

116402



1994 MAY 13 PM 2:22

May 10, 1994

██████████, Site Manager  
DOE Public Information Center  
810 Sheridan Drive  
Tonawanda, New York 14150

Dear ██████████

Enclosed are copies of the responses written by some of the students in the environmental science class you addressed last month here at E.C.C. Over all the students feel D.O.E. is doing a good job.

I have been a resident of Tonawanda for over thirty years. I believe risk from the waste is minimal and that risk will not be reduced by complete removal. I hope you can communicate this to the community so we don't spend an inordinate amount of money on unnecessary cleanup.

Thank you for speaking to my class. Perhaps in the Fall, you could come again to a new group of students. I will contact you then.

Sincerely,

████████████████████  
Professor of Physics  
Erie Community College

Enclosures  
PFK/smf

**ERIE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK  
NORTH CAMPUS

6205 Main Street - Williamsville, New York 14221-7095

Telephone: 716-851-1000 - Facsimile: 716-851-1429

Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer

I feel that the FUSRAP program has put together a good plan for the clean up of the Tonawanda site. It amazes me that the waste has been there for years and the citizens want it all moved some where else. That is just a bit silly The cost would be large and it would take a long time to complete. The plan that calls for clean up but on site storage is a much wiser plan.

Before taking this class I thought the atomic waste was bright green ooze, but now I am finding out that there is some right in our very own neighborhood. There is many problems associated with radioactive waste however the answer is not always to move it to somebody else's backyard.

The proposed plan that includes on site disposal and 90 percent excavation would be the plan that I support. To remove all the waste would be a great expense and it would take even longer to complete.

100344

Being a resident of Tonawanda for twenty years, I am concerned for the level of radioactive material at the Tonawanda site. I am glad that there is an effort to clean up the material. I was unaware of the radioactive material at this site before taking this course, but I am pleased to know that it is being cleaned up. However, I am somewhat unhappy with the proposed method that was decided for the Tonawanda site. The method chosen is partial excavation with onsite disposal. The FUSRAP brochure explains that this method would not create transport risks and provides nearly the same environmental benefit as complete excavation with onsite disposal at a fraction of the cost. If they're already going to spend \$59 million for partial excavation, why not spend \$77 million? Also, I believe that the only reason this method was selected is because it is one of the lower-cost methods. I guess partial excavation is better than no excavation, but I would have liked to have seen a better method used.

Well I went in to this meeting with the anger and disbelieve along with probably everyone else. My feelings when I left on the other hand changed dramatically. [REDACTED] convinced us that we take in more radioactive materials daily through regular household items and every day activities than through actual nuclear sites. <sup>Because</sup> 60% of total radiation is brought to us through radon. This means cigarettes, beer, antacids, and many other products release more radon into you than these sites. This particularly surprised me, just because I had no idea about this and it's hard for me to understand that not many people do know this. I feel if we educate more people about this subject it will put a lot more minds to rest. The only problem I have with all of this research that is being done is the amount of money that is being spent. <sup>Although</sup> it is going to a worthy cause it is far too costly for just research.

I can relate to this situation just because I am <sup>amongst</sup> thousands of people in the state of New York who just don't understand the whole philosophy of radioactive waste disposal. This will definately start my gun to get out any chance I can to tell people how eating a Tums is more harmful then playing golf on a possible past waste site!

Obviously I am very shocked at this news. It changes my whole perspective on most environmental issues. I plan to keep watch for anything a lot closer these days and would recommend to anyone to read up on issues like this before making conclusion on things they have no idea about.

Ag. of meeting :

116402

The Department of Energy (DOE) has completed a report that assesses contamination at the Tonawanda site in Tonawanda, New York, and has evaluated cleanup alternatives for the site. This evaluation has led to the development of a proposed plan that summarizes the analysis and explains the recommended remedy. The report and the plan together are referred to as a feasible study/proposed plan-environmental impact statement (FS/PP-EIS).

Four properties that compose the Tonawanda site are Linde Center on Sheridan Drive and Ashland 1, Ashland 2, and the Seaway Industrial Park on River Road. These properties which contain residual radioactive materials from uranium processing conducted during the early years of the nation's atomic energy program.

There are four cleanup alternatives that can be assessed to this project and their costs:

- 1. No action.....\$4 Million
- 2. Capping.....\$17 Million
- 3. Offsite disposal
  - partial.....\$59 Million
  - complete evacuation.....\$77 Million
- 4. Onsite disposal
  - partial.....\$79-262 Million
  - complete.....\$100-302 Million

The proposed plan for cleanup of the Tonawanda Site is partial excavation with onsite disposal. Under this plan, over 90 percent of the radioactive waste now at the site would be dug up and placed in a specially constructed disposal cell on one of the Ashland/Seaway properties. This engineered structure, looking like a man-made hill, would use natural materials to hold the waste in and keep water out. Barriers would include clay cap four feet thick, three feet of protective rock, and a total of three feet of sand and topsoil layers. The top layer would be covered with shallow-rooted grass. Contaminated buildings at the Linde property would be decontaminated or demolished and the resulting waste placed in the structure. Inaccessible material under the Seaway landfill would remain in place.

Response :

I believe that FUSRAP (Formally Utilized Sited Remedial Action Program) acting towards the Tonawanda waste sites are in the best interest of the people. And I support their professional opinion and support their proposed plan for clean up. There is one problem I have. The contamination in its present condition at the sites do not pose an immediate hazards for the nearby residents or for the workers or the environment. However, changes in the site usage that involves activities such as excavation or other movement of soil could result in the spreading of the contamination. This is where something should be done, either total cleanup, but then there is argument to where the waste could go, or just leave the site alone and monitor it over time as proposed by FUSRAP, and/or restrict any further use of the sites.

poor centered structure

## RESPONSE

I was surprised to learn how little the general public really knows about radioactive sites and how we are able to deal with these dangers today. [REDACTED] was very informative when he explained the low amounts of radioactive material that is located in Tonawanda, and how the U.S. Department of Energy is able to handle these problems. I also was very surprised to learn the costs that are involved in the clean up of this material. He stated that the costs could go from \$4 million to about \$300 million dollars just to clean up a site that has very low amounts of radiation. At this site, I don't think that it is necessary to move the radioactive material to a site that will take it. The dangers of this material is not great enough that would warrant the spending of \$300 million dollars to take care of a problem. I guess that I should not talk because I do not live there, but after learning the effects of this material don't think that the material is such a danger that can not be taken care of right here.

People hear "radioactive waste" and immediately want to get rid of it, that is very understandable. But, what people do not give is an answer as to where to put the material. Radioactive waste is a man made problem, if there is a site that needs to be cleaned up we as a society must deal with it, not pass the material on to someone else. People need to be educated to the dangers that are involved in radioactive material. We must deal with the problem in the most cost effective way that will still keep the level of safety at the government standards.