

## DEIS Chapter 4– CTF Member Individual comments as of 5/3/2009

Page	Paragraph / Section	Status	Comment
	<b>General</b>	edited	The Analysis of Impacts appears to focus on non-radiological impacts from the proposed site activity according to the various alternatives. The analysis of exposures is discussed in Human Health and Safety and does not address the threat to the environment in general or the impacts on other species except in the context of human consumption. The analysis should include a discussion of potential environmental impacts in terms of ecological and cumulative impacts, outside of human exposure, to current and future possible uncontrolled radiological releases.
	General	New	The analysis should include economic impacts from contamination to the environment. For example, limitations on fishing that would have a detrimental economic impact on business and tourism associated with recreational fishing.
	General	New	Will radiological releases below criteria be considered and impact?
4-11	Table 4-3	√ edited	Do the traffic volume impacts in Table 4-2 mesh with shipment projections in Table 4-52 on page 4-105? If these address different analyses that should be made more clear and, if appropriate, units of analysis should be comparable.
4-12	Para 2 Line 3	√ edited	"All shipments ...assumed to be by truck" this paragraph should be clarified to reflect that the assumption of shipment by truck is for purposes of roadway impacts only.  How is this assumption carried through into the calculation of risk?
4-22	Para 2 Line 2	edited	This paragraph should be clarified, if this is in fact the case, to reflect that only non-radiological releases are being considered in this section. The document should also more clearly articulate the difference between a high risk event (we assume a radiological release) and a higher likelihood event (sedimentation). Is sedimentation the greatest risk to local surface water quality?
4-22	Para 6	√	Long term negative surface water impacts would be improved..... (mitigated and/or eliminated?)
4-23	Para 2 Line 2	√	Shouldn't the line read "implementation of the Sitewide Removal Alternative"?

4-23	Section 4.1.4.2 Para 2 line 4	√	Typo: "exposure surfaces" should read "exposed surfaces"
4-26	Section 4.1.4.4	√	This section infers that No Action would result in no impacts. While the "No Action Alternative" is not viable, wouldn't an evaluation of the long term, potentially critical impacts be more appropriate?
4-87	4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph	New	The paragraph concerning integration of groundwater and erosion models should be revised. Because no state-of-the-art model exists to integrate ground water and erosion models, the assumption that the impacts are cumulative is not necessarily a conservative approach. The analysis should examine the possibility of exponential or other impacts from the combined interaction of groundwater flow and erosion.