

Inquiring minds want to know: Is Department of Energy playing it straight at radiation site?

By Mary Wozniak
Special to the Echo

The question is, is the Department of Energy on the level?

Inquiring minds want to know.

Timothy Henderson, president of Residents Organized for the Lewiston-Porter Environment, claims that back in 1983 the energy department quietly issued Order 5820, which reclassified the radioactive wastes at the Niagara Falls Storage Site in the Town of Lewiston as low level, thus enabling them to be land-filled.

That isn't true, a spokesman for the energy department says.


The energy department now wants to put a final cap, or an extra 4 feet of clay plus a layer of stone, on top of the clay cap covering the radioactive waste and residue so it can be left there for 200 to 1,000 years. ROLE opposes the plan.

So do the federal Environmental Protection Agency, the state Department of Health and the state Department of Environmental Conservation. They say the current standard in use at the site to contain the high-level radioactive residues is not good enough. The only answer, they say, is removing the residues to a high-level radioactive waste repository, when one is built.

The 255,000 cubic yards of radioactive material is from the Manhattan Project, which created the first atomic bomb. The Lewiston site is about 10 miles from the City of Niagara Falls, on Pletcher Road near Lutts Road. The energy department will hold an "availability session," which it likens to an open house, not a public hearing, at the site from 4 to 7 p.m. today.

Henderson's allegation about the reclassification of waste was contained in a guest editorial published by the Niagara Gazette in February. Congressman John J. LaFalce sent a copy of it to Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary in mid-March, along with a letter asking that the department review its decision for final disposition of the waste.

In the meantime, the energy department had contacted the National Academy of Sciences, an independent group of experts, and



Lewiston-Porter Echo

asked the academy to review its plan for the site.

The purpose of the academy review has not been made clear. Some officials say the academy will only review the technical data supporting the energy department's decision to put a final cap on the site.

Another said the academy will give a "risk assessment" of the plan.

One official said that if the academy decides the plan for a final cap is not safe for the surrounding environment and people, then the department will have to go back and review it.

LaFalce said in a prepared statement that the academy will give an opinion on the "validity" of the department's plan for a proposed permanent cap.

The people on the panel from the academy, whose names have not yet been released, are expected to tour the site May 2-3.

In his letter to O'Leary, LaFalce also asked that the energy department address the issues raised by Henderson in his opinion piece.

The allegation isn't new. Henderson got his information from James Rauch, an Amherst pharmacist, environmental activist and member of the Sierra Club-Niagara, who himself had made the same allegation in a 1984 letter to the editor published in The Buffalo News. Rauch also opposes the proposed final cap.

Rauch wrote that the energy department's action to reclassify the waste is against a Nuclear Regulatory Commission regulation labeled

10CFR61 does allow for the land disposal of byproduct material, he said.

"It does include byproduct material but excludes byproduct material that is uranium and thorium tailings," Rauch said.

The problem is that the uranium tailings, or byproduct material, buried at the Lewiston site, are not domestic tailings but come from the Belgian Congo, Kirk said. And the radium content of the Belgian Congo tailings — which the U.S. energy department assumed ownership of in 1983 in a \$8 million cash and diplomatic deal with Afrimet-In-

10CFR61. The regulation specifically excludes uranium/thorium wastes and tailings, which are byproducts of the processing of uranium ore, from the low-level waste category, he wrote.

But Ronald E. Kirk, the energy department's site manager for the Lewiston site, said last week that Order 5820 dealt with how to manage wastes and "included low-level wastes as far as byproduct material."

The material at the Niagara Falls Storage Site "has never been classified as anything but byproduct material," Kirk said. Regulation

► ENVIRONMENT

dussa Inc., and the Belgian government — is as high as 60 percent while domestic tailings are only at or 2 percent, he said.

In fact, the 255,000 cubic yard of material buried in Lewiston contains roughly one-third of the world's mined supply of radium.

"These are special case ores" that do not belong in the low-level category, Rauch said. "I would take issue with Ron Kirk that this kind of disposal is adequate for a human populated area that we live in."

200-1e

NFSS_08.08_0310_a

FUSRAP, Niagara Falls Site, Lewiston, New York
LEWISTON/PORTER SENTINAL Date: 4/21/94

Page: 16

1-15842