



## Recommendation No. 16

January 23, 1996

---

### Waste Management EIS

---

The waste management treatment decisions made in the near future by the Department of Energy (DOE) across its complex will have a significant impact at the Savannah River Site (SRS). The SRS Citizens Advisory Board believes that the Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (WMPEIS) begins to provide a clearer picture of these treatment plans, but we also believe that the document is not yet satisfactory (see two attached background documents). We recommend that DOE:

1. Make the WMPEIS easier to read and understand in order to help DOE and the public reach good decisions regarding waste treatment options.
2. Present radionuclide species by volumes and curies for all wastes. The data in the draft WMPEIS is currently misleading; e.g., TRU wastes by only physical volume favors sites with mostly Pu-239 versus sites with mostly Pu-238, placing SRS and the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) at a funding disadvantage relative to Hanford and the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory.
3. Discuss the meaning of the data presented on environmental justice; as now presented, the inclusion of numerous demographic maps of minority populations without explanation only serves to confuse the public.
4. Analyze more fully the treatment options considered; e.g., as presented for the TRU waste central treatment option. It fails to address the feasibility of safe shipments of untreated Pu-238 combustible wastes from SRS and LANL to an offsite facility.
5. Present health effects in context, especially those health effects below what is probably a de minimus level (not defined, but probably less than one excess health effect in number). Data should be provided with a clear explanation of health effects, in order that it not be misleading or create undue anxiety among the public.
6. Place the listed endangered species into context by discussing and comparing local and regional ecosystem relationships; don't simply list these species.
7. Elaborate and better discuss worker risks for the different treatment alternatives.
8. Review and discuss the impacts that high level waste reprocessing, plutonium and highly-enriched uranium disposition, spent fuel and other related treatment issues, presented in different environmental impact statements will have on DOE waste treatment decisions.
9. Review and discuss resource and energy recovery plans in the treatment options for all non-radioactive and radioactive chemicals and materials.

#### **Agency Responses**

[Department of Energy - SR](#)

[Department of Energy - Nevada](#)

[DOE-Savannah River to DOE-Headquarters](#)