J. Christopher Noah, Sr., Ph.D.
528 McKinne's Line
Evans, GA 30809
(706) 855-7223
fax (706) 869-0166

May 3, 1996

U. S. Department of Energy
Storage and Disposition Draft PEIS Office
P.O. Box 23786
Washington, DC 20026-5156

VIA FAX

Dear Sirs:

Thank you for the opportunity to present my views on the Storage and Disposition Draft EIS on April 30, 1996 in North Augusta, SC. As a follow up, I have additional points to be expressed. They are:

1. After years of study of the land use and environment of the Savannah River Site and the potential environmental impact this project may have; it is my conclusion that *SRS can accommodate a project of this magnitude without adversely affecting the environment.* Forty-five years of government control has actually enhanced the environment of SRS. This has been documented by the Savannah River Ecology Laboratory (University of Georgia) and the Savannah River Forest Station (USFS/USDA). However, there are indeed pockets of contamination that require attention. These can be controlled by institutional controls on future land uses.

2. *Many large-scale future missions can be accommodated by SRS.* Given the infrastructure, security, workforce competency, community support and land use, there is no reason why new missions such as this project cannot be located at SRS. This does not mean that development should be given carte blanche. Environmental controls, comprehensive planning and operational safeguards should be implemented. Having lived in Alaska during the construction of the Alyeska Pipeline, I saw first-hand how development and the environment could co-exist. However, this technological accomplishment did not come without a tremendous amount of work. 1/08.03.01

3. *This and the other projects discussed at the EIS meetings on April 30, should be considered in one planning document* (It does not have to be large). Besides being programmatically linked, future uses such as these should be judged in the aggregate. This would save time, resources and reduce confusion to the public and SRS employees. 2/11.00.08

M-167

08 03 01 **Comment Number 1**

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

11 00 08 **Comment Number 2**

Comment noted. DOE has an on-going effort in program integration.

NOAH, J. CHRISTOPHER, EVANS, GA
PAGE 2 OF 2

4. Most importantly, *careful land use planning should be undertaken prior to this or any other large scale projects.* Section 101 of NEPA generally states that planning should be undertaken and coordinated by the federal government. However, Section 102 specifically states that planning is very important and should be utilized. This was reiterated by "The Father of NEPA," Dr. Lynton Keith Caldwell, when he visited SRS on April 2. Land use planning studies concerning large federal facilities in other agencies, other DOE sites and SRS have yielded significant results - Most notably in environmental protection, consolidation of resources and savings to the public.

5. Finally, *there should be a concerted effort to open Yucca Mountain.* It is difficult to view this project in fair terms if no end-state of nuclear materials is identified. | 3/12.01.00

To provide a little background on myself, please see the attachment.

Thank you again for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Christopher Noah

attachment

M-167

12 01 00 **Comment Number 3**

Comment noted.