
Bert, Antonette	Boykin, Danette	Burdette, Clayton
Bert, Paul Q.	Boyles, Myranda	Burk, Elliott
Bessong, Jr., W. T.	Boza, Josh	Burton, Debra
Betts, David	Brackett, Virginia L.	Busbee, Delmas
Beut, Freddie S.	Bradley, Len	Busbee, Pat
Billings, T.	Brady, Misty M.	Busch, Christian J.
Birdseye, James H.	Braid, Pam	Busch, David A.
Birdseye, Scott G.	Braun, Heidi	Busch, Jr., Finace
Bishop, Grace	Bredolson, G. S.	Bush, Denise
Bishop, Nancy	Brice, Laura S.	Bussell, Chris
Bishop, Susan	Brichof, Jerald A.	Buts, Lori A.
Black, Beth	Britt, Russell	Byer, Bill
Black, Gregory J.	Britt, Jr., James H.	Cadiere, Robin L.
Black, Lynette M.	Brittany, Jr., T. Lee	Calhaun, Angela
Blackman, Jenny	Brooks, Marie	Call, Thomas Ray
Blackmon, Tina M.	Brott, M. L.	Calloway, Judy
Blanchard, Betty T.	Brown, Angela M.	Camp, David
Blanchard, Elizabeth	Brown, Ariel	Campbell, Mary
Bland, Evelyn B.	Brown, Dianne S.	Campbell, Pat
Blessings, Don	Brown, Emory	Caneck, Harry E.
Bligreldon, Glenda C.	Brown, Gay	Car, Christa
Blyth, Cory	Brown, Joe	Carleress, Edwin Geae
Boason, Cliff	Brown, Kelly	Carr, Art M.
Bodie, Laurie	Brown, Kerealsa C.	Carter, Patricia A.
Bodie, Paige F.	Brown, Linda	Carthedge, Troy
Boerstler, Kris	Brown, Nicole	Caulegh, E.
Boggs, Gerline	Brown, R. B.	Cauley, Genia
Bolan, Denise	Brown, Richard W.	Caverness, Mamie J.
Bolangia, Erika R.	Brown, S.	Ceiuris, Delauri
Bonnell, Bonita Y.	Brown, Shirle R.	Cender, A. B.
Boseman, Fran	Brown, Steven M.	Chabous, Jr., Walter
Bossing, A. I. C	Brown, Thomas B.	Chandler, Lou
Botter, J. C.	Brumbolow, James L.	Chandler, Thelma
Bourne, Ruth	Bryan, Ronnie	Chang, Paul
Bowcutt, Tamera A.	Bryant, G. C.	Chaplin, Casey

Table 1–8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors	Page
Postcard Expressing Support for DOE's Plutonium Disposition Missions at the Savannah River Site and View That Excess Plutonium Can Be Converted into Mixed Oxide Fuel to Help Meet U.S. Electrical Energy Needs (Continued)	
Chastain, Jr., Marshal	Cyreff, Pete V.
Chattin, Janice	Dabber, Penny
Cheatham, Annette	Dahlheimer, Connie
Cherry, Lacey	Dailey, Jeffery O.
Chewy, Shane	Danekso, Terisa
Chin, C. K.	Daniel, David F.
Chin, Susan	Daniels, Denise
Chrisco, Hugh E.	Daniels, Ruth
Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness	Danner, Becky
F. G. Aoulso	Dardner, Jr., James W.
Lawrence Breder Jr.	DaShickey, Kamal
J. G. Call	Data, Jr., Robert A.
Susan S. Calley	Dauben, Rovert J.
R. A. Caulan	David, Audrey
F. B. Davis	David, Kurt
Paul Grefenstette	Davidson, Jon
Michael S. Guild	Davis, Craig
Illegible	Davis, Harold W.
Laura U. Jordan	Davis, Jennifer
Teresa Mikie	Davis, Karen
Pamela P. Plunkett	Day, Daniel J.
Keith Wood	Deal, Dewayne
Susan Wood	Deal, Myrtle
Clair, Andrew	Deal, Willie
Clarck, Laurie	Derming, Richard
Clark, Adria Leal	Derr, Pam
Clark, Brad	Diarr, Ay
Clark, Jerry	Dickerson, Todd
Clark, Preston	Digley, Laura
Clay, Caroline B.	Dixon, Amanda
Clayflower, Sr., T. C.	Dixon, Barbara A.
Clegg, Trey	Dixon, Ginger
Clement, Michael A.	Dixon, Holli
Cleveland, Rocky	Dixon, Janet
Cliett, Rosemarie	Dixon, Jillian
Cline, Teresa C.	Dixon, Joseph
Cobb, Katrina N.	Dixon, Michael
Coburn, C. David	Dixon, Richard
Coburn, Cindy	Dixon, Tanja
Cockrell, Jenny	Dome, Shannon L.
Coen, Jr., James W.	Donahue, Jeannie
Cohen, Byron D.	
Cohen, Sharon V.	
Cole, Charles W.	
Coleman, Darice	
Coleman, Kimberly	
Collins, Carol B.	
Collins, Pat A.	
Conart, Erin O.	
Conlon, Bill	
Connely, M. E.	
Conner, Jr., George	
Cook, Carl M.	
Cook, Cheryl	
Cook, Daisy M.	
Cook, Dora S.	
Cox, Sam	
Craig, Elizabeth	
Craig, Jonathon J.	
Craig, Michelle L.	
Craig, Tammy H.	
Crain, V. G.	
Crawford, Cindy	
Crocker, Kelly	
Crode, Patricia	
Croetyme, Lynda O.	
Cromer, Patsey J.	
Cromer, Jr., Guy L.	
Crook, Becky	
Crowell, Linda	
Cruiz, Ramon	
CSRA, B. C. Paly	
Cude, Bonnie W.	
Culin, Larry	
Culler, Terry	
Culllugyn, K. C.	
Cullum, T. B.	
Cummings, Gary A.	
Cunningham, Alfon I.	
Cunningham, Jeff T.	
Cunningham, Shawna	
Curry, Bettina	
Cyle, J.	

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Postcard Expressing Support for DOE's Plutonium Disposition Missions at the Savannah River Site and View That Excess Plutonium Can Be Converted into Mixed Oxide Fuel to Help Meet U.S. Electrical Energy Needs (Continued)		
Doolittle, Debra	Evans, Betty	Frelin, Norma J.
Doolittle, William	Faas, Maiya	Frey, Jr., William A.
Dorfin, Howard L.	Falk, Doris J.	Frost, Kenneth
Downs, Gregory S.	Falking, Robert	Fryer, Larry A.
Drayer, Brenda	Falls, Linda A.	Fuller, Ricky
Drayer, William	Fant, Collean	Funk, Tamara
Drummy, Jacqueline	Farris, Michelle T.	Furtick, Stacy J.
DuBoise, Glenn	Fedrick, John V.	Gaelibo, George
Dudley, Jay L.	Feelgham, Virginia	Gaines, Dominique D.
Dukes, James E.	Felak, Frances	Gallwen, James
Dukes, Ryan	Felak, Thomas	Galten, Angela
Dunbar, Christopher	Felder, Arthur	Gantt, Carlo
Dunbar, Nicole	Felds, Kellie	Gardner, Christy
Duncan, Ellen F.	Fenning, Robert T.	Garman, Amanda
Dundley, Roger	Ferguson, Randall	Garnelt, Joe A.
Duquette, Darald S.	Ferguson, Lynn	Garrett, Patrick
Durban, Harriett	Fernandez, Rita S.	Gates, Kristina
Dye, Mike	Fethringer, Joel	Gay, Susan
Dyers, Christopher D.	Fields, Marcus	Geason, Paul T.
Dynarshi, C. R.	Fields, Michelle	Geblion, David S.
Dzaugis, M. F.	Finley, A. Kathleen	Gede, Sony
E & T, Michael Cooler	Fisk, Terrie	Geit, Louise
Eaves, Debby	Flanagan, Dayna	Gelder, Bethany
Eaves, Terrel	Fleetwood, Andrew S.	Gelder, Rachel
Edwards, Barry O.	Fleetwood, Brenda A.	General Physics Corporation
Edwards, Chadwick	Floherz, Shelley	Richard D. Kelley
Edwards, Faye	Floyd, Edwards E.	Genster, Gail
Edwards, Suzette R.	Floyd, Korinya L.	Georgia, Isabel
Eichstedt, Susan C.	Flythe, Linda J.	Geotz, John
Ein, Matt K.	Ford, Willie	Geralaime, Andrew J.
Eines, Kimberly	Foreman, Shirley	Gette, Charles G.
Ekleeg, L.	Forum, T.	Gewin, Franklin L.
Eldridge, Carol	Foster, Lois J.	Gibson, Jacqueline
Eldridge, Sarah	Foster, Melinda	Gibson, Jerome
Ellenberg, Sonia E.	Foster, William C.	Gilbert, D. M.
Ellis, Joe D.	Foust, Tami M.	Glenn, Patricia
Ellis, Julia	Franklin, D. M.	Glover, Barry L.
Enleson, Kathi	Frasure, Ruby N.	Glover, Randy
Esbriard, Susan	Frazer, Cora R.	Goben, Ramona
Eubale, Joe	Freeman, Jamie T.	Godluir, Danny
Eubans, M.	Freeman, Shalanda	Golden, Bo

Table 1–8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors	Page
Postcard Expressing Support for DOE's Plutonium Disposition Missions at the Savannah River Site and View That Excess Plutonium Can Be Converted into Mixed Oxide Fuel to Help Meet U.S. Electrical Energy Needs (Continued)	
Gonzales, Maria S.	Hamson, Jamie
Gonzalez, Mario G.	Hardin, Jamie
Goodman, Charlene	Hardin, Monica
Goodwin, Betty	Hardin, Yolanda
Goodwin, Daryl R.	Harmon, Mariam
Goodwin, R. C.	Harper, David T.
Goodwin, Stan	Harper, Jewille P.
Gorden, Kenneth	Harris, Chris
Gordon, Bob	Harris, John
Gordon, Don	Harris, Kyle D.
Gossard, Terry	Harris, Marlene D.
Graham, John	Harris, Melrose
Grailing, James L.	Harrison, Amy
Grant, Hazel Y.	Harrison, Brandi
Green, Frances	Hart, Felecia
Green, Levi	Hart, Fred
Green, Michelle	Hartless, Susan D.
Green, S.	Harvey, Sonya L.
Grekovic, Vivian	Harwel, Charles
Grier, Jeremy	Hathaway, Amy C.
Griffin, Carlene	Hathcex, Jennifer
Griffin, Jo Erin	Hathcox, Crystal
Griffin, Tonya	Hawthorne, R.
Groomes, Brenda	Haynie, Lisa
Growell, Whitney	Hearn, Jamie H.
Gunter, II, Chester G.	Heath, Jerry
Hale, Kristie S.	Heath, Shawn
Halebard, Diane	Heats, L.
Hall, Daisey M.	Hedges, J. Michelle
Hall, F. Lydia	Helms, Eric M.
Hall, K.	Henderson, Lisa
Hall, Lynn I.	Henderson, Robert L.
Hall, Sondra A.	Hendirx, W. R.
Hall, Yvonne	Hendrick, Kevin E.
Hallimor, Richard	Henzik, Judith A.
Halling, Jr., Shawn M.	Herren, Franklin
Hamilton, Catherine S.	Herrison, Summer
Hamilton, Tyrone	Herron, Delores
Hammond, Ruleia B.	Herron, Rhonda
Hampton, Kelvin	Hess, Michael
Hamrock, Debbie	Hess, Norman J.
	Hevel, Catherine M.
	Hewel, Stephen D.
	Hewlett, Robert D.
	Hezlett, Susanne
	Hiermer, Ron
	Hilhite, Rachel A.
	Hillis, Jean
	Hitts, Mike T.
	Hiwuh, Datcha K.
	Hixson, Joshua
	Hodges, Jennifer
	Hodges, Margaret M.
	Hoel, Doris D.
	Hoetzaschute, E. W.
	Hogan, Jason
	Hogston, Debra J.
	Hogston, Robbye
	Holcomb, George B.
	Holland, Artie
	Holles, Nadijah
	Holley, Debbie
	Hollowell, Todd
	Holmes, Christopher M.
	Home, Sherry
	Hood, Dana
	Horner, Harry P.
	Horton, Nancy L.
	Hotrizer, Anthony W.
	House, Linda
	Howard, R.
	Howard, II, M.
	Howell, Robert L.
	Hower, Donna
	Hudson, Billy
	Hudson, Ray S.
	Huelos, Ian M.
	Huggins, Artis S.
	Hunnett, Stanley
	Hurt, Jennifer L.
	Husand, Jason
	Hustead, Jeffery

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors	Page
Postcard Expressing Support for DOE's Plutonium Disposition Missions at the Savannah River Site and View That Excess Plutonium Can Be Converted into Mixed Oxide Fuel to Help Meet U.S. Electrical Energy Needs (Continued)	
Hutchins, Laramie A.	Kirkendohl, Sam J.
Hutke, Leslie S.	Kirley, Cathy
Hyers, Franklin	Kitchings, Vernetta J.
Iethan, Kathleen	Knopf, Jeremy
Illegible (77)	Knox, Daris V.
Intel, Lane	Krist, G.
IUOE	Kroft, David
Michael M. Gallie	Labute, Allen
Irwin, B. J.	LaFavre, III, Al D.
Itome, T. J.	Lamar, J.
IUOE, Local 470	Lamar, Sharma
Shelia Morris	Lambert, Ardeen
Lane D. Parker	Lamie, Leisa
Eddy L. Smith	Lance, K.
Jackson, Celia	Land, Jr., William S.
Jackson, Dreue	Landers, Mary
Jackson, H. L.	Langford, Patricia
Jackson, Kitie	Lanz, Laura
Jackson, Lesa M.	Larescz, Connie
Jackson, Maretta	Lark, Laverne
Jackson, Roger	Laswell, Candra Dawn
Jackson, Sheila	Lathimer, H.
Jackson, Terry	Laurson, Jimmie
Jaier, David A.	Lawrence, Debra A.
James, Rhonda	Lawrence, Gloria M.
Jefferson, Sheldon	Lawrence, Vernon
Jenkins, Allison	Lawson, James
Jennings, Melody	Lay, Catherine
Jennings, Sylvia	Lazarky, Frank
Jennison, Jr., A. E.	Lee, Donna A.
Jernigan, Carolyn	Leonard, Michael J.
Jessi, Jr., Oscar	Leonard, Nelma S.
Jimery, Juan	Levens, Terry
Johnson, Anna	Lever, Ray
Johnson, Bridgette M.	Leverett, Monica
Johnson, Dustin	Levey, Michael
Johnson, Jim	Lewis, Chris
Johnson, Keith	Lewis, Julie
Johnson, Linda D.	Lewis, Makeisha
Johnson, Nicole	Lewis, Robert M.
Johnson, Pat	Lewis, S. B.
Johnson, Sarah	
Johnson, Shannon	
Johnson, Stephen A.	
Jold, Weby Dillard	
Jolnes, Frank W.	
Jones, Anna	
Jones, Anne B.	
Jones, Cathie	
Jones, Cheri	
Jones, Clifford E.	
Jones, Crystal C.	
Jones, Erica	
Jones, Ernie M.	
Jones, James H.	
Jones, Jay	
Jones, Michelle Y.	
Jones, Willie L.	
Jordan, Aletha	
Jorden, Kari	
Jowers, Deborah M.	
Jurmnes, Joseph	
Kanarapatakis, L. K.	
Kaney, Katherine	
Karananedge, Mobe	
Kay, D. A.	
Kearse, Jim	
Keller, R.	
Kelley, Norma	
Kellum, Cindy	
Kelly, Joann	
Kelly, Michelle D.	
Kelly, Jr., Alfred	
Kenbolk, Lelian	
Kenison, David S.	
Key, C. A.	
Key, Willie	
Kieren, Jason A.	
Kimpel, Joseph	
King, Donna	
King, Sam J.	
Kinsey, Kristine C.	
Kirk, Emery	

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors	Page
Postcard Expressing Support for DOE's Plutonium Disposition Missions at the Savannah River Site and View That Excess Plutonium Can Be Converted into Mixed Oxide Fuel to Help Meet U.S. Electrical Energy Needs (Continued)	
Lewisinky, Carey	May, B.
Lipen, Pat	McAlhamy, Sachi W.
Lipton, Aaron	McBitler, William
Lipton, Donna J.	McBride, Joey
Litesz, J. M.	McBride, Kurt
LIUNA, Warren Hills, Sr.	McCall, Homer C.
Livingston, Chris	McCall, Steven
Lloyd, Dorothy O.	McCaukey, Maryln L.
Lloyd, Glenda	McClendon, Dhashida
Lloyd, Sr., W.	McClesheg, Carol P.
Lnop, Brian	McConnell, Avery
Local 1283, Wayne Persinger	McCoy, Mary
Loudria, Jr., Frankie	McDahee, Carlo
Lovett, Chris	McDanell, William R.
Loy, Deanne H.	McDaniel, Tanya
Lu, Gregory	McDonald, Teresa K.
Lubell, Art	McDuffie, Sterling
Ludler, Diane	MCG, Judith Fay
Luxmore, Lori	McGlue, Ashley
Lyduand, E. A.	McGregor, Timothy
Lynn, Judy	McIvers, Kay
MacCrumin, Archie N.	McKey, Loretta V.
Mack, Lloyd	McLaren, Donny
Maguire, Dora Jane	McLaughlin, Kathryn
Mahoney, Palmeria	McNeal, Crystal
Maiday, Michelle S.	Mead, R. E.
Maier, James B.	Mealing, Tony J.
Majer, Tyler L.	Meekes, Phil
Makoho, Linda	Meiler, Mark J.
Mamae, Eli T.	Melissa
Mangeldorf, J.	Melvin, Linda A.
Manuel, Pat	Meriweather, Kimberly C.
Marine, Gail H.	Merriweather, Delores
Marris, Mary J.	Merse, Cleveland
Martin, Jean R.	Messich, Linda
Martiniz, Frank	Meyer, Perry L.
Mathews, B. H.	Michifeldi, Pete
Mathis, Melissa K.	Mider, June M.
Matson, Paula	Midland Valley Chambers
Mauft, Buck	Datory Waymen
Mausur, E. J.	Milledge, Bettie K.
	Miller, Audrey R.
	Miller, Brian
	Miller, Mamie
	Miller, Shirley T.
	Milton, K.
	Mins, Roxie
	Mitchell, Donna W.
	Mitter, Adam R.
	Mitts, Antonia
	Mobly, George R.
	Moeney, Oliver W.
	Mollo, Victoria
	Momentiller, Kevin
	Montgomery, George W.
	Moody, Alonzo
	Moody, Barbara B.
	Moody, William
	Moon, Connie
	Moor, Ralph L.
	Moore, Andrea
	Moore, James F.
	Moore, Jason
	Moore, Jessica J.
	Moore, Leah
	Moore, Margaret
	Moore, Renia R.
	Morales, Jr., Alfonso
	Morals, Shannes
	Moran, Kelly
	Morgan, Louis
	Morgan, Pammie J.
	Morgan, William N.
	Morris, Claudia D.
	Morris, H. A.
	Morris, H. J.
	Morris, Hal W.
	Morris, Leslie
	Morris, Robert G.
	Mosley, John L.
	Mosley, W. L.
	Moss, Amanda

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Postcard Expressing Support for DOE's Plutonium Disposition Missions at the Savannah River Site and View That Excess Plutonium Can Be Converted into Mixed Oxide Fuel to Help Meet U.S. Electrical Energy Needs (Continued)		
Moss, Beverly G.	J. Kent Sullivan	Pelc, Sue
Moster, A. B.	Nue, Michelle	Pellard, Anne
Moyer, Anne	O'Bannen, Donna	Petterson, Joseph G.
Muehlar, W.	Odo, Cyndy	Peure, Chuck
Muhlean, Sr., Raymond B.	Odom, Beverly	Phillips, Diane
Mulleirs, Ernie W.	Ogeth, Walter	Phillips, Jamie
Mullikin, Sandy	Ohiooka, Delores	Phillips, Stanton J.
Mullis, Debra S.	Oliphane, Willie R.	Pike, Jr., Walter L.
Murff, W. C.	Oliver, Jeanette	Pines, David
Mutarielli, Mary	Oliver, Joe H.	Plenter, Margaret
Muza, Tracie	Olsen, Rebecca E.	Poeser, Sammie
Myer, Barry	Olum, Moses	Polding, M.
Myers, Richard S.	Oring, Jason	Polite, Carl F.
Nallen, Roger M.	Orlando, Robert	Polite, Debra
Naz, Diane M.	Ortega, Carmila	Pollard, Barbara
Neal, Margie	Ostunds, Gerald W.	Poole, Sara
Nealious, Joseph	Owen, Frederick B.	Pope, W. O.
Neely, Pamela	Owen, Michael	Porcelli, G. M.
Neil, Peggy	Owens, Donald W.	Postos, Marlin
Nelson, Frank E.	Owens, Sabrina	Powell, Samuel H.
Nelson, Guretu B.	Owens, Terry	Price, Bill
Nelson, Michael A.	Pafel, Dirk D.	Price, Caroline
Neuken, Vincent	Pagett, R. S.	Price, Rebecca S.
Newkirl, Charlene	Parcelli, Peter V.	Priester, Lucille
Newlhirt, Jessica	Parker, Deloris	Priester, Michael B.
Newman, Monica	Parker, Kristie	Prince, Bill
Newman, Vicky	Parry, George	Proctor, Eileen
Newsome, C. N.	Partain, Bobbie	Purltard, Brian
Newsome, Deborah	Patrick, Jacki	Quarles, Stephanie L.
Nichelson, Rosa	Patterson, Marion	Quhaley, L. H.
Nichols, Tiffany E.	Paure, Lisa	Quiyim, Ifraj T.
Nicholson, Angela	Payne, W. L.	Raber, Wallace
Nickols, Charles P.	Peak, Cheryl W.	Radduck, Danny
Niell, Miele R.	Pearson, Kari M.	Rafoth, Abby
Nix, Debbie B.	Pearson, Kimberly	Rammon, Clark
Nixon, David W.	Peebeet, Connie	Ramsay, Phillip
Nob, Burke	Peek, Kriesty	Randall, Linda
Norma, Joe L.	Peek, L. E.	Rannarie, Sheldon
North Augusta City Administration	Peek, L. M.	Raudle, G.
Charles B. Marten	Peel, Francis K.	Rawiel, Caleb
North Augusta City Council	Peel, Margie	Ray, Ailene B.

Table 1–8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors	Page
Postcard Expressing Support for DOE's Plutonium Disposition Missions at the Savannah River Site and View That Excess Plutonium Can Be Converted into Mixed Oxide Fuel to Help Meet U.S. Electrical Energy Needs (Continued)	
Ray, Joyce A.	Rucker, M. J.
Receuh, Teresa	Rudd, Nell O.
Reed, Priscilla	Ruffins, Helen R.
Reeve, Arnold P.	Runne, J. L.
Reforth, Robert J.	Rurtraus, Rocky
Reid, Dhemiétris	Rutlan, William L.
René, C.	Ryan, A.
Reyer, Ester A.	Ryberg, W. Grieg
Rice, Patti	Safford, Emma
Ricesnue, Marmi	Saita, Ronald P.
Richmond City 118th	Salyer, Linda
H. Harold	Sampson, Barbara S.
Righ, Thomas F.	Sampson, John R.
Ritchie, Donald E.	Sampson, Jr., Edwin M.
Roberson, L. Seche	Sanders, Bernard
Roberson, Lonnie	Sanders, James F.
Roberson, Rebecca	Sanders, Karl
Roberson, Toby	Sanders, Kenneth
Roberts, Alison L.	Sandri, Karlene B.
Robin, Paul	Sandri, Nader F.
Robinette, Jim	Santos, Annie I.
Robinette, Sarah L.	Sapp, Thomas M.
Robinson, Ebony	Sareely, Leta
Robinson, Georgina	Saugh, Robert A.
Robinson, Shirley	Saunders, Carla
Rogers, David	Savannah River Technical Center
Rogers, Kathryn	Margaret J. Schwanker
Rolland, Gwendolyn	Sawcutt, Marilyn
Romaine, Jr., Gerald J.	Sawyer, Gloria
Rorinler, Bill	Scales, Josh
Rose, Karen	Schmidt, James A.
Rose, Mary Anne	Schmitt, James C.
Rosenkrantz, Melissa	Schneider, David
Ross, Addie O.	Schreiber, Barbara
Ross, Cary	Schultz, Jr., Richard E.
Ross, Erin A.	Scott, Hugh A.
Ross, Sr., L. M.	Sedder, Roland S.
Rothine, S.	Sein, Christina
Rouse, Angela	Selder, Mather
Rowell, Joy	Seles, Patrick
Roy, James C.	Sestanich, James R.
	Sethi, B.
	Sewearing, Sandra
	Shade, Connie H.
	Shane, Jason A.
	Sharpe, Martha
	Shaw, John
	Sheets, Laura L.
	Sherron, Jane
	Shogren, Dotti
	Shores, Rebecca N.
	Shufler, Jerry
	Sides, Karen
	Signon, Stephen S.
	Simmons, Tonya A.
	Simms, Tori J.
	Simpson, Annie B.
	Simpson, Jr., John E.
	Sinclair, Jerry
	Sizemore, Gail
	Skinner, Harriett F.
	Smith, Brenda
	Smith, Bryan
	Smith, C.
	Smith, Corrine
	Smith, Daniel R.
	Smith, Darie C.
	Smith, Davan
	Smith, Debbie
	Smith, Ernest W.
	Smith, Frank
	Smith, Helen
	Smith, James A.
	Smith, James T.
	Smith, Kelly
	Smith, Lein A.
	Smith, Markus L.
	Smith, Mildred
	Smith, Norma N.
	Smith, Richard B.
	Smith, Susan H.
	Sosa, Jennifer

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors	Page
Postcard Expressing Support for DOE's Plutonium Disposition Missions at the Savannah River Site and View That Excess Plutonium Can Be Converted into Mixed Oxide Fuel to Help Meet U.S. Electrical Energy Needs (Continued)	
Sox, Cynthia	Tater, Joseph
Spade, Phillip	Taylor, Clint
Sparks, Edwards	Taylor, John C.
Spears, T. J.	Taylor, Mary
Spivey, Dennis	Teahell, Julie
Spradler, Joey	Temple, Grady Ronald
Stallings, Adrenea M.	Teriyle, Linda P.
Stallings, Jay L.	Thaury, Rusty
Stalworth, Robert	The Journal
Standefor, Ray	Walt Inabinet
Stanley, Allison N.	Therigh, J.
Stanley, III, Walter G.	Thibault, Jeffery
Stanton, Richard M.	Thomas, Bob
Stapleton, Suzanne	Thomas, Candice
Starleys, Dargreline	Thomas, Dennis
Steadman, Leanne	Thomas, Jermia H.
Stealey, John	Thomas, Patricia P.
Stephen, D. L.	Thomas, Stephanie
Stevens, Karen	Thomas, Troy T.
Stewart, Cynthia	Thomas, Veronica
Stewart, Myrtle	Thompson, Josiah C.
Stiheling, C. E.	Thompson, Kay R.
Still, Patricia	Thompson, Renee
Still, Stephanie A.	Thompson, Shanta R.
Stills, R.	Thurnell, Ted
Stoker, N. A.	Tobell, Matt
Stone, Lesa E.	Trapp, Andrew
Stovall, James	Tuekes, Regina
Stratlin, Jr., Charles H.	Tuely, Susan S.
Strickland, Steve	Tuntarella, Nick
Sutphin, Shannon M.	Turner, Carman A.
Sviha, Diane	Turner, Gloria
Swan, Dianne	Turner, Jason
Swerker, J. Suellen	Turner, Jennie
Taber, Quentin E.	Turner, Jermel O.
Talbert, Gregory F.	Turner, T. J.
Talbet, Ginger	Turner, Todd
Talbet, Larry	Tyler, R.
Tanner, Julius	Unison, Jr., Thomas
Tanner, Mary	Utley, Sue
Tate, Elaine	Vafade, Karan
	Van Haastrecht, Katrina
	Vann, Miriam
	Vaughn, J.
	Vaun, Gregory
	Veren, Natalia
	Veres, C.
	Vernon, Bradley
	Vert, Jason
	Void, Deborah C.
	Voss, Austin J.
	Wade, Jeon
	WAGT-TV, NBC News
	Illegible
	Waken, Patience F.
	Waldron, Helen L.
	Waldron, Sr., Jams E.
	Walh, Angie M.
	Walker, Debbie
	Walker, Geraldine
	Walker, Harrison
	Walker, Michael
	Walker, Stephanie
	Walker, Tracy
	Wallace, Lenora S.
	Wallace, Mary
	Walling, Elaine S.
	Walpole, Douglas L.
	Walpole, H.
	Walsh, Brian
	Walters, Will C.
	Ward, Mike
	Ware, Holly A.
	Warming, R.
	Warner, Milton E.
	Wash, Norman L.
	Wash, Ramona K.
	Washington, Glenn R.
	Washington, Jareth
	Waters, Daniel G.
	Waters, James J.
	Waters, Jennifer

Table 1–8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Postcard Expressing Support for DOE's Plutonium Disposition Missions at the Savannah River Site and View That Excess Plutonium Can Be Converted into Mixed Oxide Fuel to Help Meet U.S. Electrical Energy Needs (Continued)		
Waufon, Todd V.	White, Michell	Wing, F. W.
Wead, Rich	White, Thomas	Wingate, Rath C.
Weaver, Paul A.	Whitefield, John W.	Winn, Leslie
Weegians, Debra	Whitlock, Jessica L.	Winters, Kenneth R.
Wells, Keli	Wilburn, Be Anna	Wollua, J.
Wells, Rodriaguz	William, Gary	Wood, Angela
Wells, Jr., Willie L.	William, Gregory	Wood, Kathy L.
Wemut, R. H.	William, Helen P.	Woodard, Inez
Wenger, Melissa	Williams, Allen	Woodrow, A.
West, David A.	Williams, Cathy	Woods, W. T.
West, William L.	Williams, David	Woodward, Richard D.
Westinghouse Savannah River Company	Williams, Flora P.	Worthy, Samatha L.
Margy Beckmeyer	Williams, John L.	Wright, Castella E.
John Stephen Bellany	Williams, Mae	Wright, David L.
Jeffrey M. Bollibon	Williams, Michael	Wright, Donald
John A. Burnett	Williams, S. M.	Wright, Mikeia
L. G. Call	Williams, Theresa Lee	Yanger, Ana M.
Robert T. Hess	Williams, Timothy B.	Yanze, Noah
Illegible	Williams, Twame	Yarbrough, Robin M.
Lucas Jackson	Williams, Vivian J.	Young, M. C.
Reginald Jerdun	Williams, Walter	Youngblood, Janice F.
Robert Kellner	Williford, Nicole	Youngblood, W. Lewis
Warren C. Lucas	Willyha, Katrina	Zilhite, C.
Lessier B. Price	Wilson, Emily	Zipper, Jerry
Patricia B. Smith	Wilson, Erinn	Zniddleton, Latoya
Wetter, Herbert P.	Wilson, J. N.	
White, A.		
White, Deborah S.		
Questionnaire–Hanford Action.....		3–1379
Chantler, Joan	Grubmil, Ffei	Peauxa, John
Demaria, Gregg	Holenstein, Kathryn Cherie	Reif, David
Drageaux, Barbara	Low, Ian and Aiko	
Ferguson, Ken	Pearson, Christine	
Questionnaire–Hanford Action of Oregon.....		3–1383
Allen, Roderick M.	Burge, Lori	CIIBRI
Anonymous	Callison, Liz	Frank Gearhart
Barry, Tricia	Carley, Laura	Clinger, Sebastian
Beyer, Jim and Pat	Carley, Randie	Copeland, Edward
Boese, Bill	Case, Rhonda	Crawford, Marge
Bortnick, Rick	Charneski, Christine	Dafoe, Vera L.

Table 1-8. Organization and Individual Commentors as Part of a Campaign (Continued)

Commentors		Page
Hanford Action of Oregon Questionnaire (Continued)		
Dunn, Sherry K.	Klein, Robin	Pfeffer, John
Ennis, Sara	Koski, Elizabeth	Piippo, Laurel
Ettlin, Lauren	Lack, Larry	Richardson, Ann
Frazier, Bruce	Lee, Sharon	Robinson, Bob
Fredrich, Ruth O.	Lettowmaer, Margaret	Schimpf, Amy
Freeborn, Johnni	Leveque Ph.D, Phillip	Seborer, Robert
Gayek, Alexandra	Lichtenwald, Daniel	Sims, Lynn
Giddings, Rochelle	Liptan, Sherry and Tom	Southworth, Laurie P.
Greenfield, Lou and Del	Marbet, Lloyd	Starr, Charles
Grossman, Charles M.	Marsh, Betty Jane	Starr, George and Irene
Hair, Anne E.	McGehee, Marian	Tinemen, Charles
Hammond, Terry	McLoughlin, Maura	Tracy, Nancy Lou
Hartford, Susan R.	McMurry-Smith, Wanda Lee	Ullom, Richard L.
Hines, Maxine	McNary, Janet	Walicki, Joe
Honke, Michael	Meyers, Marcia	Ward, Lee Ann
Israel, Adar	Monarch Software	Ward, Rayner
Israel, Tabiah	Anonymous	Weibel, Emma Lee
Janzon, Gretchen	Norton, Elias	Wheeler, Dori and Rollin
Jayne, Victoria	Norton, Patrick W.	Wilson, Dave
Johnson, Chuck	Nussbaum, Rudi and Laureen	Wolter, Pamela
Jones, Mary V.	Oakley, J. A.	Woods, Crystal
Joslin, Rose Mary	Pairo, Rill	
Juergens, Kathleen	Penfield, Janet	

Table 1-9. Issue Categories

Issue Category	Page
Air Quality and Noise	3-50, 3-57, 3-121, 3-174, 3-355, 3-453, 3-798, 3-799, 3-822, 3-909, 3-938, 3-963, 3-994, 3-1145
Alternatives	3-3, 3-4, 3-5, 3-6, 3-9, 3-10, 3-11, 3-12, 3-15, 3-17, 3-23, 3-24, 3-25, 3-26, 3-29, 3-33, 3-36, 3-43, 3-46, 3-57, 3-59, 3-81, 3-82, 3-84, 3-86, 3-87, 3-102, 3-110, 3-111, 3-115, 3-151, 3-167, 3-169, 3-171, 3-177, 3-178, 3-179, 3-180, 3-185, 3-192, 3-193, 3-194, 3-195, 3-196, 3-197, 3-198, 3-201, 3-204, 3-206, 3-207, 3-209, 3-211, 3-215, 3-217, 3-219, 3-235, 3-236, 3-237, 3-238, 3-239, 3-240, 3-247, 3-249, 3-255, 3-281, 3-283, 3-285, 3-294, 3-302, 3-345, 3-350, 3-351, 3-353, 3-388, 3-391, 3-395, 3-398, 3-399, 3-400, 3-401, 3-404, 3-416, 3-420, 3-424, 3-427, 3-428, 3-429, 3-435, 3-445, 3-447, 3-450, 3-457, 3-468, 3-477, 3-480, 3-481, 3-487, 3-490, 3-493, 3-496, 3-498, 3-499, 3-507, 3-508, 3-509, 3-516, 3-517, 3-519, 3-521, 3-522, 3-523, 3-525, 3-526, 3-527, 3-528, 3-529, 3-530, 3-531, 3-532, 3-533, 3-535, 3-537, 3-538, 3-541, 3-543, 3-544, 3-547, 3-559, 3-562, 3-564, 3-566, 3-575, 3-577, 3-580, 3-588, 3-589, 3-590, 3-591, 3-601, 3-602, 3-605, 3-606, 3-608, 3-610, 3-611, 3-618, 3-622, 3-623, 3-624, 3-626, 3-628, 3-629, 3-637, 3-638, 3-640, 3-643, 3-644, 3-646, 3-647, 3-648, 3-649, 3-651, 3-652, 3-653, 3-654, 3-655, 3-660, 3-663, 3-666, 3-668, 3-672, 3-674, 3-676, 3-678, 3-680, 3-681, 3-683, 3-685, 3-690, 3-696, 3-697, 3-710, 3-713, 3-715, 3-717, 3-719, 3-720, 3-721, 3-722, 3-723, 3-724, 3-725, 3-726, 3-728, 3-729, 3-730, 3-731, 3-733, 3-734, 3-736, 3-738, 3-741, 3-742, 3-747, 3-749, 3-750, 3-751, 3-753, 3-754, 3-755, 3-758, 3-759, 3-760, 3-761, 3-762, 3-763, 3-764, 3-765, 3-766, 3-768, 3-769, 3-771, 3-772, 3-773, 3-775, 3-776, 3-778, 3-779, 3-782, 3-801, 3-809, 3-828, 3-829, 3-830, 3-831, 3-833, 3-836, 3-838, 3-839, 3-840, 3-842, 3-843, 3-844, 3-845, 3-846, 3-847, 3-850, 3-851, 3-854, 3-855, 3-857, 3-858, 3-859, 3-860, 3-862, 3-863, 3-864, 3-867, 3-869, 3-874, 3-875, 3-876, 3-877, 3-880, 3-882, 3-883, 3-884, 3-885, 3-886, 3-893, 3-896, 3-897, 3-898, 3-899, 3-901, 3-902, 3-903, 3-907, 3-929, 3-932, 3-936, 3-939, 3-950, 3-988, 3-989, 3-991, 3-992, 3-993, 3-997, 3-1000, 3-1002, 3-1004, 3-1005, 3-1008, 3-1010, 3-1011, 3-1014, 3-1018, 3-1020, 3-1021, 3-1022, 3-1023, 3-1024, 3-1025, 3-1031, 3-1032, 3-1033, 3-1034, 3-1037, 3-1045, 3-1047, 3-1050, 3-1052, 3-1056, 3-1059, 3-1061, 3-1062, 3-1064, 3-1065, 3-1066, 3-1067, 3-1071, 3-1072, 3-1074, 3-1075, 3-1077, 3-1079, 3-1080, 3-1084, 3-1085, 3-1088, 3-1091, 3-1094, 3-1095, 3-1096, 3-1097, 3-1098, 3-1104, 3-1105, 3-1107, 3-1113, 3-1121, 3-1139, 3-1150, 3-1164, 3-1183, 3-1184, 3-1187, 3-1188, 3-1191, 3-1192, 3-1193, 3-1197, 3-1198, 3-1199, 3-1205, 3-1206, 3-1207, 3-1208, 3-1209, 3-1210, 3-1213, 3-1215, 3-1216, 3-1217, 3-1219, 3-1220, 3-1221, 3-1222, 3-1223, 3-1224, 3-1225, 3-1226, 3-1231, 3-1235, 3-1236, 3-1237, 3-1243, 3-1244, 3-1245, 3-1246, 3-1247, 3-1256, 3-1258, 3-1261, 3-1262, 3-1263, 3-1264, 3-1268, 3-1272, 3-1276, 3-1277, 3-1279, 3-1280, 3-1281, 3-1288, 3-1289, 3-1290, 3-1299, 3-1300, 3-1302, 3-1310, 3-1311, 3-1315, 3-1321, 3-1324, 3-1325, 3-1326, 3-1327, 3-1334, 3-1335, 3-1347, 3-1349, 3-1353, 3-1359, 3-1361, 3-1367, 3-1371, 3-1373, 3-1375, 3-1377, 3-1379, 3-1384

Table 1-9. Issue Categories (Continued)

Issue Category	Page
Candidate Sites	3-127, 3-452, 3-797
Cost	3-35, 3-54, 3-85, 3-127, 3-164, 3-220, 3-431, 3-483, 3-554, 3-615, 3-748, 3-1034, 3-1055, 3-1057, 3-1062, 3-1074, 3-1075, 3-1090, 3-1093, 3-1096, 3-1097, 3-1098, 3-1101, 3-1104, 3-1121, 3-1165, 3-1188, 3-1189, 3-1190, 3-1202, 3-1203, 3-1206, 3-1217, 3-1237, 3-1238, 3-1239, 3-1240, 3-1253, 3-1265, 3-1275, 3-1276, 3-1284, 3-1285, 3-1286, 3-1303, 3-1304, 3-1329, 3-1342
Cost Report	3-222, 3-238, 3-287, 3-558, 3-560, 3-573, 3-577, 3-588, 3-590, 3-619, 3-800, 3-868, 3-1006, 3-1101, 3-1102, 3-1142, 3-1211, 3-1218, 3-1240, 3-1266, 3-1275
Cultural and Palentological	3-453, 3-454
Cumulative Impacts	3-51, 3-297, 3-456, 3-710
DOE Policy	3-32, 3-51, 3-59, 3-77, 3-81, 3-83, 3-122, 3-123, 3-124, 3-128, 3-130, 3-142, 3-180, 3-189, 3-190, 3-194, 3-208, 3-211, 3-219, 3-223, 3-224, 3-227, 3-251, 3-255, 3-267, 3-284, 3-298, 3-299, 3-300, 3-301, 3-303, 3-345, 3-353, 3-367, 3-369, 3-373, 3-375, 3-389, 3-404, 3-406, 3-417, 3-421, 3-430, 3-431, 3-432, 3-433, 3-434, 3-436, 3-437, 3-439, 3-445, 3-480, 3-482, 3-486, 3-487, 3-489, 3-490, 3-505, 3-546, 3-584, 3-611, 3-615, 3-617, 3-638, 3-651, 3-699, 3-716, 3-721, 3-724, 3-732, 3-747, 3-775, 3-792, 3-793, 3-815, 3-821, 3-832, 3-837, 3-849, 3-872, 3-879, 3-888, 3-890, 3-895, 3-905, 3-909, 3-974, 3-1002, 3-1005, 3-1008, 3-1016, 3-1037, 3-1039, 3-1046, 3-1049, 3-1051, 3-1055, 3-1062, 3-1063, 3-1067, 3-1069, 3-1077, 3-1080, 3-1082, 3-1083, 3-1087, 3-1106, 3-1114, 3-1119, 3-1124, 3-1135, 3-1138, 3-1152, 3-1157, 3-1161, 3-1165, 3-1166, 3-1181, 3-1190, 3-1193, 3-1196, 3-1204, 3-1218, 3-1219, 3-1223, 3-1235, 3-1238, 3-1240, 3-1241, 3-1242, 3-1248, 3-1251, 3-1258, 3-1259, 3-1265, 3-1266, 3-1267, 3-1283, 3-1284, 3-1285, 3-1287, 3-1288, 3-1295, 3-1296, 3-1305, 3-1306, 3-1307, 3-1309, 3-1310, 3-1319, 3-1320, 3-1328, 3-1331, 3-1332, 3-1333, 3-1339, 3-1340, 3-1341, 3-1343, 3-1344, 3-1351, 3-1356, 3-1375, 3-1379, 3-1381, 3-1383, 3-1385
Ecological Resources	3-45, 3-112, 3-455
Environmental Justice	3-81, 3-119, 3-128, 3-1320
Facility Accidents	3-44, 3-49, 3-50, 3-57, 3-122, 3-152, 3-153, 3-154, 3-155, 3-156, 3-157, 3-162, 3-171, 3-172, 3-174, 3-175, 3-176, 3-181, 3-182, 3-183, 3-184, 3-205, 3-295, 3-448, 3-453, 3-456, 3-457, 3-458, 3-576, 3-580, 3-642, 3-785, 3-786, 3-787, 3-788, 3-790, 3-794, 3-807, 3-906, 3-941, 3-954, 3-960, 3-961, 3-994, 3-1145, 3-1148, 3-1169, 3-1178, 3-1185, 3-1232, 3-1242, 3-1269, 3-1278, 3-1291, 3-1294, 3-1315, 3-1369
Feedstock	3-368, 3-374, 3-621, 3-792, 3-949, 3-1137

Table 1–9. Issue Categories (Continued)

Issue Category	Page
General SPD EIS and NEPA Process	3–11, 3–29, 3–39, 3–44, 3–46, 3–47, 3–53, 3–58, 3–61, 3–74, 3–75, 3–78, 3–85, 3–92, 3–107, 3–118, 3–127, 3–129, 3–161, 3–164, 3–191, 3–208, 3–212, 3–217, 3–227, 3–229, 3–230, 3–242, 3–253, 3–257, 3–260, 3–269, 3–276, 3–277, 3–291, 3–292, 3–303, 3–305, 3–313, 3–335, 3–352, 3–359, 3–360, 3–362, 3–371, 3–377, 3–378, 3–379, 3–381, 3–384, 3–407, 3–408, 3–420, 3–432, 3–441, 3–447, 3–458, 3–494, 3–501, 3–554, 3–566, 3–569, 3–572, 3–607, 3–611, 3–623, 3–640, 3–645, 3–661, 3–689, 3–727, 3–789, 3–790, 3–796, 3–818, 3–871, 3–892, 3–898, 3–909, 3–912, 3–914, 3–923, 3–936, 3–948, 3–952, 3–953, 3–955, 3–956, 3–957, 3–993, 3–1035, 3–1052, 3–1056, 3–1058, 3–1059, 3–1060, 3–1062, 3–1065, 3–1079, 3–1085, 3–1090, 3–1095, 3–1098, 3–1101, 3–1108, 3–1116, 3–1133, 3–1139, 3–1140, 3–1141, 3–1147, 3–1179, 3–1187, 3–1192, 3–1194, 3–1195, 3–1196, 3–1210, 3–1211, 3–1226, 3–1233, 3–1234, 3–1235, 3–1248, 3–1253, 3–1254, 3–1255, 3–1257, 3–1261, 3–1272, 3–1273, 3–1279, 3–1295, 3–1298, 3–1311, 3–1317, 3–1318, 3–1319, 3–1338, 3–1357
Geology and Soils	3–687, 3–824
Human Health Risk	3–34, 3–48, 3–125, 3–149, 3–151, 3–173, 3–174, 3–230, 3–245, 3–249, 3–250, 3–265, 3–266, 3–267, 3–268, 3–401, 3–446, 3–456, 3–549, 3–557, 3–573, 3–590, 3–591, 3–595, 3–607, 3–799, 3–805, 3–806, 3–818, 3–821, 3–822, 3–848, 3–870, 3–877, 3–878, 3–879, 3–886, 3–887, 3–903, 3–904, 3–938, 3–941, 3–955, 3–956, 3–957, 3–966, 3–967, 3–992, 3–996, 3–1006, 3–1014, 3–1015, 3–1043, 3–1112, 3–1144, 3–1146, 3–1185, 3–1214, 3–1226, 3–1227, 3–1228, 3–1229, 3–1230, 3–1246, 3–1247, 3–1249, 3–1250, 3–1251, 3–1252, 3–1255, 3–1256, 3–1291, 3–1292, 3–1293, 3–1312, 3–1314, 3–1336, 3–1337, 3–1349, 3–1350, 3–1363
Immobilization	3–58, 3–149, 3–162, 3–165, 3–166, 3–169, 3–297, 3–449, 3–450, 3–454, 3–570, 3–606, 3–687, 3–790, 3–889, 3–1280, 3–1300, 3–1355
Infrastructure	3–448, 3–454, 3–804, 3–827
Land Use and Visual Resources	3–942, 3–943, 3–944
Lead Assemblies	3–50, 3–167, 3–212, 3–222, 3–225, 3–227, 3–237, 3–239, 3–370, 3–371, 3–376, 3–595, 3–596, 3–705, 3–793, 3–1138, 3–1157
MOX Approach	3–42, 3–45, 3–54, 3–69, 3–71, 3–72, 3–89, 3–101, 3–114, 3–116, 3–117, 3–118, 3–126, 3–129, 3–161, 3–164, 3–209, 3–213, 3–242, 3–243, 3–246, 3–255, 3–262, 3–263, 3–266, 3–271, 3–283, 3–287, 3–288, 3–343, 3–345, 3–347, 3–349, 3–350, 3–357, 3–362, 3–363, 3–376, 3–393, 3–397, 3–405, 3–408, 3–409, 3–412, 3–413, 3–415, 3–416, 3–419, 3–422, 3–434, 3–438, 3–443, 3–445, 3–452, 3–463, 3–467, 3–478, 3–482, 3–486, 3–487, 3–498, 3–503, 3–504, 3–555, 3–570, 3–597, 3–598, 3–606, 3–613, 3–618, 3–632, 3–634, 3–635, 3–636, 3–643, 3–687, 3–704, 3–705, 3–747, 3–756, 3–890, 3–892, 3–897, 3–900, 3–963, 3–964, 3–968, 3–975, 3–1036, 3–1038, 3–1041, 3–1050, 3–1065, 3–1069, 3–1073, 3–1082, 3–1092, 3–1097, 3–1110, 3–1131, 3–1133, 3–1141, 3–1143, 3–1145, 3–1147, 3–1148, 3–1153, 3–1164, 3–1165, 3–1168, 3–1172, 3–1173, 3–1177, 3–1182, 3–1186,

Table 1-9. Issue Categories (Continued)

Issue Category	Page
MOX Approach (Continued)	3-1197, 3-1198, 3-1199, 3-1200, 3-1211, 3-1216, 3-1236, 3-1263, 3-1270, 3-1273, 3-1274, 3-1281, 3-1282, 3-1296, 3-1301, 3-1302, 3-1326, 3-1327, 3-1357, 3-1358, 3-1363, 3-1375, 3-1381, 3-1383
MOXRFP	3-10, 3-87, 3-121, 3-299, 3-305, 3-371, 3-394, 3-451, 3-477, 3-552, 3-582, 3-948, 3-949, 3-1060, 3-1130, 3-1132, 3-1159, 3-1169, 3-1176, 3-1201, 3-1234, 3-1257, 3-1265, 3-1269, 3-1319, 3-1329, 3-1344
Nonproliferation	3-31, 3-55, 3-80, 3-170, 3-211, 3-220, 3-227, 3-235, 3-243, 3-251, 3-257, 3-260, 3-284, 3-289, 3-290, 3-301, 3-404, 3-413, 3-416, 3-434, 3-437, 3-468, 3-480, 3-487, 3-502, 3-612, 3-661, 3-689, 3-743, 3-802, 3-868, 3-1037, 3-1049, 3-1067, 3-1080, 3-1119, 3-1121, 3-1122, 3-1123, 3-1124, 3-1127, 3-1128, 3-1129, 3-1131, 3-1153, 3-1162, 3-1163, 3-1165, 3-1167, 3-1204, 3-1205, 3-1215, 3-1266, 3-1305, 3-1306, 3-1308, 3-1330, 3-1331, 3-1333, 3-1365, 3-1379, 3-1383
NRC Licensing	3-59, 3-258, 3-354, 3-412, 3-413, 3-613, 3-614, 3-966, 3-1056, 3-1057, 3-1060, 3-1151, 3-1156, 3-1166, 3-1171, 3-1196, 3-1211, 3-1338
Other	3-108, 3-127, 3-138, 3-241, 3-259, 3-304, 3-356, 3-396, 3-402, 3-425, 3-485, 3-576, 3-598, 3-611, 3-682, 3-689, 3-693, 3-730, 3-746, 3-752, 3-769, 3-791, 3-834, 3-856, 3-861, 3-866, 3-1007, 3-1016, 3-1212, 3-1220, 3-1221, 3-1234, 3-1235, 3-1244, 3-1253, 3-1256, 3-1259, 3-1267, 3-1272, 3-1274, 3-1297, 3-1321, 3-1341, 3-1342
Parallex EA	3-298, 3-307, 3-308, 3-309, 3-310, 3-311, 3-313, 3-315, 3-317, 3-318, 3-319, 3-320, 3-321, 3-323, 3-324, 3-325, 3-327, 3-328, 3-329, 3-330, 3-331, 3-333, 3-336, 3-338, 3-339, 3-340, 3-341, 3-447, 3-467, 3-468, 3-472, 3-477, 3-1155, 3-1169, 3-1171
Pit Demonstration EA	3-166, 3-168, 3-585, 3-930, 3-931
Pit Disassembly and Conversion	3-121, 3-554, 3-582, 3-585, 3-586, 3-621, 3-785, 3-893, 3-911, 3-923, 3-924, 3-935, 3-936, 3-945, 3-946, 3-973, 3-1041, 3-1110, 3-1162, 3-1202, 3-1213, 3-1215, 3-1216, 3-1222, 3-1236, 3-1264, 3-1299, 3-1324, 3-1358
Plutonium Polishing and Aqueous Processing	3-125, 3-150, 3-169, 3-171, 3-199, 3-286, 3-411, 3-550, 3-551, 3-553, 3-580, 3-581, 3-583, 3-586, 3-620, 3-819, 3-912, 3-929, 3-950, 3-965, 3-971, 3-972, 3-1131, 3-1158, 3-1162, 3-1172, 3-1213, 3-1274, 3-1277, 3-1323
Purpose and Need	3-46, 3-47, 3-85, 3-87, 3-172, 3-497, 3-711, 3-1202, 3-1298, 3-1327
Repositories	3-292, 3-430, 3-445, 3-529, 3-951, 3-1154, 3-1155, 3-1158, 3-1164, 3-1175, 3-1296, 3-1297, 3-1319, 3-1340, 3-1364

Table 1-9. Issue Categories (Continued)

Issue Category	Page
Socioeconomics	3-453, 3-455, 3-797, 3-856, 3-961, 3-993, 3-994, 3-995, 3-996, 3-1225, 3-1226, 3-1243, 3-1248, 3-1268
Storage and Disposition PEIS and ROD	3-76, 3-90, 3-361, 3-362, 3-380, 3-547, 3-550, 3-591, 3-593, 3-977, 3-1223
Transportation	3-32, 3-48, 3-79, 3-80, 3-90, 3-91, 3-123, 3-124, 3-158, 3-159, 3-189, 3-224, 3-287, 3-300, 3-354, 3-364, 3-365, 3-405, 3-414, 3-436, 3-439, 3-450, 3-481, 3-488, 3-494, 3-550, 3-592, 3-606, 3-700, 3-701, 3-702, 3-706, 3-717, 3-720, 3-721, 3-745, 3-769, 3-777, 3-789, 3-810, 3-811, 3-820, 3-832, 3-837, 3-1009, 3-1028, 3-1038, 3-1044, 3-1051, 3-1068, 3-1081, 3-1098, 3-1112, 3-1149, 3-1196, 3-1205, 3-1210, 3-1232, 3-1233, 3-1246, 3-1253, 3-1254, 3-1270, 3-1271, 3-1294, 3-1316, 3-1317, 3-1380, 3-1385
Waste Management	3-45, 3-168, 3-173, 3-225, 3-226, 3-258, 3-448, 3-455, 3-501, 3-551, 3-556, 3-557, 3-581, 3-587, 3-593, 3-594, 3-595, 3-614, 3-624, 3-704, 3-706, 3-707, 3-804, 3-808, 3-809, 3-818, 3-820, 3-824, 3-825, 3-826, 3-827, 3-894, 3-946, 3-957, 3-971, 3-1043, 3-1111, 3-1141, 3-1143, 3-1151, 3-1155, 3-1158, 3-1159, 3-1160, 3-1161, 3-1169, 3-1227, 3-1268, 3-1291, 3-1292, 3-1312, 3-1313, 3-1335, 3-1337, 3-1344
Water Resources	3-123, 3-174, 3-425, 3-453, 3-770, 3-826, 3-832, 3-837, 3-849, 3-872, 3-895, 3-962, 3-990, 3-993, 3-994, 3-1040, 3-1231, 3-1252, 3-1315

Table 1–10. Federal Agency Commentors on the Supplement

Commentors	Page
Washington, D.C.	
United States Department of the Interior, Willie R. Taylor.....	4–3
United States Environmental Protection Agency, Richard E. Sanderson.....	4–4

Table 1–11. Foreign Country Commentors on the Supplement

Commentors	Page
Canada	
Campaign for Nuclear Phaseout, Kristen Ostling.....	4–5
ESDRC, University of New Brunswick, Jessie Davies	4–8
Sierra Club of Canada, Elizabeth May	4–10
Society Promoting Environmental Conservation, Norman Abbey.....	4–21
Scotland	
Center for Human Ecology, Kathleen Sullivan.....	4–23

**Table 1–12. State and Local Officials and Agencies and Private Organization Commentors
on the Supplement by State**

Commentors	Page
California	
East Bay Peace Action, Dale Nesbitt et al.	4–25
Colorado	
Rocky Mountain Conference, United Church of Christ, Robert A. Kinsey	4–27
Florida	
Florida Coastal Management Program, Chris McCay	4–29
Georgia	
Women’s Action for New Direction, Joan O. King	4–52
Idaho	
Citizens Advisory Board, INEEL, Charles M. Rice	4–55
Citizens Advisory Board, INEEL, Charles M. Rice	4–78
Coalition 21, George A. Freund	4–83
Kansas	
Bluesky Research, Anonymous	4–87
Maryland	
Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, Lisa Ledwidge	4–91
Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, Lisa Ledwidge	4–94
Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, Arjun Makhijani	4–95
Maryland Office of Planning, Linda C. Janey	4–98
Maryland Safe Energy Coalition, Robin Mills	4–100
Massachusetts	
Action Site to Stop Cassini Earth Flyby, Jonathan Mark	4–117
Michigan	
China, Linda J. Schweihofer	4–119
Citizens For Alternatives to Chemical Contamination, Kay Cumbow	4–120
Nuclear-Free Great Lakes Action Camp, Kevin Kamps	4–122
Port Huron, Honorable Steven G. Miller	4–124
New York	
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment, Alice Slater	4–135
North Carolina	
Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League, Louis Zeller	4–137
Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League, Louis Zeller	4–182
Physicians for Social Responsibility, Lewis E. Patrie	4–192
Unitarian Universalist Church of Asheville, Jeanette O. Patrie et al.	4–194
South Carolina	
Economic Development Partnership, Ernie Chaput	4–215
Environmentalists Inc., Ruth Thomas	4–217
South Carolina Senate, Honorable Phil P. Leventis	4–227

**Table 1–12. State and Local Officials and Agencies and Private Organization Commentors
on the Supplement by State (Continued)**

Commentors	Page
Tennessee	
Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, Earl C. Leming	4–229
Texas	
STAND of Amarillo, Inc., Don Moniak	4–231
STAND of Amarillo, Inc., Don Moniak	4–233
STAND of Amarillo, Inc., Don Moniak	4–235
Virginia	
BNFL, Inc., Malcolm Bolton.....	4–239
Concerned Citizens of Louisa County, Jerry Rosenthal	4–240
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Michael P. Murphy.....	4–246
Washington, D.C.	
Alliance for Nuclear Accountability, Brad Morse	4–259
Nuclear Control Institute, Paul Leventhal et al.....	4–263
Nuclear Control Institute, Edwin S. Lyman	4–265
Nuclear Energy Institute, Felix M. Killar, Jr.	4–283
Nuclear Information & Resource Service, Mary Olson.....	4–284
Physicians for Social Responsibility, Kathryn A. Crandall	4–295
Safe Energy Communication Council, Linda Gunter.....	4–304
Safe Energy Communication Council, Linda Gunter.....	4–308
Women’s Action for New Directions, Ann Ober	4–311
Wisconsin	
Catholic Worker House of Hospitality, Don Timmerman	4–319
Campaign	
Statement of Nongovernmental Organizations on Plutonium Disposition.....	4–365

Table 1-13. Individual Commentors on the Supplement by State

Commentors	Page
Georgia	
McCracken, Patricia.....	4-39
Sipp, Peter Fox.....	4-49
Wilcox, Robert H.	4-51
Idaho	
Huebner, Martin.....	4-84
Kenney, Richard A.....	4-86
Maryland	
Mills, Robin.....	4-112
Mills, Robin.....	4-113
Stevens, Barbara.....	4-114
Minnesota	
Lindholm, Sarah J.....	4-127
New Mexico	
Erinson, Joannie.....	4-133
North Carolina	
Karpen, Leah R.	4-188
Perry, Llewellyn.....	4-191
Wingeier, Douglas E.	4-195
Ohio	
Cahall, Diane.....	4-197
Oklahoma	
Geary, B.....	4-211
Pennsylvania	
Spera, Marcella.....	4-213
South Carolina	
Gilbert Jr., Claude L.	4-222
Poe Jr., W. Lee.....	4-226
Virginia	
LoCascio, Alex.....	4-244
Washington	
Young, Tim et al.	4-257

Table 1–14. Multiple-Signatory Document Commentors on the Supplement by State

Commentors	Page
California	
Committee to Minimize Toxic Waste	4–25
Gene Bernardi	
East Bay Peace Action	
Elizebeth Brown	
Dale Nesbitt	
Western States Legal Foundation	
Jacqueline Cabasso	
McDonald, Frank	
Neiude, Nori	
Wood, L. A.	
Wright, Gordon	
 North Carolina	
Unitarian Universalist Church of Asheville	4–194
Ruth Beard	
Robert M. MacPherson	
Al Mojannir	
Nancy Palmberg	
Timothy Pascaro	
Jeanette O. Patrie	
Lewis E. Patrie	
T. D. Rodiader	
Sam Zitu	
Robert (Illegible)	
 Washington	
Condon, M. B.....	4–257
Young, Tim	
 Washington, D.C.	
Alliance for Nuclear Accountability.....	4–263
Susan Gordon	
Carolina Peace Resource Center	
Ethan Brown	
Nuclear Control Institute	
Paul Leventhal	
Physicians for Social Responsibility	
Robert K. Musil	
Safe Energy Communication Council	
Linda Pentz	
Serious Texans Against Nuclear Dumping	
Don Moniak	
Union of Concerned Scientists	
David Lochbaum	
U.S. Public Interest Research Group	
Anna Aurillo	

Table 1-15. Public Hearing Attendees on the Supplement

Affiliation/Attendees		Page
June 15 1999—Washington, D.C.		4-321
<i>Morning Session</i>		
Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League Janet Marsh Zeller Louis A. Zeller	Mills, Robin Morgan, Lewis & Bockius Gaylea Shultz	The Nation Alex Bolton U.S. Department of Energy, Chicago Operations Office Rich Freeman Bob Selby
CACTUS Denise Lee	NAC International Kristian Kunert	U.S. Department of Energy, Federal Energy Technology Center Harold Chambers
Crawford, Sidney	Nuclear Control Institute Tom Clements	U.S. Department of Energy, NEPA Policy and Assistance Brad Morse
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Roy Kasdorf	Nuclear Information and Resource Service Mary Olson	U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Declassification Bruce W. Bremer
Duke Energy Corporation Steven P. Nesbit	Numark Associates, Inc. Jon R. Chase	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Mary E. Clark
Economic Development Partnership Ernest S. Chaput	Physicians for Social Responsibility Kathryn Crandall	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office for Federal Activities Susan Absher
Exchange/Monitor Publications Daniel Horner	Curt Wozniak	Women's Action for New Directions Ann Ober
Inside Energy Tarun Reddy	Prisoners of Our Homes Geneva Johnson	
Institute for Energy & Environmental Research Lisa Ludwidge	Safe Energy Communication Counsel Linda Gunter	
Joseph D. LaFleur, Inc. Joseph D. LaFleur	States News Service Mary Shaffrey	
Los Alamos National Laboratory Faris Badwan	Stone & Webster Engineering Corporation Paola Rozzi	
<i>Afternoon Session</i>		
20/20 Vision Cari-Ann LaGrassa	Embassy of Australia Matthew Quint	Magnus Associates D.K. Magnus
Bengelsdorf, McGoldrick and Associates Harold Bengelsdorf	Embassy of the Russian Federation Aleksander Khlunov	Neuhold, Robert J.
Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League Janet Marsh Zeller Louis A. Zeller	Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power Judith Johnsrud	Nuclear Control Institute Steven Dolley
BNFL, Inc. Malcolm Bolten	JUPITER Corporation April Marcy	Nuclear Energy Institute Felix Killar
Center for International Nuclear and Radiation Safety Ed Purvis	Kinnelly Associates Francis Kinnelly	Nuclear Information and Resource Service Mary Olson
Clavel, Guy	LMITCO Jan Forsythe Chris Moller	Physicians for Social Responsibility Kathryn Crandall
COGEMA, Incorporated Vijay K. Sazawal	MACTEC, Inc. Roxanne Fournier	Safe Energy Communication Counsel Linda Gunter
		Stevens, Barbara

Table 1-15. Public Hearing Attendees on the *Supplement* (Continued)

Affiliation/Attendees	Page
June 15 1999—Washington, D.C.	
<i>Afternoon Session (Continued)</i>	
U.S. House of Representatives, Honorable David E. Bonior's Office Jon Switalski	
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Heather Astwood	

Table 1-16. Issue Categories on the Supplement

Issue Category	Page
Air Quality and Noise	4-316
Alternatives	4-45, 4-46, 4-53, 4-76, 4-80, 4-85, 4-86, 4-125, 4-131, 4-133, 4-135, 4-168, 4-169, 4-188, 4-207, 4-209, 4-227, 4-230, 4-241, 4-278, 4-286, 4-293, 4-297, 4-301, 4-311, 4-312, 4-319, 4-327, 4-329, 4-358
Cost	4-78, 4-127, 4-194
DOE Policy	4-24, 4-43, 4-52, 4-90, 4-129, 4-240, 4-264, 4-287, 4-290, 4-305, 4-327, 4-332, 4-333, 4-348, 4-351
Environmental Justice	4-197
Facility Accidents	4-94, 4-98, 4-100, 4-126, 4-138, 4-141, 4-166, 4-168, 4-171, 4-179, 4-180, 4-181, 4-196, 4-197, 4-239, 4-260, 4-261, 4-282, 4-288, 4-303, 4-313, 4-314, 4-316, 4-317, 4-335
General SPD EIS and NEPA Process	4-4, 4-23, 4-25, 4-27, 4-31, 4-41, 4-44, 4-49, 4-50, 4-53, 4-76, 4-77, 4-81, 4-86, 4-91, 4-92, 4-96, 4-118, 4-120, 4-126, 4-129, 4-136, 4-137, 4-169, 4-172, 4-173, 4-185, 4-189, 4-191, 4-192, 4-194, 4-211, 4-220, 4-221, 4-233, 4-239, 4-253, 4-256, 4-258, 4-279, 4-280, 4-286, 4-299, 4-303, 4-311, 4-320, 4-321, 4-322, 4-323, 4-338, 4-339, 4-346, 4-347, 4-348, 4-349, 4-350, 4-356
Geology and Soils	4-110
Human Health Risk	4-141, 4-195, 4-196, 4-216, 4-227, 4-281, 4-285, 4-309, 4-334, 4-335, 4-336
Immobilization	4-77, 4-235
Infrastructure	4-41, 4-47
MOX Approach	4-3, 4-23, 4-25, 4-29, 4-42, 4-43, 4-44, 4-45, 4-48, 4-49, 4-51, 4-83, 4-85, 4-111, 4-112, 4-118, 4-120, 4-122, 4-133, 4-134, 4-139, 4-141, 4-142, 4-170, 4-172, 4-179, 4-185, 4-187, 4-188, 4-189, 4-192, 4-193, 4-198, 4-205, 4-216, 4-217, 4-219, 4-225, 4-229, 4-234, 4-235, 4-239, 4-255, 4-256, 4-260, 4-262, 4-263, 4-279, 4-283, 4-288, 4-289, 4-300, 4-302, 4-304, 4-310, 4-320, 4-324, 4-329, 4-330, 4-334, 4-347, 4-350, 4-351, 4-352, 4-355
MOX RFP	4-43, 4-45, 4-47, 4-89, 4-93, 4-94, 4-140, 4-166, 4-167, 4-179, 4-181, 4-183, 4-198, 4-238, 4-257, 4-284, 4-289, 4-290, 4-313, 4-323, 4-328, 4-331, 4-332, 4-333, 4-346, 4-347, 4-350
Nonproliferation	4-45, 4-89, 4-94, 4-128, 4-129, 4-142, 4-167, 4-186, 4-196, 4-198, 4-206, 4-219, 4-234, 4-263, 4-287, 4-298, 4-304, 4-324, 4-325, 4-326, 4-355, 4-357

Table 1-16. Issue Categories on the Supplement (Continued)

Issue Category	Page
NRC Licensing	4-171, 4-353
Other	4-42, 4-43, 4-44, 4-223, 4-297, 4-324
Parallex EA	4-5, 4-8, 4-10, 4-21, 4-117
Plutonium Polishing and Aqueous Processing	4-328
Purpose and Need	4-307, 4-310
Reactors	4-309, 4-322
Repositories	4-283, 4-307, 4-314
Transportation	4-41, 4-134, 4-138, 4-167, 4-168, 4-182, 4-205, 4-284, 4-302, 4-336, 4-337, 4-338
Waste Management	4-112, 4-113, 4-194, 4-217, 4-223, 4-255, 4-280, 4-285, 4-313, 4-318, 4-319, 4-333, 4-335
Water Resources	4-46