

OOW waste plan is protested at two other sites

ISA AUG

e after another, residents and officials
ad strong objections to the governis plans for disposing of 250,000 cubic
f radioactive material now stored at
a mer Lake Ontario Works in Lewiston.
We suffered enough from such waste,
it anywhere but here, they said.

e scene is a familiar one to Niagara ty residents, but last week the setting not Lewiston, but Oak Ridge, Tenn., anford. Wash.

cording to reports of public hearings by the U.S. Department of Energy last

week, people in Oak Ridge and Hanford don't want radioactive waste from the LOOW site brought to their community any more than people in Lewiston want it left here.

In Oak Ridge, people who have lived at the nation's headquarters of radioactivity research and development for 40 years are far from satisfied with the energy department's handling of radioactive waste.

"We have enough problems in this area without having any more imported," area resident James Young was quoted by the Knoxville Journal.

Since a 1983 report revealed problems with mercury spills and groundwater con-

tamination from energy department operations, pollution has been a major issue.

"Don't make us the garbage heap for the whole country," said Ruby Luckey, mayor of nearby Kingston, in a Journal article.

The energy department is collecting public comment until tomorrow on a preliminary environmental impact statement evaluating several options for dealing with the material at the 191-acre LOOW site on Pletcher Road.

The four major options are: do nothing, leave the material where it is but place a thicker cover over it, transport all or some of the material to Oak Ridge, and transport all or some of the material to Hanford,

Wash.

The department will not state its preferred option until late this year, but the document clearly identifies leaving the material in Lewiston as by far the cheapest and safest alternative.

That point was emphasized by Oak Ridge area residents who question the need to spend millions of dollars and run the risk of injuries and death by transporting material better left in place.

The Hanford community generally has been more accepting of the radioactive waste storage in its midst, but two groups usually on opposite sides of the issue united in their opposition to the LOOW material.

Received by OCT 9 1984