

**CMRR-NF Supplemental EIS Scoping Meeting
October 19, 2010 / White Rock Town Hall, White Rock, NM**

Written Comments (transcribed)

061	Joni Arends	<p>The meeting format does not work. One of the purposes of the scoping meeting is for the public to hear the concerns of other community members. The people of N. NM have a strong oral tradition where people learn by listening to others. We request a “classroom” type format, such as that used during the draft document hearing process. A format which does not facilitate such opportunities stifles the democratic process.</p> <p>How do we obtain copies of the posters?</p> <p>I would appreciate color copies be provided at scoping meeting in Pojoaque in an 8 ½ x 11 or 8 ½ x 14 format.</p> <p>We request a 30 day extension of the comment period.</p> <p>We request public scoping meetings in Albuquerque, Santa Fe, and Taos during the 30 day extension of time to provide comments.</p>
-----	-------------	---

Comments Entered in the Computer

082	Ms. Jody Benson	<p>Socio-economic considerations: The County is currently exploring developing all County, as well as School-owned green space for housing. It is critical that the County knows as soon as possible the number of the proposed work force who would be from out of the area and who would actually require housing. We also need to know what the wages would be: heads-up--housing in Los Alamos is extremely expensive. Los Alamos government needs to know what housing (temporary/permanent/income-level) to focus on in our development. Also, the Schools need to know this information; wages would certainly determine where the families would live, and therefore direct the schools for their own educational specifications. In addition, it is critical that the project first seeks to employ people from N. NM, rather than importing workers from elsewhere. The project can inform the communities of what skills will be required, and then the local educators and governments can encourage the local colleges to train workers to what the projected jobs will be. A partnership between the project and the local leaders will be essential to economic and social development of the region.</p> <p>ENVIRONMENTAL: The proposed parking in Sandia Canyon for the crafts and trade workers where they would transfer to busses for transport to the work site; if the workers are to be bussed, and many would not live in Los Alamos, then a regional transit/parking area would protect the canyon, save the commuters gas, and if parking were around a commercial area (i.e., Pojoaque) increase the business in that area. The ideal parking would be to share parking (pay the business--Casinos, for example), rather than increase parking that would not be necessary after the project terminates. Supporting regional transit--for example, including a transportation plan in the budget, would be important.</p>
074	Dr. Richard Martin	<p>Having viewed a number of posters and spoken to several topic experts about the CMRR (CMR replacement) facility this afternoon and evening (3:30 to 6:30 on 10-19-10), I am very favorably impressed. I am impressed by the presentation, expertise of the staff answering questions, and impressed by the available methods for public feedback. This is an example of DOE getting the process right, namely, using a more informal opportunity for the public to provide initial input to an SEIS. Good job!</p>

**CMRR-NF Supplemental EIS Scoping Meeting
October 20, 2010 / Cities of Gold Casino Hotel, Los Alamos, NM**

Written Comments (transcribed)

065	Gerald Maestas	Added enormous expense that is not necessary. Supplemental EIS demands by a few are intended to be obstacles to weapons activities. LANL employees live here too and they care about safety as much as anyone.
-----	----------------	--

Oral Comments (transcribed)

058	Jeanne Green	<p>Hello, this is Jeanne Green. I'm giving my comments for the CMRR nuclear facility on 10/20/2010. And what I want to say is #1: the need for the new CMRR nuclear facility has not been demonstrated. With the President, most other countries, and World leaders and the people calling for an end to nuclear weapons, and an already operating plutonium pit facility at LANL, where is the need for this proposed monstrosity? The need must be demonstrated first. At 4 and 1/2 billion dollars you cannot justify building a new nuclear weapons facility, diverting the people's money from away from the New Mexico population, one of the poorest in the U.S. You are taking food from the mouths of babes. So you can produce immoral weapons that kill hundreds of thousands of innocent people in a split second. There is no justification. On your website you say LANL's mission is to quote "enhance National security by ensuring the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear stockpile." Nuclear weapons are not safe. And the reliability of the stockpile has been confirmed by the Jason Report for the next century. You continue on your website developing technologies to reduce threats from weapons of mass destruction producing more WMDs to add to the nearly 10,000 we already have does not reduce the threat but increases the threat. And if car bombers are the threat, WMDs are certainly in no way effective against a moving and clandestine target. And nuclear force to annihilate a so-called rouge state would annihilate a huge civilian population which is indiscriminate, disproportionate, and highly immoral, and would contaminate the rest of the planet with radiation entering the atmosphere traveling the world via winds. Proliferation of nuclear weapons the actuality of the proposed CMRR nuclear facility is actually a boon to terrorists. The existence and proliferation of nuclear weapons threaten U.S. security. And you say your mission is to reduce threats from weapons of mass destruction. You go on to say on the website that your mission includes solving problems related to energy, environment, infrastructure, health, and global security concerns. This is fraud on a grand scale. In your fiscal year 2011 budget, you have allocated less than 1% (0.63 percent) to energy efficiency and renewable energy. Even in the face of global warming and economic collapse, you have allocated less than 8% to defense environmental cleanup, even while the Mohadra Report and independent monitoring, show the dire need of cleanup for legacy waste and a continuing contamination of water, soil, air, food, and people. The money slated for the CMRR NF should go for cleanup, compensation to the many New Mexico victims of LANL, and renewable energy jobs in New Mexico. If you have the expertise to build horrible weapons of mass destruction, surely you can summon the expertise to put hundreds of thousands of New Mexicans to work, installing solar panels on every home, building water catchment systems etc. and ensuring the safety, well being, and future of our New Mexico population. Your plan to use lavish amounts of tax payer money to produce potential for mass destruction, is the wrong direction, wrong headed, and does not benefit New Mexico, the U.S. or the world. This is the primary issue that must be addressed. And we need a new environmental impact statement to address it, not a warmed-over supplemental to your 2003 EIS which no longer applies. We need more public hearings, more public notice of hearings, more cleanup and more analysis of cumulative impact to the population. You need to address environmental justice and stop killing us with your deadly poisons for the benefit of some wealthy careerists at LANL, and super mega corporations that have no ethics or morals but only the profit motive. Furthermore, anyone who is testifying in favor of this who works for the Lab, has a conflict of interest, and their comments should not be accepted. And any person of common sense would realize the stupidity of building a nuclear weapons lab on an active earthquake fault zone.</p>
-----	--------------	---

**CMRR-NF Supplemental EIS Scoping Meeting
October 20, 2010 / Cities of Gold Casino Hotel, Los Alamos, NM**

059	Marilyn Hoff	<p>Hello, I am Marilyn Hoff and this is my recorded comment on the supplemental EIS on the CMRR building and the other parts of nuclear complex at LANL. First of all, I would like to say that this process is a little screwed up and that it seemed to be designed so other people can't listen to each other but I do appreciate that there will be a later opportunity for there to be oral presentation so people all can hear. So here is my comment – last summer when LANL performed this dog and pony show to sell Espanola on its proposed multi billion dollar new plutonium pit manufacturing facility the big emphasis was on how many new jobs this shining new project would bring to New Mexicans. Think of the benefits to New Mexicans for housing and feeding those workers who would be imported for this massive building project. The estimates on the number of jobs this mighty project would create never specified how many of said jobs would go to New Mexicans who had apparently once again stand in line for table scraps. A similar table scrap is the Supplemental EIS when a whole EIS is called for given how the present proposal is unrecognizably huger than that covered by the original EIS. Even stingier is a very hurried comment deadline for this inadequate SEIS and the stingiest of all is holding two meeker scoping hearings 20 miles apart excluding both Santa Fe and my hometown of Taos. Are you Lab folks afraid to hear from the citizen's league? Thanks to our insatiable nuclear industry New Mexico ranks high in per capita Federal money coming to the state, even though it ranks continually lower in overall prosperity. And even while Los Alamos itself ranks as one of the wealthiest counties in the United States. It simply is not and has never been true, what benefits LANL benefits New Mexico. While some as yet unidentified building contractors lick their chops over digging an impossibly deep hole and filling it with concrete to shore-up the proposed CMRR buildings' resistance to seismic events. The necessity for all this concrete constitutes an admission that this plutonium facility would be built on suspect terrain. LANL and the U.S. Government have yet to make the case that quadrupling U.S. capacity to manufacture nuclear bombs is necessary or even desirable. If LANL indeed longs to start a new nuclear arms race it is stepping forth as a destabilizing force in world politics and a time when our latest chosen national enemy, the terrorist occupy no particular geographical location to bomb to smithereens. Even though the U.S. government is under treaty obligations to build no nuclear bomb designs, the lucrative nuclear industry is determined to keep on building them and selling them to their only customer - us taxpayers. The industry pretends it is not building new nukes by calling what they are doing stockpile stewardship, or reliable replacement warheads, but piece by piece the designs of these nukes are changing and insidious concept of usable nukes is entering the industry lexicon. An industry therefore justifies its existence by insinuating that its product might actually have some function. But the fact is this insatiable industry like many others in the U.S. war machine wants to keep on churning out products that should never be used. The nuclear industry which makes a useless product, proposes a useless building project, to create a useless bomb factory, that handles arguably the most dangerous and poisonous element on Earth. The 4.5 billion and growing earmarked for the CMRR building should be used instead for cleanup of uncounted poisonous and radioactive messes already generated by the Lab. The existence of such messes attests to the shoddy safety practices by LANL throughout its history. The entire nuclear industry is infamous for making polluting deadly messes. Rocky Flats which formerly manufacturing plutonium pits, the function LANL inherited, had to be closed down because it so carelessly polluted and poisoned its neighborhood. Plutonium can spontaneously catch fire and reportedly did ignite many times at Rocky Flats with near catastrophic results. Such fires can burn the filters that protect the public from its fumes. Trying to douse these fires with water can make the plutonium go critical. LANL has not specified how its pit factory plans to deal with such fires when smoke plumes of plutonium could billow into the air we breathe. At a time when the U.S. population sinks into poverty lacking in healthcare, education, and productive jobs, lets stop throwing our taxpayer money down the black hole of useless nuclear industry with its unusable product that threatens the veritable existence of life on Earth all profits accruing to Bechtel. To justify its existence LANL need only change its mission. How does a national laboratory for clean and renewable energy sound to you?</p>
-----	--------------	---

**CMRR-NF Supplemental EIS Scoping Meeting
October 20, 2010 / Cities of Gold Casino Hotel, Los Alamos, NM**

060	Michael R. Loya	My name is Michael Robert Loya. And I would like to make a statement on behalf of Los Alamos National Laboratory. My family were down-winders when they detonated the bomb at Trinity Site and I'm also a generational New Mexican. And I want to state for the record, that if it had not been for Oppenheimer and for this national laboratory, we would have lost close to a million of our soldiers that were off the coast of Japan. They brought the best of the best to develop a weapon that was very important in the success in stopping and ending War World II. I believe that the present people that are working up at the national laboratory are not responsible for this waste but they are bringing the best technology and the best science to bear on the cleanup and I know firsthand that they are doing the best that they possibly can to remedy the cleanup up at the lab. They are diligent in their work and in their processes and they are constantly monitored by the state of New Mexico and their own processes to make sure that they comply with the cleanup order. I believe that in the future they will do their best to cleanup the area and they will be successful. And I appreciate everything that the Department of Energy has done for this area here in northern New Mexico.
057	Chelsea Cologne	Hi my name is Chelsea Cologne and I have a few comments. #1: I'd like to see a full EIS process for the CMRR facility that's under construction. I would like to see that facility, the funding and construction being paused or halted during the EIS process. For the supplemental EIS, I appreciate this voluntary hearing that you did today, and I ask that you do one in Albuquerque where I live, and in Taos and other communities in the area in northern New Mexico that usually get these kinds of hearings. I would also like to ask that you extend the time for responding and commenting by 30 days. And I think that's it.
<i>Comments Entered into the Computer</i>		
073	Ms. Jody Benson	<p>Socio-economic considerations: The County is currently exploring developing all County, as well as School-owned green space for housing. It is critical that the County knows as soon as possible the number of the proposed work force who would be from out of the area and who would actually require housing. We also need to know what the wages would be: heads-up--housing in Los Alamos is extremely expensive. Los Alamos government needs to know what housing (temporary/permanent/income-level) to focus on in our development. Also, the Schools need to know this information; wages would certainly determine where the families would live, and therefore direct the schools for their own educational specifications. In addition, it is critical that the project first seeks to employ people from N. NM, rather than importing workers from elsewhere. The project can inform the communities of what skills will be required, and then the local educators and governments can encourage the local colleges to train workers to what the projected jobs will be. A partnership between the project and the local leaders will be essential to economic and social development of the region.</p> <p>ENVIRONMENTAL: The proposed parking in Sandia Canyon for the crafts and trade workers where they would transfer to busses for transport to the work site; if the workers are to be bussed, and many would not live in Los Alamos, then a regional transit/parking area would protect the canyon, save the commuters gas, and if parking were around a commercial area (i.e., Pojaoque) increase the business in that area. The ideal parking would be to share parking (pay the business--Casinos, for example), rather than increase parking that would not be necessary after the project terminates. Supporting regional transit--for example, including a transportation plan in the budget, would be important.</p>
067	Mr. Daniel Lopez Keenan	We support the project, it is in the best interest of our country. LANL is vital to the economy of New Mexico. We are interested in supplying plumbing and mechanical equipment on this project. We understand that this project will be NQA1 and would like to learn how we can partner with LANL on this project.
068	Ms. Patricia Gallagher	Consider the use of clean, treated effluent as the water source for concrete production.

**CMRR-NF Supplemental EIS Scoping Meeting
October 20, 2010 / Cities of Gold Casino Hotel, Los Alamos, NM**

069	Ms. Joan Brown, osf	<p>I appreciated the information from the helpful LANL staff at the Espanola session. I do have concerns and questions. First: I am from Albuquerque and believe there should be hearings in Albuquerque because that area is effected by what happens at LANL and is a very large metropolitan area where I know people, who cannot drive here on an evening and drive back in the dark would like to learn more about the planned facility and express their thoughts. The water of the Rio Grande is already being affected by the past legacies of LANL.</p> <p>Second: The staff were very good in helping me see that the purpose of the facility is not for our responsibility to safeguard plutonium, which we are not responsible for perpetuity. The reason for the expensive facilities is for the production of nuclear weapons. This is a drastic waste of taxpayer money at a time when we need to be putting the best minds and financial resources into new technologies for energy efficiency, renewable energy and mitigation of climate change. The United States has more nuclear weapons than the world needs. For a decade now, the Pentagon has said that Climate Change is the greatest national security threat. Our importation of oil is more of a threat than nuclear arsenals of the world, of which we have many times more than any other nation.</p> <p>Third: I am concerned about the safety of the land and water for the future food production and health of New Mexico Citizens. We live in a desert state and water is the most vital resource, for which we can take no chances.</p> <p>Fourth: I continue to take offense that this project and others at LANL are partly justified by the work for energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies. Less than 1% of the lab's budget request is for renewable energy and development and from my conversations with the staff none of these works are within the mission or scope of the new facility.</p> <p>Fifth: My understanding is that uncertainties surround the current support facilities such as: DOE postponed a new Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility because the estimated costs increased from \$100 million to \$350 million; Where will the waste go??? DOE's plans for a 63 acre expansion for low-level radioactive waste have been delayed for years; Area G will be closed in 2015 under the Order; and DOE proposed a new Transuranic Waste Facility to replace operations at Area G, but subsequently withdrew the proposal. I take offense at touting that this facility meant for destruction and with no plan for long term waste is touting to be environmentally friendly because it is LEED certified.</p> <p>Sixth: I am concerned about the decontamination and decommissioning of the old building, including disposal of waste and transportation of waste on the restrictive road system. LANL is surrounded by ethnically diverse and very poor communities who are already suffering from the health effects of the work at LANL.</p> <p>Seventh: This is touted as a jobs project for New Mexico. LANL staff stated that after construction is completed there will be no new jobs created. Could we not better use resources to create the new green jobs of the future that secure our nation with good education and meaningful employment and a weaning of the US from old forms of energy that currently have us mired in wars in the Middle East.</p> <p>Finally: I worry about the long term future with such facilities as these. I worry about the long term ability of the United States to financially safeguard work that has begun in such facilities. When we are bankrupt because of a huge military budget deficit how will we take care of a crumbling facility that has a life expectancy of 50 years with plutonium that will be here for perpetuity? How will climate change affect this building, this country, our resources? Is there not a plan beyond 50 years? If not, is this not very short sighted.</p>
-----	------------------------	---

**CMRR-NF Supplemental EIS Scoping Meeting
October 20, 2010 / Cities of Gold Casino Hotel, Los Alamos, NM**

070	Ms. Basia Miller	<p>1. We need an overlay showing the comparison between the CMR, the proposed CMRR upon which the EIS was produced in 2003, and the newer CMRR plans?</p> <p>2. What is the breakdown in %s of the missions as envisaged for the new CMRR, compared to the present CMR</p> <p>3. What is the estimated cost per square foot for construction of the new NF, compared with those of other NFs such as the HEUMF at Oak Ridge and MOX in Savannah River SC?</p> <p>4. We need clarification about how the construction of the CMRR will affect the Lab's capability for pit production at PF4?</p> <p>5. Finally, I would request that the comment period be extended. This meeting was held on October 20 and the comment period is closing November 1. In essence, allowing us only ten days to digest and write up the information we have received this evening. More locations for scoping meetings would be very helpful as well.</p>
071	Ms. Marlene Perrotte, RSM Sisters of Mercy and Partnership for Earth Spirituality	<p>In new Mexico, we have one major river, the Rio Grande that supplies our needs for potable water as well as for agriculture and services. We need clean air to breathe and we need uncontaminated soil for agriculture etc....The mission of the CMRR needs to be addressed and the extreme amount of money projected for this project as well in view of water, air and soil...this project is not futuristic. It is part of the Cold War...At LANL we have the best minds having to deal with nuclear weapons...Our planet's very survival is at stake. The Pentagon has declared that the greatest threat to national security is climate change...It would seem only logical that we need to divert the resources of LANL's CMRR to address energy sources for the future, renewable sources like wind and solar...Nuclear weapon production is obsolete given the terrorism that we are dealing with...Most of the buildings at LANL have reached their time-life. Why do we need to build the CMRR if our political treaties and policies are to dismantle nuclear weapons. We should be finding ways to dismantle the weapons we have. We do not need to have a stockpile of plutonium weapons...We do not need to have all the uranium nuclear weapons. Let us think of the future....We can do better than move 330'x300'x125' of the pajarito plateau and bring this excavated material down the mountain, bring up all the cement, sand and use all the water to fill in the vast hole with concrete. ..After construction is done we will have a reduction in jobs. This is very short-sighted with respect to employment. After construction there will not be a gain in meaningful jobs at LANL...The cost of this project keeps increasing by billions at a time when we are in 2 major wars, high unemployment. We here in New Mexico cannot afford to let our sun and wind resources go undeveloped...The mission of LANL CMRR is the stewardship of stockpile and continued chemical analysis of plutonium which benefits WHOM? It is time to put a stop to this madness and plan for the future a future not based on destruction but on living life to the fullest.</p>
072	The Honorable Marcus Page	<p>Please reconsider this PROCESS.</p> <p>#1 So many aspects of the project at hand have changed, so that the original EIS is null and void—you all need to restart the process with a NEW whole EIS.</p> <p>#2 The spirit in your DNA guides you to take CARE of your people, environment, and self, so listen to your biological instructions--personally--when you think about this process. Ask yourself: "Will this be good for my family, country, environment, and myself?" when you consider EVERY POINT of any work that promotes nuclear science or other serious technologies that affect your health and the health of other creatures.</p>

CMRR-NF Scoping Comments

#	Name	Comment
001	John Geddie	Please add me to the mailing list for the SEIS for the CMRR-NF Project.
002	Jay Coghlan for Nuclear Watch, Alliance for Nuclear Accountability, Citizen Action, Concerned citizens for Nuclear Safety, Embudo Valley Environmental Monitoring Group, Honor Our Pueblo Existence, Nuclear Watch New Mexico, Pax Christi New Mexico, PeaceAction New Mexico, and Southwest Research and Information Center	<p>We undersigned organizations respectfully request a time extension of 30 days to the current scoping comment deadline of November 1, 2010 for the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement Project-Nuclear Facility Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (CMRR-NF SEIS).</p> <p>We believe this requested time extension is merited because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The scope of the CMRR-NF has grown dramatically, with a ~50% increase in physical footprint size and a ~7-fold increase in projected costs since NNSA's original estimates. Further, the CMRR-NF is not scheduled to be completed any earlier than FY 2020. Given all this, a 30-day extension, which we argue is the right thing to do, is hardly consequential compared to the Project's increased scope and long schedule. We think the burden is on the federal government to grant an extension. 2. In addition to increased scale and lengthened schedule the Project has seriously grown in complexity, with, for example, added related subprojects such as a concrete batch plant and 225,000 yd.³ of a lean concrete base mat to mitigate seismic concerns, and more generally more comprehensive data pointing to increased potential seismic risks. 3. Public scoping hearings are to be held October 19 and 20, which will provide the public with an opportunity to interact with NNSA personnel, ask questions, discuss concerns, and likely become better informed. Then unfortunately the comment period ends just ten days later. We believe that is not sufficient time for the general public to research, prepare and submit scoping comments after having the benefit of interacting with NNSA officials. 4. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, another significant National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process is being held concurrently with the scoping comment period for the CMRR-NF SEIS. This is the US Air Force's proposal to establish a Low Altitude Tactical Navigation area (LATN) for Special Operation forces at Cannon Air Force Base. In the USAF's own words, the initial public LATN "scoping period runs through Nov. 15, and is being conducted to allow public comment, and identification [sic] of issues, prior to initiating an environmental assessment," with public hearings currently scheduled for October 15 and 16. We believe the coinciding timing of these two issues are an onerous burden on interested members of the public, given the current schedule of CMRR-NF SEIS hearings and the scoping comment deadline of November 1. <p>In sum, given the growth in Project size, cost and complexity, and given timing issues both internal to the CMRR-NF SEIS process and in relationship to the LATN NEPA process, we believe it more than appropriate for NNSA to grant a 30-day extension for CMRR-NF SEIS scoping comments.</p>
003	Francine Lindberg	<p>As a citizen within 60 air miles of Los Alamos Labs I am concerned that the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) proposed by NNSA and DOE will not adequately address the proposed massive construction project now underway in Los Alamos. Rushing through a 'supplement' is not a responsible way to handle such a large project with unknown impacts on local residents and their livelihoods.</p> <p>I would like to have my statement on the record that I OPPOSE FULLY A SEIS AS IT WILL NOT GO FAR ENOUGH IN ADDRESSING THE CONCERNS OF LOCAL COMMUNITIES THEIR GOVERNMENTS AND CONSTITUENTS. PLEASE HALT IMMEDIATELY ANY FURTHER WORK ON THE PROJECT UNTIL VIABLE ALTERNATIVES ARE EXPLORED PROPERLY IN A FULL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.</p>
004	Aaron Tovish Mayors for Peace, 2020 Vision Campaign	<p>*Supplemental(!) Environmental Impact Statement?? Isn't that like the tail wagging the dog? Clearly a brand new EIS is needed; why pretend otherwise? AT (US citizen)</p>
005	Robin Laughlin	I think you need to abandon this whole thing. Spend the money on cleanup.

#	Name	Comment
006	David Torney	<p>Los Alamos Lab is the wrong location for a plutonium plant. You may find it expedient, but there are too many people nearby. DOE has locales suitable for a plutonium plant, for instance, the Nevada Test Site.</p> <p>The lab already contains superfund sites, and, rest assured, until the mess you already made is cleaned up, you won't be allowed to build anything there. If this plant is the sine qua non for Los Alamos Lab, then close it.</p> <p>As you will soon find out, no longer will patrons of nukes in Congress cram things down our throats which aren't good for us -- or for the environment.</p>
007	Richard L. Geddes	<p style="text-align: center;">Comments on Supplemental EIS for the Nuclear Facility Portion of the CMR Building Replacement Project</p> <p>The four alternatives proposed in the NOI do not represent a comprehensive set of alternatives, or even a reasonable range of alternatives as required by NEPA legislation.</p> <p>In the period (more than a decade) since the original Record of Decision of the Stockpile Stewardship and Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement assigning responsibility for pit manufacturing to Los Alamos, it has become clear that LANL has no capability to produce more than a demonstration quantity of pits without major construction. The 1996 ROD selected LANL for pit manufacturing because the capability to produce up to 50 pits per year there would be cheaper than anywhere else, (“<i>construction costs for providing a limited pit fabrication capacity (50 pits/yr) are less at LANL (\$310 million in 1995 dollars) than at SRS (about \$490 million)</i>”, and faster, “<i>the LANL capability would be in place at least two years earlier</i>”</p> <p>Despite the fact that costs to establish this capability are now more than 20X what was used to inform this decision, and the schedule to have capability to manufacture more than a handful of pits per year is still decades away, NNSA continues to pursue this elusive dream.</p> <p>Now all it takes is constructing CMRR-NF. According to the 2008 Complex Transformation EIS ROD - “With a new CMRR–NF providing support, the existing plutonium facility at LANL will have sufficient capability to produce between 1 and 80 pits per year.” NNSA says it is necessary to spend another \$5 billion or more, on top of the billions spent since 1996, then maybe in 15-20 years we will have limited pit manufacturing capability.</p> <p>However this capability will still be reliant on aging and suspect capability in PF-4, a facility needing substantial future upgrades and compensatory measures to achieve adequate levels of safety, security, and environmental protection, much less operational capability and reliability.</p> <p>Alternatives for this Supplemental EIS considering only variations of CMRR at LANL to create pit manufacturing capability are ignoring what most external observers, probably including NNSA officials off-the-record, would admit – Trying to make the Los Alamos National Lab and its research facilities a pit manufacturing plant was a bad idea from the start. Cost and schedule figures were biased for political purposes. The true story is emerging and in NEPA space leads to the conclusion that a <u>valid analysis needs to reopen the decisions of the Programmatic documents and consider non-LANL options for pit manufacturing.</u></p>
008	Elizabeth Lerer	<p>I am a Southern California resident and love when I have the opportunity to visit beautiful New Mexico.</p> <p>I am emailing you now as an individual concerned with how tax payer dollars are used in the United States.</p> <p>Quite simply, a supplemental environmental impact statement appears to be a waste of time when the scope of the CMRR-NF project has undergone vast changes since the original impact statement was produced . These changes have so altered the original CMRR project that an entirely new environmental impact statement is what is needed.</p> <p>Can we do a better job honoring our people, our land, our ecosystems that we love and choose to take care of?</p> <p>Please consider insisting on a fresh environmental impact statement that accurately reflects what you are asking the American tax payers to fund and what the people of New Mexico will be forced to live with.</p>

#	Name	Comment
009	Kay Matthews	<p>The following are comments regarding the need for a supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Chemical and Metallurgy Reliable Replacement Project at Los Alamos National Laboratory.</p> <p>First, because of the length of time since the original EIS was released and the significant changes that are being proposed for the project— a 50 percent increase in physical size and a projected cost of approximately seven times that of the original— a supplemental EIS is insufficient and the DOE needs to conduct an entirely new EIS.</p> <p>Second, as this country's economic situation remains unstable, and the world struggles to justify the enormous amounts of money spent on nuclear weapons, the estimated proposed costs of the CMRR facility will seriously impact the ability of agencies to enforce current regulations that protect the health of LANL's surrounding communities and environment. Specifically, funds spent on the CMRR may impact the clean-up work under the Compliance Order of Consent regulated by the New Mexico Environment Department and the individual storm water permit regulated by the Environmental Protection Agency. Another grave concern is the Buckman Direct Diversion Project, located three miles downstream of LANL, where radionuclides may enter the drinking water system of the city of Santa Fe. DOE has been on notice for more than two decades that clean-up is a priority. EPA has identified 60 “high-priority” dumpsites in Los Alamos and Pueblo Canyon that have a potential to discharge contaminants during a storm. This is where funding needs to be spent.</p> <p>Third, the citizens and communities of northern New Mexico have made it clear in public hearings regarding the proposed Complex Transformation program that would consolidate the production of plutonium pits at LANL that they believe it is time to enact a critical mission change at LANL. The impacts of LANL's nuclear weapons work on the vitality and well-being of our communities has been well documented, and the threats posed by production of up to 200 pits is unacceptable. How can the Obama administration or the "four horsemen" talk of a "world free of nuclear weapons" when we continue to spend billions of dollars on a building to house the research and development of nuclear weapons?</p>
010	Andrew Davis and Dee Homans	<p>From what I understand a Supplemental EIS for the proposed new Chemical and Metallurgy Building (the CMRR) at Los Alamos labs falls far short of what is needed. The original EIS was completed a number of years ago when the project had quite a different scope. At that time the facility would have been much smaller and had less impacts on the surrounding environment. Given the above, a new Environmental Impact Statement should be done. Any review at this point should delve deeply into alternatives, including the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons entirely due to their being "weapons of mass destruction"-- weapons which indiscriminately kill civilians and have the capacity to render the earth uninhabitable and, in my point of view, make any involvement with their creation immoral.</p>
011	Julie Sharp	<p>The National Park Service Intermountain Region has reviewed this project, and determined that no parks will be affected; therefore, we have no comments.</p>
012	Charles Pergler on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Pajarito Group of the Sierra Club	<p>The Pajarito Group of the Sierra Club is pleased to submit our scoping comments on the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), National Nuclear Security Administrations (NNSA) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Nuclear Facility Portion of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building Replacement (CMRR) Project at Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico (SEIS). Our comments are presented on behalf of over 350 Pajarito Group members who reside primarily in the Los Alamos and White Rock areas.</p> <p>As Congress declared in Title 1 of the National Environmental Policy Act <i>it is the continuing policy of the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and local governments, and other concerned public and private organizations, to use all practicable means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to foster and promote the general welfare, to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans.</i> Furthermore, <i>it is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means, consistent with other essential considerations of national policy, to improve and coordinate Federal plans, functions, programs, and resources...</i>” The Pajarito Group is a public and local organization whose members will be detrimentally affected by the proposed action.</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>1. Scoping Comment Period Extension and Involved Communities Expansion: This SEIS is of national importance with the proposed project requiring significant fiscal resources, estimated by various sources as between 3.4 to 5.0 billion dollars and, in consideration of the connected actions, could exceed 6.0 billion dollars. Given the history of DOE fiscal management of other large projects, both locally and nationally, costs would be expected to exceed even the \$6 Billion cost estimate. The material and infrastructure requirements (including housing, schools, transportation, building supplies, etc.) of such a substantial project are beyond the capacities of Los Alamos and neighboring communities to provide without their making tangible sacrifices, or providing expedient solutions, that may indeed become long lasting liabilities. As required by Council on Environmental Quality NEPA implementing regulations Section (Sec.) 1506.6 <i>In the case of an action with effects of national concern notice shall include publication in the Federal Register and notice by mail to national organizations reasonably expected to be interested in the matter... Agencies shall maintain a list of such organizations.</i> Did the NNSA provide notification to national organizations (e.g. National Park Service – Bandelier National Monument); including communities as identified and maintained in NNSA’s list of organizations to contact? The issue we identify here is a concern that impacts are not and will not be limited to a specific site.</p> <p>Given the significant changes to the original project, as defined and compared to the 2003 EIS, other communities may now provide and have an interest in offering a more appropriate project location (i.e., Nevada Test Site, Pantex, Savanna River, etc.). Without receiving proper notification and scoping meetings, these alternate communities have had their ability and right to provide scoping comments foreclosed. It should not be a foregone conclusion that Los Alamos is the sole site for the expanded proposed action. As explained in point 2 below the Pajarito Group advocates an EIS, not simply an SEIS, be undertaken because of the profound and significant changes to the originally proposed project. Those project changes now open the door to identifying and defining reasonable alternatives that include construction and operation at other DOE sites. Thus, EIS notification and scoping meetings should be held in those locations that have the capacity to support a pit production facility. Therefore, we are requesting that NNSA integrate the NEPA process with other communities and provide the national audience with an opportunity to provide scoping comments. To this end, the scoping comment period requires meaningful extension. The time extension and inclusion of other potentially affected communities will ensure that planning and decisions reflect environmental values, avoid major delays later in the NEPA process and head off potential litigation.</p> <p>2. An EIS is Required Given the significant, substantial, and profound changes in the original project proposal the Pajarito Group’s position is that a new EIS is required. Based on a comparative analysis of information provided in various documents including the original 2003 EIS it is evident that construction costs have escalated to the point that requires the prudent and reasonable action to consider other site locations. Additionally, given that pits are now known to remain viable for a century or more and that the production of new weapons is prohibited; the need and size of a “CMRR” requires analysis. It is unclear what role CMRR plays in pit production and whether it is sized to meet current or future needs. The reasonable alternatives should be, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action – Continued Use of CMR • Use of other facilities at LANL • Other site locations • Facility size requirements <p>Again the project conditions have significantly changed and it is our position that a SEIS is no longer appropriate and is not NEPA compliant nor in the best interests of the nation.</p> <p>3. Cease Physical Modifications The continuing expenditure of funds and physical actions in support of the CMRR at Los Alamos has introduced an unacceptable bias in favor of the Los Alamos location and is, thereby, a violation of NEPA regulations. Until such time as a new Record of Decision is issued, based on the preparation of an EIS as defined in point 2 above, all physical modifications in support of the “proposed” CMRR should cease and only very limited planning in support of mission implementation definition, cost assessment, and development of alternatives in support of the NEPA analysis be performed. To do otherwise is prejudicial and not in the best interests of the Country. As stated in NEPA implementing regulations <i>Sec. 1506.1 Limitations on actions during NEPA process:</i></p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>(a) Until an agency issues a record of decision as provided in Sec. 1505.2 (except as provided in paragraph (c) of this section), no action concerning the proposal shall be taken which would:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have an adverse environmental impact; or 2. Limit the choice of reasonable alternatives. <p>We note Thomas P. D'Agostino's (Under Secretary for Nuclear Security & Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration) October 28, 2010 speech in which he is quoted <i>That is why it is critical that we complete the design and construction of key facilities like the Uranium Processing Facility at Y-12 and the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement (CMRR) project at Los Alamos.</i> (Bolding added for emphasis)</p> <p>Comments such as this continue to provide us with a concern that DOE NNSA is treating NEPA as only a <i>pro forma</i> exercise. Until the Record of Decision is issued DOE and NNSA personnel should cease their prejudicial comments that are at best indicative of a perceived disdain of the NEPA process.</p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to provide our comments. Should NNSA have any questions or comments to our position we would be pleased to participate in discussions with the NNSA.</p>
013	Aurora Craig-McBride	<p>I respectfully request that the following be done before we allow the new nuclear facility in Los Alamos; 1. Prepare a "new" Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement (CMRR) Project instead of the "supplemental" to the 2003 EIS. There have been significant, substantive, and costly changes to the Project since the Final EIS was issued in 2003, thereby necessitating the federal agencies to take a "hard look" at their proposal(s).</p> <p>2. Extend the comment period by 30 days in order for the public to provide DOE/NNSA/LANL with informed scoping comments. Currently the scoping period ends November 16th, 2010.</p> <p>3. Hold scoping meetings in Albuquerque, Santa Fe, and Taos during the extended comment period. Community representatives from Albuquerque, Santa Fe, and Taos attended the scoping meeting in Pojoaque. They all asked for scoping meetings in their communities. A letter from Senator Udall would be helpful in supporting those requests.</p>
014	Robert G. Watt	<p>As a citizen living living in White Rock, I have been watching and listening to both NNSA and LANL, and listening to the Los Alamos County Council over many years, including those during which the CMRR project has been under planning. While I have no particular opinion on the need for the CMRR project as opposed to refurbishing the existing CMR building, I do have a very large concern with the logistics of the project as I understand them.</p> <p>My understanding is that a huge volume of concrete and aggregate will be hauled up Parajrito road to the construction site or to a concrete plant next door over the duration of the project. Estimates seem to be in 10's if not over 100 massive trucks streaming through White Rock on highway 502 each day for years. The safety impact of such traffic on both White Rock residents and those LANL commuters required to travel Parajrito to get to the tech areas below TA55 will be severe. It does not appear to me that the safety issues have been adequately addressed. At the very least they have not be adequately discussed with the impacted public.</p> <p>Secondly, there appears currently to be a design effort by the Los Alamos County Council to remake 502 with "traffic calming" features in White Rock which appear to mean they are considering such things as traffic circles and the addition of stop lights on 502. It is unclear to me how this modification and the massive truck traffic increase due to the CMRR project can possibly co-exist.</p> <p>I think the public not only needs to be more involved in the CMRR project logistics plan. In my opinion, if the potential safety issues involved in trucking through White Rock can not be mitigated significantly, the logistics should be scrapped. An alternative that routes trucks up East Jemez and back through the lab to the Parajrito corridor should be considered. The potential cost difference, if any, would be more that outweighed by the White Rock traffic safety concerns.</p>

#	Name	Comment
015	Scott Kovac Nuclear Watch New Mexico	At the CMRR SEIS public meetings last month, I was assured that the posters would soon be available electronically. I can't seem to find them online, at least on the LASO site, yet. I'm interested in the CMRR Nuclear Facility Project Overview (October 2010) and in the CMRR (cross section looking east) posters.
016	Laura Wolfsberg	I am an employee at Los Alamos National Laboratory, and I just want to express my concern about the CMRR closing down Pajarito Road during the years that the CMRR would be built. Pajarito Road is the main evacuation route out of Los Alamos for a large part of the lab employees if a wild fire should start. I was here during the 2000 fire which burned 49,000 acres in one afternoon, so the possibility of a fire moving rapidly through the area is not out of the question, especially with the high speed winds that regularly occur in the springtime. Please help us to have a safe way to get out of town while the CMRR is being built and keep Pajarito Road open.
017	Jody Benson	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to add comments to the NEPA scoping process on the CMRR. I attended the October session in White Rock and found it informative. At that session I submitted comments on the computers provided for that purpose. In addition, I submitted an affidavit addressing my concerns on the impacts to Los Alamos.</p> <p>However, although I speak strictly as a member of the community and not as a representative of any of the boards on which I serve, my service on the School Board, Juvenile Justice Advisory Board, and Los Alamos Public Schools Foundation has made me aware of other issues that would effect the townsite of Los Alamos:</p> <p>The traffic impact to Los Alamos townsite: With the increased haulage traffic on St. Rd 4 and the truck route, and with the shut-down of Pajarito Rd, a percentage of the thousands of commuters who normally take the truck route or Pajarito Rd to LANL will bypass the slow haulers and come up the Main Hill Rd (East Rd).</p> <p>From East Rd there are three accesses to the Lab: one is Trinity, (four lanes through business and residential areas); the speed limit on Trinity is 35 MPH, but the normal speed is 45 to 50.</p> <p>Trinity is scheduled to be upgraded in 2011 or 12. The year-long road construction will direct the extra thousand-plus cars onto one of two accesses: Canyon Rd or Central.</p> <p>Canyon Rd is through the residential neighborhood, past a Montessori school, the swimming pool, several churches, the Jewish Center, and the High School. The speed limit on Canyon is 25, but the road is wide; people often go 45. The heavy increase in traffic noise and pollution, along with substantial traffic-safety issues will significantly degrade health, safety, quality of life, and property values.</p> <p>Central Ave. is through the historic town center. Central is a designated US Main Street, a national honor. Central is engineered (narrowed) specifically to make this business center a walkable community. This street goes through the historic district as well as the science museum. Because commuting on Central would be incredibly slow, it is likely that commuters would chose residential Canyon over Central; however, just a slight increase in traffic will significantly decrease health and safety, along with the ability of both residents and tourists to enjoy this historic community center.</p>
018	Stephanie Hiller	<p>Building a giant new plutonium pit production facility undermines our international commitment to progressive nuclear disarmament. It utilizes funds that could be better spent for peacetime services. Making more nuclear weapons is just plain stupid. We are at tremendous risk of creating an accidental or intentional nuclear conflagration. The risk of a nuclear engagement should be factored into the new EIS, because that is by far the greatest consequence of the ongoing production of nuclear weapons.</p> <p>A new EIS must be done because the alternatives proposed in the 2003 final CMRR environmental impact statement (EIS) are no longer applicable today. It's time to start over and re-examine the purpose and need for the Project by preparing a <u>new</u> EIS. Further, it is premature to begin the scoping process when Secretary Chu has asked for an independent expert committee to review the need for the CMRR-NF.</p> <p>Additional reasons for a new EIS are outlined below.</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>The Costs of Trying to Build a Plutonium Pit Production Complex in a Geologically Unstable Area Are Just Too High - The total original estimate for the CMRR Project, including the recently completed \$363 million Radiological Laboratory Utility and Office Building (RLUOB), was around \$600 million in 2004. The current estimate is \$4.5 billion. The estimate, no doubt, will continue to climb.</p> <p>LANL is located between a rift valley (the Rio Grande in that area) and a volcanic range (the Jemez Mountains) in a seismic fault zone (the Pajarito Plateau). An updated seismic hazards analysis was published in May 2007. It showed a potential huge increase in seismic ground motion and activity. In all likelihood, most of the over \$3 billion in cost estimate increases since 2008 are due to efforts to address the increased seismic hazards. DOE must analyze whether \$3 billion is too high a premium to pay for a new NF. In order to address these increased seismic hazards, DOE now plans to excavate 225,000 cubic yards of earth under the proposed NF and fill the hole with concrete. DOE must address the following questions: Is the surrounding geology robust enough to support all that concrete? Would a seismic event cause the concrete “slab” to sink or shift?</p> <p>Cleanup of the Existing Mess Must Be the Priority – Not a New Nuclear Facility - DOE made a commitment to clean up the legacy waste sites at LANL when it signed the Consent Order with the New Mexico Environment Department on March 1, 2005. The Order requires cleanup of certain sites by December 31, 2015, including the Area G dump site at Technical Area 54. Construction activities for a new NF will interfere with cleanup activities, including those at the nearby Material Disposal Area C. DOE must make compliance with the Order the priority – not a new NF.</p> <p>New Alternatives Are Required – DOE must return to the drawing board in order to develop more alternatives, including not building the NF; stopping operations at the old, dangerous CMR Building; and conducting a “capacity study” to determine whether the existing facilities – as they have since 1999 when DOE limited plutonium pit manufacturing to 20 per year - can be used instead of building the proposed NF. All analyses of alternatives must incorporate the new 200,000 square foot RLUOB in the review. Operations for the RLUOB are scheduled to begin in less than two years.</p> <p><u>Requisite Analyses for the New Environment Impact Statement:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental Justice – Both Economic and Ethnicity Analyses Must Be Done - Los Alamos County is one of the richest counties in the U.S.A. It is surrounded by some of the poorest and most ethnically diverse counties in the country. Therefore, shipping any type of waste to anywhere else is an inherent environmental justice issue. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS. 2. Health Effects for Those Most at Risk - Many federal standards for protection of human health, such as limits on emissions from the proposed CMRR-NF industrial stacks, are based on "Reference Man," a hypothetical Caucasian male 20 to 30 years old weighing 154 pounds. All analyses must address the risk to a pregnant woman farmer, her fetus, and her other children under age 18, rather than Reference Man. As a matter of reproductive and environmental justice, the most potentially vulnerable human beings must be protected. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS. 3. Waste Disposal - To Use DOE Terminology: What is the “Path Forward?” - Given the anticipated lack of disposal facilities for low-level radioactive, toxic, and hazardous waste at LANL, DOE must detail where its legacy and newly generated waste will be disposed and how it will be transported to off-site facilities. DOE must detail the proposed transportation modes and routes and the impacts to the communities along the routes and those surrounding the dumps. What emergency preparedness capabilities exist along the proposed routes? 4. Water Usage in the Face of Stricter Limits Asked By DOE – DOE estimated in the 2003 Final CMRR EIS that waste generation may double and the annual water consumption may increase by 10.4 million gallons. Why should a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified building generate any waste, emit contaminants into the air, or discharge contaminated water into the canyons? DOE must explain these contradictions in the new draft EIS. 5. Climate Change Impacts Required – “Just-Do-It” - On February 18, 2010, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) released draft

#	Name	Comment
		<p>guidance for public comment about how “Federal agencies can improve their consideration of the effects of greenhouse gas GHG emissions and climate change in their evaluation of proposals for Federal actions under the NEPA.” While the guidance is being finalized, the CEQ recommends “just-doing-it.” DOE must conduct such analyses in the new draft EIS.</p> <p>6. Methods for Decontamination, Decommissioning and Demolition (DD&D) of the Existing CMR Building and the Proposed New NF - The 2004 Record of Decision (ROD) for the CMRR Project stated the existing CMR building would be DD&D in its entirety. However, the actual implementation of these decisions is dependent on DOE funding levels and allocations of the DOE budget across competing priorities, including construction of a new NF. The DD&D Work Plan must be part of the new draft EIS in order to ensure that it becomes part of the complete National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analyses. Further, the new draft EIS that will analyze the impacts of building a new NF must also examine the impacts of removing it.</p>
019	Marian Naranjo	<p>Although, it seems premature to begin this process when the Department of Energy (DOE) has asked for an independent expert committee to review the need for the CMRR-NF, I thank you for this opportunity to submit scoping comments for the proposed addition to LANL’s nuclear weapons production complex, which includes the Nuclear Facility (NF).</p> <p>I am a tribal member of Santa Clara Pueblo and the first comment is a concern that has been an overall concern since the beginning of the Manhattan Project and that is, the geographical location of a nuclear weapons laboratory/facility within the Jemez Mountains, the Pajarito Plateau. Not only is this the ancestral/aboriginal homelands to Pueblo Peoples, and is considered a Sacred Place, the area is still a place that Tribes continue to depend on for cultural survival. The idea of trying to build a Plutonium Pit Production Complex in this area is not something that can be feasibly acceptable. This area is a volcanic range, between a rift valley with deep canyons and mesas. Movement or seismic activity is and has been a natural activity for time immemorial. I understand that DOE plans to excavate 225,000 cubic yards of earth under the proposed NF and fill the hole with concrete. In consideration of the geography, this thought alone is quite shocking.</p> <p>My next comment is concern of the legacy waste sites at LANL that need to be cleaned up. It’s common sense that one cleans up a mess before you build and create more mess. I am aware of the Consent Order with New Mexico Environment Department and the commitment to clean up the legacy waste including Area G dump site and the activities at Material Area C in close proximity. These clean up activities should be a priority before building a new facility that will create more waste. Furthermore, DOE estimated that the waste generated would double. DOE must describe in detail where the newly generated waste will be disposed. If the waste is transported to off-site facilities, DOE must describe in detail the proposed transportation modes and routes. DOE must also analyze the impacts to the communities along these routes and those living in proximity to the dump areas. Including an analyses making sure that these communities are prepared for an emergency in case of an accident.</p> <p>We are living at a time of unbalanced weather changes. It would be good for DOE to analyze Climate Change in their proposal for federal actions under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. With Climate Change comes water usage. This is a grave concern for all New Mexicans. In the 2003, Final CMRR EIS, DOE estimated their annual water consumption may increase by 10.4 million gallons! With the proposed plans, it is obvious that even more water will be necessary. This is not a good idea and is necessary to state these updated figures in the EIS.</p> <p>It is hard to conceive that an expensive, certified building that received awards for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design would be allowed to generate these wastes, emit contaminants into the air or discharge any waste. A building of this caliber should remain clean and its activities should not ruin such a structure to the point of decontamination, decommissioning and demolition (DD&D). Also, if DD&D occurs, it must also be stated and included in the EIS as a required portion of the NEPA process.</p> <p>DOE must analyze the health effects for the most vulnerable, as a matter of reproductive and environmental justice. Environmental Justice both economically and ethnicity must also be analyzed in all of the above mentioned concerns.</p> <p>It would also be good for DOE to re-read the comments submitted by the Santa Clara Pueblo Tribal Council for the LANL SWEIS and the Complex Transformation which includes the signatures of members and residents who support their comments, as a matter of Government –to –Government Relations. These comments address some of these issues of concern in more detail.</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>For the reasons stated above, it seems clear that a new Environmental Impact statement (EIS) for the proposed Chemistry & Metallurgy Research Replacement (CMRR) Project as part of the Plutonium Complex at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) is needed, to re-examine the purpose and the need for such a project. A capacity study to determine if LANL can do with what they already have is warranted.</p>
020	Penny McMullen on behalf of the Loretto Community of Sisters and Co-members	<p>Please accept these scoping comments on behalf of the Loretto Community about the CMRR Nuclear Facility (NF), the proposed addition to LANL's nuclear weapons production complex.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) First, it is premature to begin the scoping process when Secretary Chu has asked for an independent expert committee to review the need for the CMRR-NF. The scoping process should be put on hold until the review is completed. 2) Then, only if the review recommends continuing with plans for the CMRR-NF, a <u>new</u> EIS is needed, not a Supplemental EIS, because the alternatives proposed in the 2003 final CMRR environmental impact statement (EIS) are no longer applicable today. 3) The total original estimate for the CMRR Project, including the recently completed \$363 million Radiological Laboratory Utility and Office Building (RLUOB), was around \$600 million in 2004 and has increased to 7.5 times as much (\$4.5 billion). The estimate will probably continue to climb. The cost is too high in these economic hard times when services for human needs are being cut. 4) A Plutonium Pit Complex should not be built in a Geologically Unstable Area. The May 2007 seismic hazards analysis showed a potential huge increase in seismic ground motion and activity in the area of the planned CMRR-NF. In order to address these increased seismic hazards, DOE now plans to excavate 225,000 cubic yards of earth under the proposed NF and fill the hole with concrete. The EIS must address the following questions: Is the estimated cost of \$3 billion for the concrete foundation too high a premium to pay for a new NF? Is the surrounding geology robust enough to support all that concrete? Would a seismic event cause the concrete "slab" to sink or shift? 5) The EIS needs to describe plans for waste disposal. Given the anticipated lack of disposal facilities for low-level radioactive, toxic, and hazardous waste at LANL, DOE must detail where its legacy and newly generated waste will be disposed and how it will be transported to off-site facilities. DOE must detail the proposed transportation modes and routes and the impacts to the communities along the routes and those surrounding the dumps, including what emergency preparedness capabilities exist along the proposed routes. 6) The March 2005 Consent Order requires cleanup of certain sites by December 31, 2015, including the Area G dump site at Technical Area 54. Construction activities for a new NF will interfere with cleanup activities, including those at the nearby Material Disposal Area C. DOE must make compliance with the Order the priority – not a new NF that would interfere with DOE's agreement with the New Mexico Environment Department. 7) The 2004 Record of Decision (ROD) for the CMRR Project stated the existing CMR building would be Decontaminated, Decommissioned and Demolished (DD&D) in its entirety. However, the actual implementation of these decisions is dependent on DOE funding levels and allocations of the DOE budget across competing priorities, including construction of a new NF. The DD&D Work Plan must be part of the new draft EIS in order to ensure that it becomes part of the complete National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analyses. <p>Further, the new draft EIS that will analyze the environmental impacts of building a new NF must also examine the impacts of removing it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8) All analyses in the new draft EIS must address the health effects from all operations of the NF for those most at risk (to a pregnant woman farmer, her fetus, and her other children under age 18) rather than Reference Man (a hypothetical Caucasian male 20 to 30 years old weighing 154 pounds). As a matter of reproductive and environmental justice, the most potentially vulnerable human beings must be protected. 9) Also as a matter of Environmental Justice, the EIS should include both economic and ethnicity analyses. Los Alamos County is surrounded by some of the poorest and most ethnically diverse counties in the country, with many family farms. They need to be protected from potential environmental harm, such as happened during the Cerro Grande fire.

#	Name	Comment
		<p>10) DOE estimated in the 2003 Final CMRR EIS that waste generation may double and the annual water consumption may increase by 10.4 million gallons. Yet the CMRR project is supposed to be a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified building. DOE must explain this contradiction in the new draft EIS and justify emitting any contaminants into the air or discharging contaminated water into the canyons, which leach into the groundwater and the Rio Grande, a source of drinking water for communities downstream from LANL.</p> <p>11) On February 18, 2010, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) released draft guidance for public comment about how “Federal agencies can improve their consideration of the effects of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change in their evaluation of proposals for Federal actions under the NEPA.” DOE must conduct such analyses in the new draft EIS.</p> <p>12) DOE must return to the drawing board in order to develop more alternatives, including not building the NF; stop operations at the old, dangerous CMR Building; and conduct a “capacity study” to determine whether the existing facilities (as they have since 1999 when DOE limited plutonium pit manufacturing to 20 per year) can be used instead of building the proposed NF. All analyses of alternatives must incorporate the new 200,000 square foot RLUOB in the review. Operations for the RLUOB are scheduled to begin in less than two years.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these comments from the Loretto Community of Sisters and Comembers.</p>
021	Melissa Larson	<p>I am writing comments regarding the CMRR project proposed for construction at Los Alamos National Laboratory.</p> <p>In the first place, the DOE’s National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) must explain the diverting funds away from nuclear waste clean-up, renewable energy programs and nuclear non-proliferation timetables to accommodate the 4.5 billion dollar projected cost of building the new plutonium pit facility.</p> <p>Secondly, what is the purpose of expanding the current rate of which these triggers for nuclear weapons are being produced?</p> <p>There is the huge expense of containing and controlling the radioactive, toxic and hazardous waste that these enterprises generate, let alone the fact that much of the waste which has already been generated has not been adequately handled or contained.</p> <p>The purpose and need for the project has not been examined, and it’s impact on local and world populations has not been analyzed. It’s potential lethal effects to people, land and life should be given serious thought. A project of this scope and size will negatively the environment in New Mexico, and similarly produce negative effects on the environment of the whole world. The environmental impact of such a project needs close scrutiny.</p> <p>The Costs of Trying to Build a Plutonium Pit Production Complex in a Geologically Unstable Area Are Just Too High - The total original estimate for the CMRR Project, including the recently completed \$363 million Radiological Laboratory Utility and Office Building (RLUOB), was around \$600 million in 2004. The current estimate is \$4.5 billion. The estimate, no doubt, will continue to climb.</p> <p>LANL is located between a rift valley (the Rio Grande in that area) and a volcanic range (the Jemez Mountains) in a seismic fault zone (the Pajarito Plateau). An updated seismic hazards analysis was published in May 2007. It showed a potential huge increase in seismic ground motion and activity. In all likelihood, most of the over \$3 billion in cost estimate increases since 2008 are due to efforts to address the increased seismic hazards. DOE must analyze whether \$3 billion is too high a premium to pay for a new NF. In order to address these increased seismic hazards, DOE now plans to excavate 225,000 cubic yards of earth under the proposed NF and fill the hole with concrete. DOE must address the following questions:</p> <p>Is the surrounding geology robust enough to support all that concrete? Would a seismic event cause the concrete “slab” to sink or shift?</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>DOE must return to the drawing board in order to develop more alternatives, including not building the Nuclear Facility; stop operations at the old, dangerous CMR Building; and conduct a “capacity study” to determine whether the existing facilities – as they have since 1999 when DOE limited plutonium pit manufacturing to 20 per year - can be used instead of building the proposed NF. All analyses of alternatives must incorporate the new 200,000 square foot RLUOB in the review.</p> <p><u>Requisite Analyses for the New Environment Impact Statement:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All differences between 2003 and now must be listed and analyzed. Every single difference between the original proposed facility and the current one must be listed and analyzed, including size, construction techniques and proposed operations. 2. Environmental Justice – Both Economic and Ethnicity Analyses Must Be Done - Los Alamos County is one of the richest counties in the U.S.A. It is surrounded by some of the poorest and most ethnically diverse counties in the country. Therefore, shipping any type of waste to anywhere else is an inherent environmental justice issue. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS. 3. Health Effects for Those Most at Risk - Many federal standards for protection of human health, such as limits on emissions from the proposed CMRR-NF industrial stacks, are based on "Reference Man," a hypothetical Caucasian male 20 to 30 years old weighing 154 pounds. All analyses must address the risk to a pregnant woman, her fetus, and her other children under age 18, rather than Reference Man. As a matter of reproductive and environmental justice, the most potentially vulnerable human beings must be protected. Also current rates of cancer and other health impacts must be examined as they now affect the Northern New Mexican communities. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS. 4. Waste Disposal -- Given the anticipated lack of disposal facilities for low-level radioactive, toxic, and hazardous waste at LANL, DOE must detail where its legacy and newly generated waste will be disposed and how it will be transported to off-site facilities. DOE must detail the proposed transportation modes and routes and the impacts to the communities along the routes and those surrounding the dumps. What emergency preparedness capabilities exist along the proposed routes? 5. Water Usage in the Face of Stricter Limits Asked By DOE – DOE estimated in the 2003 Final CMRR EIS that waste generation may double and the annual water consumption may increase by 10.4 million gallons. Why should a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified building generate any waste, emit contaminants into the air, or discharge contaminated water into the canyons? DOE must explain these contradictions in the new draft EIS. 6. Methods for Decontamination, Decommissioning and Demolition (DD&D) of the Existing CMR Building and the Proposed New NF - The 2004 Record of Decision (ROD) for the CMRR Project stated the existing CMR building would be DD&D in its entirety. However, the actual implementation of these decisions is dependent on DOE funding levels and allocations of the DOE budget across competing priorities, including construction of a new NF. The DD&D Work Plan must be part of the new draft EIS in order to ensure that it becomes part of the complete National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analyses. Further, the new draft EIS that will analyze the impacts of building a new NF must also examine the impacts of removing it. <p>The LANL scientists could be better employed making scientific advances in renewable technologies like solar and wind power, hazardous waste clean-up and neutralization of toxic chemical emissions. Projects could be designed to benefit humanity, rather than threaten mass destruction. Currently 65% of LANL’s budget goes to nuclear weapons projects, while only 1% is put towards clean, renewable energy projects. It would be wiser and publicly more acceptable to change the priorities, giving 65% to life-supporting and enhancing technologies and 0% to death-dealing weaponry. To summarize my comments, I would suggest a complete appraisal of what facilities and capacities are now in place at LANL, what are the goals of LANL for 2010 and beyond and who is financing and supporting the proposed 200,000 square foot, 4.5 billion project and for what ends.</p>

#	Name	Comment
022	Cynthia Jaramillo	<p>I am writing this to you as a concerned citizen of New Mexico, a member of the Pueblo of Isleta. I was made aware of the proposed Environmental Impact Study posted by through the Federal Register October 1, 2010 just Monday, November 8th. I may or my not be too late to comment, but I feel my concern over this matter should be considered since this proposed project will impact me and my community.</p> <p>My concern is related to the chemical dumping in the Rio Grande River as a result of this project. The statement claiming that these chemicals, once dumped in the river will be within acceptable EPA standards for safety. As it is, we are already living with hazardous chemicals in our river because dumping in the river has long been in practice by federal agencies and corporations such as LANL, Intel and hospital facilities. My community cannot use the water for ceremonial purposes because of the health risks associated with drinking it. The river is a significant part of our culture, but we can no longer consume the river water because it is a health hazard to us. Not being able to include the life-giving water of the river in our religious ceremonies has deeply and negatively impacted our culture.</p> <p>Have long term studies been conducted on the effects of the water, soil and sediment and health of the citizens that have been in contact with these chemicals? If so, where do I find that study? My tribe, the Pueblo of Isleta relies heavily on the river for irrigation of crops, and the compounded contamination of our river water will be extremely harmful to consumers and livestock if the dumping continues to increase. If this measure is approved, I feel that LANL will look at this approval as a free reign to use our river as a back yard dumping ground. When projects are being conceptualized, a plan for disposal must also be included. Dumping in our river appears to be the easy solution to ridding themselves of the chemical waste, washing their hands of it and leaving the citizens to deal with the effects of it. This is not acceptable.</p> <p>It is a known fact that uranium is a cancer causing agent, and the health and safety of people living downstream from the Los Alamos are already negatively affected with these chemicals. I don't feel there are any safe levels of these chemicals in our rivers, yet the citizens of our state continue to face an uphill battle with laws and decisions that don't weigh favorably for citizens, rather, they favor projects such as this.</p> <p>Continued and increased dumping of chemicals in our river will surely increase the contamination of our soil, our crops, and most importantly, our health. I ask that my concerns be included and be given the consideration it deserves.</p>
023	Donald Machen	<p>I would like to add my comments to the NEPA scoping process on the CMRR. This letter addresses my concerns on the impacts to Los Alamos relating to the possible closure of Pajarito Road.</p> <p>I have served on the Los Alamos County Planning and Zoning Commission and am currently involved and assisting in the NM502/Trinity Drive Corridor Study. These activities have made me aware of issues that affect the townsite of Los Alamos. I am writing as a member of the community of Los Alamos.</p> <p>My comments relate to the traffic impact to Los Alamos townsite: With the increased haulage traffic on State Rd 4 and the truck route to LANL, and with the possible shut-down of Pajarito Rd, a percentage of the thousands of commuters who normally take the truck route or Pajarito Rd to LANL will bypass the slow haulers and come up the Main Hill Rd (East Rd). Los Alamos County should enforce truck traffic traveling on the truck route and not the Hill Rd., thus exacerbating the traffic situation.</p> <p>From East Rd there are three accesses to LANL. One access is Trinity Drive (four lanes through business and residential areas and the speed limit on Trinity is 35 MPH, but the normal speed is 45 to 50 at the moment). However NM502/Trinity will most likely be upgraded to reflect the business, residential and pedestrian uses based on the corridor study, which is now in progress.</p> <p>Based upon the corridor study, Trinity is expected to be upgraded in 2011 or 12. The year long road construction will direct the extra thousand-plus cars onto one of two accesses: Canyon Rd or Central.</p> <p>Canyon Rd is through the residential neighborhood, past a Montessori school, the Los Alamos County swimming pool, several churches, the Jewish Center, and the High School. The speed limit on Canyon is 25 MPH, but the road is wide; people often go 45 MPH. The heavy increase in traffic noise and pollution, along with substantial traffic-safety issues will significantly degrade health, safety, quality of life, and property values.</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>Central Ave. is through the historic town center. Central is a designated US Main Street, a national honor. Central is engineered (narrowed) specifically to make this business center a walkable community. This street goes through the historic district as well as the science museum. Because commuting on Central would be incredibly slow, it is likely that commuters would chose residential Canyon over Central; however, just a slight increase in traffic will significantly decrease health and safety, along with the ability of both residents and tourists to enjoy this historic community center.</p> <p>I urge the DOE to consider upgrading the truck route, E. Jemez Road, before any closure of Pajarito Road is considered.</p>
024	Marilyn Hoff	<p>Last summer, when LANL performed its dog and pony show to sell Espanola on its proposed multi-billion dollar new plutonium pit manufacturing facility, the big emphasis was on how many new jobs this shining project would bring to New Mexicans. Think of the benefits to New Mexicans for housing and feeding those workers who would be imported for this massive building project! That’s right—a big proportion of these prospective workers apparently will be coming from somewhere else. Will the contractors hired to profit from this pricey project also be imported?</p> <p>Thanks to our insatiable nuclear industry New Mexico ranks high in per capita federal money coming to the state, even while it ranks continually lower in overall prosperity, and even while Los Alamos itself ranks as one of the wealthiest counties in the US. It simply is not and has never been true that what benefits LANL benefits New Mexico.</p> <p>The estimates on the number of jobs this \$5 billion and counting project would create never specified how many of said jobs would go to New Mexicans, who would apparently once again stand in line for table scraps. A similar table scrap is this Supplemental EIS , when a whole EIS is called for, given how the present proposal is unrecognizably huger than that covered by the original EIS. Even stingier is the very hurried comment deadline for this inadequate SEIS. I urgently request and extended comment deadline. And stingiest of all is holding two meager scoping hearings 20 miles apart, excluding both Santa Fe and my home town of Taos. Are you Lab folks afraid to hear from the citizenry? Please hold scoping hearings in Taos, Santa Fe, Albuquerque, and Espanola. Pojoaque and White Rock are not the only New Mexico communities downwind and downwater of LANL.</p> <p>So I write to demand a full, new EIS in honor of the ever expanding plans for the proposed LANL bomb factory complex. A Supplemental EIS amending the old irrelevant EIS is simply not sufficient to assess, for example, such weighty issues as the impact on the seismic integrity of the area from a 125 ft deep hole filled with 225,000 cubic yards of concrete. How does all this weight of concrete ameliorate the shaky location it is projected to float upon? What, too, will be the environmental consequences of gobbling up all the water necessary to mix said concrete?</p> <p>While some as yet unidentified building contractors lick their chops over digging this impossibly deep hole and filling it with concrete to shore up the proposed CMRR building’s resistance to seismic events, the necessity for all this concrete constitutes an admission that this plutonium facility would be built on suspect terrain. LANL and the US Government have yet to make the case that quadrupling US capacity to manufacture nuclear bombs is necessary or even desirable. If LANL indeed longs to start a new nuclear arms race, it is stepping forth as a destabilizing force in world politics, at a time when our latest chosen national enemy, the terrorists, occupy no particular geographical location to bomb to smithereens.</p> <p>Even though the US government is under treaty obligation to build no new nuclear bomb designs, the lucrative nuclear industry is determined to keep on building them and selling them to their only customer, us taxpayers. The industry pretends it is not building new nukes by calling what they’re doing “stockpile stewardship” or “reliable replacement warheads” but piece by piece the designs of these nukes are changing, the insidious concept of “usable nukes” is entering the industry lexicon, and the industry thereby justifies its existence by insinuating that its product might actually have some function. But the fact is that this insatiable industry, like many others in the US war machine, wants to keep on churning out products that should never be used. The nuclear industry, which makes a useless product, proposes a useless building project to create a useless bomb factory that handles, arguably the most dangerous and poisonous element on earth.</p> <p>The \$5 billion and growing estimated for the CMRR building and the rest of the pit manufacturing complex should be used instead for clean-</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>up of uncounted poisonous and radioactive messes already generated by the Lab. The existence of such messes attests to the shoddy safety practices of LANL throughout its history. The experience at Rocky Flats attests to the perils of shoddy safety processes. The entire nuclear industry is infamous for making polluting, deadly messes. Rocky Flats, which formerly manufactured plutonium pits, the function LANL inherited, had to be closed down because it so carelessly polluted and poisoned its neighborhood. Plutonium can spontaneously catch fire, and reportedly did ignite hundreds of times at Rocky Flats, twice (in 1957 and 1969) with near-catastrophic results. Such fires can burn the filters that protect the public from its fumes. Trying to douse these fires with water can make the plutonium go critical. LANL has not specified how its pit factory plans to deal with such fires, when smoke plumes of plutonium could billow into the air we breathe. LANL has demonstrably over the years shown little concern about polluting its surroundings.</p> <p>At a time when the US population sinks into deepening poverty, lacking in health care, education and productive jobs, let's stop throwing our taxpayer money down the black hole of the useless nuclear industry with its unusable product that threatens the veritable existence of life on earth, with profits accruing to Bechtel. To justify its existence LANL need only change its mission. I would much rather comment on an EIS for a national laboratory for clean and renewable energy.</p>
025	Jeanne Green	<p>The major question I have that needs to be addressed is the NEED for the CMRR-NF. The need has not been demonstrated and it is my understanding that this subject will not be addressed with a Supplemental EIS.</p> <p>With the President, most other countries, world leaders and the people calling for an end to nuclear weapons <u>and</u> an already operating plutonium pit factory at LANL, where is the need for this proposed monstrosity. That should be the first question that it addressed in this proposal and it is not addressed at all in the SEIS.</p> <p>At \$4.5 billion LANL and it's employees cannot justify building a new nuclear weapons factory, diverting the people's money away from the New Mexico population, one of the poorest in the U.S. (except for the town of Los Alamos). LANL is taking food from the mouths of babes to produce immoral weapons that kill hundreds of thousands of innocent people in a split second. There is NO justification and there is not a real "no action" alternative even offered in the SEIS.</p> <p>On LANL's website, you say LANL's mission is to "enhance national security by ensuring the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear stockpile". Nuclear weapons are not "safe" and the reliability of the stockpile has been confirmed by the Jason Report for the next century.</p> <p>The website mission statement continues, "developing technologies to reduce threats from weapons of mass destruction." Producing more weapons of mass destruction to add to the nearly 10,000 the U.S. already has, does not reduce the threat but increases the threat. If car-bombers are the threat- WMDs are certainly in no way effective against a moving and clandestine target. And the use of nuclear force against a so-called "rogue state" would annihilate huge civilian populations which is indiscriminate, disproportionate, highly immoral, internationally illegal and would contaminate the rest of the world as well with radiation entering the atmosphere and traveling the planet via winds. Proliferation of nuclear weapons (the actuality of the proposed CMRR-NF) is in fact a boon to terrorists. The existence and proliferation of nuclear weapons threatens U.S. security, whereas your mission statement claims the intent to reduce threats from WMDs.</p> <p>LANL's mission, the website statement continues, includes: " solving problems related to energy, environment, infrastructure, health and global security concerns." This is fraud on a grand scale. The LANL Fiscal Year 2011 budget allocates less than 1% (.63%) to energy efficiency and renewable energy, even in the face of global warming and economic collapse. LANL allocates less than 8% to Defense environmental clean-up, even while the LAHDRA report and independent monitoring show the dire need for clean-up of legacy waste and the clean-up of the ongoing contamination of our water, soil, air, food and people. The money slated for the CMRR-NF should go instead for clean-up, compensation to the many New Mexico victims and for renewable energy jobs in New Mexico. If you have the expertise to build unconscionable weapons of mass destruction, surely you can summon the expertise to put hundreds of thousands of New Mexicans to work installing solar panels on every home, building water-catchment systems, implementing conservation measures, etc. to ensure the survivability of New Mexican people into the future.</p> <p>The LANL plan to use lavish amounts of taxpayer money to produce the potential for wholesale destruction of the planet is the wrong direction, wrong-headed and does not benefit New Mexico, the U.S. or the world. It does benefit LANL's wealthy careerists and the weapons manufacturing mega corporation moguls.</p> <p>The need or lack of need for this new nuclear bomb factory must be addressed. We need a new Environmental Impact Statement to address it, not a warmed over supplemental to your 2003 EIS. We need more public hearings. Two poorly-publicized hearings in very small towns is</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>paltry considering the scale of this project. We need more public notice, more clean-up and more analysis of cumulative impacts to the local populations. LANL needs to address environmental justice issues with high populations of Native Americans and Hispanic people being exposed to carcinogens and radioisotopes emitting from the plant and radioactive waste storage areas. These poisons are washing into the canyons, streams and rivers, into our air, even our food and possibly our aquifer. Where will we get clean water to drink if this continues?</p> <p>Stop killing us with your deadly poisons, invoking patriotism and national security when the benefit is to some wealthy administrators at LANL and associated mega-corporations of the military-industrial complex that have no morals or ethics but only the profit motive.</p> <p>And any person of common sense would realize the stupidity of building a nuclear weapons production lab on an active earthquake fault zone.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments. Please withdraw plans to build the CMRR-NF.</p>
026	Alice Rebekah Twocrows	<p>I am a citizen of the New Mexico and live down wind from the Los Alamos Plant. I have been active for more than 30 years in bringing to light the immoral and impractical and outrageous and ridiculous and no one can win situation of the continuation of manufacturing more weapons of mass destruction.</p> <p>In these times, I am sure that whatever threats there are to the safety and continuation of these United States can not be solved by such weapons. They are the dinosaurs of weaponry. In my mind, it is ignorance and stupidity that honors such as what goes on at Los Alamos and all the other plants that are part of such evil intention.</p> <p>I am not a pacifist and I quote from a song by the great folk artist Pete Seeger, "If an army invaded this land of mine, I would be out on the firing line,".</p> <p>A secure nation is one in which its citizenry is educated, well fed with jobs and places to live. The continuation in these times to use so much of our resources including the brightest minds of our country in the making of weapons and war is beyond immoral to being consciously evil.</p> <p>Please for the sake of all living beings, stop, STOP RIGHT NOW THE MAKING OF WEAPONS OF MASS DISTRUCTION.</p>
027	Jean Nichols	<p>I am writing to provide you with my scoping comments about the CMRR Project, which includes the Nuclear Facility (NF), the proposed addition to LANL's nuclear weapons production complex. The alternatives proposed in the 2003 final CMRR environmental impact statement (EIS) are no longer applicable today. It's time to start over and re-examine the purpose and need for the Project by preparing a new EIS.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is premature to begin the scoping process when Secretary Chu has asked for an independent expert committee to review the need for the CMRR-NF. The costs of building a Plutonium Pit Production Complex in a geologically unstable area are just too high - The total original estimate for the CMRR Project, including the recently completed \$363 million Radiological Laboratory Utility and Office Building (RLUOB), was around \$600 million in 2004. The current estimate is \$4.5 billion. The estimate will continue to climb.</p> <p>LANL is located between a rift valley (the Rio Grande in that area) and a volcanic range (the Jemez Mountains) in a seismic fault zone (the Pajarito Plateau). An updated seismic hazards analysis was published in May 2007. It showed a potential huge increase in seismic ground motion and activity. In all likelihood, most of the over \$3 billion in cost estimate increases since 2008 are due to efforts to address the increased seismic hazards. DOE must analyze whether \$3 billion is too high a premium to pay for a new NF. In order to address these increased seismic hazards, DOE now plans to excavate 225,000 cubic yards of earth under the proposed NF and fill the hole with concrete. DOE must address the following questions: Is the surrounding geology robust enough to support all that concrete? Would a seismic event cause the concrete "slab" to sink or shift?</p> <p>Cleanup of the existing contamination must be the priority, not a new nuclear facility - DOE made a commitment to clean up the legacy waste sites at LANL when it signed the Consent Order with the New Mexico Environment Department on March 1, 2005. The Order requires cleanup of certain sites by December 31, 2015, including the Area G dump site at Technical Area 54. Construction activities for a new NF will interfere with cleanup activities, including those at the nearby Material Disposal Area C. DOE must make compliance with the Order the priority – not a new NF. LANL does not have a good safety and security record and we do not need a repeat of the accidents, disasters, and clean up costs of Rocky Flats CO.</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>New alternatives are required – DOE must return to the drawing board in order to develop more alternatives, including not building the NF; stop operations at the old, dangerous CMR Building; and conduct a “capacity study” to determine whether the existing facilities – as they have since 1999 when DOE limited plutonium pit manufacturing to 20 per year - can be used instead of building the proposed NF. All analyses of alternatives must incorporate the new 200,000 square foot RLUOB in the review. Operations for the RLUOB are scheduled to begin in less than two years.</p> <p>Requisite Analyses for the New Environment Impact Statement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental Justice – Both Economic and Ethnicity Analyses Must Be Done - Los Alamos County is one of the richest counties in the U.S.A. It is surrounded by some of the poorest and most ethnically diverse counties in the country. Therefore, shipping any type of waste to anywhere else is an inherent environmental justice issue. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS. 2. Health Effects for Those Most at Risk - Many federal standards for protection of human health, such as limits on emissions from the proposed CMRR-NF industrial stacks, are based on "Reference Man," a hypothetical Caucasian male 20 to 30 years old weighing 154 pounds. All analyses must address the risk to a pregnant woman farmer, her fetus, and her other children under age 18, rather than Reference Man. As a matter of reproductive and environmental justice, the most potentially vulnerable human beings must be protected. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS. 3. Waste Disposal - To Use DOE Terminology: What is the “Path Forward?” - Given the anticipated lack of disposal facilities for low-level radioactive, toxic, and hazardous waste at LANL, DOE must detail where its legacy and newly generated waste will be disposed and how it will be transported to off-site facilities. DOE must detail the proposed transportation modes and routes and the impacts to the communities along the routes and those surrounding the dumps. What emergency preparedness capabilities exist along the proposed routes? 4. Water Usage in the Face of Stricter Limits Asked By DOE – DOE estimated in the 2003 Final CMRR EIS that waste generation may double and the annual water consumption may increase by 10.4 million gallons. Why should a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified building generate any waste, emit contaminants into the air, or discharge contaminated water into the canyons? DOE must explain these contradictions in the new draft EIS. 5. Climate Change Impacts Required – “Just-Do-It” - On February 18, 2010, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) released draft guidance for public comment about how “Federal agencies can improve their consideration of the effects of greenhouse gas GHG emissions and climate change in their evaluation of proposals for Federal actions under the NEPA.” While the guidance is being finalized, the CEQ recommends “just-doing-it.” DOE must conduct such analyses in the new draft EIS. 6. Methods for Decontamination, Decommissioning and Demolition (DD&D) of the Existing CMR Building and the Proposed New NF - The 2004 Record of Decision (ROD) for the CMRR Project stated the existing CMR building would be DD&D in its entirety. However, the actual implementation of these decisions is dependent on DOE funding levels and allocations of the DOE budget across competing priorities, including construction of a new NF. The DD&D Work Plan must be part of the new draft EIS in order to ensure that it becomes part of the complete National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analyses. Further, the new draft EIS that will analyze the impacts of building a new NF must also examine the impacts of removing it. <p>Thank you for your consideration of my comments. I, like many other of my neighbors, have already suffered the effects of being downwind of Los Alamos Lab. Indoor accumulated dust from my house tested dangerously high in Strontium 90, possibly from the time of the Cerro Grande Fir, but certainly from LANL's activities. This year I was diagnosed with cancer, as are far too many of our residents. We need a health study of the whole area downwind of the lab, and we certainly do not need an expanded nuclear weapon factory. At this point in history, with climate change and increased seismic activity around the globe, to move blindly forward on the CMRR-NF is insanity. Please take these and other comments seriously and halt this project.</p>

#	Name	Comment
028	Liana Sanchez	I am writing to provide you with my scoping comments about the CMRR Project, which includes the Nuclear Facility (NF), the proposed addition to LANL's nuclear weapons production complex. The alternatives proposed in the 2003 final CMRR environmental impact statement (EIS) are no longer applicable today. It's time to start over and re-examine the purpose and need for the Project by preparing a <u>new</u> EIS. Further, it is premature to begin the scoping process when Secretary Chu has asked for an independent expert committee to review the need for the CMRR-NF.
035	Drilling Mora County	
036	Betsy Millard	
037	Jon Klingel	I request 120 days to provide comments about the draft CMRR EIS. Public hearings on the draft EIS should be held in surrounding communities, including Albuquerque, Española, Santa Fe, Taos, and White Rock.
041	David Bacon	<p>The Costs of Trying to Build a Plutonium Pit Production Complex in a Geologically Unstable Area Are Just Too High - The total original estimate for the CMRR Project, including the recently completed \$363 million Radiological Laboratory Utility and Office Building (RLUOB), was around \$600 million in 2004. The current estimate is \$4.5 billion. The estimate, no doubt, will continue to climb.</p> <p>LANL is located between a rift valley (the Rio Grande in that area) and a volcanic range (the Jemez Mountains) in a seismic fault zone (the Pajarito Plateau). An updated seismic hazards analysis was published in May 2007. It showed a potential huge increase in seismic ground motion and activity. In all likelihood, most of the over \$3 billion in cost estimate increases since 2008 are due to efforts to address the increased seismic hazards. DOE must analyze whether \$3 billion is too high a premium to pay for a new NF. In order to address these increased seismic hazards, DOE now plans to excavate 225,000 cubic yards of earth under the proposed NF and fill the hole with concrete. DOE must address the following questions: Is the surrounding geology robust enough to support all that concrete? Would a seismic event cause the concrete "slab" to sink or shift?</p> <p>Cleanup of the Existing Mess Must Be the Priority – Not a New Nuclear Facility - DOE made a commitment to clean up the legacy waste sites at LANL when it signed the Consent Order with the New Mexico Environment Department on March 1, 2005. The Order requires cleanup of certain sites by December 31, 2015, including the Area G dump site at Technical Area 54. Construction activities for a new NF will interfere with cleanup activities, including those at the nearby Material Disposal Area C. DOE must make compliance with the Order the priority – not a new NF.</p> <p>New Alternatives Are Required – DOE must return to the drawing board in order to develop more alternatives, including not building the NF; stop operations at the old, dangerous CMR Building; and conduct a "capacity study" to determine whether the existing facilities – as they have since 1999 when DOE limited plutonium pit manufacturing to 20 per year - can be used instead of building the proposed NF. All analyses of alternatives must incorporate the new 200,000 square foot RLUOB in the review. Operations for the RLUOB are scheduled to begin in less than two years.</p> <p><u>Requisite Analyses for the New Environment Impact Statement:</u></p> <p>1. Environmental Justice – Both Economic and Ethnicity Analyses Must Be Done - Los Alamos County is one of the richest counties in the U.S.A. It is surrounded by some of the poorest and most ethnically diverse counties in the country. Therefore, shipping any type of waste to anywhere else is an inherent environmental justice issue. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS.</p> <p>2. Health Effects for Those Most at Risk - Many federal standards for protection of human health, such as limits on emissions from the proposed CMRR-NF industrial stacks, are based on "Reference Man," a hypothetical Caucasian male 20 to 30 years old weighing 154 pounds. All analyses must address the risk to a pregnant woman farmer, her fetus, and her other children under age 18, rather than Reference Man. As a matter of reproductive and environmental justice, the most potentially vulnerable human beings must be protected. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS.</p> <p>3. Waste Disposal - To Use DOE Terminology: What is the "Path Forward?" - Given the anticipated lack of disposal facilities for low-level radioactive, toxic, and hazardous waste at LANL, DOE must detail where its legacy and newly generated waste will be disposed and how it will be transported to off-site facilities. DOE must detail the proposed transportation modes and routes and the impacts to the</p>
049	Janet Greenwald, Co-coordinator of Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive Dumping	
054	Rhea Goodman	
055	Elana Sue ST. Pierre, Healthy Water NOW ASAP	
056	Peter McCarthy	

#	Name	Comment
		<p>communities along the routes and those surrounding the dumps. What emergency preparedness capabilities exist along the proposed routes?</p> <p>4. Water Usage in the Face of Stricter Limits Asked By DOE – DOE estimated in the 2003 Final CMRR EIS that waste generation may double and the annual water consumption may increase by 10.4 million gallons. Why should a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified building generate any waste, emit contaminants into the air, or discharge contaminated water into the canyons? DOE must explain these contradictions in the new draft EIS.</p> <p>5. Climate Change Impacts Required – “Just-Do-It” - On February 18, 2010, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) released draft guidance for public comment about how “Federal agencies can improve their consideration of the effects of greenhouse gas GHG emissions and climate change in their evaluation of proposals for Federal actions under the NEPA.” While the guidance is being finalized, the CEQ recommends “just-doing-it.” DOE must conduct such analyses in the new draft EIS.</p> <p>6. Methods for Decontamination, Decommissioning and Demolition (DD&D) of the Existing CMR Building and the Proposed New NF - The 2004 Record of Decision (ROD) for the CMRR Project stated the existing CMR building would be DD&D in its entirety. However, the actual implementation of these decisions is dependent on DOE funding levels and allocations of the DOE budget across competing priorities, including construction of a new NF. The DD&D Work Plan must be part of the new draft EIS in order to ensure that it becomes part of the complete National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analyses. Further, the new draft EIS that will analyze the impacts of building a new NF must also examine the impacts of removing it.</p>
029	OTBAIGAS	<p>I AM ABSOLUTELY PROTESTING ANY MORE ATTEMPTS TO KEEP LOS ALAMOS LABS WORKING AT CREATING WAR WEAPONS AGAINST HUMANS.</p> <p>I AM DISGUSTED AND AMAZED THAT I LIVE IN BEAUTIFUL NEW MEXICO AND THIS STATE IS A CENTER OF THE WORST WAR WEAPONS CREATIONS IN OUR USA.</p>
030	Sheri Kotowski Embudo Valley Environmental Monitoring Group	<p>I am writing today on behalf of the Embudo Valley Environmental Monitoring Group and many community members living downwind and downstream from LANL to provide you with scoping comments about the CMRR Project, which includes the Nuclear Facility (NF), the proposed addition to LANL’s nuclear weapons production complex from. EVEMG has worked since 2003 to address issues surrounding air borne contamination releases from nuclear weapons production at LANL and their effects on public safety, human health and the environment in our traditional land-based communities.</p> <p>First and foremost on my mind is that all construction should come to a stand still until a new Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is prepared. It is apparent from new studies (2007) that the site is geologically unstable, that clean up under the 2005 Consent Order will physically and financially compete with the new construction and that issues of prime farmland have been over looked. Additionally, DOE/LANL needs to seriously and intently re-evaluate the “Design/Build” concept for a project of this magnitude. These separate issues are compounded by the outrageous cost increases since the beginning of the project over the last six years; especially when governmental leadership is driving at “austerity measures” in the face of an economic depression. Further, DOE Secretary Steven Chu, has asked for an independent expert committee to review the <i>need</i> for the CMRR-NF. We can now see that the alternatives proposed in the 2003 final CMRR environmental impact statement (EIS) are no longer valid. It’s time to start over and re-examine the purpose and need for the Project by preparing a <i>new</i> EIS.</p> <p>1. The Costs of Trying to Build a Plutonium Pit Production Complex in a Geologically Unstable Area Are Just Too High - The total original estimate for the CMRR Project, including the recently completed \$363 million Radiological Laboratory Utility and Office Building (RLUOB), was around \$600 million in 2004. The current estimate is \$4.5 billion. The estimate, no doubt, will continue to climb.</p> <p>LANL is located between a rift valley (the Rio Grande in that area) and a volcanic range (the Jemez Mountains) in a seismic fault zone (the Pajarito Plateau). An updated seismic hazards analysis was published in May 2007. It showed a potential huge increase in seismic ground motion and activity. In all likelihood, most of the over \$3 billion in cost estimate increases since 2008 are due to efforts to address the increased seismic hazards. DOE must analyze whether \$3 billion is too high a premium to pay for a new NF. In order to address these</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>increased seismic hazards, DOE now plans to excavate 225,000 cubic yards of earth under the proposed NF and fill the hole with concrete. DOE must address the following questions: Is the surrounding geology robust enough to support all that concrete? Would a seismic event cause the concrete “slab” to sink or shift? Please include an evaluation of the success of “Design/Build” regarding new seismic findings with a cost analyses.</p> <p>Cleanup Must Be the Priority – Not a New Nuclear Facility - DOE made a commitment to clean up the legacy waste sites at LANL when it signed the Consent Order with the New Mexico Environment Department on March 1, 2005. The Order requires cleanup of certain sites by December 31, 2015, including the Area G dumpsite at Technical Area 54. Construction activities for a new NF will interfere with cleanup activities, including those at the nearby Material Disposal Area C. DOE must make compliance with the Order the priority – not a new NF.</p> <p>New Alternatives Are Required – DOE must return to the drawing board in order to develop more alternatives, including not building the NF; stop operations at the old, dangerous CMR Building; and conduct a “capacity study” to determine whether the existing facilities – as they have since 1999 when DOE limited plutonium pit manufacturing to 20 per year - can be used instead of building the proposed NF. All analyses of alternatives must incorporate the new 200,000 square foot RLUOB in the review. Operations for the RLUOB are scheduled to begin in less than two years.</p> <p><u>Requisite Analyses for the New Environment Impact Statement:</u></p> <p>1. Environmental Justice – Both Economic and Ethnicity Analyses Must Be Done - Los Alamos County is one of the richest counties in the U.S.A. It is surrounded by some of the poorest and most ethnically diverse counties in the country. Therefore, shipping any type of waste to anywhere else is an inherent environmental justice issue. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS.</p> <p>2. Health Effects for Those Most at Risk - Many federal standards for protection of human health, such as limits on emissions from the proposed CMRR-NF industrial stacks, are based on "Reference Man," a hypothetical Caucasian male 20 to 30 years old weighing 154 pounds. All analyses must address the risk to a pregnant woman farmer, her fetus, and her other children under age 18, rather than Reference Man. As a matter of reproductive and environmental justice, the most potentially vulnerable human beings must be protected. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS.</p> <p>3. Waste Disposal - To Use DOE Terminology: What is the “Path Forward?” - Given the anticipated lack of disposal facilities for low-level radioactive, toxic, and hazardous waste at LANL, DOE must detail where its legacy and newly generated waste will be disposed and how it will be transported to off-site facilities. DOE must detail the proposed transportation modes and routes and the impacts to the communities along the routes and those surrounding the dumps. What emergency preparedness capabilities exist along the proposed routes?</p> <p>4. Water Usage in the Face of Stricter Limits Asked By DOE – DOE estimated in the 2003 Final CMRR EIS that waste generation may double and the annual water consumption may increase by 10.4 million gallons. Why should a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified building generate any waste, emit contaminants into the air, or discharge contaminated water into the canyons? DOE must explain these contradictions in the new draft EIS.</p> <p>5. Analysis of Impacts Concerning Water Quality and Water Quantity in Agriculture. As an issue of food security, over the next years New Mexicans need to be able to feed ourselves. Water quality is of the utmost importance. The uppermost reaches of our watersheds are contaminated by the nuclear weapons industry at levels exceeding agricultural soil standards. Through a watershed cycle, the soil network on the forest floor effects water quality. Because we are located in a semi arid climate food producers rely on snow melt for irrigation through our acequias water so quantity is also of the utmost importance. DOE must provide a complete analysis on water use concerning agricultural activities both up stream and downstream from the proposed NF.</p> <p>6. Climate Change Impacts Required – “Just-Do-It” - On February 18, 2010, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) released draft guidance for public comment about how “Federal agencies can improve their consideration of the effects of greenhouse gas GHG emissions and climate change in their evaluation of proposals for Federal actions under the NEPA.” While the guidance is being finalized, the CEQ</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>recommends “just-doing-it.” DOE must conduct such analyses in the new draft EIS.</p> <p>7. Methods for Decontamination, Decommissioning and Demolition (DD&D) of the Existing CMR Building and the Proposed New NF - The 2004 Record of Decision (ROD) for the CMRR Project stated the existing CMR building would be DD&D in its entirety. However, the actual implementation of these decisions is dependent on DOE funding levels and allocations of the DOE budget across competing priorities, including construction of a new NF. The DD&D Work Plan must be part of the new draft EIS in order to ensure that it becomes part of the complete National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analyses. Further, the new draft EIS that will analyze the impacts of building a new NF must also examine the impacts of removing it.</p> <p>8. Analysis and Impacts to Regional Prime Farmland. The “New Mexico Agricultural Statistics 2000” states “New Mexico’s agricultural industry entered the 21st century by setting a cash receipts record of \$2.1 billion for the state’s farmers and ranchers. This industry remains important to the state’s economy. Food producing in Northern New Mexico as an issue of <i>security</i> needs to be addressed also. DOE must recognize that there are agricultural activities in the vicinity of LANL and conduct a proper analysis as required by NEPA.”</p> <p>In conclusion, many federal, state and independent studies conducted over the last decade indicate that environmental contamination from the nuclear weapons industry is dispersed through out the LANL site and throughout our communities surrounding the site. This is an indication that LANL needs to focus on advancing clean-up technologies, promoting regional health studies to evaluate injury including compensation to the injured people and environmental restitution in order to restore vitality to all life. LANL does not need an expansion of the activities that will continue to generate and deposit profuse amounts of radioactive, toxic and hazardous waste locally and globally. DOE needs to analyze for the alternate of “No Nuclear Facility” in order fund life affirming activities</p>
031	Astrid Webster	<p>The EIS produced in 2003 to enable the building of the CMRR fell far short of its legal obligation to assess the impact of the project on the environment inhabited by the people of New Mexico with regard to long range environmental degradation, the economy and a variety of measures of well-being which are equally vital aspects of our environment. Prior to making New Mexico the first and still core home of nuclear weapons production, the state used to be in the reange of 35th to 37th in per capita income and other measures of well-being. After becoming the anchor for nuclear weapons production, we slid 10 or more places on many of those measures and have steadfastly remained there. In other words, the measures of environmental impact were far too narrow to begin with. The idea of a fault under the Pajarito Plateau had never occurred to these august scientists who so lightly took the fate of the state and world into their hands.</p> <p>To supplement something that was insufficient in the first place simply compounds the insufficiency. Simply increasing the concrete 100 fold and letting the price tag skyrocket are indications that this project was never well managed, was never about acting with regard to the safety and security needs of our citizens. Had that been the aim, the Los Alamos National (read 90+% privatized) Labs would have seen a steady disinvestment in nuclear arms in the past decades and a shift to labs that had established themselves as capable of leading a charge to provide for real security for our citizens by investing in sustainable jobs and researching renewable energy that put gainful employment and thriving within the grasp of every hardworking New Mexico citizen.</p> <p>The CMRR-NF Supplement to the EIS is an effort to take a nudule of isolation and privilege that sits above a growing sea of struggling humanity, paint over the rust with a hasty supplenent and call it good. The DOE, the NNSA, the DOD and the government in general are looking at the wrong problems and responding with even more inappropriate solutions, a clear case of two wrongs not setting things right but rather courting disaster. A new EIS, truly done rather than a formality with a guaranteed yes for the aforementioned has a chance of protecting our environment, but only if it comes with a sincere exploration of options including no action and clean up the legacy waste before adding a new generation of solutions that are worse than the problem.</p> <p>If the Pentagon can pinpoint the greatest danger facing the US as climate instability, surely the DOE, the NNSA, the DOD ought to be able to see the folly in constructing a new building to house a new generation of nuclear weapons that waste precious capitol on infrastructure and technologies that use up waning resources at alarming rates, further degrading an already beleaguered environment that destabilizes the climate so we can threaten environments and the people who inhabit them anywhere on the globe. That such an option, of saving resources and environment by cooperating to solve challenges we all face, has never been considered calls into question not only the validity of the original EIS but also the principals of democracy by which we purport to live.</p>

#	Name	Comment
032	<p>Beata Tsosie-Peña,</p> <p>David F. García,</p> <p>Luis J. Peña,</p> <p>Michelle Peixinho and Jessica Frechette-Gutfreund, Española Valley Women's Health,</p> <p>Rosalía Triana, Una Resolana</p> <p>Enrique Martínez, Una Resolana</p> <p>Rudolfo and Isis Serna, Mutant Root Artist Collaborative,</p> <p>Ann Hunkins, TWU's Environmental Justice Focus Group,</p> <p>Clarissa A. Duran, CSO del Norte/Una Resolana</p> <p>Jennette Bando, TWU's Environmental Justice Focus Group,</p> <p>Angela Moreno, Indigenous Women's Health Program,</p> <p>Young Women United</p> <p>Kathryn Sherlock on behalf of Santa Fe RESULTS</p> <p>Anjali Taneja MD MPH</p>	<p>In regards to the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement we, as members of downwind and downriver impacted communities, request that all construction and work on the new CMRR is halted until a new Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is released, reviewed, and communicated to the impacted populations. As the surrounding communities health and well being is directly affected by the environmental consequences of such a facility, there needs to be a significant increase in the way that we are receiving information, opportunities for direct input, and direct involvement in decision making procedures. Additional scoping meetings need to be held in every community within a 100-mile radius of Los Alamos National Labs, Sandia National Labs, the WIPP sites, and in Uranium mining communities both in state and out of state. Public comment should be allowed as ongoing throughout the finalization of this process considering the changes in size, scope and cost of the proposed CMRR facility. We also request that more in-depth and comprehensive responses to all public comments are published alongside each other on the website and in the new EIS in order to facilitate understanding and to maintain transparency on the actual impact of these comments.</p> <p>It is vital that the state permits LANL will be applying for, and those they are exempt from, be included in the new EIS; with specific information therein regarding what will be released into the environment on a daily/regular basis. Information needs to be included that details the longevity of any radioactive or other toxins that will be released as a result of this new building. The lifespan of this facility (and the old one) must be taken into account in order to assess not only short term releases but also include the plan for decommissioning the building and/or improving it in 50 years, and what will be done with the waste generated in that time. Financial assurance needs to be guaranteed so that our communities are guaranteed cleanup, containment, disposal and treatment of accidental and/or routine releases and exposures. We request a complete analysis of what support facilities, as well as their capacity and capabilities, will be needed for the proposed CMRR, including the cost and any additional environmental impacts or changes as a result of the need for this increased support. Similar to what happened to the communities at the Trinity site, where there was no plan in place to determine the impacts on local populations, and who now face cancer rates four times the national average, their needs to be solid information that ensures there will be <i>zero harm</i> on our well being as a result of this industry.</p> <p>We, as members of impacted communities, oppose the compartmentalization of public commentary. Of major concern is how comments are labeled as being "beyond the scope of the CMRR- EIS", because this does not leave room for our worldview and knowledge held by land-based people, regarding the holistic implications of what is being done to THEIR LAND. In addition to not holding equal value to the knowledge and contributions of local communities, the manner in which the technical material is presented, only serves to disenfranchise a population suffering from economic, social, educational and linguistic disparities. This is documented in the CMRR- EIS public comments that reference that more time is needed for comment, community education and outreach, and comprehensive, in-depth health studies. Another problematic factor is the methodology in which the public's comments were responded to. The comments were superficially abstracted, and the commenter's were instructed to refer back to the EIS document. This sort of response allowed for a one-dimensional understanding of what the commenter's were asking or stating. Much of the cultural commentary was disregarded and never addressed in this summarization. It trivialized their statements, concerns, and inquiries about the EIS by responding in a way that directed them back to the document. This serves to end dialogue rather than enhance it, and denies the public a meaningful response to their comments. It inappropriately patronizes the general population, and unfairly discredits the knowledge bases of our community experts on these matters.</p> <p>Based on the findings in the Los Alamos Historical Document and Retrieval Assessment report (LAHDRA), which states that airborne plutonium releases in early production years at LANL exceed those of Hanford, Rocky Flats, and Savannah River combined, making us the most polluted nuclear site in the nation. This fact warrants LANL's immediate action on legacy waste clean up before any new facility can be built that will only add to this contamination. We are in support of Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety and Nuclear Watch New Mexico's statement that, "The Department of Energy (DOE) must explain the impacts of diverting funds away from cleanup, renewable energy, and nonproliferation programs at LANL for a new manufacturing facility for plutonium pits or "triggers" for nuclear weapons called the CMRR."</p> <p>A new EIS statement will only be relevant if the current standard of reference for determining safe levels of exposure to both workers and the general population is discontinued. This current standard is based on "reference man", a hypothetical male model which endangers the majority of the population in its' limitations. This standard does not protect women, children, the elderly, people of color, the unborn fetus, or any other demographic that falls outside of these narrow parameters from harm. If the agencies responsible for the EIS continue to use these inadequate ways of measuring contamination, then it endangers and threatens local populations. This model of reference is limited in its' focus on male human life. The new EIS report needs to factor in the impacts on the plant, insect, and animal communities with whom we share a delicate ecology. Our water, air and soil health are vital considerations that need to be included in any revised impact</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>statements.</p> <p>In addition, the current EIS standards of measurement are unsatisfactory because it does not include impacts of multiple exposures to radiological, toxic, and hazardous materials. The unique pathways of exposure that land-based people face as a result of growing and harvesting our own food, hunting, fishing, gathering wild plant-life, being outdoors for longer periods of time, livelihoods that include ranching, pottery, woodwork, natural pigments, the harvesting of forest materials, drinking, bathing, and irrigating with water, harvesting rainwater, breathing air, and ceremonial cultural practices within the pueblos all need to be analyzed, considered and respected. This needs to be done by creating meaningful dialogue and processes with local communities.</p> <p>We have stated reasons for the new EIS, but feel it is also necessary to express our opposition for the need for a new CMRR building in the first place. The cost is too high, historical impacts and legacy waste have yet to be addressed, and the region is unsuitable seismically, geographically, and culturally for the continuation of the nuclear industry in the Jemez Mountain Plateau. We hope and pray that LANL may shift its focus from an industry whose core is based on destructive values and a culture of violence to one that respects the sustainability of life.</p> <p>As people who live in the shadow of this industry and who do not share its values, we ask that LANL's shift in mission begin with open dialogue and sincere consideration of our requests and concerns. Let this shift in mission begin with recognizing that this new facility is not needed or wanted here. We pray that our concerns are not trivialized and silenced as has been done in the past, and that we can continue living here, while healing from the damage that has already been enacted upon us. We look forward to furthering this discussion and to creative solutions to this issue that we are all affected by and involved in together.</p>
033	Liz Woodruff and Alicia Dressman on behalf of Think Outside the Bomb National Youth Network	<p>Think Outside the Bomb is a national youth anti-nuclear network representing hundreds of young people working for nuclear disarmament. We have held conferences nationwide over the past seven years. In our national campaign last August we joined in solidarity with New Mexicans who oppose the new plutonium pit facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory, the CMRR. This letter represents one of many we have submitted over the last year relevant to the licensing of the proposed CMRR. Please also see the attached list of demands we presented to LANL, during our non-violent demonstration at the current CMR facility on August 6th, 2010. This listing will give you a broader context for understanding the following comments.</p> <p>If the National Nuclear Security Administration is to aspire to stewardship of the environment and taxpayer money, it should <i>write a new EIS for the proposed CMRR Nuclear Facility and strongly consider the addition of a new alternative, not building the CMRRNF</i>. The dilemma is multifold, including cost estimates of \$4.5 billion which has prompted Secretary of Energy Chu to call for an independent review panel of the need for the proposed facility. A majority of the cost estimate is attributed to strategies for reinforcing CMRR against seismic activity. <i>The only strategy to neutralize the threat is eliminating the mission of plutonium production</i>. LANL is already grappling with the issue of environmental remediation, and yet creating future waste streams from plutonium pit production continues to be treated as inconsequential.</p> <p>This is most aggrieving to the citizenry which will bear the consequences of past, current, and proposed environmental negligence. Thus far, the voice of the community in Espanola, NM and the entire area surrounding LANL has been marginalized in the decision-making process. This warrants additional hearings in the public interest. <i>Regulatory processes evaluating the proposed CMRR must look to Environmental Justice through both economic and ethnicity analyses in a new EIS and all regulatory processes must provide ample opportunity for public comment, impact and influence from indigenous, Latino and youth in the area.</i></p> <p>Time and time again LANL has demonstrated irreverence for fiscal conservatism and common sense. This is particularly evident in the CMRR project, which disregards the issue of future waste disposal in light of ongoing concerns with legacy waste management. With insufficient space to accommodate future burial at LANL, the waste must be shipped offsite, putting communities at risk on the transport route. In a position paper, "Intrastate and Interstate Transportation of Spent Nuclear Fuel is a Public Health Risk," The American Public Health Association "encourages efforts by congress to discontinue the production of nuclear waste that must be stored or transported and the research and development of new nuclear technologies." <i>Resolving the issue of waste disposal comes before expediting the CMRR project.</i></p> <p>In light of these concerns, we urge you to cut the plutonium mission of the CMRR project. We call for a public hearing in Espanola, NM, so that the people of New Mexico living in the immediate vicinity of the Laboratory may have an opportunity to comment on the danger of continued plutonium work at Los Alamos.</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>Cleanup of Existing Legacy Waste Must Be the Priority – Not a New Nuclear Facility - DOE made a commitment to clean up the legacy waste sites at LANL when it signed the Consent Order with the New Mexico Environment Department on March 1, 2005. The Order requires cleanup of certain sites by December 31, 2015, including the Area G dump site at Technical Area 54. Clean up must be a funding priority. Construction activities for a new NF will interfere with cleanup activities, including those at the nearby Material Disposal Area C. DOE must make compliance with the Order the priority – not a new NF.</p> <p>New Alternatives Are Required – DOE must return to the drawing board in order to develop more alternatives, including not building the NF; stop operations at the old, dangerous CMR Building; and conduct a “capacity study” to determine whether the existing facilities – as they have since 1999 when DOE limited plutonium pit manufacturing to 20 per year - can be used instead of building the proposed NF. All analyses of alternatives must incorporate the new 200,000 square foot Radiological Laboratory/Utility/Office Building (RLUOB) in the review. Operations for the RLUOB are scheduled to begin in less than two years.</p> <p><u>Requisite Analyses for the New Environment Impact Statement:</u></p> <p>1. Environmental Justice – Both Economic and Ethnicity Analyses Must Be Done - Los Alamos County is one of the richest counties in the U.S.A. It is surrounded by some of the poorest and most ethnically diverse counties in the country. Therefore, shipping any type of waste to anywhere else is an inherent environmental justice issue. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS.</p> <p>2. Health Effects for Those Most at Risk - Many federal standards for protection of human health, such as limits on emissions from the proposed CMRR-NF industrial stacks, are based on "Reference Man," a hypothetical Caucasian male 20 to 30 years old weighing 154 pounds. All analyses must address the risk to a pregnant woman farmer, her fetus, and her other children under age 18, rather than Reference Man. As a matter of reproductive and environmental justice, the most vulnerable human beings must be protected. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS.</p> <p>3. Waste Disposal - To Use DOE Terminology: What is the “Path Forward?” - Given the anticipated lack of disposal facilities for low-level radioactive, toxic, and hazardous waste at LANL, DOE must detail where its legacy and newly generated waste will be disposed and how it will be transported to off-site facilities. DOE must detail the proposed transportation modes and routes and the impacts to the communities along the routes and those surrounding the dumps. What emergency preparedness capabilities exist along the proposed routes?</p> <p>4. Water Usage in the Face of Stricter Limits Asked By DOE – DOE estimated in the 2003 Final CMRR EIS that waste generation may double and the annual water consumption may increase by 10.4 million gallons. Why should a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified building generate any waste, emit contaminants into the air, or discharge contaminated water into the canyons? With water being a highest value resource, DOE must <i>anticipate</i>, explain and justify the consequences of its use of water. DOE must explain these contradictions in the new draft EIS.</p> <p>5. Climate Change Impacts Required – “Just-Do-It” - On February 18, 2010, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) released draft guidance for public comment about how “Federal agencies can improve their consideration of the effects of greenhouse gas GHG emissions and climate change in their evaluation of proposals for Federal actions under the NEPA.” While the guidance is being finalized, the CEQ recommends “just-doing-it.” DOE must conduct such analyses in the new draft EIS.</p> <p>6. Methods for Decontamination, Decommissioning and Demolition (DD&D) of the Existing CMR Building and the Proposed New NF - The 2004 Record of Decision (ROD) for the CMRR Project stated the existing CMR building would be Decontamination and Decommissioning and Disposal (DD&D) in its entirety. However, the actual implementation of these decisions is dependent on DOE funding levels and allocations of the DOE budget across competing priorities, including construction of a new NF. The DD&D Work Plan must be part of the new draft EIS in order to ensure that it becomes part of the complete National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analyses. Further, the new draft EIS that will analyze the impacts of building a new NF must also examine the impacts of removing it.</p>

#	Name	Comment
038	Stephen Gilbert	<p>I am writing to provide you with my scoping comments about the CMRR Project, which includes the Nuclear Facility (NF), the proposed addition to LANL's nuclear weapons production complex. The alternatives proposed in the 2003 final CMRR environmental impact statement (EIS) are no longer applicable today. It's time to start over and re-examine the purpose and need for the Project by preparing a <u>new</u> EIS. Further, it is premature to begin the scoping process when Secretary Chu has asked for an independent expert committee to review the need for the CMRR-NF.</p> <p>I request 120 days to provide comments about the draft CMRR EIS. Public hearings on the draft EIS should be held in surrounding communities, including Albuquerque, Española, Santa Fe, Taos, and White Rock.</p> <p>The Costs of Trying to Build a Plutonium Pit Production Complex in a Geologically Unstable Area Are Just Too High - The total original estimate for the CMRR Project, including the recently completed \$363 million Radiological Laboratory Utility and Office Building (RLUOB), was around \$600 million in 2004. The current estimate is \$4.5 billion. The estimate, no doubt, will continue to climb.</p> <p>LANL is located between a rift valley (the Rio Grande in that area) and a volcanic range (the Jemez Mountains) in a seismic fault zone (the Pajarito Plateau). An updated seismic hazards analysis was published in May 2007. It showed a potential huge increase in seismic ground motion and activity. In all likelihood, most of the over \$3 billion in cost estimate increases since 2008 are due to efforts to address the increased seismic hazards. \$3 billion is too high a premium to pay for a new NF. In order to address these increased seismic hazards, DOE now plans to excavate 225,000 cubic yards of earth under the proposed NF and fill the hole with concrete. DOE must address the following questions: Is the surrounding geology robust enough to support all that concrete? Would a seismic event cause the concrete "slab" to sink or shift? This proposed solution is ludicrous by any reasonable standards.</p> <p>Cleanup of the Existing Mess Must Be the Priority – Not a New Nuclear Facility - DOE made a commitment to clean up the legacy waste sites at LANL when it signed the Consent Order with the New Mexico Environment Department on March 1, 2005. The Order requires cleanup of certain sites by December 31, 2015, including the Area G unlined dump site at Technical Area 54. Construction activities for a new NF will interfere with cleanup activities, including those at the nearby Material Disposal Area C. DOE must make compliance with the Order the priority – not a new NF.</p> <p>New Alternatives Are Required – DOE must return to the drawing board in order to develop more alternatives, including not building the NF; stop operations at the old, dangerous CMR Building; and conduct a "capacity study" to determine whether the existing facilities – as they have since 1999 when DOE limited plutonium pit manufacturing to 20 per year - can be used instead of building the proposed NF. All analyses of alternatives must incorporate the new 200,000 square foot RLUOB in the review. Operations for the RLUOB are scheduled to begin in less than two years.</p> <p><u>Requisite Analyses for the New Environment Impact Statement:</u></p> <p>1. Environmental Justice – Both Economic and Ethnicity Analyses Must Be Done - Los Alamos County is one of the richest counties in the U.S.A. It is surrounded by some of the poorest and most ethnically diverse counties in the country. Therefore, shipping any type of waste to anywhere else is an inherent environmental justice issue. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS.</p> <p>2. Health Effects for Those Most at Risk - Many federal standards for protection of human health, such as limits on emissions from the proposed CMRR-NF industrial stacks, are based on "Reference Man," a hypothetical Caucasian male 20 to 30 years old weighing 154 pounds. All analyses must address the risk to a pregnant woman farmer, her fetus, and her other children under age 18, rather than Reference Man. As a matter of reproductive and environmental justice, the most potentially vulnerable human beings must be protected. Such analyses</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>must be completed in the new draft EIS.</p> <p>3. Waste Disposal - To Use DOE Terminology: What is the “Path Forward?” - Given the anticipated lack of disposal facilities for low-level radioactive, toxic, and hazardous waste at LANL, DOE must detail where its legacy and newly generated waste will be disposed and how it will be transported to off-site facilities. DOE must detail the proposed transportation modes and routes and the impacts to the communities along the routes and those surrounding the dumps. What emergency preparedness capabilities exist along the proposed routes?</p> <p>4. Water Usage in the Face of Stricter Limits Asked By DOE – DOE estimated in the 2003 Final CMRR EIS that waste generation may double and the annual water consumption may increase by 10.4 million gallons. Why should a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified building generate any waste, emit contaminants into the air, or discharge contaminated water into the canyons? Los Alamos is in a ‘high desert’, ‘semi arid zone’, with severely limited water supply. The recent discovery in a monitoring well on LANL property of hexavalent chromium due to water use in a LANL cooling tower, at a level four times the maximum EPA allowed for human consumption does not bode well for LANL’s care and consideration of the local aquifer. DOE must explain these contradictions in the new draft EIS.</p> <p>5. Climate Change Impacts Required – “Just-Do-It” - On February 18, 2010, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) released draft guidance for public comment about how “Federal agencies can improve their consideration of the effects of greenhouse gas GHG emissions and climate change in their evaluation of proposals for Federal actions under the NEPA.” While the guidance is being finalized, the CEQ recommends “just-doing-it.” DOE must conduct such analyses in the new draft EIS.</p> <p>6. Methods for Decontamination, Decommissioning and Demolition (DD&D) of the Existing CMR Building and the Proposed New NF - The 2004 Record of Decision (ROD) for the CMRR Project stated the existing CMR building would be DD&D in its entirety. However, the actual implementation of these decisions is dependent on DOE funding levels and allocations of the DOE budget across competing priorities, including construction of a new NF. The DD&D Work Plan must be part of the new draft EIS in order to ensure that it becomes part of the complete National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analyses. Further, the new draft EIS that will analyze the impacts of building a new NF must also examine the impacts of removing it. Considering the age and use of this facility, processing plutonium for many years, the costs may be quite astronomical.</p>
040	Erich Kuerschner	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the CMRR.</p> <p>It is my position that the increase in projected cost, from the last time alternatives were compared and an Environmental Impact Statement [EIS] completed is of such magnitude (\$600M to ~ \$4.5B) that nothing else needs to be said in terms of an EIS being mandated.</p> <p>It would be highly unlikely that ANY investment whose costs had increased by that magnitude would still be the most appropriate alternative. In that sense doing an EIS Supplement, focusing only on how to mitigate the impacts of what might once have been the most appropriate investment, without considering is a waste of everyone’s time, and would result in a large waste of taxpayer dollars.</p> <p>Once the decision has been made to study the most reasonable alternatives, I would be most happy to participate, and spend time articulating the details of how the impacts, particularly the economic impacts, might best be studied to reveal the full menu of options available, and the costs and benefits that might be expected from each of the reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>I have little to no interest in spending time on an alternative that could not possibly be the most appropriate one.</p> <p>I thank you, and your staff, for all the thought and effort you have expended in making available your understanding of this project to me personally. I look forward to continuing the dialogue, but in a more meaningful format, as mandated by NEPA, in a new EIS. After all, Sect 1504.12 of the Implementing Regulations states:</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>Sec. 1502.14 Alternatives including the proposed action.</p> <p><i>This section is the heart of the environmental impact statement. Based on the information and analysis presented in the sections on the Affected Environment (Sec. 1502.15) and the Environmental Consequences (Sec. 1502.16), it should present the environmental impacts of the proposal and the alternatives in comparative form, thus sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice among options by the decisionmaker and the public. In this section agencies shall:</i></p> <p><i>(a) Rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, and for alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated.</i></p> <p><i>(b) Devote substantial treatment to each alternative considered in detail including the proposed action so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits.</i></p> <p><i>(c) Include reasonable alternatives not within the jurisdiction of the lead agency.</i></p> <p><i>(d) Include the alternative of no action.</i></p> <p><i>(e) Identify the agency's preferred alternative or alternatives, if one or more exists, in the draft statement and identify such alternative in the final statement unless another law prohibits the expression of such a preference.</i></p> <p><i>(f) Include appropriate mitigation measures not already included in the proposed action or alternatives.</i></p> <p>I have the utmost faith in the NEPA process. I worked on my first EIS in 1972 as a staff economist for the Skidmore Owings and Merrill Environmental Study Group headed by Howard McKee. His leadership is still recognized as a model for how to do an EIS, and was perhaps the first case where the preferred (and adopted) solution was sub item (c), an alternative “not within the jurisdiction of the lead agency” [in this case, the Federal Highway Department]. Ironically enough, Howard , whose obituary I would also like to be placed into the record, was the partner of Mike Keiser, the developer of the “Bandon Dunes” golf course, the inadvertent poster boy for David Kay Johnson’s “<u>Free Lunch: How the Wealthiest Americans Enrich Themselves at Government Expense (and Stick You With the Bill)</u>”. I mention all this to give an indication of the extent of the problem we face, and the people determined to get us back on track.</p> <p>Attachment: Howard McKee obituary</p> <p>Attachment 1:</p> <p>Howard Lee McKee of Chicago, Ill., and Cascade Head, Ore., died on Dec. 8, 2007, after a long battle with colon cancer.</p> <p>He was born in Charleston, W. Va., on Oct. 27, 1939, the youngest child of William Howard McKee and Millie Jane Cline. Howard attended public schools in Charleston and Columbia University in New York City, earning a bachelor's degree in economics, a Master of Arts in architecture and a Master of Arts in urban design. Immediately after his university studies, Howard was hired by the architectural firm of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill (SOM). His first assignment was in Washington, D.C., where he worked on the redesign of Pennsylvania Avenue. At SOM, Howard focused on the broader questions of architecture, including whether a building met the different purposes and</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>functions it would serve and how it would fit into the surrounding environment. He worked on major design projects in Baltimore, Md., where his attention to land use and urban design contributed to the elimination of a freeway in the Inner Harbor area; in Saudi Arabia, where he was on the team that designed the city of Yanbu; and at the Esalen Institute in California where he redesigned the campus.</p> <p>In 1971, Howard transferred to the Portland office of SOM where he headed the Environmental Studies group. He brought an outside perspective to Oregon and led a design team that would challenge conventional thinking. He was a major contributor to the Mount Hood Freeway design team that ultimately defeated the plan for the inner city freeway. The team worked closely with the Oregon and Portland governments to design a plan that preserved the natural and agricultural resources within the urban environment. Tasked with finding solutions to the city's transportation needs, Howard and his team created the Portland light rail system and the Portland Transit Mall, innovations in urban transportation that are models for city planners around the country. As part of this effort, Howard helped to draft Oregon's famous land-use law, still in effect today. According to Greg Baldwin, prominent Portland architect, Howard's work in Portland represented a key characteristic of the 1970s, "that of making tough decisions, and then designing and executing a series of policies and projects that made those decisions not only right, but essential to our well being as a community."</p> <p>Moving to Chicago in 1984, Howard joined the design team for the proposed 1992 World's Fair, planned as a celebration for the centennial of the 1893 Chicago World's Fair. Although Illinois scrapped the plan for the fair in 1987, Howard and his team made a major contribution to the city by rerouting the Lake Shore Drive artery and designing open green space around the museum campuses, creating the beautiful waterfront drive around Lake Michigan. In 1988, Howard left SOM to do independent design work, including projects in Russia where the post-perestroika government was making an effort to renovate historic buildings. At the same time, he joined forces with Michael Keiser of Chicago, to create the great American links golf course, Bandon Dunes, Oregon. Bandon Dunes is truly the legacy left by Howard McKee. As Keiser's partner from the concept stage and throughout the ongoing development, Howard was responsible for locating the land on the south coast of Oregon, an area of "breath-taking beauty," in his own words. He led the team that secured the necessary land permits and designed every structure in the vast resort. For the past 20 years, Howard has been devoted to what he called the "soul work" of creating a resort that allowed a genuine experience for golfers, a resort settled into the environment, a pure challenge, uncluttered by manmade amenities. When the first course opened in 1999, Howard explained, "The vision was malleable, but the principles don't change. It's honoring the land. It's building on the natural environment here that gets discovered if you spend time with it. The key is not to violate it." Steve Goodwin, author of "Dream Golf," described Howard in this way: "He is an unusual mixture of principles and passions: an intellectual who has a deep respect for nature and the supernatural, a man of science who puts a premium on the work of the imagination, a rationalist who never forgets the mysteries of the psyche. He is a high-minded thinker who loves to putter around on his property and to work with his hands, a philosopher who likes to sweat. He is a serious man who laughs easily and uproariously. He sometimes comes across as a hard-nosed realist, at other times as a New Age dreamer and a bit of a woo-woo. Those who worked with him weren't always able to pin him down philosophically, but they were in agreement on two of Howard's most conspicuous traits. One, his intellectual curiosity was voracious, and whenever a subject interested him, he learned it inside out and upside down. Two, he was brilliant; he could think and talk circles around most people, but he did so in a way that made them feel flattered to be in a conversation with him."</p>

#	Name	Comment
042	Bob Walsh	<p>I respectfully submit this comment on the needed scope of the <i>Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Nuclear Facility Portion of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building Replacement Project at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), Los Alamos, New Mexico</i>. I would appreciate its serious consideration by the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and look forward to the agency's comprehensive response.</p> <p>The scope should include the environmental impact from transportation accidents, particularly aircraft accidents. I was the lead on the safety analysis for a proposed storage arrangement at Pantex. That site is not only under a takeoff pattern from the Amarillo airport, but it is also close to a location used as a reference by long-distance flights. We concluded that (1) that the risk from long-distance flights was greater than the risk from the local airport and (2) that the impact was potentially very significant, depending among other things on the wind direction. The proposed storage arrangement was abandoned.</p> <p>Our analysis was specified to exclude security threats. However, because our report contained information that could guide a terrorist attack, it was classified. That was before the September 2001 incident in New York City.</p> <p>Clearly your EIS should consider both accidents and intentional acts. We had good confidence in our methodology for accident frequency and wind probability. However, we had great uncertainty about both the effects of a jet fuel burn on the contents and the distribution of entrained material by the wind.</p> <p>At a recent public meeting, a representative of LANL was touting the new facility. Asked whether the EIS had considered aircraft accidents, he assured the audience that military ground vehicles with machine guns would shoot down any approaching aircraft. I took that to mean that aircraft accidents had not been considered seriously.</p>
043	Virginia J. Miller	<p>I am calling for a new Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the CMRR-NF at LANL. The current SEIS is inadequate to the task and the alternatives in the 2003 EIS are no longer relevant. There have been too many changes, including the Presidential vision of a nuclear weapons free world. The existing Nuclear Facility is working with a production rate of less than ten plutonium pits per year. No new nuclear pits are needed. The existing nuclear stockpile will last for many years, while the U.S. and the rest of the world disarms. DOE must justify why a \$4.5 billion new NF is needed. It is a waste of our tax dollars desperately needed elsewhere, including the priority of cleanup at LANL to help protect our water which increasingly will come from the Rio Grande.</p> <p>Both economic and ethnicity analysis is needed regarding environmental justice. Analysis must protect those most at risk. All analysis must address the risk to a pregnant woman farmer, her fetus, and her other children under age 18, rather than Reference Man. As a matter of reproductive and environmental justice, the most potentially vulnerable human beings must be protected.</p> <p>Expanded plutonium pit production diverts resources from other more important work, including mission diversification addressing today's real national security threats of nonproliferation, energy independence and conservation, benign cleanup technologies and global warming; non-nuclear solutions that will not increase production of dangerous nuclear waste and storage. Our present waste processing and disposal facilities are failing. DOE must fully analyze all alternatives if these facilities are not available, including no construction of the NF. Waste treatment alternatives must be analyzed.</p> <p>What does LEED certified mean when waste generation continues, as well as air emissions and discharges to canyons which flow to the Rio Grande? I also want analysis of climate change impacts from this project to be required.</p> <p>Any analysis must include the decontamination, decommissioning and demolition (DD&D) of the existing CMR building and the source of funding to carry it out.</p> <p>The cost of trying to build a plutonium pit factory in a geologically unstable area is way too high and Mother Nature is much more powerful. The updated seismic hazards analysis published May 2007 showed a potential huge increase in seismic ground motion and activity. It is insane to move forward with NF at LANL!</p> <p>DOE must address the cumulative impacts from past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions on the 50-mile radii surrounding DOE facilities and missions. DOE must be specific about potential impacts to water, air and soil, environmental justice, transportation, economics (including tourism), emergency preparedness, and waste generation.</p> <p>We don't need a new NF!!! Thank you for your attention. Please pay attention!!!</p> <p>PEACE</p>

#	Name	Comment
044	Ralph Hutchison on behalf of the Oak Ridge Environmental Peace Alliance	<p>The first and most fundamental analysis required in an Environmental Impact Statement is the purpose and need for the proposed action. For a project such as the proposed Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement Nuclear Facility, which has grown in scope and expense since it was first proposed, the need for justification of the facility grows in proportion to the cost of the facility the cost in dollars and the cost in security.</p> <p>The CMRR-NF is now projected to have construction costs of at least \$4 billion and lifetime operating costs considerably higher.</p> <p>While the SEIS presumes the facility is necessary based on the original statement of purpose and need, this presumption can not be incorporated into the SEIS. In late October 2010, Secretary of Energy Chu indicated the purpose and need for the CMRR-NF is not firmly established; he has ordered an independent review of both the CMRR-NF and its sister facility, the proposed Uranium Processing Facility in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. The SEIS should not proceed until the full report of the independent review is prepared and published, and the public has an opportunity to review the report and any associated supporting documentation; at that time, DOE/NNSA should hold a public hearing to receive the publics response to the revised statement of purpose and need, reflecting at least two fundamental questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should any CMRR-NF be built when Los Alamos National Laboratory already has sufficient capacity for plutonium pit production to meet the mission requirements for Stockpile Stewardship and Management? 2. If a CMRR-NF is found to be necessary, what capacity is justified by the findings of the independent review since no reasonable future stockpile scenario (projected for the operational lifetime of the CMRR-NF) requires a pit production capacity of 80 warheads/year? <p>The policy costs of the CMRR-NF may be even more critical than the economic cost. The proposed CMRR-NF, combined with the proposed UPF and the new Kansas City Plant, will expand current US warhead production capacity far beyond any reasonable level required for stockpile surveillance and Life Extension missions. Expanding warhead production capacity in the guise of modernization will undermine US efforts to constrain nuclear proliferation around the globe. It is no exaggeration to say a likely consequence will be a new global arms racenot only increased modernization efforts by current nuclear weapons states, but the pursuit of nuclear capabilities by additional nations who, in light of provocative US action (massive investment in new production capacity), will lose faith in the US disarmament commitment contained in Article 6 of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.</p> <p>This costthe proliferation impact of expanding US warhead production capacity, should be included in the analysis prepared for the CMRR-NF and the UPF. In the past, the Department of Energy has provided this analysis for other projects that were reasonably foreseen to impact US nonproliferation efforts, including the National Ignition Facility, the Stockpile Stewardship and Management program, and the return of spent fuel from foreign research reactors. As noted in a 2009 briefing in Washington, DC by Ambassador Robert Grey, former US Ambassador to the Conference on Disarmament, a double standard, whereby the United States increases its weapons production capacity in the name of modernization while denying the right of other nations to pursue nuclear capabilities, is untenable. Ambassador Greys analysis squares with common sense and is irrefutablecontinued reliance on a robust nuclear arsenal by the United States not only violates our 1970 commitment in the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty to pursue in good faith negotiations leading to disarmament at an early date, and not only undermines US stated nonproliferation goals in theory, it actively compels nations such as Iran to pursue nuclear capabilities in an effort to deter attacks by hostile nations which possess nuclear weapons (the United States and Israel, to name two).</p> <p>Any thoroughgoing independent review will raise this issue though it runs counter to the official position of the directors of the National Labs and the weapons production facilities. In fact, the recognition of this policy dilemma will be one measure of the credibility of the independent review commissioned by Secretary Chu.</p> <p>A second measure of credibility for the independent review will be its assessment of the production capacity requirements of the US stockpile stewardship and management program. According to knowledgeable weapons experts, the current Life Extension Program mission requires a capacity to produce a maximum of eleven warheads/year and can probably be reliably accomplished at a capacity of 5 warheads/year. This number is far below the projected capacity of the CMRR-NF and the UPF (currently 80 warheads/year).</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>At a capacity requirement of 12 warheads/year or less, the need for the CMRR-NF evaporates; the current pit production capacity at LANL is 20 warheads/year, nearly double the capacity required for a rigorous stockpile maintenance program, including Life Extension.</p> <p>Given this fact, the question now becomes one of efficient use of resources and the protection of workers and the environment, and can be asked simply: Can any environmental, safety and health deficiencies in existing facilities be satisfactorily resolved at a price less than \$4 billion dollars?</p> <p>The answer, in the case of CMRR-NF (as well as the UPF in Oak Ridge) is unquestionably Yes.</p> <p>So we conclude: the nation does not need, nor can it afford, a new \$4 billion plutonium pit production facility at Los Alamos. From a proliferation policy standpoint, the proposed CMRR-NF is dramatically oversized and will serve as a provocation to other states. From an economic standpoint, a new facility will exceed the cost of upgrades to existing facilities by several orders of magnitude.</p> <p>The plan for the CMRR-NF has changed profoundly since it was first proposed; its scope, size and cost have expanded. At the same time, US nuclear policy and the world around us has also changed President Obama has committed the United States to a vision of a world free of nuclear weapons and the nations of the world have indicated they are approaching the end of their patience with the failure of nuclear weapons states to achieve their commitments under Article 6 of the NPT. This change faces us in the opposite direction of the proposed oversized modernization plans of the DOE/NNSA.</p> <p>The impact of the new reality on the purpose and need for the CMRR-NF is inescapable, and the SEIS should reflect the rapidly diminishing need for an oversized, overpriced CMRR-NF whose purpose can be met at less cost to the environment, to the pocketbook of the nation, and to the security of the world.</p>
045	Brenda Blume	<p>I am very worried about this proposal. I will be getting my drinking water downstream from Los Alamos as well as all of Santa Fe and the possibility of radiation in the water that we will drink is too great.</p> <p>Los Alamos is in the mountains where severe weather is not uncommon and the roads get icy and dangerous. Driving trucks with plutonium on those roads is stupid.</p> <p>Our economy is weak and there is talk of not being able to provide services to the poor because there is no money. I work for NM state government and worry that I could loose my job because of the poor economy. Invest in us the people not in making bombs.</p> <p>Find a place that is not in the mountains and has easy access to safe transportation and already ready has buildings to make the pits if you must make them. Perhaps military bases would be a good place.</p>
046	Scott Yundt and Marylia Kelley	<p>Tri-Valley CAREs is a non-profit organization founded in 1983 by Livermore, California area residents to research and conduct public education and advocacy regarding the potential environmental, health and proliferation impacts of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and other sites in the U.S. nuclear weapons complex.</p> <p>Due to concerns in our community about the negative environmental, health, non-proliferation, economic and security implications of increasing U.S. nuclear weapons production capabilities, Tri-Valley CAREs submits the following scoping comments for the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement-Nuclear Facility (CMRR-NF) on behalf of its 5,600 members, including members who have moved to NM.</p> <p>Tri-Valley CAREs is very concerned about the proposed addition to LANL's nuclear weapons production complex, especially the CMRR-NF. Since the original 2003 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the facility, significant conditions have changed and/or been proposed for the U.S. nuclear weapons complex, including but not limited to those related to the New START treaty, which may be ratified in</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>the near future.</p> <p>Tri-Valley CAREs believes that a full re-examination of the "purpose and need" under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the CMRR-NF is necessary. This should be accomplished through the preparation of a new EIS. It is of concern to us that a Supplemental EIS is an insufficient vehicle for re-examination of "purpose and need." A Supplemental EIS is also insufficient given the expanded scope of the CMRR-NF.</p> <p>Further, it is premature to conduct the scoping process pursuant to a Supplemental EIS when Dept. of Energy (DOE) Secretary Chu has asked for an independent expert committee to review the "need" for the CMRR-NF.</p> <p>At a minimum, this present public scoping process should not end before that Secretarial review is completed and made public. Moreover, the Secretary's review should become (a) part of the DOE National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) consideration of whether a full EIS or a Supplemental EIS is undertaken and (b) part of the Administrative Record in either event.</p> <p>In the event the DOE NNSA decides to proceed with a full EIS or proceeds with this Supplemental EIS, the following comments on the scope of that review apply:</p> <p>1. Other Reasonable Alternatives are Required in the Pending NEPA Document (Whether an EIS or Supplemental EIS).</p> <p>The Notice of Intent to prepare this Supplemental EIS contains three options: the so-called "no action" alternative (which is to build the CMRR-NF and its ancillary and support activities per the old EIS Record of Decision), an Alternative 1 (which is to continue to use the CMR Building with no facility upgrades beyond routine maintenance), and Alternative 2 (similar to Alternative 1 but with extensive CMR upgrades).</p> <p>The decision whether to construct and operate a new CMRR-NF does not (and should not) hinge on the substantial, continued use of the old CMR Building for decades to come.</p> <p>Tri-Valley CAREs is suspicious that DOE NNSA has constructed the above-listed alternatives in such a manner as to facilitate declaring in the final document that major programmatic activities in CMR for decades to come is not a good solution and, therefore, the only option is to proceed with the full CMRR-NF as planned. In reality, that's a "Hobson's Choice" and there are reasonable alternatives that do not depend on either a new CMRR-NF or substantial long-term programmatic use of the old CMR.</p> <p>an additional, reasonable option that must be fully analyzed in the pending draft EIS or draft Supplemental EIS.</p> <p>Given that the CMRR Radiological Laboratory Utility and Office Building (RLUOB) is built and is slated to become operational within 2 years, its capabilities must be taken into account. Further, given that the CMRR-NF is not slated to be completed until about 2020, other relevant LANL activities between the present and 2020 must be included in the analysis. (In other words, the issue is not merely what LANL could do differently today, it is what LANL could reasonably do differently by 2020 that must be considered in the NEPA analysis). In this context, LANL's PF-4 must be considered in conjunction with the CMRR RLUOB.</p> <p>That analysis must take into account that PF-4 presently holds equipment that need not stay until 2020, such as the ARIES "pilot project," which was never supposed to be permanent there. Additionally, PF-4, we were told by LANL management, has other space that could be available in the future but which presently holds contaminated plutonium wastes in acid, a waste management issue that is waiting to be dealt with.</p> <p>Therefore, a reasonable alternative could be to devote a small portion of the massive resources that would have been used to construct the CMRR-NF to clean up and clean out the areas in PF-4 that could be made available and pair that capability for "heavy lab" activities with the "light lab" capabilities of the already built CMRR-LUOB.</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>Moreover, there is no demonstrated "need" for LANL to increase its plutonium pit production capability from 20 pits/year to the proposed 50-80 pits/year (or above). We note in this regard that after demonstrating a diamond stamp pit production capability at LANL, about 11 pits were produced - and then in subsequent years pit production has hovered around single digits, according to the numbers that we have been given. (Tri-Valley CAREs does not believe that even 20 pits/year pits are needed, but, in any event, the agency's perceived "need" can be met by 20 pits/year.)</p> <p>Thus, the reasonable alternative analyzing the integrated potential capabilities of PF-4 (in the 2020 time frame) and the CMRR-LUOB, must be considered also in the context of continuing at the current rate of 20 pits/year at LANL, which has been the limit since 1999.</p> <p>The DOE NNSA must also consider as reasonable that significant progress on U.S. and global nuclear disarmament is possible before 2020. This speaks to "purpose and need" of the CMRR-NF as well as its "alternatives." Without such a consideration, billions of tax-payer dollars may be spent on a facility that stymies rather than enhances the opportunities to move forward toward a more safe and sustainable world, free of nuclear weapons.</p> <p>2. The NEPA Process Must Not be Prejudiced or Predetermined, or it is Rendered Legally Deficient.</p> <p>According to NEPA, an EIS must serve as the means of assessing the impacts of a proposed action and alternatives before a commitment to a particular action is made by the lead agency. The EIS must not be a justification of decisions that were made prior to completion of the NEPA analysis. 40 C.F.R. 1502.2(g).</p> <p>DOE NNSA must not prejudice the selection of the proposed action by committing resources prior to the NEPA decision. Whether a draft EIS or Supplemental EIS is prepared, the standard regarding predetermination of outcome by an agency is the same. It is forbidden.</p> <p>DOE NNSA has taken actions to accelerate construction of the CMRR-NF. It combined two project management stages under DOE Order 413.3A of "Approve performance baseline" and "approve start of construction" to expedite the start of construction. It has also come to light that the DOE NNSA divided the project into packages so that construction on some parts could go forward, even if the baseline had not been established for other parts. Additionally, we understand that DOE NNSA has already determined what the footprint of the facility should be and that all future design and construction must conform to those specifications.</p> <p>Additionally, top DOE NNSA officials have been quoted by reputable reporters as stating that the CMRR-NF is essential to agency plans and that the agency is "committed" to completing the CMRR-NF as currently envisioned. How is this not predetermination? The draft EIS or Supplemental EIS must, given the circumstances, go the extra mile in detailing how and why the agency has not predetermined the outcome of the NEPA review before its completion. Moreover, we note that the proof of this must extend beyond mere assertion and be carried through in the analysis of "purpose and need", "alternatives" (and other sections) and be demonstrated in the final decision.</p> <p>3. Cleanup of the Existing Contamination and Waste Management Issues Must Be the Priority at LANL - Not a New CMRR-Nuclear Facility.</p> <p>A legal obligation was undertaken to clean up the legacy waste sites at LANL when the parent agency signed the Consent Order with the New Mexico Environment Department on March 1, 2005. The Order requires cleanup of certain sites by December 31, 2015, including the Area G dump site at Technical Area 54. Construction activities for a new CMRR-NF will interfere with cleanup activities, including those at the nearby Material Disposal Area C. DOE NNSA must make compliance with the Order the priority - and demonstrate how it will achieve that priority in the draft NEPA review.</p> <p>In this regard, and as alluded to in our alternatives comment, the "opportunity" cost of building the CMRR-NF on the unmet cleanup and waste management needs at LANL must be carefully examined.</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>4. A Thorough Analysis of the Expected Costs of the Facility Must be Included.</p> <p>Since the initial EIS, the estimated costs to build this facility have skyrocketed. The total original estimate for the CMRR Project, including the recently completed \$363 million Radiological Laboratory Utility and Office Building, was around \$600 million in 2004. The current estimate is \$4.5 billion. The estimate, we are told, may continue to climb.</p> <p>This huge growth in cost is largely due to the fact that the site is in a geologically unstable area. LANL is located between a rift valley (Rio Grande in that area) and a volcanic range (Jemez Mountains) in a seismic fault zone (the Pajarito Plateau).</p> <p>An updated seismic hazards analysis was published in May 2007. It showed a potential increase in seismic ground motion and activity. What percentage of the more than \$3 billion in recent cost estimate increases are due to efforts to address the increased seismic hazards? DOE NNSA must analyze whether an additional \$3 billion in estimated costs is too high a premium to pay for a new NF. In order to address these increased seismic hazards, DOE NNSA now plans to excavate 225,000 cubic yards of earth under the proposed NF and fill the hole with concrete. DOE NNSA must also address the following: Is the surrounding geology robust enough to support all that concrete? Could a seismic event cause the "slab" to sink or shift? In trying to solve one problem, is another being created?</p> <p>5. Environmental Justice - Both Economic and Ethnicity Analyses Must Be Done.</p> <p>Los Alamos County is one of the richest counties in the U.S. It is surrounded by some of the poorest and most ethnically diverse counties in the country. Therefore, shipping any type of waste to anywhere else is an inherent environmental justice issue. We support our NM colleagues' demand that this analysis must be done in the new draft EIS or draft supplemental EIS.</p> <p>6. Health Effects for Those Most at Risk.</p> <p>Many federal standards for protection of human health, such as limits on emissions from the proposed CMRR-NF industrial stacks, are based on "Reference Man," a hypothetical Caucasian male 20 to 30 years old weighing 154 pounds. All analyses must address the risk to a pregnant woman farmer, her fetus, and her other children under age 18, rather than Reference Man. As a matter of reproductive and environmental justice, the most potentially vulnerable human beings must be protected. As a matter of racial justice, indigenous peoples' (i.e., first Nation) culture and diet must also be considered in determining vulnerability and risk.</p> <p>7. Waste Disposal - To Use DOE Terminology, "What is the "Path Forward?"</p> <p>Given the anticipated lack of disposal facilities for low-level radioactive, toxic, and hazardous waste at LANL, DOE NNSA must detail where its legacy and newly generated waste will be disposed and how it will be transported to off-site facilities. DOE NNSA must analyze the proposed transportation modes and routes and the impacts to the communities along the routes and those surrounding the dumps. What emergency preparedness capabilities exist along the proposed routes?</p> <p>8. Water Usage in the Face of Stricter Limits Asked by DOE.</p> <p>The agency estimated in its 2003 Final CMRR EIS that waste generation may double and the annual water consumption may increase by 10.4 million gallons. Why should a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified building generate waste, emit contaminants into the air, and/or discharge contaminated water into the canyons? DOE NNSA must explain these contradictions.</p> <p>9. Climate Change Impacts Analysis Must be Included</p> <p>On February 18, 2010, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) released draft guidance for public comment about how "Federal</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>agencies can improve their consideration of the effects of greenhouse gas GHG emissions and climate change in their evaluation of proposals for Federal actions under the NEPA." While the guidance is being finalized, the CEQ recommends "just-doing-it." DOE must conduct such analyses in the new draft EIS or draft Supplemental EIS.</p> <p>10. Methods for Decontamination, Decommissioning and Demolition (DD&D) of the Existing CMR Building and the Proposed New NF.</p> <p>The 2004 Record of Decision (ROD) for the CMRR Project stated the existing CMR building would be DD&D in its entirety. However, the actual implementation of these decisions is dependent on DOE funding levels and allocations of the agency budget across competing priorities, including construction of a new NF. The DD&D Work Plan must be part of the new draft EIS in order to ensure that it becomes part of the complete National Environmental Policy Act analyses.</p> <p>Further, the new draft EIS or supplemental EIS that will analyze the impacts of building a new CMRR-NF must also examine the impacts of removing it.</p> <p>11. The Impacts of the CMRR-NF (and the Pit Production Increase it will Enable) on Nuclear Proliferation and U.S. Treaty Obligations Must be Examined.</p> <p>First, a non-proliferation analysis must be part of the draft NEPA review document, be it an EIS or Supplemental EIS. The analysis must examine (a) the project's potential deleterious impact on U.S. image abroad and on the country's nonproliferation goals, (b) the project's potential impact on other nuclear weapons states' decisions to commit to new nuclear arms control and disarmament measures - and on non-nuclear weapon states' willingness to so remain in the face of increased U.S. plutonium pit production in general and the CMRR-NF's role in particular, and (c) the potential impact of other nations' unfavorable response(s) on the U.S.</p> <p>Equally, DOE NNSA must consider how the agency will ensure compliance with the spirit and letter of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). As a signed, international treaty obligation, the NPT is, according to Article 6 of the U.S. Constitution, the supreme law of the land (along with the Constitution itself).</p> <p>The signatory non-nuclear weapons states parties to the NPT have long decried any nuclear weapon state's "modernization" of its arsenal. The New Agenda Coalition stated, "Any plans or intentions to develop new types of nuclear weapons or rationalization for their use stand in marked contradiction to the NPT, and undermine the international community's efforts towards improving the security of all states." Hans Blix stated that "any state contemplating replacement or modernization of its nuclear weapons systems must consider such action in the light of all relevant treaty obligations and its duty to contribute to the disarmament process." The previous UN Secretary-General Kofi Anan spoke out against modernizing nuclear arsenals or delivery systems. The current Secretary-General, Ban Ki-moon, spoke eloquently on this topic at the NPT Review Conference in May 2010. And, in their submittal to the NPT Review Conference this year, the Non-Aligned Movement's statement opposed modernization programs by nuclear weapons states.</p> <p>These are only a few examples of how NPT states parties and UN officials at the highest levels have interpreted the obligations of nuclear weapons states under the NPT's Article VI disarmament clause to forego the exact types of activities that the CMRR-NF would enable. This contradiction, and its potential negative consequences, must be fully considered in the draft EIS or draft supplemental EIS for the CMRR-NF.</p> <p>12. A Thorough Analysis of Security and Terrorism Risks Must be Undertaken, and an Unclassified Summary Must be Included in the New, Draft NEPA Document.</p> <p>The analysis must include "outside" and "insider" threats, and their potential adverse impacts on workers and the surrounding community. Some reasonable scenarios include, but are not limited to, airplane crash, platter charge or other attack at a critical point (which may not be the CMRR-NF itself, but, rather, a more vulnerable point in the related plutonium, waste or transport processes), access to material by unauthorized persons with knowledge of radiological device construction, material theft, discharged employee(s) whose badge(s)</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>was not turned in (all too common), disgruntled or depressed employee(s), etc.</p> <p>While details about how to gain access (for example) may be classified appropriately, it is neither necessary nor appropriate to classify all substantive aspects of the analysis. In particular, the environmental and health impacts to other workers and the public must not be classified.</p> <p>13. Request for Background Documents to be Posted on the Web and Made Available in NM Repositories.</p> <p>DOE NNSA has undertaken the step to place background documents on the web, which goes beyond the minimum NEPA requirement, in the past, and Tri-Valley CAREs has availed itself of the source documents when they have been made accessible. We request that this be done for the CMRR-NF NEPA review. We believe this step will enhance the quality of comments the agency will receive from the public.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of our comments on the type of NEPA review required (full EIS with new "purpose and need" section) and on the scope of the pending NEPA review for CMRR-NF.</p>
047	Jay Coghlan and Scott Kovac, Nuclear Watch New Mexico	<p>Attached are Nuclear Watch's scoping comments for the CMRR-NF SEIS. Acknowledgment of receipt and readability to jay@nukewatch.org is appreciated. [see attached file: 047A_Nuclear Watch.pdf]</p>
048	Kathy Sanchez, TEWA Women United	<p>I have attached comments from Tewa Women United for the CMRR-NF. I do hope they are taken seriously and worthy of some more dialogues into the environmental impacts to our health and well being as we do our daily living in our northern New Mexico and indigenous homelands.</p> <p>[see attached file: 048A_K. Sanchez.pdf]</p>
050	Katharine Kagel	<p>I am writing to provide you with my scoping comments about the CMRR Project, which includes the Nuclear Facility (NF), the proposed addition to LANL's nuclear weapons production complex. The alternatives proposed in the 2003 final CMRR environmental impact statement (EIS) are no longer applicable today. It's time to start over and re-examine the purpose and need for the Project by preparing a <u>new</u> EIS. Further, it is premature to begin the scoping process when Secretary Chu has asked for an independent expert committee to review the need for the CMRR-NF.</p> <p>The Costs of Trying to Build a Plutonium Pit Production Complex in a Geologically Unstable Area Are Just Too High - The total original estimate for the CMRR Project, including the recently completed \$363 million Radiological Laboratory Utility and Office Building (RLUOB), was around \$600 million in 2004. The current estimate is \$4.5 billion. The estimate, no doubt, will continue to climb.</p> <p>LANL is located between a rift valley (the Rio Grande in that area) and a volcanic range (the Jemez Mountains) in a seismic fault zone (the Pajarito Plateau). An updated seismic hazards analysis was published in May 2007. It showed a potential huge increase in seismic ground motion and activity. In all likelihood, most of the over \$3 billion in cost estimate increases since 2008 are due to efforts to address the increased seismic hazards. DOE must analyze whether \$3 billion is too high a premium to pay for a new NF. In order to address these increased seismic hazards, DOE now plans to excavate 225,000 cubic yards of earth under the proposed NF and fill the hole with concrete. DOE must address the following questions: Is the surrounding geology robust enough to support all that concrete? Would a seismic event cause the concrete "slab" to sink or shift?</p> <p>Cleanup of the Existing Mess Must Be the Priority – Not a New Nuclear Facility - DOE made a commitment to clean up the legacy waste sites at LANL when it signed the Consent Order with the New Mexico Environment Department on March 1, 2005. The Order requires cleanup of certain sites by December 31, 2015, including the Area G dump site at Technical Area 54. Construction activities for a new NF will interfere with cleanup activities, including those at the nearby Material Disposal Area C. DOE must make compliance with the Order the priority – not a new NF.</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>New Alternatives Are Required – DOE must return to the drawing board in order to develop more alternatives, including not building the NF; stop operations at the old, dangerous CMR Building; and conduct a “capacity study” to determine whether the existing facilities – as they have since 1999 when DOE limited plutonium pit manufacturing to 20 per year - can be used instead of building the proposed NF. All analyses of alternatives must incorporate the new 200,000 square foot RLUOB in the review. Operations for the RLUOB are scheduled to begin in less than two years.</p> <p><u>Requisite Analyses for the New Environment Impact Statement:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental Justice – Both Economic and Ethnicity Analyses Must Be Done - Los Alamos County is one of the richest counties in the U.S.A. It is surrounded by some of the poorest and most ethnically diverse counties in the country. Therefore, shipping any type of waste to anywhere else is an inherent environmental justice issue. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS. 2. Health Effects for Those Most at Risk - Many federal standards for protection of human health, such as limits on emissions from the proposed CMRR-NF industrial stacks, are based on "Reference Man," a hypothetical Caucasian male 20 to 30 years old weighing 154 pounds. All analyses must address the risk to a pregnant woman farmer, her fetus, and her other children under age 18, rather than Reference Man. As a matter of reproductive and environmental justice, the most potentially vulnerable human beings must be protected. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS. 3. Waste Disposal - To Use DOE Terminology: What is the “Path Forward?” - Given the anticipated lack of disposal facilities for low-level radioactive, toxic, and hazardous waste at LANL, DOE must detail where its legacy and newly generated waste will be disposed and how it will be transported to off-site facilities. DOE must detail the proposed transportation modes and routes and the impacts to the communities along the routes and those surrounding the dumps. What emergency preparedness capabilities exist along the proposed routes? 4. Water Usage in the Face of Stricter Limits Asked By DOE – DOE estimated in the 2003 Final CMRR EIS that waste generation may double and the annual water consumption may increase by 10.4 million gallons. Why should a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified building generate any waste, emit contaminants into the air, or discharge contaminated water into the canyons? DOE must explain these contradictions in the new draft EIS. 5. Climate Change Impacts Required – “Just-Do-It” - On February 18, 2010, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) released draft guidance for public comment about how “Federal agencies can improve their consideration of the effects of greenhouse gas GHG emissions and climate change in their evaluation of proposals for Federal actions under the NEPA.” While the guidance is being finalized, the CEQ recommends “just-doing-it.” DOE must conduct such analyses in the new draft EIS. 6. Methods for Decontamination, Decommissioning and Demolition (DD&D) of the Existing CMR Building and the Proposed New NF - The 2004 Record of Decision (ROD) for the CMRR Project stated the existing CMR building would be DD&D in its entirety. However, the actual implementation of these decisions is dependent on DOE funding levels and allocations of the DOE budget across competing priorities, including construction of a new NF. The DD&D Work Plan must be part of the new draft EIS in order to ensure that it becomes part of the complete National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analyses. Further, the new draft EIS that will analyze the impacts of building a new NF must also examine the impacts of removing it.
051	Elliott Skinner and Linda Hibbs	<p>We are writing to provide you with my scoping comments about the CMRR Project, which includes the Nuclear Facility (NF), the proposed addition to LANL’s nuclear weapons production complex. The alternatives proposed in the 2003 final CMRR environmental impact statement (EIS) are no longer applicable today. It’s time to start over and re-examine the purpose and need for the Project by preparing a <u>new</u> EIS. Further, it is premature to begin the scoping process when Secretary Chu has asked for an independent expert committee to review the need for the CMRR-NF.</p> <p>We request 120 days to provide comments about the draft CMRR EIS. Public hearings on the draft EIS should be held in surrounding communities, including Albuquerque, Española, Santa Fe, Taos, and White Rock.</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>The Costs of Trying to Build a Plutonium Pit Production Complex in a Geologically Unstable Area Are Just Too High - The total original estimate for the CMRR Project, including the recently completed \$363 million Radiological Laboratory Utility and Office Building (RLUOB), was around \$600 million in 2004. The current estimate is \$4.5 billion. The estimate, no doubt, will continue to climb.</p> <p>LANL is located between a rift valley (the Rio Grande in that area) and a volcanic range (the Jemez Mountains) in a seismic fault zone (the Pajarito Plateau). An updated seismic hazards analysis was published in May 2007. It showed a potential huge increase in seismic ground motion and activity. In all likelihood, most of the over \$3 billion in cost estimate increases since 2008 are due to efforts to address the increased seismic hazards. DOE must analyze whether \$3 billion is too high a premium to pay for a new NF. In order to address these increased seismic hazards, DOE now plans to excavate 225,000 cubic yards of earth under the proposed NF and fill the hole with concrete. DOE must address the following questions: Is the surrounding geology robust enough to support all that concrete? Would a seismic event cause the concrete “slab” to sink or shift?</p> <p>Cleanup of the Existing Mess Must Be the Priority – Not a New Nuclear Facility - DOE made a commitment to clean up the legacy waste sites at LANL when it signed the Consent Order with the New Mexico Environment Department on March 1, 2005. The Order requires cleanup of certain sites by December 31, 2015, including the Area G dump site at Technical Area 54. Construction activities for a new NF will interfere with cleanup activities, including those at the nearby Material Disposal Area C. DOE must make compliance with the Order the priority – not a new NF.</p> <p>New Alternatives Are Required – DOE must return to the drawing board in order to develop more alternatives, including not building the NF; stop operations at the old, dangerous CMR Building; and conduct a “capacity study” to determine whether the existing facilities – as they have since 1999 when DOE limited plutonium pit manufacturing to 20 per year - can be used instead of building the proposed NF. All analyses of alternatives must incorporate the new 200,000 square foot RLUOB in the review. Operations for the RLUOB are scheduled to begin in less than two years.</p> <p><u>Requisite Analyses for the New Environment Impact Statement:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental Justice – Both Economic and Ethnicity Analyses Must Be Done - Los Alamos County is one of the richest counties in the U.S.A. It is surrounded by some of the poorest and most ethnically diverse counties in the country. Therefore, shipping any type of waste to anywhere else is an inherent environmental justice issue. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS. 2. Health Effects for Those Most at Risk - Many federal standards for protection of human health, such as limits on emissions from the proposed CMRR-NF industrial stacks, are based on "Reference Man," a hypothetical Caucasian male 20 to 30 years old weighing 154 pounds. All analyses must address the risk to a pregnant woman farmer, her fetus, and her other children under age 18, rather than Reference Man. As a matter of reproductive and environmental justice, the most potentially vulnerable human beings must be protected. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS. 3. Waste Disposal - To Use DOE Terminology: What is the “Path Forward?” - Given the anticipated lack of disposal facilities for low-level radioactive, toxic, and hazardous waste at LANL, DOE must detail where its legacy and newly generated waste will be disposed and how it will be transported to off-site facilities. DOE must detail the proposed transportation modes and routes and the impacts to the communities along the routes and those surrounding the dumps. What emergency preparedness capabilities exist along the proposed routes? 4. Water Usage in the Face of Stricter Limits Asked By DOE – DOE estimated in the 2003 Final CMRR EIS that waste generation may double and the annual water consumption may increase by 10.4 million gallons. Why should a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified building generate any waste, emit contaminants into the air, or discharge contaminated water into the canyons? DOE must explain these contradictions in the new draft EIS. 5. Climate Change Impacts Required – “Just-Do-It” - On February 18, 2010, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) released draft

#	Name	Comment
		<p>guidance for public comment about how “Federal agencies can improve their consideration of the effects of greenhouse gas GHG emissions and climate change in their evaluation of proposals for Federal actions under the NEPA.” While the guidance is being finalized, the CEQ recommends “just-doing-it.” DOE must conduct such analyses in the new draft EIS.</p> <p>6. Methods for Decontamination, Decommissioning and Demolition (DD&D) of the Existing CMR Building and the Proposed New NF - The 2004 Record of Decision (ROD) for the CMRR Project stated the existing CMR building would be DD&D in its entirety. However, the actual implementation of these decisions is dependent on DOE funding levels and allocations of the DOE budget across competing priorities, including construction of a new NF. The DD&D Work Plan must be part of the new draft EIS in order to ensure that it becomes part of the complete National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analyses. Further, the new draft EIS that will analyze the impacts of building a new NF must also examine the impacts of removing it.</p>
052	Joni Arends on behalf of Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety	<p>Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety (CCNS) respectfully submits the following comments about the scope for the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Nuclear Facility Portion of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building Replacement Project at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), Los Alamos, New Mexico (CMRR-NF EIS). CCNS is a non-governmental organization which formed in 1988 to address community concerns about the transportation of nuclear waste from Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) through Santa Fe to the then proposed Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). Our mission is to protect all living beings and environment from the effects of radioactive and other hazardous materials now and in the future.</p> <p>Need for New EIS – Not a Supplemental. The alternatives proposed in the 2003 final CMRR EIS are no longer applicable today. It’s time to start over and re-examine the purpose and need for the Project by preparing a new EIS. Further, it is premature to begin the scoping process when Secretary Chu has asked for an independent expert committee to review the purpose and need for the CMRR-NF.</p> <p>In addition, significant changes have been made to the scope of the CMRR-NF and therefore a new CMRR-NF environmental impact statement (EIS) is required. Some of the significant changes are new information about a 50 percent probabilistic increase in the seismic risk, a doubling of the size of the NF, the proposal to remove 225,000 cubic yards of the geologic formation below the proposed site, and the cost. Since this process began a few short weeks ago, the estimated cost of the NF has increased from \$4.5 billion to \$5.9 billion – roughly a 25 percent increase. The new draft EIS must address the projected and skyrocketing costs, along with the purpose and need for the NF.</p> <p>In Order to Protect the Buckman Direct Diversion Project, Clean up of the 212 Dumpsites in Los Alamos/Pueblo Canyon System Is Needed NOW. CCNS questions why there isn’t a 25 percent increase in environmental management funding available in order to address the 212 dumpsites in the Los Alamos and Pueblo Canyon system that are threatening the Buckman Direct Diversion (BDD) Project when it rains or when snow melts. In April 2010, plutonium, PCBs, and dioxins were found by LANL in melting snow at the E110/E109.9 gage station – the last gage station before the Los Alamos Canyon flows to the Rio Grande. The BDD Project will provide 60 percent of the drinking water for the residents of the City of Santa Fe, Santa Fe County and Las Campanas.</p> <p>In September 2009, the representatives from the Alliance for Nuclear Accountability were given a briefing at LANL. CCNS was present. We were told that LANL held \$800 million in unexpended appropriations. Is any of that funding available to address the 212 dumpsites in the Los Alamos Canyon system? The new individual storm water permit, issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), went into effect on November 1, 2010. In that permit, EPA identified 40 of those dumpsites as “high priority” sites, requiring clean up in the next three years.</p> <p>How can we together solve the threat to the Buckman before the snow melts in the spring and the Buckman goes on-line?</p> <p>DD&D Work Plan for the CMR. The 2003 Final CMRR EIS stated that demolition of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research (CMR) Building at Technical Area 3 is dependent upon funding and the submittal of a decontamination, decommissioning and demolition (DD&D) work plan. CCNS urges the Department of Energy (DOE) and National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to incorporate the CMR DD&D work plan into the draft EIS so that the connected action may be incorporated and analyzed for public review and comment.</p> <p>Request for a 120-Day Comment Period for the draft EIS. Given the increase in scope for the CMRR-NF, DOE/NNSA must provide</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>sufficient time for the public to review the draft EIS, plus the references. Time must be allowed for community meetings, trainings, and information sharing. CCNS urges DOE/NNSA to provide a 120-day comment period.</p> <p>Draft EIS Hearings Must Be Held in Albuquerque, Española, Los Alamos/White Rock, Santa Fe, Taos, and Other Locations. DOE/NNSA held two scoping meetings in October -one in White Rock and one in Pojoaque. At the White Rock meeting, there was no opportunity to hear the public comments of the people providing them. We and others complained. DOE/NNSA heard our concerns and a special time at the Pojoaque meeting was set aside for the public to talk to the public. Fortunately, Cultural Energy recorded the comments. Because it is essential that those public comments be part of the scoping record, CCNS submits the public comments recorded by Cultural Energy – available at <http://www.culturalenergy.org/mp3/cmrr-seis20oct10.mp3> and <http://www.culturalenergy.org/mp3/beata-prayer20oct10.mp3> - with these comments. We request that they be transcribed and become part of the draft EIS.</p> <p>We also note that a few weeks prior to the CMRR-NF scoping meetings, DOE/NNSA held public scoping meetings about the Plutonium Disposition EIS at the Courtyard by Marriott in Santa Fe. There was a court reporter and an audio recording of the public comments. We are disturbed by the inconsistency between the two sets of scoping meetings, especially with regard to documenting oral public comments made during the public scoping meetings. We request that Carol Borgstrom, DOE HQ NEPA Office, review with DOE/NNSA about the inconsistencies between the public scoping meetings and make appropriate changes as necessary.</p> <p>The Costs of Trying to Build a Plutonium Pit Production Complex in a Geologically Unstable Area Are Just Too High - The total original estimate for the CMRR Project, including the recently completed \$363 million Radiological Laboratory Utility and Office Building (RLUOB), was around \$600 million in 2004. The current estimate is \$5.9 billion. The cost estimate, no doubt, will continue to climb. See above.</p> <p>LANL is located between a rift valley (the Rio Grande in that area) and a volcanic range (the Jemez Mountains) in a seismic fault zone (the Pajarito Plateau). An updated seismic hazards analysis was published in May 2007. It showed a potential huge increase in seismic ground motion and activity. In all likelihood, most of the over \$3 to \$4 billion in cost estimate increases since 2008 are due to efforts to address the increased seismic hazards. DOE must analyze whether \$3 to \$4 billion is too high a premium to pay for a proposed NF. In order to address these increased seismic hazards, DOE now plans to excavate 225,000 cubic yards of earth under the proposed NF and fill the hole with concrete. DOE must address the following questions: How much would the NF weigh, including the concrete slab/mat? Is the surrounding geology robust enough to support the weight of all that concrete? Would a seismic event cause the concrete “slab/mat” to sink or shift? What would be the potential consequences?</p> <p>Cleanup of the Existing Mess Must Be the Priority – Not a New Nuclear Facility - DOE made a commitment to clean up the legacy waste sites at LANL when it signed the Consent Order with the New Mexico Environment Department on March 1, 2005. The Order requires cleanup of certain sites by December 31, 2015, including the Area G dumpsite at Technical Area 54. Construction activities for a new NF, including the realignment of the Pajarito Road, will interfere with cleanup activities, including those at the nearby Material Disposal Area C. DOE must make compliance with the Order the priority – not a new NF.</p> <p>New Alternatives Are Required – DOE must return to the drawing board in order to develop more alternatives, including not building the NF (as the No Action Alternative); stop operations at the old, dangerous CMR Building; and conduct a “capacity study” to determine whether the existing facilities – as they have since 1999 when DOE limited plutonium pit manufacturing to 20 per year - can be used as an alternative to constructing the proposed NF. A capacity study should reveal whether a NF is needed.</p> <p>Further, all analyses of alternatives must incorporate and include the new 200,000 square foot RLUOB in the review. Operations for the RLUOB are scheduled to begin in less than two years.</p> <p>Further, it is disingenuous and confusing to name the “No Action Alternative” as constructing and operating the CMRR-NF. Please correct the language in the draft EIS so that the No Action Alternative is an alternative in which no action is taken.</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>Alternatives should include the following: (1) Continuing the “clean out” the existing facilities in order to better utilize the space. For example, the removal of 14 tons of cellulose materials from the basement of the TA-55 plutonium facility as recommended by the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB). (2) Utilizing safes for special nuclear materials. See October 1, 2010 DNFSB Weekly Report. (3) Installing the required structural and safety systems as recommended by HHS at DOE HQ. (4) Complying with the 10 CFR 830 requirements for safety basis analysis as described in the recent DNFSB letter to Secretary Chu regarding exceeding the “safety envelope” for off-site releases from nuclear weapons work at LANL.</p> <p>Requisite Analyses for the New Environment Impact Statement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental Justice – Both Economic and Ethnicity Analyses Must Be Done - Los Alamos County is one of the wealthiest counties in the U.S.A. It is surrounded by some of the poorest and most ethnically diverse counties in the country. Therefore, shipping any type of waste to anywhere else is an inherent environmental justice issue. Analysis of both transportation up the Hill and down the Hill must be done. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS. 2. Health Effects for Those Most at Risk - Many federal standards for protection of human health, such as limits on emissions from the proposed CMRR-NF industrial stacks, are based on "Reference Man," a hypothetical Caucasian male 20 to 30 years old weighing 154 pounds. All analyses must address the risk to a pregnant woman farmer, her fetus, and her other children under age 18, as well as for Reference Man. As a matter of reproductive and environmental justice, the most potentially vulnerable human beings must be protected. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS. 3. Waste Disposal - To Use DOE Terminology: What is the “Path Forward?” - Given the anticipated lack of disposal facilities for low-level radioactive, toxic, and hazardous waste at LANL, DOE must detail where its legacy and newly generated waste will be disposed and how it will be transported to off-site facilities. DOE must detail the proposed transportation modes and routes and the impacts to the communities along the routes and those surrounding the dumps. What emergency preparedness capabilities exist along the proposed routes? 4. Water Usage in the Face of Stricter Limits Asked By DOE – DOE estimated in the 2003 Final CMRR EIS that waste generation may double and the annual water consumption may increase by 10.4 million gallons. DOE must explain why a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified building would generate any waste, emit contaminants into the air, or discharge contaminated water into the canyons. DOE must explain these contradictions in the new draft EIS. 5. Climate Change Impacts Required – “Just-Do-It” - On February 18, 2010, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) released draft guidance for public comment about how “Federal agencies can improve their consideration of the effects of greenhouse gas GHG emissions and climate change in their evaluation of proposals for Federal actions under the NEPA.” While the guidance is being finalized, the CEQ recommends “just-doing-it.” DOE must conduct such analyses in the new draft EIS. <p>Thank you for your consideration of our comments. We are grateful for the 15-day extension of time to provide comments. Please contact us with any questions or comments.</p>

#	Name	Comment
053	Cathie Sullivan	<p>The alternatives proposed in the 2003 final CMRR environmental impact statement (EIS) are no longer applicable today. <u>Further, it is premature to begin the scoping process when Secretary Chu has asked for an independent expert committee to review the need for the CMRR-NF.</u></p> <p>The Costs of Trying to Build a Plutonium Pit Production Complex in a Geologically Unstable Area Are Just Too High - The total original estimate for the CMRR Project, including the recently completed \$363 million Radiological Laboratory Utility and Office Building (RLUOB), was around \$600 million in 2004. The current estimate is an incredible \$4.5 billion.</p> <p>Cleanup Must Be the Priority – Not a Nuclear Boondoggle - DOE made a commitment to clean up the legacy waste sites at LANL when it signed the Consent Order with the New Mexico Environment Department on March 1, 2005. The Order requires cleanup of certain sites by December 31, 2015, including the Area G Tech Area 54.</p> <p><u>Needed Analyses for the New EIS</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental Justice 2. Health Effects for Those Most at Risk - Many federal standards for protection of human health, such as limits on emissions from the proposed CMRR-NF industrial stacks, are based on "Reference Man," a hypothetical Caucasian male 20 to 30 years old weighing 154 pounds. <u>All analyses must address the risk to a pregnant woman farmer, her fetus, and her other children under age 18, rather than Reference Man.</u> As a matter of reproductive and environmental justice, the most potentially vulnerable human beings must be protected. Such analyses must be completed in the new draft EIS. 3. Waste Disposal - Given the anticipated lack of disposal facilities for low-level radioactive, toxic, and hazardous waste at LANL, DOE must detail where its legacy and newly generated waste will be disposed and how it will be transported to off-site facilities. DOE must detail the proposed transportation modes and routes and the impacts to the communities along the routes and those surrounding the dumps. What emergency preparedness capabilities exist along the proposed routes? 4. Water Usage – DOE estimated in the 2003 Final CMRR EIS that waste generation may double and the annual water consumption may increase by 10.4 million gallons. Why should a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified building generate any waste, emit contaminants into the air, or discharge contaminated water into the canyons? (An analogy might be made for a LEED facility associated with production of nuclear weapons to Habitat for Humanity building Auschwitz.)
075	LeRoy Moore	<p>The Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center (RMPJC) is a non-profit organization founded in 1983 in Boulder, CO, to conduct research, public education and advocacy regarding the potential environmental, health and proliferation impacts of the Rocky Flats nuclear bomb plant and other facilities in the U.S. nuclear weapons complex.</p> <p>Due to concerns in our community about the negative environmental, health, non-proliferation, economic and security implications of increasing U.S. nuclear weapons production capabilities, RMPJC submits the following scoping comments for the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement-Nuclear Facility (CMRR-NF) on behalf of its 2,000 members.</p> <p>RMPJC is very concerned about the proposed addition to LANL's nuclear weapons production complex, especially the CMRR-NF. Since the original 2003 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the facility, significant conditions have changed and/or been proposed for the U.S. nuclear weapons complex, including but not limited to those related to the New START treaty, which may be ratified in the near future.</p> <p>RMPJC believes that a full re-examination of the "purpose and need" under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the CMRR-NF is necessary. This should be accomplished through the preparation of a new EIS. It is of concern to us that a Supplemental EIS is</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>an insufficient vehicle for re-examination of "purpose and need." A Supplemental EIS is also insufficient given the expanded scope of the CMRR-NF.</p> <p>Further, it is premature to conduct the scoping process pursuant to a Supplemental EIS when Dept. of Energy (DOE) Secretary Chu has asked for an independent expert committee to review the "need" for the CMRR-NF.</p> <p>At a minimum, this present public scoping process should not end before that Secretarial review is completed and made public. Moreover, the Secretary's review should become (a) part of the DOE National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) consideration of whether a full EIS or a Supplemental EIS is undertaken and (b) part of the Administrative Record in either event.</p> <p>In the event the DOE NNSA decides to proceed with a full EIS or proceeds with this Supplemental EIS, the following comments on the scope of that review apply:</p> <p>1. Other Reasonable Alternatives are Required in the Pending NEPA Document (Whether an EIS or Supplemental EIS).</p> <p>The Notice of Intent to prepare this Supplemental EIS contains three options: the so-called "no action" alternative (which is to build the CMRR-NF and its ancillary and support activities per the old EIS Record of Decision), an Alternative 1 (which is to continue to use the CMR Building with no facility upgrades beyond routine maintenance), and Alternative 2 (similar to Alternative 1 but with extensive CMR upgrades).</p> <p>The decision whether to construct and operate a new CMRR-NF does not (and should not) hinge on the substantial, continued use of the old CMR Building for decades to come.</p> <p>RMPJC is suspicious that DOE NNSA has constructed the above-listed alternatives in such a manner as to facilitate declaring in the final document that major programmatic activities in CMR for decades to come is not a good solution and, therefore, the only option is to proceed with the full CMRR-NF as planned. In reality, that's a "Hobson's Choice" and there are reasonable alternatives that do not depend on either a new CMRR-NF or substantial long-term programmatic use of the old CMR.</p> <p>an additional, reasonable option that must be fully analyzed in the pending draft EIS or draft Supplemental EIS.</p> <p>Given that the CMRR Radiological Laboratory Utility and Office Building (RLUOB) is built and is slated to become operational within 2 years, its capabilities must be taken into account. Further, given that the CMRR-NF is not slated to be completed until about 2020, other relevant LANL activities between the present and 2020 must be included in the analysis. (In other words, the issue is not merely what LANL could do differently today, it is what LANL could reasonably do differently by 2020 that must be considered in the NEPA analysis). In this context, LANL's PF-4 must be considered in conjunction with the CMRR RLUOB.</p> <p>That analysis must take into account that PF-4 presently holds equipment that need not stay until 2020, such as the ARIES "pilot project," which was never supposed to be permanent there. Additionally, PF-4, we were told by LANL management, has other space that could be available in the future but which presently holds contaminated plutonium wastes in acid, a waste management issue that is waiting to be dealt with.</p> <p>Therefore, a reasonable alternative could be to devote a small portion of the massive resources that would have been used to construct the CMRR-NF to clean up and clean out the areas in PF-4 that could be made available and pair that capability for "heavy lab" activities with the "light lab" capabilities of the already built CMRR-LUOB.</p> <p>Moreover, there is no demonstrated "need" for LANL to increase its plutonium pit production capability from 20 pits/year to the proposed 50-80 pits/year (or above). We note in this regard that after demonstrating a diamond stamp pit production capability at LANL, about 11 pits were produced - and then in subsequent years pit production has hovered around single digits, according to the numbers that we</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>have been given. RMPJC does not believe that even 20 pits/year pits are needed, given the certified long life of pits produced at Rocky Flats and still deployed or in storage. In any event, the agency's perceived "need" can easily be met by 20 pits/year.)</p> <p>Thus, the reasonable alternative analyzing the integrated potential capabilities of PF-4 (in the 2020 time frame) and the CMRR-LUOB, must be considered also in the context of continuing at the current rate of 20 pits/year at LANL, which has been the limit since 1999.</p> <p>The DOE NNSA must also consider as reasonable that significant progress on U.S. and global nuclear disarmament is possible before 2020. This speaks to "purpose and need" of the CMRR-NF as well as its "alternatives." Without such a consideration, billions of tax-payer dollars may be spent on a facility that stymies rather than enhances the opportunities to move forward toward a more safe and sustainable world, free of nuclear weapons.</p> <p>2. The NEPA Process Must Not be Prejudiced or Predetermined, or it is Rendered Legally Deficient.</p> <p>According to NEPA, an EIS must serve as the means of assessing the impacts of a proposed action and alternatives before a commitment to a particular action is made by the lead agency. The EIS must not be a justification of decisions that were made prior to completion of the NEPA analysis. 40 C.F.R. 1502.2(g).</p> <p>DOE NNSA must not prejudice the selection of the proposed action by committing resources prior to the NEPA decision. Whether a draft EIS or Supplemental EIS is prepared, the standard regarding predetermination of outcome by an agency is the same. It is forbidden.</p> <p>DOE NNSA has taken actions to accelerate construction of the CMRR-NF. It combined two project management stages under DOE Order 413.3A of "Approve performance baseline" and "approve start of construction" to expedite the start of construction. It has also come to light that the DOE NNSA divided the project into packages so that construction on some parts could go forward, even if the baseline had not been established for other parts. Additionally, we understand that DOE NNSA has already determined what the footprint of the facility should be and that all future design and construction must conform to those specifications.</p> <p>Additionally, top DOE NNSA officials have been quoted by reputable reporters as stating that the CMRR-NF is essential to agency plans and that the agency is "committed" to completing the CMRR-NF as currently envisioned. How is this not predetermination? The draft EIS or Supplemental EIS must, given the circumstances, go the extra mile in detailing how and why the agency has not predetermined the outcome of the NEPA review before its completion. Moreover, we note that the proof of this must extend beyond mere assertion and be carried through in the analysis of "purpose and need", "alternatives" (and other sections) and be demonstrated in the final decision.</p> <p>3. Cleanup of the Existing Contamination and Waste Management Issues Must Be the Priority at LANL - Not a New CMRR-Nuclear Facility.</p> <p>A legal obligation was undertaken to clean up the legacy waste sites at LANL when the parent agency signed the Consent Order with the New Mexico Environment Department on March 1, 2005. The Order requires cleanup of certain sites by December 31, 2015, including the Area G dump site at Technical Area 54. Construction activities for a new CMRR-NF will interfere with cleanup activities, including those at the nearby Material Disposal Area C. DOE NNSA must make compliance with the Order the priority - and demonstrate how it will achieve that priority in the draft NEPA review.</p> <p>In this regard, and as alluded to in our alternatives comment, the "opportunity" cost of building the CMRR-NF on the unmet cleanup and waste management needs at LANL must be carefully examined.</p> <p>4. A Thorough Analysis of the Expected Costs of the Facility Must be Included.</p> <p>Since the initial EIS, the estimated costs to build this facility have skyrocketed. The total original estimate for the CMRR Project, including the recently completed \$363 million Radiological Laboratory Utility and Office Building, was around \$600 million in 2004. The</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>current estimate is \$4.5 billion. The estimate, we are told, may continue to climb.</p> <p>This huge growth in cost is largely due to the fact that the site is in a geologically unstable area. LANL is located between a rift valley (Rio Grande in that area) and a volcanic range (Jemez Mountains) in a seismic fault zone (the Pajarito Plateau).</p> <p>An updated seismic hazards analysis was published in May 2007. It showed a potential increase in seismic ground motion and activity. What percentage of the more than \$3 billion in recent cost estimate increases are due to efforts to address the increased seismic hazards? DOE NNSA must analyze whether an additional \$3 billion in estimated costs is too high a premium to pay for a new NF. In order to address these increased seismic hazards, DOE NNSA now plans to excavate 225,000 cubic yards of earth under the proposed NF and fill the hole with concrete. DOE NNSA must also address the following: Is the surrounding geology robust enough to support all that concrete? Could a seismic event cause the "slab" to sink or shift? In trying to solve one problem, is another being created?</p> <p>5. Environmental Justice - Both Economic and Ethnicity Analyses Must Be Done.</p> <p>Los Alamos County is one of the richest counties in the U.S. It is surrounded by some of the poorest and most ethnically diverse counties in the country. Therefore, shipping any type of waste to anywhere else is an inherent environmental justice issue. We support our NM colleagues' demand that this analysis must be done in the new draft EIS or draft supplemental EIS.</p> <p>6. Health Effects for Those Most at Risk.</p> <p>Many federal standards for protection of human health, such as limits on emissions from the proposed CMRR-NF industrial stacks, are based on "Reference Man," a hypothetical Caucasian male 20 to 30 years old weighing 154 pounds. All analyses must address the risk to a pregnant woman farmer, her fetus, and her other children under age 18, rather than Reference Man. As a matter of reproductive and environmental justice, the most potentially vulnerable human beings must be protected. As a matter of racial justice, indigenous peoples' (i.e., first Nation) culture and diet must also be considered in determining vulnerability and risk.</p> <p>7. Waste Disposal - To Use DOE Terminology, "What is the "Path Forward?"</p> <p>Given the anticipated lack of disposal facilities for low-level radioactive, toxic, and hazardous waste at LANL, DOE NNSA must detail where its legacy and newly generated waste will be disposed and how it will be transported to off-site facilities. DOE NNSA must analyze the proposed transportation modes and routes and the impacts to the communities along the routes and those surrounding the dumps. What emergency preparedness capabilities exist along the proposed routes?</p> <p>8. Water Usage in the Face of Stricter Limits Asked by DOE.</p> <p>The agency estimated in its 2003 Final CMRR EIS that waste generation may double and the annual water consumption may increase by 10.4 million gallons. Why should a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified building generate waste, emit contaminants into the air, and/or discharge contaminated water into the canyons? DOE NNSA must explain these contradictions.</p> <p>9. Climate Change Impacts Analysis Must be Included</p> <p>On February 18, 2010, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) released draft guidance for public comment about how "Federal agencies can improve their consideration of the effects of greenhouse gas GHG emissions and climate change in their evaluation of proposals for Federal actions under the NEPA." While the guidance is being finalized, the CEQ recommends "just-doing-it." DOE must conduct such analyses in the new draft EIS or draft Supplemental EIS.</p> <p>10. Methods for Decontamination, Decommissioning and Demolition (DD&D) of the Existing CMR Building and the Proposed New NF.</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>The 2004 Record of Decision (ROD) for the CMRR Project stated the existing CMR building would be DD&D in its entirety. However, the actual implementation of these decisions is dependent on DOE funding levels and allocations of the agency budget across competing priorities, including construction of a new NF. The DD&D Work Plan must be part of the new draft EIS in order to ensure that it becomes part of the complete National Environmental Policy Act analyses.</p> <p>Further, the new draft EIS or supplemental EIS that will analyze the impacts of building a new CMRR-NF must also examine the impacts of removing it.</p> <p>11. The Impacts of the CMRR-NF (and the Pit Production Increase it will Enable) on Nuclear Proliferation and U.S. Treaty Obligations Must be Examined.</p> <p>First, a non-proliferation analysis must be part of the draft NEPA review document, be it an EIS or Supplemental EIS. The analysis must examine (a) the project's potential deleterious impact on U.S. image abroad and on the country's nonproliferation goals, (b) the project's potential impact on other nuclear weapons states' decisions to commit to new nuclear arms control and disarmament measures - and on non-nuclear weapon states' willingness to so remain in the face of increased U.S. plutonium pit production in general and the CMRR-NF's role in particular, and (c) the potential impact of other nations' unfavorable response(s) on the U.S.</p> <p>Equally, DOE NNSA must consider how the agency will ensure compliance with the spirit and letter of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). As a signed, international treaty obligation, the NPT is, according to Article 6 of the U.S. Constitution, the supreme law of the land (along with the Constitution itself).</p> <p>The signatory non-nuclear weapons states parties to the NPT have long decried any nuclear weapon state's "modernization" of its arsenal. The New Agenda Coalition stated, "Any plans or intentions to develop new types of nuclear weapons or rationalization for their use stand in marked contradiction to the NPT, and undermine the international community's efforts towards improving the security of all states." Hans Blix stated that "any state contemplating replacement or modernization of its nuclear weapons systems must consider such action in the light of all relevant treaty obligations and its duty to contribute to the disarmament process." The previous UN Secretary-General Kofi Anan spoke out against modernizing nuclear arsenals or delivery systems. The current Secretary-General, Ban Ki-moon, spoke eloquently on this topic at the NPT Review Conference in May 2010. And, in their submittal to the NPT Review Conference this year, the Non-Aligned Movement's statement opposed modernization programs by nuclear weapons states.</p> <p>These are only a few examples of how NPT states parties and UN officials at the highest levels have interpreted the obligations of nuclear weapons states under the NPT's Article VI disarmament clause to forego the exact types of activities that the CMRR-NF would enable. This contradiction, and its potential negative consequences, must be fully considered in the draft EIS or draft supplemental EIS for the CMRR-NF.</p> <p>12. A Thorough Analysis of Security and Terrorism Risks Must be Undertaken, and an Unclassified Summary Must be Included in the New, Draft NEPA Document.</p> <p>The analysis must include "outside" and "insider" threats, and their potential adverse impacts on workers and the surrounding community. Some reasonable scenarios include, but are not limited to, airplane crash, platter charge or other attack at a critical point (which may not be the CMRR-NF itself, but, rather, a more vulnerable point in the related plutonium, waste or transport processes), access to material by unauthorized persons with knowledge of radiological device construction, material theft, discharged employee(s) whose badge(s) was not turned in (all too common), disgruntled or depressed employee(s), etc.</p> <p>While details about how to gain access (for example) may be classified appropriately, it is neither necessary nor appropriate to classify all substantive aspects of the analysis. In particular, the environmental and health impacts to other workers and the public must not be classified.</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>13. Request for Background Documents to be Posted on the Web and Made Available in NM Repositories.</p> <p>DOE NNSA has undertaken the step to place background documents on the web, which goes beyond the minimum NEPA requirement. We request that this be done for the CMRR-NF NEPA review. We believe this step will enhance the quality of comments the agency will receive from the public.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of our comments on the type of NEPA review required (full EIS with new "purpose and need" section) and on the scope of the pending NEPA review for CMRR-NF.</p>
066	Greg Mello Los Alamos Study Group	<p>From: Greg Mello [mailto:gmello@comcast.net] Sent: Saturday, November 20, 2010 8:17 AM To: (G) LASO NEPA Public Comment Mailbox Subject: SEIS scoping comments</p> <p>November 20, 2010</p> <p>By email to: nepalaso@doeal.gov Reference: 505-665-0113</p> <p>Mr. John Tegtmeier, CMRR-NF SEIS Document Manager National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Los Alamos Site Office 3747 West Jemez Road, TA-3 Building 1410 Los Alamos, NM 87544</p> <p>Dear John –</p> <p>I’ve left these “scoping” comments until now while working on our National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) litigation regarding this project, the broad subject of which is the proper scope for NEPA analysis concerning the proposed Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement Nuclear Facility (CMRR-NF). I urge you to review these submittals for recommendations regarding the present process.[1]</p> <p>I can’t offer a “cookie cutter” approach because the process in which you are engaged is so mis-aligned with the realities of agency action, facts on the ground, and law. For these reasons I encourage you to just start over. It is virtually impossible to repair what you have offered.</p> <p>I am sorry if this timing – five days after the formal closure of your comment period – is in any way inconvenient, but the process in which you are engaged has not merited a high priority compared to other fora in which comments can be offered. We have also had a death and a grave illness in our family.</p> <p>Among our principle comments are that 1) investment in the project must stop during NEPA analysis, 2) <u>all</u> reasonable primary and secondary alternatives must be examined as NEPA’s implementing regulations require, and 3) there is nothing to “supplement” in the original environmental impact statement (EIS) given that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has abandoned all the alternatives examined there. Hence the process of preparing a supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) to which you are assigned is improperly named and grossly inadequate. The scope of analysis presented in the October 1, 2010 Notice of Intent (NOI) is irreparably narrow and cursory.</p> <p><u>The present effort is one of transparent bad faith.</u> Not only is NNSA not halting its advanced commitment to a particular project alternative during the NEPA process, as is required by law and common sense, but each of us can read of the full commitment of the entire Executive Branch to building the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement Nuclear Facility (CMRR-NF). We read it on the front pages of our newspapers[2], in the trade press,[3] on the White House web site[4], and in the updated “Section 1251 Report” (attached to this</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>email).</p> <p>Nevertheless you are tasked to pretend to conduct an objective SEIS process in which two of the proposed alternatives are <i>primary</i> alternatives, i.e. they would not build the project. Given the full commitment expressed by government officials to a particular alternative as well as the continued expenditures of great sums, we must conclude that this SEIS process is a fraud. It puts you in an unfortunate position.</p> <p><u>My colleagues and I aren't sure what process NNSA used to provide notice of this SEIS process and suspect it was inadequate.</u> Neither I nor anyone else here received any direct notice from NNSA or DOE by mail or any other means. No one else with whom I have spoken has either. I personally learned of the NOI, and the opening of the comment period, from news reporters I happened to know. We knew a SEIS process was coming sometime, though we didn't know when, only because we are engaged in litigation on the topic. We could not discover that any of the cognizant staff members at the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) had ever seen any formal notice. We aren't sure whether the tribes were formally notified, or local governments. For this reason also it appears you need to start over. This is a matter of national importance – were your national mailing lists used?</p> <p><u>We are also concerned there were no hearings in other relevant NNSA locations,</u> given that the choice of Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) as a plutonium warhead core (“pit”) production site was predicated on total costs which were initially estimated to be about a factor of ten lower than today's, in constant dollars.[5] In part these costs stem from the relatively recent discovery of greater seismic hazard at LANL and the subsequent realization that the unconsolidated volcanic ash beneath the site poses significant seismic problems. These geologic factors suggest other sites as reasonable alternatives, especially the Savannah River Site (SRS), where NNSA and DOE are constructing a large plutonium manufacturing and waste handling infrastructure. There should have been notice given, and a hearing or two there. Pantex and the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) are also reasonable sites. NNSA may say that these alternative sites were examined when LANL was chosen, which is true. But the basis for that decision strongly included economic and technical factors that have not been reexamined since. Given the huge cost increase, these sites merit re-examination.</p> <p><u>The parties notified and the means of their notification are matters of public record. I would like this information and with this letter I am requesting it.</u></p> <p><u>I would also like to attach my 2002 scoping comments on what became the 2003 CMRR EIS,</u> for two reasons. Most of these issues are still germane and have not been considered. Also, DOE did not include those comments in its comment response materials or even list me or this organization as a commentator at the time. Perhaps I will have better luck this time.</p> <p>Concerning the October 1 NOI, consider first the “No Action” alternative. As described it is very far from “no action,” as it would build a CMRR-NF as decided in 2004. It is also an alternative which NNSA has declared impossible and unrealistic. <u>Such a “No Action” alternative is therefore doubly absurd and discredits the present process.</u></p> <p><u>“CMR Alternative 1” is also absurd, having been previously labeled unacceptable by NNSA and the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board (DNFSB). In fact, the unsuitability of this alternative is used by NNSA as the primary justification for the CMRR project.</u> In addition, NNSA has already abandoned 3 of 7CMR wings.</p> <p>NNSA knows these alternatives are unrealistic.</p> <p><u>“CMR Alternative 2” is reasonable, provided if applies only to some subset of the four southern wings of CMR and when considered together with other programmatic and infrastructure decisions which are not stated.</u> Without those decisions, it too would not be reasonable.</p> <p>So this SEIS would analyze just one or possibly two reasonable alternatives, the preferred alternative being by definition reasonable to NNSA. This is very below any legal or professional standard.</p> <p>Disregarding the bad faith aspects, the NOI offered is so sketchy as to be nearly a complete <i>tabula rasa</i>. There is a highly abridged notice and comment opportunity here not just because, as it presently appears, few if any were notified, but also because what notice was obscurely provided in the Federal Register was itself highly abridged.</p> <p>There is such a complete lack of analysis underlying the decision to build CMRR-NF that is difficult to know where to start.</p> <p>The first step would be to lay out the proposed mission clearly. This I cannot do for you. As time is limited, these comments will</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>largely pass over this foundational problem.</p> <p>I can offer a <u>discussion of recommendations for pit management policy</u>, which bears on CMRR-NF's central purpose and need. It is dated about 10 months but the facts have not changed that much. <u>It is impossible to define alternatives unless NNSA clarifies the proposed mission of CMRR-NF. The building itself is not its mission</u>, as DOE Order 413.3A makes plain:</p> <p>The mission need is independent of a particular solution, and should not be defined by equipment, facility, technological solution, or physical end-item. This approach allows the Program the flexibility to explore a variety of solutions and not limit potential solutions.[6]</p> <p>NNSA cannot define its purpose as "building a building like CMRR-NF." This does not generate any alternatives.</p> <p>What does NNSA mean when it says CMRR-NF is being built in a modular, expansible manner? In other words, what is the actual decision being made? This may connect with the preservation of the space to the west of CMRR-NF as a possible expansion space. There are many ways in which the nature of the proposed CMRR-NF – its project definition – is vague, open-ended, and incomplete. <u>We simply do not know the mission of CMRR-NF.</u></p> <p>Next comes the issue of available existing and planned infrastructure and how the proposed mission(s) are to be integrated with others. Reasonable primary alternatives to CMRR-NF will involve the use, or <i>the planned contingent use</i>, of various subsets of the following existing and planned facilities (the net programmatic HazCat II space shown is approximate):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At LANL <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. PF-4 (HazCat II) 59,500 sq. ft. b. CMR Wing 9 (Hazcat II) 8,000 sq. ft. c. CMR Wing 7 (Hazcat II or III) 8,000 sq. ft. d. CMR Wing 5 (Hazcat II or III) 8,000 sq. ft. e. CMR Wing 3 (Hazcat II or III) (no HEPA) 8,000 sq. ft. f. RLUOB (radiological) 19,500 sq. ft. g. Possibly others, HazCat II and III ? 2. At LLNL <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Superblock 25,000 sq. ft. 3. At SRS <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. MFFF (<u>gross</u> area process building, 500,000 sq. ft) b. K-Area Complex or PDCF (incl. storage) ? 4. At INEL <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Existing, planned Pu facilities ? 5. At Pantex <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Pit requalification capability modest 6. Pu storage large 7. At various sites (Pu storage) large

#	Name	Comment
		<p>8. At WIPP (disposal) n/a</p> <p>9. Private industry sites (contractor-owned and -operated)</p> <p>So, without being able to clarify where we stand as to mission, we must come to the question of alternatives somewhat in the dark. <u>NNSA should consider primary, secondary, and tertiary alternatives to CMRR-NF.</u></p> <p>A. <u>Primary CMRR-NF alternatives: not building CMRR-NF or not building it now</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A suite of options involving <u>delay of CMRR-NF</u> for a period of time (e.g. one decade), then re-examining the issue. This alternative will save discounted operations costs as adjusted by discounted changes in construction costs and a discounted premium for reinitiating design, if the project does not change. This savings is large but hard to predict, approximating \$1 B for a ten year delay. 2. A suite of options involving <u>contingency plans</u> for pit production, involving various sites above. One can distinguish levels of contingency with their associated strategies. Such strategies would draw upon NNSA's full suite of facilities, listed above in I. 3. CMRR-NF with or without the "hotel option." 4. A suite of options involving <u>pit recycling and metal purification at SRS</u> (K-Area or PDCF), which diminishes the purpose and need for space in the PF-4, CMRR-NF complex. 5. A suite of options involving <u>building RLUOB only</u> (since this is nearly done, these options are variations of the "no action alternative") <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Build RLUOB only and <u>modify PF-4 in the TA-55 Reinvestment Project (TRP)</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. By changing the building <i>physically</i> ii. By changing the <i>mission mix and internal equipment</i> in PF-4, for example by moving the entire Pu-238 operation to INL, as previously planned, creating a more contingent-pit-production-dedicated profile of missions for PF-4. Moving Pu-238 activities from PF-4 to INL would liberate about 15,000 ft² in PF-4. iii. These changes could be <i>contingent</i> upon future policies and events. b. Using or maintaining Superblock at LLNL as a HazCat II facility for some CMRR-NF purposes c. Using elements of the Pu infrastructure at SRS, especially in a contingency mode d. Using elements of the Pu infrastructure at INL, especially in a contingency mode. e. Wings 9, 7, 5, and perhaps 3 are apparently going to be kept until 2022 at least, if not 2026. Keep part of these suite of facilities longer than that, focusing upgrades on that <i>part</i> of CMR. There are currently no plans to tear down Wing 9. So Alternative 2 in the SEIS NOI really addresses upgrading a subset of wings 7, 5, and 3. f. Combinations of the above. <p>B. <u>Secondary alternatives: building CMRR-NF with a different overall concept</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The present CMRR-NF is 342 ft x 304 ft. It has a gross square footage of 381,000 ft², meaning there are nominally 4 (counted) floors in the building. This design requires that the building bottom be 75 ft below grade, requiring an additional 50-60 feet of concrete below that to a total depth of 125 ft. This is very costly and has great environmental impacts. Is this the only way to build this? <p>Is replacement of the unconsolidated ash layer a firm requirement if a) the "hotel concept" were dropped and the building</p>

#	Name	Comment
		<p>bottom was 25-35 ft higher?</p> <p>The lab space in the building is evidently about 150 ft by 150 ft in size on the third floor up, or 22,500 ft². It is surrounded by a 77-96 ft buffer of other building space on all sides.</p> <p>Could the CMRR-NF be built less deep but wider? Is it true that NNSA is preserving the area to the W of CMRR-NF for another possible facility, and if so shouldn't this be part of the project description?</p> <p>Could the CMRR-NF be built higher and bermed, or fitted with blast protection via double walls, gabions, or other measures?</p> <p>C. <u>Tertiary alternatives with differing impacts that affect the construction process</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Alternative locations for the source of aggregate; these sources affect trucking impacts in a big way 3. Road alternatives. 4. And so on. <p>D. <u>Alternatives for D&D of CMR</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These are driven or connected to choices as to partial use. <p>E. <u>Alternatives for D&D of CMRR</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grout in place 2. Remove and dispose <p>The above sketch does not exhaust the possible alternatives, includes mixing and matching missions (assuming NNSA knows what these are) with facilities. Here are some illustrative possible elements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refurbish CMR Wing 9, with other CMR utility, security, and safety upgrades as needed 2. Refurbish CMR Wing 7, with other CMR utility, security, and safety upgrades as needed 3. Refurbish CMR Wing 5, with other CMR utility, security, and safety upgrades as needed 4. Refurbish CMR Wing 3, possibly as utility core, with other CMR utility, security, and safety upgrades as needed 5. Reconfigure or task PF-4 to include some CMR missions as needed 6. Operationally and/or physically upgrade RLUOB to include some transient HazCat II missions 7. Move Pu-238 missions from PF-4, e.g. to INL 8. Use elements of the Pu infrastructure at INL to absorb some LANL Pu missions and tasks 9. Retain Superblock as a HazCat II facility or a contingent one 10. Cancel PuO2 production for MOX 11. Use SRS K Area Complex or other location for long-term Pu storage 12. Use PDCF or MFFF to prepare Pu metal for pit manufacturing, liberating space at TA-55 13. Dedicate a portion of MFFF to some aspect of the pit production mission or some other Pu mission(s) 14. Pause CMRR-NF at CD 2 and take selected interim actions, including actions from this list

#	Name	Comment
		<p>15. Contingency planning (in lieu of prompt facility and program initiation), affecting various facilities</p> <p>As I said, what NNSA has provided is too sketchy to truly comment upon, all other problems notwithstanding. You pose a so-called "wicked problem," with no solution.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention. I believe NNSA should pull back its SEIS NOI and start over with something far more substantive in the way of analysis. I have been requesting this for some years now.</p> <p>Sincerely, Greg Mello</p> <hr/> <p>[1] "CMRR Nuclear Facility: Litigation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) http://www.lasg.org/CMRR/Litigation/CMRR-NF_litigation.html.</p> <p>[2] E.g. today: John Fleck, "Nuclear Spending Plan Up," <i>Albuquerque Journal</i>, 11/ 19/10, http://www.abqjournal.com/news/state/19232507888newsstate11-19-10.htm</p> <p>[3] E.g. any recent issue of <i>Nuclear Weapons and Materials Monitor</i>, such as today's.</p> <p>[4] White House, "Fact Sheet: An Enduring Commitment to the U.S. Nuclear Deterrent," 11/17/10, http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2010/11/17/fact-sheet-enduring-commitment-us-nuclear-deterrent</p> <p>[5] For a discussion see April 6, 1998 Declaration of Gregory Mello, http://www.lasg.org/technical/pit-affidavit.htm.</p> <p>[6] https://www.directives.doe.gov/directives/current-directives/413.3-BOrder-ac1/view?searchterm=None</p> <p>-- Greg Mello * Los Alamos Study Group * www.lasg.org 2901 Summit Place NE * Albuquerque, NM 87106 505-265-1200 voice * 505-577-8563 cell * 505-265-1207 fax</p> <p>To subscribe to the Study Group's main listserv, send a blank email to lasg-subscribe@lists.riseup.net.</p> <p>[see attached file: 066A_Section 1251 report.11-17.final.pdf] [see attached file: 066B_Pit management recommendations Mello 1-22-10.pdf] [see attached file: 066C_CMRR EIS -- Mello to Withers, 2002.pdf]</p>
062	Bonnie Bonneau	See attached pdf file for comment: 062 Bonnie Bonneau.pdf
063	Jackie Dulle	See attached pdf file for comment: 063 Jackie Dulle.pdf
064	James Cobble	See attached pdf file for comment: 064 James Cobble.pdf
076	Basia Miller	See attached pdf file for comment: 076 Basia Miller.pdf
077	Francine Lindberg	See attached pdf file for comment: 077 Francine Lindberg.pdf
078	John Otter	See attached pdf file for comment: 078 John Otter.pdf
079	Josha Madalena, Governor, Jemez Pueblo	See attached pdf file for comment: 079 Pueblo of Jemez.pdf

#	<i>Name</i>	<i>Comment</i>
080	Suzy Kane	See attached pdf file for comment: 080 Suzy Kane.pdf
081	Edwin G. Fernandez, President - Penasco Area Communities Association	See attached pdf file for comment: 081 Fernandez_Penasco.pdf
083	Dee Homans	<p>As a long time member of the Los Alamos Study Group and resident of Santa Fe, New Mexico, I have been following the plans for the Chemistry and Metallurgy Building (CMRR) at Los Alamos National Labs for a number of years.</p> <p>The supplemental EIS process which has just begun is grossly inadequate and inappropriate given the changes to the originally approved design which have occurred; The project is different and far bigger than when originally conceived and has many more environmental impacts---Construction will increase greenhouse gas emissions, generate a huge amount of traffic, create massive quantities of waste that require disposal and involve much more acreage than initially proposed etc Only a completely new EIS could adequately address these changes.</p> <p>I am therefore requesting you to halt further investment at this time and initiate a new EIS which considers alternatives including the alternative of renouncing the goal of manufacturing more pits for new warheads.</p> <p>In my opinion, because nuclear weapons are weapons of mass destruction (they kill civilians indiscriminately and have the potential to make the earth uninhabitable) , they are immoral and dangerous, and we should not continue to contribute resources to their existence . Only then will our efforts at nuclear reduction have any credibility.</p>
084	Michael E. Wismer Los Alamos County	See attached pdf file for comment: 084 Michael Wismer_Los Alamos County.pdf