AHOUSE, LORETTA, SEATTLE, WA
PAGE 1 OF 2

Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) Public Comment Form

Name (optional): Loretta Ahouse
Address (optional): 1305 - 4th Ave Suite #908
Seattle WA 98101

Please write down your comments and drop this form in the marked boxes before you leave tonight. These forms will be submitted to the Department of Energy as part of the formal comment on this PEIS. If you are unable to complete this form tonight, written comments can be mailed to:

Department of Energy
Office of Fissile Materials Disposition
P.O. Box 23786
Washington, D.C. 20026-3786

or, you can call this toll-free number to leave comments by phone: 1-800-820-5156. Comments must be submitted by May 7, 1996.

The Department of Energy has identified three types of technologies as options for disposing of weapons-usable fissile materials. The Department has also considered a "no action alternative" which would result in long-term storage of these materials. Please write down your comments on the following three types of options for disposal and the storage option.

1. Materials Immobilization/Vitrification - Immobilize fissile materials by mixing them with glass, glass bonded zeolites, or ceramics.

I support immobilizing of plutonium (and high level nuclear waste). I am not sure what from the summary of tonight's presentations explained the differences between the various immobilization options 1/08.03.01

2. Deep borehole disposal - Materials would be disposed in boreholes at least 2.5 miles deep, in geologically stable formations. Materials could be disposed directly into the deep borehole, or materials could be immobilized first, and then deposited into the deep borehole.

The unrestricted disposal into a deep borehole option is ridiculous and should not be considered at all 2/08.03.01

3. Reactor Options - Surplus plutonium/highly enriched uranium would be made into MOX fuel for use in nuclear reactors, destroying by fission a major portion of the weapons grade materials.

This option would only encourage future development of nuclear power which I oppose. It is not a viable option - economically it makes no sense to run the reactor fuel and nuclear waste is still a problem 3/08.03.01

4. Storage Options - USDOE would continue existing storage practices for weapons-usable fissile materials at current locations and/or consolidate that storage at one or more of the designated sites.

M-222

08 03 01 Comment Number 1

The Department of Energy acknowledges the commentor's support for the Vitrification Alternative. Decisions on disposition of weapons-usable fissile materials will be based upon environmental analyses, technical and economic studies, national policy considerations, and public input.

08 03 01 Comment Number 2

The Department of Energy recognizes the commentor's concern with the Borehole Alternatives. Decisions on the disposition alternatives will be based upon environmental analyses, technical and economic studies, national policy considerations, and public input.

08 03 01 Comment Number 3

The Department of Energy acknowledges the commentor's opposition to the Reactor Alternatives. However, NEPA requires that DOE look at all reasonable alternatives and, therefore, alternatives involving reactors must be considered. Decisions on the disposition of weapons-usable fissile materials will be based upon environmental analyses, technical and economic studies, national policy considerations, and public input.

Please use this space to write down any additional comments on the Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

My final comment is on the public comment process. This meeting in Seattle would have benefited from allowing more time for citizens to speak instead of listening to the experts. The discussion groups were very helpful and should have had more time. 4/08.02.00

Any decisions that are made about these issues has to bear in mind the Pu will be around longer than our govt. We must use a technology that best protects future generations, as well as our own. 5/01.00.00

M-222

08 02 00 **Comment Number 4**

Comment noted. However, the Seattle meeting was not sponsored by DOE. DOE was an invited guest.

01 00 00 **Comment Number 5**

Comment noted.