Comment No.	Comment	Response
L-56	STATEMENT OF VIRGINIA M. SWEENY P. O. Box 2269 Aiken, SC 29802	
L-56-01	I am concerned about possible side effects - that is specifically ...a spill, leak, accidental release, or explosion. I am concerned and even frightened about our close proximity to SRS. There is a definite problem with trust between the general population and government facilities, for this reason I do not feel reassured about future use of the CIF.	Please refer to Section 4.6 of the EA. The analysis concludes there are no significant risks.
L-56-02	I am concerned about a health risk assessment not being done - no matter how long it takes, not the cost. My children are the most important thing in the world to me. They are worth the time and money it would cost to determine health risks.	Please refer to Responses L-18-03, L-18-07 and Section II, F.

Comment No.	Comment	Response
L-57	<p>STATEMENT OF PETER TEPLY 31 Downing Street Columbia, SC 29209</p> <p>The proposed Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) on the proposed Consolidated Incineration Facility (CIF) at the Savannah River Site is not warranted. The data in the Environmental Assessment (EA) study that was the basis for the proposed FONSI was incomplete and misleading. The EA: (1) assumed unrealistic destruction efficiency;</p>	
L-57-01		Please refer to Section II, G.
L-57-02	(2) failed to qualify and quantify the unburned chemicals, products of incomplete combustion, and the heavy metals likely to be emitted from the proposed CIF;	Please refer to Response L-18-02, and Section II, F.
L-57-03	(3) ignored the health risks of chronic exposure to incinerator emissions;	Please refer to Response L-18-03
L-57-04	(4) down played the health and safety threats to workers; and	Please refer to L-17-05.
L-57-05	<p>(5) failed to address the accumulative effect of having a third hazardous waste incinerator in South Carolina. For these reasons, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the proposed CIF must be done. The people of South Carolina deserve no less. In addition, as a matter of policy, a facility like the CIF should never be considered without an EIS.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing that the DOE will take our health and safety seriously and order an EIS on the proposed CIF.</p>	Please refer to Section II, A and Response L-18-07.

Comment No.	Comment	Response
-------------	---------	----------

L-58 **STATEMENT OF JANE TOLLISON**
 Box 314
 Norway, SC 29113

L-58-01 I am opposed to incineration of hazardous waste including wastes such as solids (?), sludges (?) and organic and aqueous liquids (?) - including the examples (?) oils, paints, solids (?), rags (what kinds of?), clothing (what kinds of?), and floor cleaning materials (made of what?).

Please refer to Section II, C, D, F, H and Section 4.6 of the EA.

First, what ever we put into the air, water, and land cycles back to us! I don't want to breath this radioactive waste. I don't want to drink it, and I don't want to eat it. Putting it into the air, as you propose, assures us of all three.

Second, you have no research to prove the safety of what you propose.

Third, I do not want to be your guinea pig for your research into this matter.

Apparently, you people failed third grade science and the life cycle bit. Or your greed in the name of government controls you. Not me! Think, people! You are screwing it up!

Comment No.	Comment	Response
L-59	<p>STATEMENT OF TOM TURNIPSEED 1337 Assembly Street P. O. Box 11601 Columbia, SC 29211-1601</p> <p>As a former state senator who represented the Aiken and Barnwell counties and an environmental activist in South Carolina, I hereby respectfully request that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) be made regarding the proposed Consolidated Incineration Facility (CIF) at the Savannah River Site.</p>	Please refer to Section II, A.
L-59-01	<p>More than anything else, I am concerned about the accumulative effects of having another incinerator in South Carolina when we already import so much carcinogenic materials for incineration in South Carolina.</p> <p>I also respectfully request an EIS because I believe the environmental assessment done earlier this year:</p>	Please refer to Response L-18-07 response.
L-59-02	<p>1. Fails to account for potential impacts on the food chain.</p>	Please refer to Response L-18-05.
L-59-03	<p>2. Gives an inaccurate picture of day-to-day incinerator operation and monitoring.</p>	Please refer to Response L-18-06.
L-59-04	<p>3. Does not take into account the serious threat to worker health and safety.</p>	Please refer to Response L-17-05.
L-59-05	<p>4. Gives an unrealistic appraisal of destruction and removal efficiency.</p>	Please refer to Section II, G.

Comment No.	Comment	Response
L-59-06	5. Does not qualify and quantify the overwhelming majority of unburned chemicals, products of incomplete combustion and heavy metals likely to be admitted from the incinerator	Please refer to Response L-18-02.
L-59-07	6. Ignores the risk of chronic exposure to incinerator emissions. Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.	Please refer to Response L-18-03.

L-60	STATEMENT OF THE WARLEY FAMILY 103 Whetsell Reevesville, S. C. 29471	
------	--	--

L-60-01	<p>On behalf of the health and welfare of my family, I strongly object to the proposed CIF to incinerate oils, paints, solvents, etc. only approximately 50 miles from where we live in Reevesville, S. C.; This incineration will add more and more air pollution to our already overloaded bad quality air. Cement plants in Harleyville and Holly Hill already overburden our polluted air by burning hazardous waste. They are 10 -15 miles from us. South Carolina's air is terribly polluted at the present time by almost 200 different types of chemical plants.</p>	
---------	--	--

		Please refer to Response L-18-07.
--	--	-----------------------------------

The EPA TRI report shows that South Carolina is the 16th worst air polluted state in the nation with industrial only (i.e. no auto fumes included) deadly poisonous toxic chemicals in the amount of 62,613,127 lbs being released on an annual basis into S.C.'s air. According to this report, S. C. has more industrial toxic chemical releases to the air than New Jersey or Massachusetts. Also, according to this report, S. C. ranks right behind New York and California with releases of toxic chemicals to the air, and those two states have much greater areas than S. C.

The Westinghouse Electric plant and the medical waste incinerator in Hampton, S. C. also adds air pollution to the air my family breathes.

Comment No.	Comment	Response
L-60-01 (Continued)	<p>A recent study (monitoring) test by Regional EPA showed that our air was badly polluted by the ethyl petrochemical plant in Orangeburg with above normal amounts of the following toxic chemicals: Toluene, benzene, methylene chloride, and acetone.</p> <p>S.C.'s topography is similar to the basin effect in Los Angeles; we need to clean up, rather than add more air pollution with hundreds of additional autos coming on the road each week. The power plants at Canady's Cross Roads also adds pollution to our air.</p>	Please refer to Response L-18-07.

Comment No.	Comment	Response
L-61	STATEMENT OF PATRICK L. WHITWORTH 5 Guyton Street Greenville, SC 29615	
L-61-01	The statement that a hazardous waste incinerator does not pose a threat to the environment is ludicrous. Available documentation on existing hazardous waste incinerators proves quite the opposite is true. The least that should be expected of the Department of Energy is the performance of an environmental impact statement.	Please refer to Section II, A.
L-61-02	With the cold war with Russia no longer posing a threat, the need to continue the manufacture of plutonium and uranium is questionable. The present amounts of the necessary materials in storage is enough to supply present all of the nations unnecessary nuclear weapons. What little of this material that will deteriorate can be easily replaced with current stores. Therefore, the need for waste disposal methods is not as great as maybe it once was.	Please refer to Section II, B.
L-61-03	The proposed solution of encapsulating the ash materials, left after incineration, in cement is not a proven scientific solution. Cement is not leak-proof which will allow leakage and the cement will deteriorate over time, leaving us to deal with the problem again through expensive remediation. And who will pay for the remediation? The U. S. taxpayers and the citizens of South Carolina will.	Please refer to Response L-48-01.

Comment No.	Comment	Response
L-61-04	<p>Another hazardous waste incinerator in South Carolina is not what we need! The Thermal-Kem incinerator in Roebuck has continually had problems meeting the maximum emissions allowable by the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) and has been fined numerous times by SCDHEC. It would be foolish indeed to assume that the proposed incinerator for Aiken would be operated with less detrimental effects.</p>	Please refer to L-18-07.
L-61-05	<p>Incinerators have the potential to pollute the air, soil and water in a wide circle from the plant. The higher the stack on the incinerator, the further widespread the potential for pollution. I have attached a position paper on incinerators based on extensive research I gathered from numerous identified sources. If your office will take the time to peruse the paper, there can be little doubt that an Environmental Impact Statement is necessary before consideration can be given to constructing an incinerator for radioactive and other hazardous wastes.</p> <p>I am opposed to the siting of a hazardous waste incinerator at the Savannah River Site.</p>	<p>DOE has reviewed the commenter's position paper. Please refer to Section II, A</p>

Comment No. **Comment** **Response**

L-62 **STATEMENT OF MRS. THOMAS WILSON**
300 Wood Haven Dr., Apt. 2507
Hilton Head Island, SC 29928

L-62-01 The citizens of S.C. deserve a thorough
analysis of the risks and environmental impact
of constructing and operating the CIF. Please
consider this analysis very carefully for the
health of the entire state.

Please refer to Section II, A.

**DATE
FILMED**

9 / 17 / 93

END